

University of San Diego

Digital USD

---

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

---

1990

## Diverse Voices of Leadership: Different Rhythms and Emerging Harmonies

Kathleen E. Allen EdD  
*University of San Diego*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

---

### Digital USD Citation

Allen, Kathleen E. EdD, "Diverse Voices of Leadership: Different Rhythms and Emerging Harmonies" (1990). *Dissertations*. 535.

<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/535>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact [digital@sandiego.edu](mailto:digital@sandiego.edu).

DIVERSE VOICES OF LEADERSHIP:  
DIFFERENT RHYTHMS AND EMERGING HARMONIES

by  
Kathleen E. Allen

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education  
University of San Diego

1990

Dissertation Committee  
William Foster, Ed.D., Director  
Ed Kujawa, Ph.D.  
Mary Scherr, Ph.D.

COPYRIGHT 1990

## ABSTRACT

### LEADERSHIP IN A DIFFERENT VOICE: DIFFERENT RHYTHMS AND EMERGING HARMONIES

In our current research literature leaders have been identified through traditional sampling techniques; techniques in which individuals are selected by positions, reputation, and organizational success. The background assumptions for these techniques include that of leadership as a top-down phenomenon, under the purview of CEOs and presidents. Articulated by these sampling techniques is a voice of leadership that is based within the American individualistic culture, a voice from leaders who are white, older, and men.

The purpose of this study was to explore whether there are different voices of leadership which are not presently reflected in the leadership literature. Fifteen individuals were interviewed and asked to relate their leadership life story. These individuals were selected based on diversity in gender, age, position, ethnicity, culture, race, and experience.

The author found that there are multiple voices of leadership which are not presently reflected in the current literature. These diverse voices of leadership represent a

way of thinking about leadership within socio-centered cultures and from a care perspective.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
LIST OF FIGURES . . . . .	vi
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Issue . . . . .	1
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	5
Importance of the Study. . . . .	8
Definition of Terms. . . . .	8
Summary. . . . .	10
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW . . . . .	12
Sampling Techniques. . . . .	12
Position. . . . .	12
Reputation. . . . .	14
Organizational Success. . . . .	14
In General. . . . .	15
Organizational Theory. . . . .	16
Historical Overview . . . . .	17
Emerging Concepts . . . . .	21
Power. . . . .	24
Leadership . . . . .	32
Summary. . . . .	36
CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY. . . . .	39
Qualitative Research . . . . .	39
Assumption 1: The Nature of Reality. . . . .	39
Assumption 2: The Relationship of Knower to the Known. . . . .	40
Assumption 3: Generalization . . . . .	41
Assumption 4: Causal Linkages. . . . .	42
Assumption 5: The Role of Values . . . . .	42
In Sum. . . . .	45
Sample Selection . . . . .	45
Dimensions. . . . .	45
Gender . . . . .	45
Ethnicity, Culture, and Race . . . . .	45
Diversity of Context . . . . .	45
Positional Responsibility. . . . .	46
Age. . . . .	46
Criteria and Population . . . . .	46
Data Collection. . . . .	48
Interview Questions. . . . .	49
Data Analysis. . . . .	51
Limits of the Study. . . . .	52

CHAPTER IV	DIFFERENT RHYTHMS. . . . .	55
	Susan: Invisible Leadership . . . . .	56
	Placing Susan in Her Context. . . . .	56
	On Leadership . . . . .	57
	On Relationships with People. . . . .	60
	On Vision . . . . .	61
	On Change . . . . .	61
	On Power. . . . .	63
	On Teachers . . . . .	63
	On Paradoxes. . . . .	64
	On Leadership Learnings . . . . .	64
	Rebecca: Leadership that Makes a Difference . . . . .	65
	Placing Rebecca in Her Context. . . . .	65
	On Leadership . . . . .	71
	On Relationships with People. . . . .	72
	On Vision . . . . .	75
	On Change . . . . .	76
	On Power. . . . .	76
	On Teachers . . . . .	76
	On Struggles. . . . .	77
	Anne: Leadership of Harmony . . . . .	78
	Placing Anne in Her Context . . . . .	78
	On Leadership . . . . .	83
	On Relationships with People. . . . .	84
	On Vision . . . . .	86
	On Change . . . . .	87
	On Power. . . . .	89
	On Teachers . . . . .	89
	On Paradoxes. . . . .	90
	Ellen: Leadership from a Care Perspective . . . . .	91
	Placing Ellen in Her Context. . . . .	91
	On Leadership . . . . .	94
	On Relationships with People. . . . .	97
	On Vision . . . . .	98
	On Change . . . . .	99
	On Power. . . . .	100
	On Having Fun . . . . .	101
	On Observations . . . . .	102
	Judy: Leadership of Attunement. . . . .	103
	Placing Judy in Her Context . . . . .	103
	On Leadership . . . . .	109
	On Relationships with People. . . . .	110
	On Vision . . . . .	110
	On Power. . . . .	111
	On Fun. . . . .	112
	Mary: Connected Leadership. . . . .	112
	Placing Mary in Her Context . . . . .	112
	On Leadership . . . . .	115
	On Relationships with People. . . . .	116
	On Vision . . . . .	118
	On Drive and Values . . . . .	119

On Power . . . . .	119
On Change . . . . .	120
On Teachers . . . . .	121
On Observations . . . . .	122
Gail: Leadership Is . . . . .	122
Placing Gail in Her Context . . . . .	122
On Leadership . . . . .	125
On Relationships with People. . . . .	127
On Life Themes and Values . . . . .	128
On Change and Power . . . . .	128
On Paradoxes. . . . .	129
Beth: A Leadership of Common Dreams . . . . .	130
Placing Beth in Her Context . . . . .	130
On Leadership . . . . .	135
On Relationships with People. . . . .	136
On Vision . . . . .	138
On Change . . . . .	140
On Power. . . . .	140
On Teachers . . . . .	141
John: Sovereign Leadership. . . . .	142
Placing John in His Context . . . . .	142
On Leadership . . . . .	149
On Relationships with People. . . . .	150
On Vision . . . . .	150
On Change . . . . .	151
On Power. . . . .	151
Dave: Natural Leadership. . . . .	152
Placing Dave in His Context . . . . .	152
On Leadership . . . . .	155
On Relationships with People. . . . .	157
On Vision . . . . .	157
On Power. . . . .	158
On Paradoxes and Struggles. . . . .	159
CHAPTER V EMERGING HARMONIES . . . . .	161
The Moral Dimension. . . . .	162
Relationships. . . . .	164
Focus on Process . . . . .	168
Development and Renewal. . . . .	169
Drive, Meaning and Vision. . . . .	171
Connections. . . . .	172
Power. . . . .	174
Location of Leadership . . . . .	175
Teachers . . . . .	175
Change . . . . .	176
Uniqueness of Person . . . . .	177
Leadership from a Care Perspective . . . . .	177
An Emerging Voice. . . . .	178
CHAPTER VI SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	180
Summary. . . . .	180
Discussion . . . . .	186



Implications for Practitioners . . . . .	191
Implications for Future Research . . . . .	193
Conclusion . . . . .	195
APPENDIX A. . . . .	197
Consent Form . . . . .	197
REFERENCES. . . . .	199

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Organizations: Dominant and Emergent Paradigms	22
2	Power: Dominant and Emergent Paradigms	31
3	Leadership: Dominant and Emergent Paradigms	35

CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Issue

Three years ago I sat in a room full of doctoral students who were studying the illusive phenomenon of leadership. As we read and pondered about leaders and the concept of leadership, I realized that many of these people did not see themselves as leaders. Their framework for identifying leaders seemed limited to individuals who were their bosses, Chief Executive Officers (CEOs), or political figures. The underlying theme was that leadership is practiced by someone at the top of the hierarchical ladder. With growing awareness, I realized that this framework was reinforced by all the texts and articles we were reading.

Many authors have studied leadership from a similar assumption base. When they selected their samples they drew from CEOs, past presidents, political or spiritual leaders, and managers (Barnard, 1938; Bass, 1981; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Burns, 1978; Cohen & March, 1984; Fiedler, 1967; Gibbons, 1986; Greenleaf, 1977; Hersey & Blanchard, 1977; Huff, 1985; Iacocca, 1984; Kotter, 1988; Levinson & Rosenthal, 1984; Loden, 1985; Maccoby, 1981; Nanus, 1989; Peters, 1987; Vroom & Yetton, 1973; Yukl, 1981). Whether it

was 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. These assumptions went unchallenged by most of the people in the class, not because these individuals weren't intelligent or creative, but because these assumptions fit their own beliefs about where leadership could be found.

My background experiences did not lead me to the same assumption. I had spent 18 years developing leadership in college students and watching them practice it within volunteer organizations. In my experience I saw leaders throughout the organization. I saw myself as a leader and looked for leadership at the bottom as well as the top of an organization. That was how the volunteer organizations I worked with survived. They constantly needed to identify and encourage leadership in all of their members. They also worked better if more persons acted with the sovereignty of leaders. In my experience too many leaders did not spoil the brew; instead they made it into a high performing organization (Vaill, 1986).

As I reflected on the difference between the studies of leadership and my own experience I realized that there were reasons for the different perspectives. Our leadership studies up until now have been shaped by the methodologies

that have been used in the identification of whom to study. Our past samples have been generated through three main methodologies: identifying leaders through (1) the positions they hold, (2) their reputations as leaders, and, (3) their organizations' success. Each sampling technique makes assumptions about leadership, where and how it is practiced, and who is a leader.

The first problem for any researcher of leadership is to develop a means for identifying whom to interview and observe. In other words, who are leaders? What do they look like? Where do they exist within an organization? These are difficult questions, and in the tradition of scientific research methodology these authors had to come up with a rationale that stood the test of objectivity. This generated the common sampling techniques that are presently used for the study of leadership.

In the first sampling technique leaders were identified by the position held within an organization. Organizational presidents, CEOs, and heads of political parties were interviewed (Barnard, 1938; Burns, 1978; Greenleaf, 1977; Iacocca, 1984; Kotter, 1988; Levinson & Rosenthal 1984; Loden, 1985; Maccoby, 1981). The assumption behind this sampling technique was that if a person was a president of a country, an organization, or in a position of authority, he must then be a leader. A connection therefore existed

between the concept of leadership and organizational or political position.

In the second technique people were selected by reputation (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Conger et. al., 1988; Gibbons, 1986; Huff, 1985). The assumption made in this sampling technique was that leadership was visible and that persons were leaders if others perceived them as such. The rationale was that followers could recognize a leader when they saw one through the leader's actions, position and visibility.

Leaders in the third technique were identified through ability to run successful organizations (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Iacocca, 1984; Peters, 1987; Peters and Waterman, 1982; Vaill, 1986). The assumption was that if an organization was successful than the person at the top of the organization must be a leader.

These sampling techniques are the primary methodologies we have used in our study of leaders and leadership. I believe that our methodology shapes our findings. We have generated a lot of information on leadership as practiced by individuals who are at the top of their organizations. These individuals are predominately white males, who weave together management and leadership concepts, because they are both managers and leaders.

The information these studies have generated may not be giving us a complete view of leadership, however, precisely because of the assumptions of objectivity in the sampling methods.

#### Purpose of the Study

There are problems with our current methods of studying leadership. Sampling by position creates an interactive dynamic between management goals and leadership. If the study of leadership is connected with positions of authority and power, our findings will reflect issues of task accomplishment, authority, power, and control. Leadership will be seen as a tool of management to get employees to do what is needed to produce a product or result. These studies hinder our ability to see how leadership is different from management, or how leadership could be practiced without organizational authority or power resources.

Sampling by reputation also presents problems, including a built-in cultural bias that the "leaders" selected reflect a shared cultural definition of leadership. This definition has been shaped in part by the people who are presently practicing leadership and by the belief in our culture of who qualifies as a leader, where leaders exist in an organization, and how leadership is practiced. When

individuals are asked to identify leaders, they list those persons who fit the culture's definition of leadership, and who reflect the actions of people whom they have been taught to see as leaders.

The presumption that sampling by reputation is valid is based on the notion that leadership is visible. One can not develop a reputation that he or she is a leader by practicing invisible leadership; having a reputation of being a leader has a visible quality to it. So measuring leadership by reputation includes, by definition, a cultural bias.

Selecting a leader based on successful transformation of an organization assumes a direct cause and effect between success and the leadership abilities of the head of the organization. This encourages the belief that one person can be powerful enough to control all human, environmental, and organizational variables. A disservice is then done to both individuals and organizations by assuming that one person can create and take credit for all change.

Reliance on sampling by position, by individual reputation, or by organizational success decreases the diversity in views of leadership, in part because most individuals who have been interviewed are white males; only those women and people of color who have been successful in negotiating the traditional hierarchical system are



included. Because white males are at the top of most of our organizations, their ways of leading affect our beliefs of who leads and how leadership is practiced. This creates a mutual reinforcement of a white male voice of leadership.

Because the results of these sampling techniques reflect an incomplete picture of leadership, the purpose of this study is to examine how leadership is conceptualized and practiced by individuals who reflect diversity in age, gender, and organizational position, and to report the contexts within which leadership is practiced, with respect to ethnicity, culture, race, and type of organization. Findings about leadership from the people who have not been considered leaders in the traditional sense will be compared with traditional and cutting-edge ideas about leadership, organizations, and power. The primary question to be explored is,

Are there different voices of leadership that are not presently reflected in the current leadership literature?

Other questions may be entertained within the context of this larger question; they include:

How do individuals who lead from different levels of an organization think about and practice leadership?

Do individuals who have practiced leadership in multiple contexts see leadership differently?

How does diversity in ethnicity, culture, gender, age, positional responsibility, and contextual experiences affect the perceptions and practice of leadership?

If there are different ways of seeing leadership, how do they compare with our traditional and emerging ideas of leadership?

#### The Importance of this Study

Our present study of leadership is shaped by the lens through which we look. In order to understand the leadership phenomenon more fully, and to expand our current knowledge of leadership, we must look where we have not looked before.

Both theoreticians and practitioners can use this study: Theoreticians can include the concepts presented here with traditional views to form a fuller view of leadership, and practitioners can expand their views of what leadership looks like, how it is practiced in organizations, and how it may be different when practiced by different persons.

#### Definition of Terms

Developing a single definition of leadership for the purposes of this study is difficult; there are multiple definitions that reflect the diversity of views of

Leadership being considered in this work. The definitions presented here are appropriate to leadership at the beginning of this research, but as the reader goes through the study, emerging and context-specific definitions will appear.

### Leadership

Leadership addresses the fundamental core of human life, focusing on issues of courage, vision, ethics and spirituality as they contribute to the definition of, and action toward, the common good. (Terry, 1988 p. 2)

Leadership is the courage to bring forth, and let come forth, authentic action in the commons. (Terry, 1988, p. 4)

Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes. (Rost, 1989, p. 60)

Leadership is the result of the actions of one or more individuals that elevate individuals, an organization or a society towards a higher developmental and moral level. Leadership is focused on the long-term benefit of individuals, and moves society toward a common good.

## Leadership Practices

These are the tools, processes, and strategies in which individuals engage that result in leadership. These practices may include discovering mutual agreement, connecting ideas, people, and events, and influencing one another.

## Summary

This study is a response of limited methodology issues and the resulting lack of diversity of population studied in past leadership research. The sample for this study is drawn from persons in the middle or bottom of their organizations, who have led in a variety of organizational contexts, and who represent age, gender, cultural, ethnic, and racial diversity.

An in-depth interview technique is used in which the individual's leadership life story is recorded. The interviewing technique allows the individual to choose what is relevant to that person's conceptualization, development, and practice of leadership. The collection of these stories help us to gain a diverse perspective of leadership and to understand the holistic nature of the individual especially with respect to leadership. In Chapter IV ten of these stories are presented in the form of profiles, and in Chapter V, the themes and patterns of all 15 individuals who

were interviewed are summarized. Chapter VI includes a discussion of the research findings, implications of these findings, and suggestions for future study.

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review is divided into four sections: sampling techniques that have been used in various studies of leadership, the evolution of organizational theory, the issue of power, and the evolution of leadership whose roots lie in the methodologies described.

#### Sampling Techniques

##### Position

The most common sampling technique for identifying leaders is by position: the assumption is that if one wants to find leaders then one should look for them among people who hold positions of authority (CEOs, presidents of organizations, elected politicians, and high level managers). For example Nanus (1989) interviewed 100 leaders in depth, and another 100 leaders were asked to complete questionnaires. While Nanus acknowledged that leaders exist at all levels of an organization, the leaders in his samples were "drawn from those at the very top because they are most

easily recognized and often illustrate the intended point most directly" (Nanus, 1989, p. xiii).

Levinson and Rosenthal (1984) interviewed and observed six CEOs from major corporations. In 1976, Michael Maccoby reported using questionnaires, interviews, and Roschach tests with 250 corporate managers and executives in his study of leadership and later (Maccoby, 1981) interviewed six leaders, in depth, who represented government and industry in the United States and abroad. One of the six subjects in his sample was a woman. Maccoby selected only persons who held positions of management or were elected or appointed to positions.

Kotter (1988) interviewed 20 city managers and general managers in the private and public sector. Peters (1987) developed his sample from persons who attended his workshops on creating excellence in organizations. These individuals initially included CEOs, and then people who headed mid-sized companies and plant division managers from giant firms.

Yukl (1981) based his work on research generated from "looking at behaviors of managers and other kinds of leaders" (p. 92). His definition of leadership reinforced his methodology. He defined leadership as "being in charge of other people, having authority over others, [and] being in a position of leadership or power" (p. 83).

Kouze and Posner (1987) used a wide variety of data-gathering techniques, including surveys and in-depth interviews. Their sample was drawn from middle and senior level managers in private and public sector organizations.

Burns (1978) used biographical and literary references, and case studies of political leaders to illustrate his ideas on leadership. Gardenswartz and Rowe (1987) selected their sample from women who were CEOs or vice-presidents of large corporations, entrepreneurs with \$5 million plus in revenues per year, or public elected officials.

### Reputation

The second sampling technique for identifying leaders to interview is by reputation. Gibbons (1986) generated her sample within one company and had managers nominate individuals by reputation. Bennis and Nanus (1985) used a combination of reputation and organizational success to identify 60 CEOs to interview and observe. Their sample had a median age of 56 and the individuals had an average of 22.5 years with the employing company. Their sample included six women and Afro-Americans. It is not clear if any of the Afro-Americans were women.

### Organizational Success

Another sampling technique involves interviews of



persons who are in charge of successful organizations. Probably the best example of looking at leadership from an organizational-success sampling technique is that of Peters and Waterman (1982). They studied 62 successful companies and interviewed their leaders. The results contributed to the thinking that a "strong leader is instrumental in making the company excellent" (p. 26).

### In General

Categorizing these studies as using positions, reputation, or organizational success sampling techniques is too simplistic. Actually, authors of most studies used combinations of these techniques. Some patterns in the sampling techniques are apparent, however, and much of what we know about leadership has been generated by studying individuals at or near the top of business. Rost (1989) stated "almost all leadership scholars . . . study presidents and CEOs who are male. (They are) . . . equating leadership with being on top of hierarchy in an organization and with being masculine" (p. 8). He further noted that "none of the new leadership books or articles has been able to get rid of management background assumptions underlying the leadership theories" (p. 15). The review of the sampling techniques used to study leadership supports this view.

### Organizational Theory

Our present study of leadership has occurred within the context of organizations, and from positions of power, which exist in an external environment. As external conditions change, the concepts of organizations, power and leadership evolve. For example, Terreberry (1985), discussed the concept of external environments to explain the interconnectedness between the organization and the field in which it operates. Turbulence has been added recently to such initial concepts as placid environments or disturbed-reactive environments as the rapidity of change increases. The concepts of external environments, leadership, organizational theory and power are interrelated, and can be compared with a web. If a change occurs in the context of any of these domains it creates a change in the other areas as well, so that if external environments change and create a corresponding change in organizational structures, then concepts of leadership and power also change. In order to understand the results of our leadership studies, therefore, they must be seen within the evolutionary context of our thoughts about organizations and power.

After a brief historical overview of organizational theory, ideas will be identified that are emerging in

organizational theory as a result of the concept of environmental turbulence.

### Historical Overview

Organizational theory is useful because it contains basic assumptions of how organizations work and how to identify the issues within organizations. There have been a number of theories over the years, and as our thoughts about organizations have evolved, and as the world has changed, different metaphors have been used to describe organizations.

At the turn of the century environmental change was forcing a shift from individually-driven work to organizations. The external environment was challenging, but in a different way than it is today in part, perhaps, because it didn't seem to move as fast. The scientific age, with its belief that the nature of the universe could be understood through empirical science, was in place (Harmon, 1988). There was a belief that one could predict and control nature if only one could know enough. Reductionist and positivist thinking was dominant in science (Gleick, 1987), and the universe was assumed to be like a big clock that could be understood through reducing it to its parts. Things could eventually be predicted and controlled through understanding the workings of the parts.

At this time, organizational systems of bureaucracy became more fully developed. Organizations were thought of as rational structures with goals, work roles, and technology of how to produce a product (Bolman and Deal, 1984). The focus was on how to structure organizations to get things done. An underlying assumption existed that people were rational, and that problems could be solved by analyzing how the parts of the organization fit together, and by changing the structure. The metaphor for this organizational frame was a machine that operated in routinized, efficient, reliable, and predictable ways (Morgan, 1986).

This frame had its limitations. One drawback was that the complexity and non-rational side of human behavior were not acknowledged. With the advent of the Hawthorne studies it was discovered that human motivation had an effect on productivity. This insight forced a reassessment of the rational frame of organizational theory.

The human resource or relations organizational frame evolved which emphasized the interdependence of people and organizations (Bolman & Deal 1984). In this frame, organizations were seen as existing to serve human needs as well for producing a product, and the focus was on how to develop a good fit between people's needs, skills, and values and the organization's goals and job descriptions.

People were seen as the most critical resource of an organization. Individuals motives were seen as self-actualizing, and it was assumed that if people were encouraged to grow, the organization would grow. Sometimes this concept is seen as the "feel good" approach to organizations because its initial focus was on satisfying people as a way to increase production. Organization development, contingency theory, motivation theory, and T-Groups all came out of this approach to organizations. The organization was viewed as an organism, a living system, existing in a wider environment on which it depended. (Morgan, 1986).

With the advent of the civil rights movement, labor unions, and research on power elites, another way of explaining organizations evolved. Proponents of the political frame suggested that people were motivated by self interest, not the self-actualization of the human resource frame. In the political frame of organizational theory, power, conflict, and distribution of scarce resources are the central issues in organizations (Bolman & Deal, 1984). Employees form coalitions to get what they want. Leaders develop power bases and use power and influence to control the outcomes of organizational decisions. Organization is a jungle, with survival of the fittest as a rule of interaction.

Most recently a cultural frame for understanding organizations has evolved. Rational, human resource, and political frame concepts did not always explain the reality of organizations. Even when these concepts were used in combination some things remained a mystery. The cultural frame evolved in part out of the broader awareness of different cultures because of the globalization of the world and business. The electronic age, with computers, international businesses, and advanced technologies, increased the rapidity of change. Pressed for additional ways of explaining organizations, theorists went beyond the machine, organism, and jungle metaphors and looked to how meaning was created within organizations. A cultural/symbolic frame evolved in which organizations were seen as cultural entities comprised of shared meanings made up of unconscious assumptions and values in the minds of people. These shared meanings have been found to take on a life of their own, and to be reflected in the artifacts, rituals, and symbols of the organization (Bolman & Deal, 1984; Schein, 1985). The culture helps organizational members make sense of events that happen in their life. Reality becomes a socially-constructed, abstract set of concepts that are very difficult to decipher. Leaders try to shape and reinforce culture, and spend their time in the intangible realms of creating meanings.

### Emerging Concepts

These four frames reflect the present state of organizational theory. But what's next? Out there on the cutting edge, Clark (1985), Kotter (1985, 1988), Lincoln (1985), Schwartz and Ogilvy (1979), and Weick (1985) have responded to the constant change and the increasing complexity of the external environment. Their thoughts are reflective of the changes in the scientific paradigm happening in physics and other disciplines (Ferguson, 1987; Gleick, 1987; Harmon, 1988; Kidder, 1988). They have addressed organizational theory as a process rather than a set of issues. Lincoln (1985) delineates a dominant and emergent paradigm of organizational theory. The emergent paradigm challenges our background assumptions about organizations and offers a new metaphor of the organization as a hologram instead of a machine, organism, jungle, or culture. These researchers have suggested that the paradigm shift that is occurring in the way we see organizations moves one from viewing the organization as linear to the organization as non-linear, dynamic, and turbulent. (Figure 1).

## ORGANIZATIONS

<u>Dominant Paradigm</u>	<u>Emergent Paradigm</u>
Simple/probabilistic	Complex and diverse
Hierarchy	Heterarchy
Mechanical	Holographic
Determinate	Indeterminate
Linearly Causal	Mutually Causal
Assembly	Morphogenesis
Objective	Perspective

Figure 1. Organizations : Dominant and emergent paradigms, developed by Schwartz and Ogilvy (1979).

Organizations are no longer thought to be simple by Schwartz and Ogilvy, and other authors. The notion of organizations as having increasing diversity, complexity, and interdependencies (Clark, 1985; Huff, 1985; Kotter, 1985; Morgan, 1988; Quinn, 1989; Vaill, 1989; Weick, 1985) challenges our linear way of solving problems, making decisions, developing long-range plans, and creating change.

While each author differs on how far we have moved toward this new paradigm, they all agree that we are moving. The dominant paradigm is based on the beliefs that organizations are simple, based on hierarchy (a natural order of authority), mechanical (the metaphor used is organization as a machine), determinate (predictable),



linearly causal (A leads to B), incremental in changes (as in an assembly line), and objective (a single objective truth exists). These assumptions which are embedded in the dominant paradigm, suggest that one person, at the top of an organization, can control that organization, and this belief is reinforced by the sampling techniques of position, reputation, and organizational success.

The emergent paradigm is based on different beliefs and assumptions about organizations: organizations are complex and diverse, heterarchical (with relationships based on interdependence and less on natural authority), holographic (there is a holographic relationship between the individual and the organization; the person is the organization and the organization is the person), indeterminate (unpredictable), mutually causal (actions and responses are mutually shaping, rather than of linear cause and effect), morphogenetic (change is rapid and not necessarily linear, radical change can happen), and are subject to being approached through multiple perspectives (reality is socially constructed and there is no single "truth").

If our organizations fit the emerging paradigm, it is important to note that the concepts of leadership and power and how to study them will change. For example leaders in the emergent paradigm could be found anywhere in an organization because of this paradigm's heterarchical

nature. In a heterarchical system, leadership may have to be redefined as starting with each individual and emanating outward in all directions (Oncken, 1984). Self-perception may define leadership. Because of its holographic and socially constructed nature, in the emergent paradigm, individuals who perceive themselves as leaders are leaders.

### Power

As theorists discover an emergent paradigm for organizational theory, so do the concepts of power shift. Power, which is traditionally attached to positions of authority and is used to gain control over decisions, actions, and people, would look quite different in a flatter, complex, specialized, and diverse organization. Historically power has been defined as the ability to control others (Eisler, 1987; French, 1985; Gardner, 1986; Hagberg, 1984; Korda, 1975,; Pfeffer, 1981; Steiner, 1981). While fancier definitions and equations exist for power and one's ability to use it successfully, the traditional paradigm definition of power is "control over," and the method of achieving that control is the acquisition of "might" (Eisler, 1987; Gardner, 1986). Over the centuries the form that "might" takes has changed. The assumption of "power over" is that if one is stronger (in some way) then one can get others to do one's bidding. Initially, "might"

was defined physically; in more recent years it has evolved to include accumulated resources, that is, having what others want (exchanges), having access to someone in power, or the ability to set the agenda (Brown, 1986; Pfeffer, 1981; Steiner, 1981). The methods for achieving what one wants include overt or covert power plays that can be applied either in physical or psychological ways (Burns, 1978; Maccoby, 1976; Steiner, 1981).

With these concepts of power come assumptions of the conditions within which "power over" can exist and thrive. One condition that affects the power dynamic is scarcity (French, 1985; Pfeffer, 1981; Steiner, 1981). If the amount of something can be controlled, and if this item can be made to appear attractive, then the item can be considered scarce and power will increase for the person who controls the valuable item.

The second assumption is the link of power and dependence. In order to have power over someone, dependence upon a resource is needed. Emerson (1962) stated

Thus it would appear that the power to control or influence the other resides in control over the things he values, which may range all the way from oil resources to ego support. In short, power resides implicitly in the other's dependence (p. 32).

If one can gain control over a resource, then, one can

effect its perceived value, can influence the perceived dependence on the item and can maintain or increase one's power. Control over the availability of a resource links scarcity and dependence and therefore becomes another definition of might (Pfeffer, 1981).

The concept of "power over" requires an organization that is hierarchical, simple, and has a linear cause and effect. The accumulation of power resources is facilitated as one achieves higher positions of authority in hierarchical structures. A position is assumed to provide one with the natural authority to hire, fire, or tell an employee what to do, but in the emergent paradigm, the notion of natural authority by position is being eroded by growing interdependence, complexity, specialization, and diversity, and the zone of indifference occurring within organizations (Barnard, 1938; Kotter, 1985, 1988).

Srivastva and Cooperrider (1986) stated:

. . . the erosion of faith in traditional concepts of power (is) associated with a bureaucratic system of hierarchical obedience and command, subordination and superordination. The erosion of faith is attributable to many factors: unprecedented rapid changes in technologies and communications; increasing diversity and specialization of people at work; a better-educated, professionalized work force; widespread

concern for more democratic life-styles; the desire for truly meaningful work; irreversible global interdependence; and the recognition that executives are all too human. . . (p.1).

They go on to state that if "the world in which power operates has become increasingly complex, so must our conceptions of power" (p. 2). These external environmental changes have led to the exploration of an emergent paradigm of power.

Common themes began to appear in the work of a number of authors (Block, 1987; Campbell, 1984; French, 1985; Gardner, 1986; Jamison, 1984; Pfeffer, 1981; Srivastva, 1986; Steiner, 1981). That the traditional paradigm of power is not working and that something new is needed was one of those themes. Such changes in organizations as the increase of complexity are having an effect on how power is thought of and used. As complexity increases so does specialization within the organization, and this develops interdependence within subunits which eliminate linear dependence associated with "power over."

Interdependencies create boundaries on power. For example, this story appeared in the news in 1989. The King of Sweden could not get a permanent special parking space in Oslo. The parking authority felt that it would set a precedent and everyone would want the same exception to the

rule, and refused to grant his request. The king, under the old paradigm, would seem to have more than enough power to get a parking space, but the specialization that created the parking authority placed boundaries on his power.

The boundaries of power based on specialization lead to what Kotter (1985) termed the "power gap." Kotter (1985) stated a power gap exists when "the power that comes with the job is . . . less than the power one needs to do the job well" (p. 27). He further explained that "in big and complex executive jobs, this built-in 'power gap' is quite large. Just surviving under these circumstances requires some additional clout. Performing well requires more. Leading demands still more" (p. 27). We clearly need to go beyond our existing concepts of power to solve this inherent problem of the emergent paradigm.

In the traditional paradigm of power, power is perceived as tangible and capable of being owned by an individual. Resources, coercion, rewards, positions, and access are some examples. Referent and expert power bases are the most intangible forms of power that an individual can have under the dominant paradigm (Yukl, 1981). In the new paradigm power is owned by the people of an organization or community, and is intangible in nature.

Berlew (1986) regarded power to be human energy. He believed that there needs to be a push (structure) and pull

(vision) energy within an organization to release the human energy of that system. While the leader may exercise influence over the system, the power source is the people in the system.

In order to release this energy, however, one needs to lead people out of the dependence model to one of autonomy (Block, 1987; French, 1985). The progression is to move an organization from a power over model to a power to and power with. "Power over" is linked with control, dependence, and scarcity of resources; a constant amount of power must be assumed to be within a system. This makes power relatively tangible, including the positions, objects, and resources. The acquisition of power becomes a zero-sum game, with only winner and losers. These concepts of power are embedded in the assumptions of the dominant paradigm of Schwartz and Ogilvy (1979).

The move toward autonomy starts with the concept of "power to." A concept in which power develops the capacity of individuals within an organization. The capacity "to do" something is defined and shaped by the community and the members of the organizations, and is legitimized as a valuable skill to learn by the culture in which it is embedded. Power in this case is formed through connections and networks (French, 1985).

"Power with," the sharing of power with other members of the organization, allows power resources and energy of the whole to be more than the sum of its parts. In order to feel empowered, one must be able and skillful enough to be effective, and one needs to have shared knowledge and information, and multiple heterarchical links with other members of the organization. When power is both intangible and infinite as it is in this model, it can function in the paradox of multiplying when it's given away (Block, 1987; Hagberg, 1984; Jamison, 1984). The concepts of "power to" and "power with" fit the assumptions of the emergent paradigm of Schwartz and Ogilvy (1979). Creating personal autonomy instead of dependency results in a flatter organization's effectiveness, and enhances the development of leaders on all levels, and allows for the greater organizational flexibility needed in a constantly changing world.

A diagrammatic representation of the paradigm shift of power is presented in Figure 2.



## POWER

<u>Dominant Paradigm</u>	<u>Emergent Paradigm</u>
"power over"	"power with"
power used to control	power shared
Tangible power sources	Intangible power sources
money, number of staff, office space, position or access to the decision maker (power by association)	ideas, energy, people's abilities and capacities ("power to")
Power used to win	Power used to engage people mutual shaping and legitimizing of ideas
Obvious power	Unobtrusive power
used in the presence of conflict	used in the absence of conflict

Figure 2. Power: Dominant and emergent paradigms

The emergent paradigm of power presents a direct challenge to our assumption that power and control are synonymous. In the emergent paradigm, power and influence are perceived as fluid, with an absence of control, which complements Burns's (1978) and Gardner's (1990) suggestion that leadership should provide a freedom of choice and mutuality of goals between leaders and followers. This does

not mean that there isn't influence, but there is an acknowledgement that control over people and events is impossible in an organization that is complex, heterarchical, mutually causal, multi-perspective, and indeterminate.

Leaders in the emergent power paradigm look at power in terms of influence. They use such strategies as negotiating credibility (developing trust, rapport, and respect outside of one's position), forming inclusive visions, organizing decision-making processes and norms, and empowering diverse participants (Brown, 1986). Those who lead using the emergent power paradigm work in the third dimension of power, which is characterized by overt cooperation, decision by quiescence, and power sources that are embedded in cultural myths and ideologies (Brown, 1986). The third dimension also introduces the use of unobtrusive power, that is, power used in the absence, rather than the presence of conflict (Brown, 1986).

### Leadership

A variety of leadership definitions and concepts have evolved as leadership has been influenced by history and changing times. An outgrowth of the "great man" theory, in which leadership was seen as preordained and a special domain of great men in history (Bass, 1981), was the "trait"

approach to the study of leadership, in which personality traits were related systematically with leadership effectiveness (Bass, 1981).

In the 1950s the researchers at Ohio State University began to focus on behavior, that is, on how leaders acted rather than traits. This generated studies on task and relationship leadership in the 1960's. Hersey's and Blanchard's (1969) theory of situational leadership, in which leadership is seen as the matching of different styles to different situations, and Fiedler's (1967) contingency theory were still tied to traditional paradigm assumptions, with leadership considered to be a tool for management. These themes were followed by the development of leadership as a function of position and role responsibility, with "systems" thinking playing a big part in the concept of leadership.

As issues of power were surfacing in other areas of organizational theory and the society at large, the concept of leadership as power surfaced (Bass, 1981). French and Raven (1959) identified five primary bases of power, and McClelland (1975) defined the developmental stages of power and described the human need for power. In this setting leadership is defined as the ability to make a difference, to get things done, and to use power effectively to achieve an end.

In recent years leadership's definition has expanded to include vision and cultural leadership, which, in turn, includes the creation of shared-meaning systems (Adams, 1986; Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Burns, 1978; Kotter, 1988; Nicoll, 1986). Responding to the need for vision and meaning in a constantly changing world, visionary leadership clarifies trends and identifies future directions, bringing leadership out of the tangible realm of power resources and tasks to the intangible world of seeing possibilities and shaping organizational culture. Visionary leadership and the creation of meaning, fit the assumptions underlying the cultural frame of organizational theory.

The definition of leadership now evolving goes beyond vision to social ethics (Gardner, 1990). Social ethics leadership "addresses the fundamental core of human life, focusing on issues of courage, vision, ethics and spirituality as they contribute to the definition of, and action toward, the common good" (Terry, 1988, p. 2). Social ethics leadership involves dialogue with followers, rather than dictating to them (Kinsman, 1986; Nicoll, 1986). It raises the question: "Leadership toward what?" and moves us in the direction of the common good. How can leadership enhance the human community?

It is clear that our unfolding concepts of leadership are a result of the changing contexts of organizations,

society, and power. The emerging concepts, however, reflect the assumptions of shifting paradigms in power, organizational theory and society (Figure 3).

#### LEADERSHIP

<u>Dominant Paradigm</u>	<u>Emergent Paradigm</u>
Hierarchical	Heterarchical/collective
leader and followers	leadership alongside
Tangible tasks	Intangible tasks
fragmented	holistic / connected
Management concepts	Meaning systems
organized	messy/multi-
	perspectives
analytical/objective	intuitive/connected
reductionist approach	holistic ideas
	and perspectives
linear causality	mutual shaping
compartmentalized	interdependent
Predictable causality	Dynamic flexibility
Rational (of the head)	Head and heart combined
	(emotions and spirit)
Power over	Power to & power with
Organizational goals	Purposeful direction
Individual focus	Common good

Figure 3. Leadership: Dominant and emergent paradigms.

Figure 3 reflects the beginning shift in assumptions about leadership that have appeared as a result of a changing environment. The emergent paradigm of leadership challenges some of the core assumptions of where leadership is located; this, in turn, calls into question the use of traditional sampling techniques used in leadership research. The process of discovering what leadership looks like in the emergent paradigm will involve changing the assumptions of where leadership is found and who should be studied.

#### Summary

In the review of the literature there are common themes or directions within each area as change in one area spreads change in another. Because of the interrelationship between the external environment and organizational theory, an emergent paradigm of organizational theory is evolving. The shift toward a turbulent, non-linear, dynamic environment, is creating a corresponding change in organizational theory. As organizational theorists have teased out the different assumptions of organizations, there has been a corresponding shift in the thinking about power. Organizational theory, leadership, and power all have themes of increasing complexity in our society brought about by the rapid changes that have affected the core assumptions of each discipline

(Terreberry, 1985). The old rules of organizations, power and leadership no longer work.

One effect of increasing complexity has been a move toward seeing things in the intangible realm; another is the increase in fluidness and flexibility in leadership and in organizations. The concept of control has changed in all disciplines. The degree of control that is possible, and that is desirable, has come into question. It is no longer assumed that one can control the variables of work, leadership, or people. Emergent concepts of power are responding to the change of assumptions of the world from a linear to a non-linear, dynamic, and turbulent system. Active cooperation and involvement of followers is clearly necessary for the health and success of leadership.

The concept of culture and the social construction of reality has found its way into our applications of leadership and power, and one can see how concepts from various disciplines interconnect and affect others.

The final implication of the emerging paradigm is that it creates a need for a shift in the traditional sampling techniques used to study leadership. Because leadership in a flatter organizational structure will be spread out, and complexity and diversity will be norms in any organization, concepts of leadership and leadership practice will be changing. Multiple or collective leadership may be one way

to match the heterarchical, complex, mutually-causal, and multiple-perspective elements of organizations. This research is designed to extend the literature through exploration of diverse concepts of leadership by study of different individuals, those who are in lower-level positions, and who bring to the social construct experiential diversity.



## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### Qualitative Research

The intent of this dissertation as stated in Chapter I, is to discover different or additional ideas about leadership through the use of an alternate sampling technique. The search for a new sampling technique leads one out of traditional scientific methodology and toward qualitative and literary research models, where one must draw from different assumptions about the nature of reality, the relationship of the knower to the known, the possibility of generalization, the possibility of causal linkages, and the role of values in inquiry (Guba & Lincoln, 1985; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Smith, 1989). Qualitative research provides a source of these alternative views in the five axioms on which it is based.

#### Assumption 1: The Nature of Reality

Qualitative inquiry is based, in part, on the premise that "realities are multiple, constructed and holistic" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 37). This axiom implies that there is no single tangible reality "out there" that can be

divided into its parts and studied independently of each other, thus leadership needs to be studied holistically. Leadership is not like a machine, it can not be reduced into various units. When leadership is studied through its parts, something essential is lost. The method of examination in this research is to study leadership through examining individual leadership life stories, in a holistic fashion, so that interconnections can be discerned.

The concept of multiple realities suggests that perceptions of leadership are not made up of a singular objective view. Our leadership concepts are effected by the values and experiences of the people we study. This study is designed to explore the multiple realities of leadership through interviewing several individuals whose diverse approaches are under-represented in our current studies of leadership.

#### Assumption 2: The Relationship of the Knower to the Known

The second axiom in qualitative inquiry is that the "knower and the known are interactive and inseparable" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 37), that is, the researcher and the object of inquiry can not remain independent of each other. This implies that the inquirer and the respondent can influence one another. Understanding is created through connection and participation with the "subject," rather than

through a separate objectivity (Schaefer & Fassel, 1988). The use of a human being as the instrument of inquiry is supported by this axiom, as are the uses of instinct, intuition, knowledge, and experience in the selection of respondents and in the analyzing of the data.

### Assumption 3: Generalization

The third axiom is that "only time- and context-bound working hypotheses are possible" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 37). The traditional positivist research paradigm is based on the belief that truth emerges through generalizing data, and that truth is constant. While this assumption may be possible when studying the physical sciences, it may not fit our study of human phenomena. This axiom is that truth is affected by time and context, and therefore changes over time, suggesting that there is no single truth surrounding leadership, and that our understanding of leadership will be enhanced through studying individuals whose evolving experiences and context provide them with multiple realities. An individualistic approach allows for the constantly-evolving nature of truth, especially with respect to leadership. Leadership is a human phenomenon, and is time and context bound; leadership can not be separated from its context in the organization and its time in history.

#### Assumption 4: Causal Linkages

The fourth axiom is that "all entities are in a state of mutual simultaneous shaping, so that it is impossible to distinguish causes from effects" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 37). Traditional research has been designed to delineate cause and effect, so that we can predict and control our world. Leadership has not been immune to this approach. Much of our research on leadership involves four, six, or seven key strategies, critical characteristics, or skills that leaders need to be effective (Bass, 1981; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Nanus, 1989). "Effective" is defined as accomplishing what the leader wants done. The axiom proposed here suggests that we need to study leadership from a lens of mutual simultaneous shaping (heterarchy) rather than linear cause and effect (hierarchy), supporting the interviewing of people who are not at the top of the organization, because it may be in places other than the top that we can see elements of this mutual simultaneous shaping. In our studies of CEOs and organizational presidents, the view of mutual shaping is obstructed by the nature of organizational management.

#### Assumption 5: The Role of Values

The fifth axiom is that inquiry is value bound (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In our traditional positivist paradigm

research is considered to be value free this is presumed to be assured through the use of objective methodology. The suggestion derived from this axiom, however, is that researchers cannot be neutral because they are influenced by their deep background assumptions. A researcher designs studies, and subjects respond through their unique personal backgrounds, experiences, and gender. Both the researcher and the respondent are value bound. This researcher acknowledges that all inquiry is value bound, and that our present research on leadership has been generated through a value-bound lens. This study was designed to see if the ways we conceptualize leadership would change if we studied leadership through a different set of background assumptions in the design of the study, the way the sample was selected, and the diversity of the sample.

#### In Sum

These axioms of qualitative research help tease out a new way of studying leadership. They support the concept of socially constructed reality, which creates another way of identifying leaders. Under the socially-constructed-reality principle, persons who perceive themselves as leaders, are in fact, leaders in their own eyes. This socially constructed, self-labeling is one way to broaden our sampling techniques beyond position, reputation, and

organizational success. It moves us out of the bind of only sampling people at the top of our organizations, providing openings for people from diverse backgrounds, whose experiences have shaped their perceptions of leadership, to be interviewed. And it takes the study of leadership out of the context of hierarchical organizations to multiple positions and contexts.

These propositions also suggest that we need to study leadership holistically in order to understand them. The concept of collecting individual leadership life stories came out of the need to study leadership in a holistic fashion, rather than by categories or actions. Leadership life stories are a variation of in-depth interviews, and are designed to allow the interviewee to select the life experiences related to the development of leadership. The interviewees, through their words, show the connections between themselves, their experiences, and their leadership. Understanding of the concepts of leadership emerges from the individual life stories, and from the themes and patterns that connect and differentiate them.

The study's boundary is provided by its purpose, which is to explore how diversity in the sample affects the ways individuals conceptualize leadership, leaders, and the practice of leadership.

### Sample Selection

The sampling technique was based on the axioms of qualitative research. The author also borrowed from a literary model for interviewing interesting people who appeared to reflect the purposes of the study. Individuals were sought who reflected the kind of diversity in five different dimensions, not usually seen in our past leadership studies.

#### Dimensions

Gender. The first dimension was gender. A female person was identified as representing diversity because the majority of individuals who have been interviewed in the study of leadership have been men.

Ethnicity, culture, and race. The second dimension grouped ethnic, cultural, and racial diversity because these groups have been under-represented in the study of leadership.

Diversity of context. The third dimension represented diversity of context in which the individuals practiced leadership. Context was defined as fields of work or volunteer experience. A person was identified as

representing diversity if he or she had practiced leadership in two or more different contexts, e.g., business, education, politics, state or federal government service, and non-profit and volunteer organizations.

Positional responsibility. The fourth dimension was positional responsibility. A person was identified as diverse if he or she was not at the top of their organization.

Age. The fifth dimension was age. If a person was less than 50 years old he or she was identified as having diversity on this dimension. In the Bennis and Nanus (1985) sample the medium age was 56. Most of the CEOs and presidents are 50 years or older because it takes time to achieve those positions.

#### Criteria and Population

The criteria used for an individual to be selected as a subject included reflection of diversity on at least three different dimensions. This criterion was established to insure representation of people who were "different" from the white male CEOs who have been the major part of our traditional studies. The interviewees who were selected perceived themselves as leaders. That these individuals



defined themselves as leaders was the basis for their selection, rather than, as in traditional studies, because of position in the organization or reputation. This self-definition came from the interviewee's own perceptions, feedback from others, and past leadership experiences. Ability to articulate and reflect upon their leadership actions was important and the individuals in this study, without exception, were able to do that.

The sample was drawn from around the United States, and included nine women and six men, who were identified through personal contacts and referrals. Those who were identified through personal contacts were individuals whom I had observed or worked with over the years, either in volunteer or work settings. Five of the sample reflected ethnic, racial, or cultural diversity, that is, five subjects were not Caucasian protestant Americans. Each person in the sample had practiced leadership in at least two different contextual settings, and often had done so in three or more. The range of leadership contexts included non-profit organizations, volunteer political organizations, business, state and federal government, professional organizations, community volunteer organizations, secondary and higher education, and sports teams.

Each individual in the sample practiced leadership from positions other than the top of the organization. Four of

the sample were 32 years or younger, seven were between 33 and 42, and three individuals were older than 43. Of the 15 individuals interviewed, ten were particularly interesting to this author, because they reflected diversity on more than three dimensions. These 10 leadership life stories are highlighted in Chapter IV. All of the 15 interviews are used to develop the themes and patterns that are reflected in Chapter V.

#### Data Collection

This study was exploratory and descriptive in nature and took place in the field. The data-gathering technique was to collect each person's leadership life story through an in-depth interview (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). The "human instrument" was used because of the need for sensitivity in responding to the complexities of the interview interaction (Guba & Lincoln, 1985). The author was the interviewer for all 15 leadership life stories. The interview was semi-structured, and each interview started by the interviewer asking each interviewee to share their "leadership life story." During this part of the interview the interviewer only asked clarification and probing questions. A series of follow-up questions were then asked concerning specific areas of interest, if they had not already been expressed in the interview (Borg & Gall, 1983).

At the beginning of the interview, each individual signed a consent form indicating that he or she understood the purpose of the study and the method of instrumentation, and gave consent to voluntarily be a participant in this research. All interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed. In addition interview notes, methodology notes and theory notes were kept (Gorden, 1956; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1989). Each interview was summarized and sent back to the interviewee to check for accuracy. The subject then had an opportunity to change, correct, add, or approve the essence of the content of their interviews. This served as a member check to help establish credibility and truth value in the study (Guba & Lincoln, 1985).

#### Interview Questions

1. Leadership Life Story - Please share with me your leadership life story. Think back to your first leadership experience, describe what it was like and so forth, and continue describing these experiences as they occurred up to the present. During this phase of the interview, only clarification questions and probing questions were asked.

Examples are:

- o Could you tell me more about that?

- o How does this experience relate to your leadership life story?
  - o What was this experience like?
  - o What other leadership experiences have you had?
2. The following additional questions were asked if they were not covered in the interview.
- o How did you learn leadership?
  - o Who or what were your teachers?
  - o How would you describe your leadership?
  - o How has your view of leadership evolved over time?
  - o Is your leadership different now from what it was the first time?
  - o How does change happen?
  - o Why do you lead?
  - o What drives you?
  - o What are your relationships like between leaders and others?
  - o What are the qualities of these relationships?
  - o How have people changed as a result of working with you?
  - o What does power mean to you? Is it a useful concept?
  - o Is coercion a useful concept to you?

### Data Analysis

The data were analyzed in two ways. First in an attempt to capture the essence of the individual's views, definition, and practice of leadership, a profile of each person and that person's ideas of leadership was generated. Ten of these individual profiles were elaborated upon and sent to the interviewee for a member check. These member checks resulted in 11 changes. Two individuals added the name of a person or experience which influenced his or her leadership development, two individuals corrected their ages as recorded, and the other changes included minor editing of phrases. These ten elaborated individual profiles of leadership are presented in Chapter IV.

The data analysis for this qualitative study took time to synthesize because of the quantity and diversity of information. Each interview was listened to, read and analyzed by the author. The themes and patterns were generated from two levels: first, a holistic view of the individual profiles, and second categories, themes, and patterns that cut across interviews (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1989; Spradley, 1979). This process was a little like "constructing explanations" by looking "for convergence of . . . data sources" (House, 1978, p. 37) and using introspection as a source of insight. A content analysis of key stories, words, metaphors, and repeating

ideas was done. These analyses led to a list of concepts that each individual had used to describe his or her leadership life story. The concepts were charted on newsprint, and individual comments were written underneath, creating a visual picture that helped to generate categories that were common to all interviewees, as well as to identify how each individual was different. Using these analytical skills, the information generated from the categories and cross-checking of data, the author identified common responses that emerged from the collected information (Marshall & Rossman, 1989).

Different themes and patterns, that emerged from all 15 of these interviews highlighting the similarities and differences in the individuals' leadership stories, are described in Chapter V.

Thoughts about what diverse voices of leadership bring to our study of leadership, ideas grounded in the experiences of the people interviewed for this study, (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; House, 1978; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1989) will be developed in the final chapter of this document.

#### Limits of the Study

The limits of this study are also its strengths. This study is an exploration to widen our present knowledge of

leadership. Its purpose is one of discovery rather than verification. This means that the results of the study will not be generalizable to the total population which, in the scientific paradigm, is a weakness. It is possible, however, that leadership does not fit into the scientific paradigm. The holistic nature of the leadership life stories demonstrates how leadership is interconnected with other aspects of a persons life and strengthens our understanding of leadership. Further research will be needed to clarify and extend the ideas discovered here.

The small sample size and the use of qualitative research assumptions appropriate to this study, would be weaknesses in quantitative studies. It is this author's view that the sample size and qualitative approach are open to debate in terms of their relative strength or weakness for this study. There are, however, some clear weaknesses in the use of interviews as the source of information. The data are open to misinterpretation owing to cultural differences. Appropriate interpretation is dependent on a relationship of openness and honesty between the interviewer and subject, and is highly dependent on the ability of the researcher to control for her own biases and on her ability to be resourceful and systematic in her technique (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). The interview is a very useful technique, however, for discovering complex interconnections in

phenomena and for obtaining a large data base (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). Some of the drawbacks of using interviews will be mitigated through member checks of the initial transcripts and of the synthesis of the life stories.

The biggest methodological weakness is the sampling technique used to identify whom to interview. The interviewees were selected for their diversity and interesting thoughts on leadership and because they believed themselves to be leaders. The labeling of themselves as leaders does not guarantee that others perceive them as leaders; these subjects are not at the top of their organizations, however each interviewee had received outside validation of his or her leadership from work and volunteer experiences. The credibility of the interviewees as leaders rests in the mind and instincts of the reader. Each reader who absorbs each leadership life story will decide on the credibility of these self-proclaimed leaders (Smith, 1989).

I believe that each of these weaknesses is mitigated to a great degree by the qualitative nature of the study, and by the strengths of interviews as a data-gathering technique for a qualitative review. These appear to be appropriate methods to fulfill the purpose of the study, which is to expand our knowledge of leadership.



CHAPTER 4  
DIFFERENT RHYTHMS

The summaries of leadership life stories of 10 individuals presented in this chapter are designed to give the reader a profile of each person's thoughts on leadership and how that person's own leadership has evolved. The segment about leadership that appears in each story can not be treated as separate from the individual's life and who that individual is as a person. Leadership life stories for these interviewees are completely intertwined with what they value, how they relate to people, and key life-marker events. The only way to appreciate fully their views on leadership is holistically. Each person's story and ideas about leadership form a unique reflection of his or her history, culture and experience. All aspects of the lives of the interviewees relate to and help us understand their ideas of leadership. Where possible I have attempted to capture the essence of the individual's concept of leadership in the section title.

## Susan: Invisible Leadership

### Placing Susan in Her Context

In order to understand Susan's leadership life story, one must first know something about her. Susan is 42 years old and presently working for a school system, where she works with a team of colleagues on parent involvement and school improvement. Working for a living is relatively recent for Susan. Before accepting this position, she volunteered in the community, was vice-president of the PTA, worked with the League of Women Voters, was politically active in desegregation and parent involvement issues in the school systems in her community, and reared her family.

Susan is disabled, which has shaped her life themes and the leadership issues which she has chosen. When she was a child, she received free medical care for a series of operations on her leg. Susan states, "I felt I had an obligation because of all this free medical care. I didn't think of it as being a free ride, but rather a gift, and I had to give something back." This led to the development of a strong sense of social responsibility, which Susan describes as "looking out for people who are less fortunate than I."

Because of her disability Susan was "isolated in high

school because most high school kids don't know how to deal with someone who has a disability." Feeling isolated also shaped another leadership theme. Susan has consistently been involved in issues that increase the involvement and access of persons who have traditionally been excluded.

The other life theme in her leadership is creating change. Susan is driven to make a difference and "do good," which she describes in the context of social responsibility. She is driven more by these ideals than by any personal recognition she would receive. She measures her effectiveness on the outcome of her and others' efforts. She states,

After a period of time you realize you've shaped something and may have made a difference. Most of my life I sort of go on doing things, and don't consciously think I am leading. Yet, looking back on events over my life, I've realized I've made an impact or felt very satisfied by the outcome. I put a value on the outcome and it gives me personal satisfaction.

#### On Leadership

Susan's first identifiable leadership experience happened in college in part because of the sense of isolation she experienced in high school. Since that time Susan has found that "almost every group I got involved in I

got selected for a position of leadership." The roots of Susan's sense of leadership are embedded in that first college experience. She characterizes her way of leading as "including people. . . . I never saw myself as exciting or dynamic and so if I think about why I was selected, it was probably because I had this ability to work with an enormous range of people." She was "perceived to be fair . . . [and] a boundary spanner." She made sure that jobs were divided up and that in meetings everyone had a chance to have a say.

She defines leadership as influencing and shaping events, creating change and making a difference. The process of leadership is highly complex and involves "searching for information, sharing information, and building on each others' information . . . helping to build a vision in others that you can do things differently," creating a framework that allows for others involvement, reading the environment, establishing connections, building networks, and developing people.

Susan believes that leadership does not have to be visible. She observes that "we often fail to grasp the multiplicity of players involved in a successful outcome. . . . Credit is attributed to people still there, not those that helped shape the success but are no longer there." She is persuaded that the way you get something in place which is far bigger than yourself is to do it with

others.

All these things I've done have always been done with others. That is part of the power of leadership; if you try to do it all yourself you are very limited as to what you can accomplish, whereas if you are creating with other people, and get them excited about your idea, and they . . . [choose to] carry it forward, it will be far bigger than the . . . [original] person.

So Susan thinks that leadership can be invisible. She attributes this to her experience with the League of Women Voters "where collectively we were able to do far more than anything we could do individually." Her belief in invisible leadership also is shaped by the amount of time it takes to create lasting change. In any political change process, the individual who initiated the process or moved it along at a critical time may have moved on to another issue. By the time a result is seen, therefore, many key leaders have moved on to another issue and it is the present leaders who receive the sole credit for the change. Susan sees it differently. She thinks that the effectiveness of these invisible leaders is measured by their ability to transfer their visions to others in such a way that others call them their own. Another way invisible leadership works is that the invisible leader becomes a catalyst. In this process

I see my role as bringing two people or groups

together, each of whom has a piece of the information, . . . to dispel boundaries . . . I see this group has a piece or position or opportunity, and another group has pieces, and I can bring them together and something happens, and I disappear in the process.

### On Relationships with People

Susan, as a leader and a person, works to establish and maintain mutual relationships. There is a sense of equity, respect, and collegiality in her leadership life themes and her practice of leadership. She cares about people and her decision making is tempered with the knowledge of "how decisions affect self-esteem and self-worth." This mutuality is also based in wanting "people to feel involved . . . because it was painful being excluded because of my disability."

She is convinced that leadership is the development of people through

creating a framework by which people can be developed. . . . I think I do develop people in that I am exceedingly generous in my information, and by giving that information I do develop them, because I think knowledge is power. . . . When I'm working with people we enjoy the experience. . . . [and] People keep coming back and working with me because something happened.

Susan does not use the word "followers." She explains "I have fellow travelers," not followers. "Followers are much more subservient, I don't think of members like that so I never use the word. . . . [I have] mutual relationships."

#### On Vision

Susan proposes that leadership is about building a vision within others that [they] can do things differently. Her sense of vision has a fluidness embedded both in the creation and in the sharing. Susan starts with an image that is also fluid, that is, a vision "that's not so fixed that others can't add to it through dialogue, as opposed to debate." She goes for a direction with her vision . . . "but I'm willing to take many paths to get there; I want others involved in determining the path we take." Sometimes vision is generated through empathy, through feeling and knowing what others feel. When she expresses what others feel it can result in the articulation of a vision.

#### On Change

Susan is a project coordinator among many project coordinators. She is not in charge of an office or a group of projects; she works with a team of people who are all charged with the implementation of a project. Because of this and Susan's personal experience and uniqueness, she

thinks about change as something that has a grass-roots flavor to it. For example, Susan's change is driven by issues. She does not feel bound by the organization in which she works or its structure. She makes connections and develops networks with others based on hers and their issues. She uses these relationships to create change and to do her job "with an oblivion to the organization rules. I have a way of . . . not fighting the bureaucracy but ignoring it and not giving in to its rules, without becoming belligerent. It is like Ghandi's passive resistance."

She believes that it is the "strength of my beliefs that works through people's resistance." Susan describes change as a process that spans over time. She has several propositions and beliefs that are reflected in the way she creates change. For example,

if you create with others and get them excited about an idea they will carry it forward. Collective creation is much more powerful than the individual creation of an idea. A perceived discomfort that is channeled can bring about change. [You must be] persistent with change . . . keep resurfacing the issue in multiple contexts.

And finally "If you want to change something you have to be willing to change. That is, you have to allow yourself to evolve with the issue. It's a paradox, you've changed and



haven't changed at the same time."

Change is connected to decision making. Susan sees decision making as a blend of ideas that are shaped by and with inputs. Its something that is mutually agreed upon.

#### On Power

Susan believes that power is an integral part of leadership. She defines power as the ability to do something. "Power for me is the unleashing of people's potential." She makes a distinction between power and coercion.

Power is positive but coercion is negative because it destroys human relations. . . . Power is really freeing, if we share or create power, then I think a more lasting value is going to come out. Coercion is going through the motions but the long term potential for a positive outcome is really limited.

#### On Teachers

Susan identifies the League of Women Voters and the women she worked with over her years with the League as her primary teachers of leadership. "It was fantastic, it taught me how to search for information, share information, build on each others information, and use information to influence things." The League was a model and she received

as much as she gave. It was from this experience that she learned the "difference between position of leadership and influence leadership."

She also identified some experiences in which she learned what not to do. She learned that she got upset when people were treated negatively; therefore, for her, the use of power does not extend to hurting others. She has experienced the misuse of power, and as a result she chooses not to use coercive power.

#### On Paradoxes

Susan identifies a few paradoxes of leadership. In the area of vision, she believes a leader needs to have a mental image and at the same time be fluid about that vision. She sees the creation of a vision as a process not just a product. Another paradox is that Susan's conviction that one can confront people on issues without tearing them down while doing it. So she sees conflict as a part of leadership, but not at odds with the mutual and respectful relationships she maintains.

#### On Leadership Learnings

Susan makes a series of observations on what she has learned about leadership over the years. First of all "it is difficult, [one] has to keep involving people and learn

to develop capabilities and capacity of others." She sees leadership as a "demanding role; you are concerned about how you are influencing others, and whether you are doing the right thing." Leaders need to keep "seeing implications and sensing the natural play of events." There is a waiting for things to unfold that is balanced against pre-planning. One must keep one's antenna out waiting for the next piece of information. Finally, leadership involves the building of networks, keeping people in touch and establishing connections.

Rebecca: Leadership That Makes a Difference

#### Placing Rebecca in Her Context

Rebecca is a 32 year-old who is presently working with a large non-profit organization in New York City. Within this organization, she coordinates a nationwide program on creating "A Workplace of Difference." She teaches others to appreciate and learn how to work with people from different cultures and ethnic backgrounds. Before this experience Rebecca worked in higher education. She has extensive volunteer experience in professional and community organizations.

She is shaped by her history and experience. There have been a lot of instances where the "leader role" was

given to Rebecca. Her first remembered leadership experience came when she was three or four years old. At that time she was selected "president" of a neighborhood club made up of herself and her two best friends. As Rebecca says the selection of her as president "was automatic, they and I assumed it!" Rebecca's interest in playing this role was helped by the role model her mother provided.

My mom was the president of an organization at that point, and she didn't work when I was a kid so this was the first time in my three or four years of life that she wasn't home a lot because she was going to meetings. It was explained to me she was doing something very important, she was a president. So when we formed our club, I had to be president, and I'm not really sure I understood what that meant, but it was a given that was the role I was going to play.

Rebecca's mother influenced the development of Rebecca's sense of team collaboration, social responsibility and community.

I am a child of a survivor from the period of the Holocaust, and my mom grew up in an orphanage and didn't get her parents back as a couple until she was 15, so her life was very team-oriented, as opposed to family centered. She was one of 15 girls in a

dormitory room when she was seven and eight, . . . [she] saw herself as the center of the team, trying to hold together a group of people. I think that has been the greatest influence in my life because I grew up in a home with people who had survived the war and a relative was always showing up somewhere, someone always sleeping on the couch who spoke a different language and looked a little different, and it was our job to make them feel a part of the community.

Her mother's background also shaped Rebecca's value of social responsibility, her sense of efficacy, and her drive to make a difference in this world.

That is the gift I got from my mother. She said what was most horrifying to her as a child of the Holocaust was that the world let this happen. She spent half her life [being] angry and realized the only way that was going to change was if she started to stop letting that happen.

Rebecca's family culture includes stories that reinforce this sense of community and of the importance of building those relationships based on trust.

My mother would say: you know your uncle wouldn't be the millionaire he is today if the family hadn't bound together to get him into college, and I wouldn't have the life I have to day if this relative or that friend

hadn't helped us and it is important that you build those bonds.

Rebecca also got her sense of possibilities from her mother. Being aware that her mother's life had been taken away from her, and seeing how she reclaimed and rebuilt it gave Rebecca the sense "that anything is possible but you have to trust people . . . a big part of what I am is a result of what she is." From these gifts Rebecca has shaped a way of leading that is keyed on quality relationships, team-oriented efforts, and an interest in making the world a better place.

Among the other gifts that Rebecca's mother gave Rebecca are self confidence, and understanding of the natural tie between self confidence and success.

She pointed out to me that you may have a lot of people believe in you but until you believe in yourself nothing is going to matter, and [she] gave me what I needed to develop that. Also a strong sense of conviction; her family died rather than convert . . . and that translated down to the time when I could walk. We were tied to my mother at some cause or peace rally my whole life. When there were marches for Soviet Jews, we were there with the rest of the family as soon as we could walk, and if there was a Russian family

that suddenly showed up in our city, they would be living at my mother's house, eating at our table. You had a social responsibility, that was part of your life.

Rebecca's strength as a leader comes from her core beliefs. She has a deep sense of social responsibility. She has to believe in the mission of her work in order to be effective. She makes sure that the mission of the organization in which she works matches her own values. She likes the sense of challenge and a chance to impact the world. She believes that "if something is wrong, you have to stop letting it happen. . . . It's your responsibility as part of living in this world." From her view point, the world is going to have to change if we are to survive. And as part of that awareness she has to believe that anything is possible.

Rebecca believes strongly in collaboration, community, and connectedness and that we need to value our diversity. There is a story that Rebecca tells that encompasses her approach to leadership and to life.

They say heaven and hell is the same thing, there is a big long table and there are 20 or 30 people around the table and they are hungry--really starving. In the middle of the table is this big pot of delicious smelling soup and every person has a real long spoon

and as they are dipping their spoons in and turning around to eat the soup and the spoons are so long that every time they turn around they keep hitting their faces. They never get the soup in their mouths and that is hell. In heaven it's the same table and everyone is just as hungry and the same long spoons but the difference is they are feeding each other. That is how I view change, we have to figure out if we don't feed each other nobody is going to eat. We have to support each other, and your concerns have to become my responsibility and there have to be alternatives to what doesn't work. You just can't say it doesn't work! I will never get that spoon in my mouth, but that doesn't mean I can't eat. That is the summary of my style.

Rebecca's personal history, values, and life themes are focused on the community and on issues of helping to create a better world. This is reflected in her belief that, like the people in heaven in her story, she does not need to feed herself.

She does not think it necessary that you put your name on things. She is not as driven by personal recognition as the ability to make a difference and have an impact on the world.

Another leadership-shaping event came when Rebecca



became a dean at a school in New York.

When I got the job . . . I knew they didn't want a woman for the job. . . . The school was 200 years old and I was the first female dean and non-engineer dean ever. I had a lot of opposition from the faculty also because I hadn't finished my doctorate. I had to really win them over and I started out trying to become one of the boys. My leadership style changed dramatically that year. I woke up and said they hired me, they did not hire a man, if they wanted a man they shouldn't have hired me and I'm going to stop trying to be one of the boys and just be me.

#### On Leadership

Rebecca used to think that leadership meant being in control, being informed, setting direction, having a vision, and creating a team. This initial view of leadership has evolved to creating human and physical structures that bring things together. She defines leadership success as taking the group somewhere, getting the task done, seeing growth and change, and having her presence make an impact. She also defines success as a feeling that people involved in a project experience. "People feel good about what they are doing. Progress is being made." Fun is experienced. Rebecca sees vision, controversy and challenge as natural

parts of leadership. But for Rebecca the core of leadership is a process of relationships mixed with vision. She sees herself as a translator between people and people's visions.

#### On Relationships with People

For Rebecca relationships are the key to leadership. She believes she is most effective as a leader with a team. "There does have to be respect and concern in order for me to be effective . . . we don't have to love each other" but the respect is essential. She sees this as a

female trait because I work for a man who doesn't have those problems--he doesn't care who hates him. He and his staff don't even have to be civil to one another as long as the job gets done. It doesn't work for me.

Rebecca tends to both the group and individual needs. She knows everyone in her organization very well, from the elevator operator and the receptionist, to her staff and the president of the organization. She sees people as unique individuals and understands that those individuals operate from different contexts, which means that she needs to work with each person from this perspective. The quality of Rebecca's relationships are exemplified in this story.

One of the unique things when I left . . . [a previous job] was the woman who had started . . . [the program] that I ended up running. When I left they had a good-

bye party and she came to it, and said, "You developed relationships with people on a level that I never considered." She had people who worked for her, and I had 125 friends. I knew every one of the teachers that worked for me. I had dinner with each of them at least once during the year. I sat down with them and knew their family lives, and what they really wanted to be when they grew up, and I tried to gear their courses to reflect that.

Rebecca is interested in building a community in an organization. Her "work team becomes her work community." She believes that "if you feel a part of something, you produce, enjoy, grow, and learn." Therefore leadership, for her, is making people feel a part of something.

She also works to increase the capacity of others to do things. She does this because she believes that people feel better about themselves if they are capable. She develops and empowers others by creating ways for them to participate in the decision making and visioning process. She also creates situations that allow others to direct themselves. Finally she doesn't "give people answers, but a means of obtaining answers." The process that a staff person goes through in seeking information and finding answers gives that person a sense of accomplishment and personal satisfaction. For Rebecca, this kind of empowerment of

others makes her no longer necessary. The team will take over, and she can move on to another project.

There are frustrations with people that Rebecca experiences. Rebecca does not like it when she has members of her team who want her to tell them what to do. Her interest in empowerment is so strong that dependent behavior "drives her nuts." A similar sense of frustration occurs when a member doesn't want to be part of the team. When either of these situations happen Rebecca will do everything within her ability to build a sense of autonomy in each of these persons and to teach each how to be a part of the team.

#### On Vision

From the beginning of Rebecca's leadership she was a visionary. She always pictured where she was going and identified what success looked like. Years later, when the concept of vision and leadership appeared, Rebecca realized that what she thought of as natural was not something that everyone thought about. She thinks of vision as "a creating and motivating process for people."

Rebecca usually "starts with a vision that is changeable by those I respect." She believes that leadership can't have all of the answers. So part of the visioning process involves "a mutual conversation in the

creation of a vision." A conversation might go like this:

I'm going to say this is how we can do this. My vision of the world may not be the right one but overall I want it to look something like this. If you are going to be a part of it, obviously the vision's got to be both of ours. Because I am collaborative in the way I work, you're going to help me refine my vision or maybe I'll buy into yours. The basic concept of what I'm looking for is there and this is where I want to get to and how it looks. You are going to join with me, I hope, because you believe in the underlying ideas.

#### On Change

Creating change is one of Rebecca's life themes. As long as she can remember, change has interested her. She pursues change that is in the long term interests of people. It isn't change for the short run or for the individual. Rebecca believes that if you want to change something you "go to the biggest opponent and persuade that person." She also uses strategies of building coalitions with the persuadeables, those who initially oppose a project, and of working with those few to build a sense of participation and ownership that makes everyone want to be part of the project. This kind of participation and ownership creates successful change.

### On Power

Power is a useful concept for Rebecca. For her power means

respect of those who follow you, and having some who follow you. Being in a [formal or informal] position that allows you to be directive to the point that you don't have to be. I don't feel powerful when I'm told go make this group do this. I feel powerful when I'm told, . . . go work with them. That's power for me.

Rebecca uses power to gain a listening ear for a project on which she is working. She does not consider it as fulfilling a personal want, but rather as a tool she uses to create change.

Rebecca also believes her personal power comes from the strength of her core beliefs. "What I do right now I truly in my heart believe in." This kind of heart-connected work gives Rebecca a personal power that is felt by anyone with whom she comes in contact.

### On Teachers

Rebecca identified four individuals who taught her something about leadership. The first teacher was her mother who taught her to be team oriented, the value of being a part of the community, that it is important to build

bonds with people, that anything is possible, that you have to trust people, that self-confidence was tied to success, and the value of social responsibility.

Another teacher taught her to be supportive, and that one could lead quietly and without needing to be recognized as the leader. A third person taught her how to make people think abstractly. "He pulled things out of others and directed learning that exposed us [to different experiences]." The fourth individual taught her that all experiences were opportunities that brought with them constant learnings.

### On Struggles

Rebecca has struggled with things. One was an imposter complex when she felt she was an imposter inside, even though others thought she was the real thing. She also had to work hard with balancing her ego with the needs of the team. As editor of her high school year book, she had a very competent staff whom she wanted to tell what to do and whose actions she wanted to control. She learned that her ego needs had to be balanced with the needs of others when her staff rebelled.

Another conflict is connected to the quality of her relationships. In the past she was totally accessible to everyone, but as her projects began to take her to more and

more audiences, she found the need to protect some part of herself. She believes that she needs to set a boundary, or people will take everything she can give and not leave her with anything of herself. This is a current struggle for her.

Then there is the matter of developing a vision. The difficulty arises from "having to be able to [personally] see the vision and believe in it . . . to be able to show how others fit in, and still be open to their input or their vision." Rebecca thinks that a leader needs to be able to articulate a vision and be able to tell another person how that person can connect with it. The struggle for Rebecca comes with demonstrating and articulating the necessary sense of confidence while showing an openness to others' vision and their input.

Anne: Leadership of Harmony

#### Placing Anne in Her Context

Anne is a 37 year-old Japanese-American. Presently she is a college administrator. She has had a variety of experiences in different positions within higher education as well as within volunteer organizations. She is married and has two children.

Anne has only just begun to see herself as a leader,



owing at least in part to her first "leadership" experience in junior high school when she was elected president.

In some ways that was a negative experience and played a part in me thinking I was not a leader. I decided to run for president and then all my friends decided they didn't like me. It was a real traumatic thing, deciding I didn't care because I was running against a friend. It didn't matter if I got elected by my peers, so I campaigned to the younger sixth graders and got elected. In some ways it was a valuable lesson, but who wanted to go through that again? I had kids who wouldn't walk to school with me, those junior-high tactics. In high school and college I shied away from thinking of myself as a leader. Because it was such a hard experience, I didn't want to be a leader.

This experience impacted Anne quite a bit. First she learned that part of being a leader was "having to stand alone on some things and [taking] the chance that you won't always be liked for the things you decide to do. It's not always easy and fun." The second way this experience impacted Anne was that "I [have] never again, to this day, run for an elected position. I became involved as a resident assistant in college and saw there a different kind of leadership." She did not think of herself as a leader until five years ago.

I really enjoyed being a resident assistant, being that kind of leader, one of a group. I think I knew I did a good job but I still didn't connect that meant I was a good leader. I was saying I'm good with people and can bring them together, but I wasn't thinking that meant I was a good leader.

At that time, Anne's view of leadership was still shaped by her high school experience. She thought that leaders were people "who said the Pledge of Allegiance, were good in front of groups, were entertaining speakers, made decisions, and directed people in meetings." This definition of leadership did not represent the way Anne interacted with people.

In thinking back on her career in higher education Anne says

From the very beginning . . . [I] was promoted very quickly. . . . It's taken me a long time to see myself as a leader. I felt I was a hard worker, that I cared deeply, and those were the reasons I was given more opportunities. Although I was being recognized and promoted, all [the] affirmations were there except inside of me. . . . Somewhere along the line I began to realize that whatever my style was it was working. And the way I was able to work through people, the same things I did well as a resident assistant were actually

working well for me in higher education. That could be leadership, it wasn't just a person who is very good up front, you know, tell a few jokes in the beginning of the speech, very entertaining presenter . . . or the person who directed people in a meeting and made decisions. I've always been one to work through others in that decision-making process so it was very hard for me to recognize that was leadership. When I was able to see a lot of change being impacted in the ways I worked, [that] the kind of ideas generated [were] very different from what was happening elsewhere in the university, it suddenly began to sink in that this is leadership. I was formulating a new direction, bringing together something that has never existed before. I just did it a different way, probably a more effective way. I looked at other examples of leadership and thought what was so great about them? They are making speeches and quick decisions, but there were a lot of morale problems [among their staffs]. Anne believes that her culture and gender affected her ability to perceive herself as a leader.

For so long I didn't think I was a leader because there aren't many role models. I haven't thought about it enough, but I always thought it had something to do with culture and being a woman. It has just taken me a

long time to be comfortable saying this [is] who I am and this is good. There are times I know I need to adjust my style to others to make it work, for example, a meeting with my supervisor and him asking me what I thought of something and I raised a question back to him. And some of it is reflecting the Asian art of respecting his leadership over me. Another part is the discerning woman, or the other thing is I believe I like asking questions in the process of coming up with an answer. He says you [as a leader] give the answers, you don't ask questions and so I realize in order to get his respect I need to articulate and answer directly when asked and do what may not be my style. I find myself adjusting a lot in the process. It is hard for me to say "this is my style," but I find that when you come right out and say that, they are more understanding. Later on I had a conversation with this same supervisor and shared my leadership style and hoped that he could respect that and understand it when I am raising questions. He probably needed help to see there could be another way of leading because in his frame of reference he had never known this before.

Another theme of Anne's leadership is her emphasis on developing harmony within her staff and as part of her decision-making process.

I sometimes wonder if it is a cultural thing. You read about Japanese businesses and there are a lot of closed-doors things. I don't know exactly what the dynamics are that go on in those meetings, but I know in our family it was that way. You talk about things inside the family, there has to be a certain amount of sharing that goes on internally, and I like that part of discussing things within and then representing one united force outside. You have to work long enough that your inside is in agreement with you on something and they can all buy into it.

This search for harmony is one of her leadership trade marks. She likes to "create harmonizing structures or organizations and developing people."

#### On Leadership

Anne defines leadership as the "ability to impact systems, create change, bring others along in that process, and to inspire people to seek those kinds of things." She defines success as impacting change and developing others. Her thinking about leadership has evolved from perceiving it as making quick decisions or being able to talk in front of groups to a kind of leadership that is with others, not over others. This has corresponded with a shift from seeing leadership as black and white to "present view of seeing the

gray. It's not being 'wishy-washy' . . . you bring issues together, you look at both sides."

In order to understand more fully how Anne puts these ideas into practice one must look at other aspects of Anne.

### On Relationships with People

Anne uses these words to describe her relationships.

I think of myself as a peer to them. . . . I don't set myself apart because of my position. They are all different. . . I listen to them for their personal issues as well as professional issues. . . . You need to deal with the whole person.

Anne believes in relationships based on equity. "I don't believe my ideas are better than others; we really need each other."

She works toward harmony with her staff. This entails discussing things within the staff and presenting one united force outside. Anne sees that this takes more time to make the agreement happen internally, but it creates this sense of harmony.

Sometimes my staff says that harmony is too big a desire on my part. In a western mind, harmony means no disagreement, everyone liking each other, but harmony to me is a certain tone of how we are together that is

accepting and [has] respect for each other. I don't expect people will all agree with me but I do expect a certain tone to how we operate. I think of a certain peaceful quality that I think of with harmony and it's not agreement, I don't know how to define that better. I really think there are things about my culture and background that reflect in how I operate and people need to work that through. Some have a tough time with that and can't figure out who I am.

One of Anne's challenges in thinking about leadership and relationships this way is that some people are always trying to get me to be someone else, I have a hard time with that. . . . I tried to be someone else and . . . realized I just have to be myself. . . I couldn't live up to others ideas of a leader, I was just who I am and that is the only way it will work.

These different expectations sometimes create confrontations with people with whom Anne works.

These things aren't fun to go through but when you really think about it these things are healthy. I do have staff who are willing to confront me and let me know what's not working. When that happens we work it through and there is enough that is learned and not destroyed that it is helpful. In everything that

happens, good and bad, I feel there is something to grow from it.

As a result of working with Anne, people feel more confident, more empowered, and more able to deal with ambiguity. Anne listens and cares about others and as a result they feel they are treated honestly.

Anne is open to different ways of doing things and looks for the beauty in diversity. She sees the uniqueness of each individual which is why she places so much importance on the relationships. She sees relationships as a key to leadership. Anne does not use the word followers to describe the people with whom she works.

#### On Vision

Anne believes that vision "evolves through talking with people, like asking: What do we want to accomplish? What do we want to do now? How could we do this?" And then she watches for when the person's eyes to light up. It is the light in their eyes that tells Anne that persons care about what is being talked about. Ideas for Anne's vision come in relationship to others.

In staff meetings I will raise the topics and let them go, I don't go in with a preset formula. My ideas come in relationship with other people. I don't even have



the ideas until I sit down with others. We share ideas and I come up with better suggestions as I am doing that in process, rather than at my desk and try to develop a proposal. There is all this shared allegiance to things because they really have a part in putting it together. It is very honest also because I can't come with preset notions of what I think is best. Some people who come from different styles don't always believe that, you would always have a preset notion, but I really don't. Sometimes that has made me think I'm not a very good leader, that I should have this [idea or vision] in advance. But my mind works with others in collaboration.

For Anne, it is in these kinds of discussions and interactions that mutual visions are born.

#### On Change

Anne has always been part of creating change. It is one of her life themes. She does this "by initiating personal visits with key people, lunch meetings that were informal not around specific topics but just getting to know one another." This involves sharing visions and gaining respect. While this takes time, the amount of change Anne has accomplished indicates that the value she places in relationships affects the amount of change she can impact.

On Power

Anne is not driven by power. She defines power as something she feels in combination with others.

I am not doing things for the desire for power.

Although I have found I do enjoy impacting systems, I like to see changes happen and feel I am a part of that. It doesn't have to be myself alone doing it.

Maybe not power in terms of my own power, but I like to use whatever is in me in coordination with others, to impact change which is powerful. I don't think I'm in this position, or would seek other positions because they would give me power. That wouldn't be the reason to do something. . . . There is a certain amount of power that comes with positions that is useful if you use it to induce change. But power for power's sake is not as important as the thing that gives me the greatest amount of enthusiasm, making an impact.

However she makes a distinction between that kind of power usage and coercion.

I'd rather have a person come to see something themselves than be coerced. Coercion is a very last resort. I don't know if it even works. [When you use coercion] the person goes away bitter. They haven't learned anything. They have a lot of things they can

use to blame outside of themselves, it is just real unproductive. My secretary wonders sometimes because people walk into my office and she knows there is a real confrontation and they walk out happy. It has to do with affirming what is good in a person, what their strengths are and at the same time helping them see there are weaknesses.

#### On Teachers

One of Anne's teachers of leadership was her family background. In her family she was the peacemaker between her father and siblings. This gave her the ability to handle disagreements and taught her how to look for things people have in common. In general, she had an absence of role models for the development of her way of leading; however, she was mentored by an administrator at the first institution in which she worked.

The key teacher was Jim. . . . I think he did a lot. He was the Vice President for Student Affairs when I first started. Later he has talked about noticing me as a graduate student, and then as a head resident, and deciding that I was someone he wanted to empower, which amazes me. . . . He asked if I thought it was all by chance that I ended up on those committees. I never realized he was the person behind a lot of those

things. He is someone who brings people together in the process of getting them excited in a vision he sees. . . . I think I've watched him more than anyone else and I saw how effective he could be in collaboration and relation building. [Anne's leadership style] has just slowly evolved though. . . . I think my style has evolved out of who I am as a person and then how I could use that person to be effective.

#### On Paradoxes

Anne balances between a series of paradoxes that her leadership view creates. One is the leadership/friendship paradox. This involves the resolving of the apparent contradiction of having to stand alone as a leader and not always being liked for what you do with the need to be connected with others. Anne transcends this paradox by being both despite the inherent conflict.

The second paradox comes from being emotionally driven and also mind driven. Anne uses her mind and her emotions to relate to people and issues. She finds this a paradox because the organizations in which she has practiced leadership tend to be mentally driven. Her use of her feelings creates a "both/and" rather than an "either/or" use of her mind and her emotions. The paradox comes from not

fitting into a simple "either/or" pattern for the people to whom she relates. For Anne, leadership is not one or the other, it is both mind and emotion. This "both/and" rather than "either/or" pattern extends to being in charge and maintaining a sense of mutuality in her relationships. Many individuals with whom she comes into contact have a difficult time understanding that one can be in charge and have mutual relationships at the same time. Anne says that it takes a balancing act because it's not the normal way of doing things. One way she does this is by taking people who feel separate and connecting them. "That is not a traditional way we have led in this country; we tend to operate by working with individuals to produce things but not necessarily connecting".

The final paradox is embedded in the concept of harmony that includes disagreement. For Anne this is not a paradox, but some of her staff experience confusion when their cultural up-bringing tells them that these two things shouldn't go together.

Ellen: Leadership from a Care Perspective

#### Placing Ellen in Her Context

Ellen is 38 years old, Jewish, married and has two children. Currently Ellen is a faculty member and the chair

of the business department at a college in Boston, Massachusetts. Ellen's previous experience has been in business and government service, and she is an active volunteer in her community.

One of Ellen's life themes has been involved in creating change and making an impact. This life theme was modeled early for Ellen by her mother.

There was a lot of role modeling. My mother was a take-charge person and I guess by osmosis or something I was always aware that when she saw something that needed to happen, she got involved and made it happen. . . . I remember in second grade my mother and father took on the school board . . . that was the first time I was aware you could change things. But not without a price, making friends and influencing people also made enemies.

In junior high school Ellen started getting involved and continued her leadership activities through high school. At that time she saw leadership as being in charge, which created a conflict with one of her best friends. When she was editor of the yearbook, she thought that being a leader was being in charge which meant telling people what to do.

One of my then very good friends was the editor of one section and she and I had words one day. She said, "Just quit being so bossy!" And I remember thinking, I

know you can do this job and do it well, but what if you don't? I think I had the wisdom to let her alone. I do remember that I was in conflict. . . . It had big impact, it was a golden moment of realizing there may be another way of looking at this. Twenty-two years later it still rings a bell, and I can still remember the scene, what we were wearing etc. . . . It was probably an eye-opening moment realizing if you have good people, your job is not to direct them but help them do what needs to be done in their way.

When Ellen went to college she gave up being in charge. She found her yearbook-editor experience and the conflict with her friend too disturbing. She thought that being in charge meant that you couldn't be friends as well. So she gave up being in charge.

I had always been the person in charge and had expectations placed on me, and in college for four years, I wanted to be lost in the crowd and it felt really good. Then I decided that I should become a real person and get a job, and I moved into positions where I could take charge of things. [College allowed Ellen to develop another facet of herself.] It was the social, people stuff. Developing more intimate relationships. Figuring out what my own expectations were of myself rather than everyone else's.

It was after college that Ellen finally realized that her high school idea of leadership was modeled after her mother, who saw leadership as being in charge of people and working over them. "Hers always worked in a hierarchical and bureaucratic setting and my life had never been satisfactory in bureaucratic settings."

Ellen developed a different way of leading that involves working with others, not over them. She also realized that "you don't know it all, couldn't know [it all], don't what to know it all, and that [it] is probably better [that way]." These insights have their roots in the conflict with her friend on the high school yearbook.

From her family background she also received the belief that "I have to do the right thing." This kind of moral dimension shows up in her values and the way she lives her life. Ellen gets involved with issues and people, she cares, she believes in working for the benefit of others, and for the community. She values friendships, sharing, honesty, independence, human beings, and people having a code by which they can live. These values and this moral dimension will continue to show up throughout her leadership life story.

#### On Leadership

Ellen lists the following things as outcomes of



leadership. Leadership has occurred when people "accomplish goals, people have fun, grow and learn, when people's talents and skills are used, change happens, and wrongs get righted." Ellen describes leadership more as a process of how people relate to each other than as a set definition. Her comments about leadership include: "Your job is not to direct them but to help them do what needs to be done in their way." This is a little like "leadership as facilitation, making things happen but not necessarily doing them." There is a connecting function that the leader plays. "It is connecting people with jobs. . . . Leaders don't know it all. . . . Leaders aren't in front or on top."

This kind of connecting also has a value base to it. She believes that leadership is bringing people together for mutual benefit. It is not just a user activity. . . . There is a moral core that says (using people) is wrong, you don't do that to people, but also that over the long term people want to participate and use those skills when there is a positive return, some good feeling about it.

She has learned that she is good at bringing people together who are splintered. She does this by developing some healthy respect for skills I don't have nor will ever develop because they just aren't me. How to make the most out of those people who have these

wonderful skills, and accepting that I don't have those skills. It is wonderful someone else has them, and the goal is how do you get them on your team?

Ellen believes that "leaders may not be the most visible ones [in an organization]. You can have people behind the scenes as positive influencers." Ellen discovered this when she worked for state government. "I found out those who are visible may very well be the puppets, and the movers and shakers are not necessarily in front, and they wield more influence by virtue of being invisible." She has also noticed this in volunteer organizations. ". . . They lead by doing; people watch them do, and they don't make a big deal. They lead by example, and these are the people who get the group moving in a very quiet way. In volunteer organizations they will quietly ask for help and a crowd slowly forms in that direction."

This idea that leaders may not be visible fits with another idea Ellen has about leadership. Ellen believes that the ultimate goal of leadership is to become unnecessary. She describes a couple who are jointly president of the PTA. The first year their goal was the "get the community back in the school again . . . That was a novel concept; they didn't want to run it, they wanted community involvement." The second year they decided to run again and their "goal [this time] was to become useless. To

become unnecessary. . . . There will always be a president, but that role will be perceived as bringing the community together to run itself."

This kind of leadership means that there has to be a strong element of developing people. Ellen describes it this way. "There's a concept of bringing people along. An unfolding that happens when people feel comfortable and challenged. . . . Leadership provides that environment that gets things out of people that they didn't know they had."

[Lastly Ellen observes that] organizations can run without any leadership, they just don't run well. . . . The organization can survive but the waste is just tremendous. Painful, sad, the waste of human resources, of human potential, and wasting talent, and waste of money too. . . . It's depressing. It doesn't move people in positive ways.

So for Ellen leadership is releasing the potential of the people of an organization.

#### On Relationships with People

Ellen works with people, not over them. She sees people holistically. Whatever is happening in one area of a person's life affects the other areas. It becomes a flow back and forth. A leader can not ignore that flow. Ellen describes the quality of her relationships this way. "A

personalized process operates intimately in connection with others, a mutual caring; not friendship, but caring. Recognizing that a person's personal life comes to work sometimes. Recognizing people are human." She does not group persons into theories of motivation or management, she sees each person as a unique individual. This creates complexity for her, but allows for an effectiveness that is based on mutual caring.

Ellen is very much a developer of the person. In order for her leadership to be most effective, she needs those who feel empowered and capable, so she enables persons to move toward an independence that allows them to work problems out for themselves. She lets them know how important they are, and works for the day when they don't need her any more, except on a connectedness level.

Ellen talks about seeing others' fears and emotional issues. She believes that these emotions have to be dealt with or the group will not be able to work effectively. So her relationships are both intellectual and emotional.

#### On Vision

To Ellen, vision is having a "sense of where an organization should be six or seven years from now, and finding a mutual place where we are all comfortable." She generates a vision much like she makes decisions. First she

involves people. She gives out information so people get involved in the goal. There is a criterion that she also uses. In any decision-making process, Ellen finds a way to use each person's gifts in a positive way. Another criterion is that the direction chosen has to be one of mutual benefit, not self-serving or short term.

### On Change

Ellen gets involved in creating change because ". . . it's there and because things aren't going right. When things like equity, fairness, rights, options, opportunities are being challenged or aren't there," there is a reason to become involved.

Ellen spreads her own brand of change through "getting to know people, keeping links open and connecting things." She has learned that you have to deal with a person's underlying fears of change in order to diffuse anger so collaborative discussion can be had.

Ellen has experienced many difficult change situations where a lot of suspicion, anger, fear and hatred was exhibited. She has learned that "you can change things, but not without a price." When asked what she has learned from these difficult situations she responded:

To cry in private! That anger is often a mask for fear. For me that was important to recognize, what was

coming out as anger or hatred could be a mask for insecurity and anxiety. Deal with that, and you can diffuse a lot of it. What I've seen also is positions are very nice, but they are only as good as the people who fill them, only that powerful. In an academic setting that is very clear because positions in and of themselves don't have a lot of power, unlike corporate organizations.

#### On Power

Ellen defines power as empowerment. "An empowerment process that creates a sense of independence and capacity that creates a desire to be in charge of one's life." She sees her role as a leader to "create an environment that encourages the sense of 'I can do anything.' . . . where everyone is a leader." For Ellen, power is something that is experienced by everyone in the process of getting something accomplished. This power is unleashed because everyone brings something to the process and one is in control over one's own tasks. The sense of independence and inter-dependence that is felt by everyone generates an energy that makes each person feel powerful.

Ellen does not believe in coercion or control. "Coercion only works in the short run, and never in the long run. Empowerment works only in the long run, but not in the

short run." Ellen leads and makes decisions in terms of what will be good over the long run. So she does not choose to use coercion. Controlling people also has its drawbacks. It "doesn't help you get things done, [especially] if you want them to come back for more."

Ellen thinks that this kind of long-term development and empowering orientation is gender-based.

I wonder sometimes [when] we talk about kids growing up and leaving home . . . [it] is the expectation among mothers that this will happen and it is the goal [of the mother], and it is always such a shock to fathers when it happens. The empty-nest syndrome is not a women's phenomenon at all."

#### On Having Fun

What Ellen has learned about leadership comes from other aspects of her life as well. Whether its from her family, her work or her volunteer experiences, Ellen is always drawing from one dimension of her life to help understand another. For example, Ellen coaches soccer for six-year-olds in her community. From this experience she learned

if everyone is having fun they will do anything. This is also true in organizations as well. The concept of fun changes. If you are having fun, you are on your

way. The concept of fun is "we are in this together."  
In volunteer organizations, if there isn't fun there is  
no point in doing it. [Besides] humor gets you through  
a lot of shit.

### On Observations

Ellen currently teaches management and leadership. She  
is well read in these fields. At the end of the interview  
Ellen made these observations about leadership.

One of the obvious ones is that the literature has  
ignored about 95% of the population. Of all the people  
I've seen doing a great job of leadership, very few are  
represented in any way, or their style isn't  
represented in the literature, certainly in managerial  
literature. I guess there is a lot of leadership that  
goes on in families and friends, and all kinds of  
places that no one looks at, that makes all those  
structures work. And work more effectively than most  
structures. I haven't given a lot of thought to it,  
but those softer things that happen in friends and  
family units that make them work so well could probably  
be applied to traditional organized structures to their  
benefit. I wonder how it is that families manage to  
survive and go in a common direction and that isn't  
deemed any form of leadership and [it's a form of



leadership] that tends to be [based on] mutuality, as opposed to top and bottom. And that who is the leader shifts based on times, energies, situations, and all kinds of things, and that it works. Maybe a leader for all seasons is not a useful concept.

Judy: Leadership of Attunement

Placing Judy in Her Context

Judy is 28 years old, married, with one child. She presently is working as an assistant academic advisor at a college in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Previous to this Judy was a college administrator at a college in Texas. Judy is in an assistant position presently, owing, in part, to moving to Minneapolis to get married. Judy has been active in volunteer organizations, and has been "involved in organizational stuff" since she was a child.

Judy was greatly influenced by her mother's role modeling of leadership and involvement.

I guess I was involved, and always wanting to be involved, in some activity, and I think through direction of Mom, through her directive style and her involvement in the church, of course Judy's going to have to get involved in posting bake-sale signs, of helping with the church dinners or singing in the

church choir, because that's what was expected. I think it was just sort of role modeled that you can get involved and you do your best and you make a difference.

Judy was also influenced by her father, from whom she learned about the social dynamic involved in leadership. He modeled a kind of low-key leadership which was based in relationships, empathy, motivation, negotiation, and listening. "He showed me how to work with people effectively. His leadership was listening-oriented."

Initially Judy thought leadership was being responsible for

whatever needed to happen: activities, events, making sure that the high school prom went off. And being responsible for keeping people involved or communicating to them what was going on. Sometimes the drawback, but mostly a strength for me, is that I am tuned into what was happening in the process or non-verbally with people in relationships, and as a president I could do something about that in terms of getting people involved.

Judy had some learning to do as a young leader. The first was learning that she didn't have to do everything. Judy's initial definition of leadership meant that she was responsible for doing things. She saw leadership as

answering the question "who's the sucker who's going to worry about this?" Later when the pressure of meeting everyone's expectations became too great, she "shifted to seeing leadership as more of a working through others than doing it herself."

Another shaping experience for Judy was when a friend of hers got jealous of her in high school.

I came home crying and Mom said people sometimes get jealous of what you're doing and that's peoples' way of dealing with it. They get envious of what you're working on or they get tired of seeing Judy's initiative and that was the first hard lesson I think I had to learn. Why do I have to worry about that, but I did. And to be liked was another high need, so that would really get to me if I [was] picked on when I felt I was just doing what I thought needed to be done, and I was working hard to make things better. But the interpersonal stuff got in the way sometimes.

This struggle of the need to be liked and independent so she could do what she felt was important has woven through Judy's leadership since childhood. It is only recently that this issue seems to be lessening for her.

Judy has had some significant leadership models and teachers. In addition to her mom, whom she credits with teaching her to make things better, modeled community

involvement and a directive style, she identifies two key teachers in high school who provided conditions for her to evolve as a leader. They got her involved and broadened her set of experiences. They were always asking her to do something she hadn't done before. Another teacher encouraged her and respected her.

Judy's college years were significant to her further development of leadership. One of her first key learning experiences was when she found out that the president of the programming board was not a student, and was in violation of the constitution. Judy's reaction was strongly negative. She thought his behavior was "non-professional, not ethical, not one that deserves the respect from the campus community." She realized something about herself then . . . "I guess I have to have an underlying philosophical agreement with the organization." She had become involved with the programming board

because they said program for the campus, service-oriented, members were the most important, all volunteer run, and I liked that because it was all connected [with my values]. But when you really got into the thick of it and found that some of the sleaze of campus were hanging out and were abusing the monies and the system, I just thought "do I want to be a part of this?" because I had a higher respect for myself, my

energies, and my time.

Eventually Judy became vice president and then president of the organization. She changed the tone and created ethical integrity in the organization.

It was during her two terms of president that Judy's leadership education intensified. She had three significant teachers and models in the advisor and the student development staff. She learned she could definitely make a difference. She learned and practiced the skills that would help her lead: motivating, running a meeting, retaining members, etc. Most important of all, she developed an awareness of putting theory into practice and an ability to think through situations and come up with strategies to respond to problems and challenges.

Another lesson Judy learned in college was that "just because you're elected the leader doesn't mean you are the leader," so Judy has since made a distinction between leadership and having a position of leadership.

When Judy went on to get her master's degree, she found another mentor. The supervisor of her graduate internship taught her how to do formal training, and encouraged in her the willingness to take risks. She learned by watching her, and to this day uses what she learned about planning retreats.

It was also during this time that Judy came to the realization that she needed to make a difference in those areas in which she was involved.

I see the way I can motivate others and make changes that are necessary, to make it definitely better, I can improve it. Maybe there's some ego involved too where there may be some recognition. . . . I have a hard time being normal, just being one of the players. But at the same time I need to be one of the players. [It is a paradox for me, this] need to fit in and be liked, and be comfortable with the people I'm with, but I need to be independent of that, and do what I feel is important. So that is conflicting. . . [which is why I feel] most comfortable when I've had a formal niche because that gives me the permission to take off and be independent . . . and to do what needs to be done, because I understand the philosophy and there's an underlying supportive base for that. So that if it comes back negative to me interpersonally, I can either justify it in my head or justify it with those people. Judy, then, draws part of her strength in her leadership from the members giving her legitimacy.

Judy is presently confronting this issue directly. Her present position is at the bottom of her structure, yet she

continues to try to shape the direction and quality of the organization. She is learning that "being attuned to others is as big of a liability as it ever could be when you're closer to the bottom of an organization." Judy sees a liability in the situation because it causes her to confront this issue of needing a formal niche directly. Her attunement with others creates a sense of responsibility in her from which she can not turn away . . . so she leads from the bottom of her organization.

Another struggle that Judy has had is the imposter syndrome. She has constantly been promoted before her time, and been placed in positions beyond her experience. She has had to struggle with the feeling that she "shouldn't be there."

#### On Leadership

Judy thinks that leadership creates certain outcomes: When leadership has occurred those involved gain self-respect, increase their sense of self-esteem, and see the differences they make. Individual goals and values match the organization's activities and goals. Finally there is a connection with some higher purpose. Judy sees leadership as "providing a service, developing others, helping others, having an ethical component, and having a connection to something larger within the community."

### On Relationships with People

Judy talks a lot about a social dynamic that occurs in the interaction between people. You don't have leadership if you don't have this interaction. A leader's relationships are based on equity, respect, mutuality, and an attunement to needs. A leader can not put herself on a pedestal, because she will lose something with the individuals with whom she works. The equality embedded in the relationship increases a sense of connectedness and a commitment to the mutual goals of person and organization.

Judy willingly shows her "humanness," her mistakes, and her lack of knowledge. She doesn't cover these things up, or believe that they are weaknesses; rather she feels one can use her humanness to reinforce the mutuality and equality of the relationship.

She sees relationships as fluid, always changing and evolving. There is a give-and-take and a mutual development that occurs as a result of leadership. The paradox of her relationships is that although a relationship may be one she considers to be one of equity, she sees herself as a teacher as well as a partner. Judy feels that the mutual teaching and learning role increases everyone's self-esteem and helps persons create meaning for themselves.



### On Vision

Judy defines vision as "an awareness of what is missing or what ought to be." She "plays off of others" to come up with ideas that turn into visions, and uses her attunement with others to see where things are missing. She believes that you can affect the vision of an organization from the bottom by talking to people.

This means of shaping vision from a position at the bottom of an organization fits in with her views of creating change. She believes that if you get along, earn respect, listen to people, take time to meet with others, and demonstrate that you want to work with them, then you can implement change and be successful. She develops and maintains relationships with all the key players of an organization whom her sense of attunement helps her identify. Her consistency and basic ethical orientation gain respect, and this allows her to influence the organization. Creating change from the bottom of an organization is not without its frustrations, but right now it is what Judy does.

### On Power

Judy says that the word "power" makes her nervous. To her it implies manipulation in a negative way, and has a

"using others" quality to it. In her experience, power has been used in specific situations for personal gain. She likes the word "influence," which she defines as being given by others because it is earned, and as having legitimacy because, in being given by others, influence is based on a mutual relationship.

#### On Fun

Judy sees fun as a part of leadership. She defines fun as what happens when everything is working right. When this is happening, people see the differences they make. The goals and values of the event or project match what the individuals want to be a part of, making the experience meaningful and fun!

Mary: Connected Leadership

#### Placing Mary in Her Context

Mary is 28 years old, and is working at a university as an adviser to volunteer student groups. Her many personal experiences as a volunteer include in her own professional organization serving on the board of the national branch of that organization.

The roots of Mary's leadership began in her family, and grew from the expectations, opportunities, and role models

presented there.

I am the oldest of 13 grandchildren, and was always in charge when the kids were supposed to do something. When I think about putting a 10-year old [Mary] in charge of those kids, that was a lot of responsibility. In terms of my style, I come from a very matriarchal family, the women are in charge, the men are either silent or sort of in and out. It was really natural for women, including me, to be in that role, so when I am faced with someone who doesn't think that is normal I have a very strong reaction.

From this experience she learned that it "was natural" for women to be leaders, and she has thought of herself as a leader almost from childhood. She also learned some things, as a 10-year old who was responsible for her 13 siblings and cousins, about working with people.

I was meeting people [three and four year olds]) where they were, and figuring out a motivation for getting them to do what I wanted them to do. I realize I am fairly good at that, entering into an interaction with someone, and almost having me disappear, and having the outcome be what I want but having the other person believe it was a result of what they wanted. Part of responsibility [was], my family had high expectations of me and that message was communicated, not overtly,

but covertly. They thought I was important enough to be responsible, so I better not mess this up. That is a tape that runs through my head a lot.

Mary remembers her first formal leadership experience when she achieved the highest leadership position in the high school drill team. She realized that she was more effective than the people before her and after her in getting the team organized, committed, and structured. Mary's perception was confirmed by comments from the students and many faculty.

Mary's college years were ones of exploration. She learned, as a student employee, some valuable lessons of what leadership is not. She discovered by watching individuals in leadership positions who did not set good examples, that a leader needs to understand the "big picture," to be willing to confront issues and people, and not to be self centered. Within the same organization where she observed what leadership is not, Mary found her first mentor, a woman named Deb. It was through working with Deb that Mary first realized that

two people at the bottom of an organization can have a large impact on people's lives . . . because we took time to listen to students, and they began to care more because we cared. They started to see the big picture. When Mary pursued her master's degree at a mid-western

university, she found two more mentors and learned to match theory with practice. She learned that a leader needs to have a presence and a relationship with those with whom she works.

Mary's experience during this period as a student representative on a national organization's board of directors was significant, in that it tore down her preconceived notions of persons in high places. She discovered that just because one was elected or held a position in an organization did not necessarily mean that one was a leader.

Mary's first position after she earned her master's degree was at a university in Southern California, where she realized how each organization's culture is different, and that culture shapes what a person can do. "If you don't match it, you can be in big trouble."

#### On Leadership

Mary defines leadership success as occurring when an individual takes over and functions as a leader. She thinks that leadership is a lot like teaching, and that participatory leadership leads to ownership, growth, and accomplishment. In her experience, cooperation works better than iron-fisted leadership. Mary believes that one needs both a tangible product and growth among the people in the

group. A leader needs to understand the big picture, not to be afraid of confrontation, be assertive, and to have ideas where information can be found.

### On Relationships With People

Mary develops relationships as a means of communicating with people. She believes that language and the other person's self-confidence affect the quality of the relationship. A trust needs to be built so that mutuality is created in the relationship. Mary is always trying to "move people to a level of autonomy, so that an equal and mutual relationship can occur."

Mary describes her relationships as moving through developmental phases as a person become more and more autonomous.

I see it more, not as an action of me on them but us together, figuring out what is best for the organization, the program, and the individual. So much has to do with language. . . . Hopefully you get to the point in the relationship that you can say whatever is on your mind and they will accept that [without placing more weight on the leader's words than their own].

Mary hopes a relationship develops to a stage where she can have a direct, equal conversation, and where her directness doesn't affect what the other person thinks. Mary wants the

other individual to be able to engage her in dialogue on an equal basis.

Mary makes decisions on the kind of directness she will use based on an assessment of the individual and of that person's historical context and experience. For example, Maybe it is that the last person they worked with told them what to do, so I tread more softly. If I am going to say something direct, maybe I preface it with "I'm not telling you what to do, but. . ." If you don't have any information about how the other person operates you need to figure that out; expectations, roles, etc. Until we learn that we can't operate effectively.

Mary sees this learning about each other as an evolutionary process which eventually moves persons into mutual relationships, a kind of placing a person in context that is a highly individualized process. There is plenty of room for misunderstanding and mistakes, which is why Mary is very committed to the value of feedback in relationships.

Mary bases her relationships in equity. She doesn't think of people as followers.

I don't like that word at all because it implies separation. To me leaders and members are the same people, just by chance, luck, or choice one person gets

to run the meeting or pull the ideas together. The functions are all one piece of the puzzle, and [when] I think [of the words] leaders and followers, I'm not sure I'd want to be a follower. It reminds me of a little dog. I prefer the word member.

Mary uses information as a vehicle to empowerment of others. In her experience, "people feel really disconnected if they aren't informed and stop working to their potential." Mary's relationships clearly are based on open communication.

The other theme in Mary's relationships is her interest in having a positive impact on the lives of others. This brings a teaching, developing, aspect to her leadership that is always involved in her interactions. She sees her role as having an impact on others, so that they, in turn, can have an impact on others.

#### On Vision

Mary sees the development of vision as an interactive process. She asks others what they think, and "where do we want to be?" She sees everyone as representing a different constituency or uniqueness, so each voice is valuable to the visioning process. Mary trusts in the process, and finds that ideas flow from that trust.



### On Drive and Values

Mary is driven by a lot of things. She likes recognition and positive reinforcement, but acknowledges that her need for recognition is less now than it used to be. She likes a sense of challenge in her work, and is driven by seeing herself and others achieve tangible results. Mary's leadership is driven by a need to make a difference. She wants people to question injustice and work toward racial and gender equality, peace, and peaceful methods of conflict resolution. These values reflect the kinds of things with which Mary will get involved. She likes to work in an organization that reflects these values.

### On Power

Mary defines power as "getting something by a method other than mutual voluntary agreement." She doesn't like to use this kind of power, and chooses not to use it. She sees this kind of power as limiting, and prefers to use influence.

Mary connects the use of power with control, and finds that it doesn't work in a fluid organization. She uses the trust, quality of the relationship, and common values to ensure that the organization flows together. For her, authority and control do not work, and she uses

connectedness in their place. "Authority doesn't have a lot of relevance [for me]; respect is a concept I can pull out that does have relevance."

### On Change

Mary is in the business of creating change. She thinks of change as a process.

I have to figure out first what I want the change to be, then assess where the student is. I may make the smallest suggestion, and the student may run with it and it could be done, but if it is going to be some work, I try to plant little seeds all around the organization. . . . I might make a small suggestion at a meeting, [but I] don't do a lot of that stuff in formal settings because then they think you are trying to take over. . . . [I do it a lot] in informal settings, [I] ask what they think about things. My more formal suggestions may be to immediate supervisors or subordinates and then, typically some action would result. Inaction could happen, too, and if that happened I would see if I was the only person who thought it was a good idea. If I really liked . . . [the idea] I may do it again, but twice is my limit. If . . . [the idea] began to happen I would do anything I could to foster it. . . . like growing a tree . . .

what ever path the idea takes, charting it, figuring out where it is going. Or you find out what individuals you need to target and let them know you are there for support . . . talking to . . . providing resources, etc.

### On Teachers

Mary has had some interesting teachers. She identifies her grandmother as teaching her how to lead by love, and of having the quality of "knowing what needs to be done when but being able to explain it in a way that it doesn't seem she is telling you to do it."

[Deb] was the first person I was able to look at as a professional role model and see this is what a woman having a career means. Also with Deb, some of the prices you have to pay for being a woman in the work world and the battles you have to fight. . . . [From Kathy] . . . watching her lead a complex organization and have to balance different things. The things she enjoyed and what she had to do because of her position. Learning about being conceptual, about teaching, . . . how to be a good teacher. I would say Steve [taught me how to] run a meeting without saying a word which is a valuable skill.

### On Observations

Mary leaves us with these observations which occurred during the interview.

One thing I thought of in terms of connection. Most of my role models have been women, except Steve, but my supervisors have been women and that has had a big impact on how I view leading. I mean who gets to be the "boss" [or] who gets the nameplate on the door. . . [doesn't matter to me]. It is more important that someone would come up to me and say I did a real good job. Even monetary rewards aren't as motivating to me as other things, and I think the connectedness stuff has a lot to do with that.

Gail: Leadership is:

### Placing Gail in Her Context

Gail is a combination of her history and experiences and in order to put her leadership life story into perspective one must know a little bit about her. Gail is 47 years old and presently working as a faculty member at a community college in Southern California. She has had a wide variety of experiences, including being a nun in the Maryknoll order, being actively involved in political change

both locally and internationally, being a college administrator, and holding union leadership positions.

She was born and reared in New York City, and the first time she identified herself as a leader was in first grade at the age of five. She remembers the first day of school when she and her neighbor Joey both had to walk across some big streets to get to the grade school eight blocks away. Her mother told her to hold Joey's hand when they crossed the streets.

I remember seeing Joey petrified of leaving his mother. . . . I was going down the steps and seeing the fear on Joey's face . . . my immediate reaction was to say, "Joey, we can start holding hands now!!!" I remember walking up the block having my fingers squished, and Joey and I went through eight years of grade school with him holding my hand, literally. . . . He was never a bother, I was security for him and I didn't think of myself as security but he always felt that sense of trust. It wasn't demeaning, it was the two of us and we were going to get through 42nd Street alive. Looking back, that was the beginning.

From this experience Gail learned that leadership is "outreaching to someone's ideas of feelings, outreaching to enable them to come forth."

Gail's childhood playground was another base for her views on leadership. She was always drawn toward a team effort, and her "leadership style began in learning how to collaborate. . . . Learning to play in unison." In collaboration, Gail learned to speak her mind, to take risks in creating new ways of playing, and not to blame others if it didn't work. Gail also grew up in a place where a strong sense of community existed. This experience has stuck with Gail and one of her leadership themes is "having an interest beyond yourself--in the pursuit of the common good."

Gail entered the Maryknoll Order when she was 18 years of age. From this experience she learned about the rest of the world. While in the Order, she was educated, and she traveled and spent time in Africa and other cultures. Her multi-cultural experiences taught Gail the importance of culture. Maryknoll also reinforced drives that are at the base of Gail's leadership. Gail is driven to make a contribution to the world. She sees leadership and her life as one and this includes "having a spiritual dimension--a calling," which brings a sense of integrity to her work. Her experience in the Maryknoll Order also reinforced her values of truth and justice. She sees part of her leadership as "having a passion and a sense of responsibility for ethical leadership."

After Gail left the Maryknoll Order, she participated in T-Groups with Carl Rogers, was married, divorced, and adopted a child from Central America. The roots of her leadership remain embedded in all her life experiences, which she continues to embrace with gusto.

### On Leadership

In the interview Gail would often stop in the middle of a story and say "I think leadership is . . ." The story was a context in which her views about and practice of leadership came to life. Here is the list of her "leadership is" statements.

Leadership is:

- o    outreaching to someone's ideas of feelings,  
      outreaching to enable them to come forth
- o    about ways of creating--these ways of creating  
      mark a leader
- o    remembering whom you're working with--remembering  
      what people's contributions can be--you don't  
      forget a person's strength
- o    knowing when you're not going to get your way and  
      that it doesn't mean you can't do what you feel  
      most creative about--you have to think of other  
      ways to satisfy this need
- o    the ability to understand when you need guidance

- o recognizing the equality (of others), the sense of self-worth, and other people's worth
- o projecting what others are feeling
- o taking that risk
- o sharing information
- o the ability to focus
- o sharing ideas and saying "are you going to come with me?"
- o a calling with a spiritual dimension, a sense of integrity
- o the ability to see the reality beyond the reality
- o mobile, it can be anywhere
- o taking a stance
- o empowering others

Gail's concepts of leadership involve a focus on process. Her big picture is making a contribution to the world that is based on her values of social justice and a building toward a common good. She also blends leadership practice and its outcome with herself as a person. There are no clear lines between who she is as a person and who she is as a leader. To her, leadership is a way of interacting with the world.

Gail defines leadership success on a process and a product level. Success occurs when "people are having fun, enjoying themselves, (while) they are making a difference in



a collaborative way." For Gail the leadership, change, and decision making processes are fun!

#### On Relationships with People

Gail's relationships with people starts with "knowing how interdependent we all are." This sense of interdependence forms the basis of her collaborative relationship with others where "we all share the joy of winning and the fear of losing." She sees leadership as "a team effort where each person can say if something is bothering him or her." The process of establishing this sense of voice in people "embeds each person with his or her own conscience."

Gail avoids stereotyping others. She sees each person as unique. She develops a memory of each person, which is constantly added to and revised, and which is "interwoven in context. Knowing who you are, where you come from, and where you're going." The process Gail uses to develop this sense of memory of others comes from sharing and self-disclosure; "self-disclosure is important in forming memory and trust in relationships." Gail sees each individual as having a special culture and feels it's her job to understand that culture and share her own in return.

Empowerment which Gail defines as "exploring what's

already inside you, trusting what you know," is a major theme in Gail's relationships with others. Empowerment involves asking the question "What do you want to do?" and comes, in part, from "associating with people who are empowered, and [it] needs a sense of hope as well"

#### On Life Themes and Values

Gail's sense of personal integrity, which is at the core of her leadership, is embedded in her values and the life themes. Gail has always been involved in community-oriented, life-giving, collaborative efforts. She perceives herself as a feminist, and works to create and shape organizations built on equality, with people making contributions. She believes that elitism is negative because it sets one apart from others. This is why Gail's leadership seems to be done from within a team, not above it.

Gail values things like "patience, a sense of humor, non-game players, truth, and justice." She continues to probe; she is a life-long learner. She respects all life and other persons' beliefs.

#### On Change and Power

For Gail creating change and power are connected. She sees change happening as a result of a shift in attitudes of people that happens when people work together in a creative

and collaborative way. This working-together interaction generates learning, and the process of learning is a key to the empowerment process.

Power is defined as "the ability to mold and create and make decisions. [It is] the ability [for each person] to say 'yes' and 'no' . . . the ability to have choices." This sense of personal power gives one the "ability not to let yourself be abused." So power, to Gail, is the calling forth of the power of others so that they can realize that power in themselves.

#### On Paradoxes

One of Gail's paradoxes is that as a leader, one has to stand her ground, and this creates a feeling of separateness, which goes against her sense of connectedness. The paradox is in the apparent incompatibility of being separate and connected at the same time.

Another paradox involves collaboration, that is the process of articulating and working out differences, which involves conflict, fun, knowing people, and agreeing. The paradox for Gail is in the perception that collaboration is inefficient. In her experience "collaboration takes more time but is more effective in the long run."

## Beth: A Leadership of Common Dreams

### Placing Beth in Her Context

Beth is 46 years old, she is married and has one child. Presently she is the director of a department at a university in Nebraska. Before coming to the university, Beth taught speech and theater and was recognized as the outstanding teacher in Nebraska. Beth is actively involved in her community, and has been the Chair of the Board of Directors of her professional organization.

Beth was reared on a farm and is the eldest of six children. This background helped form one of the core beliefs that has shaped Beth's leadership. The agricultural community "is one that takes responsibility for each other and helps one another. You helped your neighbors and watched out for each other." This and other experiences gave Beth a connected focus to her leadership.

Beth's initial leadership experience started in childhood.

My memories are probably somewhat assisted by what my mother has told me, and she says I've always been a leader, ever since I was old enough to interact with people. As the oldest of six children, I remember organizing them to play games, and on Friday nights we

would go to the movie theatre in our little town, and the next day I would organize my brothers and sisters to act out plays based on the movies. I think that was my first experience with leadership, with my siblings. . . . My mother tells me my [elementary] teachers would always remark that I was a leader.

Beth's first significant leadership experience

was as a sophomore or junior in high school (a small school!), and our pep club was a big thing. . . . And I remember I was astounded to think they would nominate me, an underclassman, as President for the biggest organization in our school.

Beth's instincts were to involve others rather than do things herself. She remembers "figuring out it was fun to get other people to participate in ordering concessions, and liked organizing the systems to get concessions sold at games." Beth realized she liked creating the systems for involvement. This has stuck with her for the rest of her life, and is a trade mark of her leadership. When she taught high school theatre, she designed a system of involvement that got 94 students in the production out of a total school population of 97. This is an example of her gift in this area.

Beth believes she learned this ability to involve others from watching her mother.

I suspect where I saw leadership modeled my whole life has been with my mother. She was, is, a strong community leader and probably very much the same mode, very participative. She was always going off to some club meeting, and I remember the dining room table as always full of things to mail or deliver or for others to pick up. She had us out selling 'Buddy Poppies' when we were five years old; doing good deeds for the community. She probably modeled it for me.

Beth had an on-going conflict between the need for affiliation and the need for responsibility. This started in high school when Beth wanted to be "Miss Popularity" but got elected student council president. She began to sense at that time that being Miss Popularity was not her claim to fame. "I was other things, anything that was just being picked on popularity; that wasn't what I was supposed to be. I was doing the organizing and seeing the bigger picture and that's what I had to do instead."

Her term as president of the high school student council triggered another learning experience, the enhancing of her sense of integrity and the moral dimension of her leadership.

One time some of my friends went to a basketball game and they had done some minimal vandalism and the principal called me into the office and said we have a

problem with two girls who did this vandalism and we need to respond to it. I was not especially excited about doing that, but realized we had to. . . . I remember that I was in a conflict, because those girls were my friends and . . . I knew that I had a responsibility in my role as student council president in this organization called a school, and a couple of my friends had screwed up so something had to be done to uphold . . . the integrity of our school. I felt a responsibility to the school. . . and I [learned this from] my parents, [the] wonderful teachers; [they were] great role models who instilled a lot of social responsibility [in me].

A replay of this issue happened to Beth in college when she was elected President of her sorority.

I tell people to this day that this is when I learned to be a leader most . . . when I developed confidence in my abilities. We had a lot of conflicts in the house at the time when we were to select our representative for the Greek "Big Snob and Old Grouch" competition. Usually the president was elected. A conflict arose, and I was going to have to deal with it, and I knew that if I dealt with it they were not going to pick me as the representative. [This was my] first big ethical dilemma. I thought I could just

[ignore] this conflict, but of course I didn't. Because I couldn't. I could not, I had some kind of a moral dimension in me that said you know this is right. I just knew it, and it wasn't like I was this goody-two-shoes person who followed every rule, but I knew it was the right thing to do and I had to do it. The girls were angry, and I wasn't the Big Snob representative, and now I laugh about it, but then the tension was very clear, I had to do what was best for the organization and deal with this conflict. [The] women in the house did not do what they said they would and we had to or our organization wouldn't work. We dealt with the conflict and worked through it; the sun still came up, but the fact that I'm telling you about it now shows it still was a big deal. If a fairy had come along to give me three wishes, I think I would have said I want to be the most popular person in my school and I want to have the highest grades in my school. Instead I ended up probably being the best leader but I didn't know how important that was. And then the recognition started.

Another theme that runs through Beth's leadership life story has to do with expectations. Beth has been affected by others' expectations of her. A key example of how others' belief in her affected her self-perception as a



leader occurred in college.

I was always surprised people would choose me. Tom [Beth's husband] and I have had some conversations about the whole confidence issue, for me it is a very delicate thing. It seems like I should be incredibly confident but yet I'm not always at all. But all these people in college felt I was capable of being a leader and I think I knew I was a leader for sure.

Her family, a variety of teachers, fellow students, and colleagues have all, at one time or another propelled her into a leadership opportunity or into learning by expecting her to do the "right thing," or because they assumed she could do it. This theme is something that Beth now follows with the people with whom she works. She expects people will get involved, she expects people to voice their opinions and in fact she demands that they talk, and she expects people to learn and grow.

The theme of connection also comes up again and again. Beth believes her work is connected to something larger than the day to day tasks. "In our . . . office we have a clear vision of what our responsibilities are to ourselves and students and not just to the university, but to the world." She believes that one can co-create a future. What she and her staff do in their office is connected to the world.

### On Leadership

Beth defines leadership as "creating conditions for shared vision and empowerment in order to achieve success that a group has defined, which includes factoring in success factors from outside as well. . . . The group takes responsibility for defining success and the leader facilitates all of that." She also believes that leadership has to be ethical, connected, and responsible to the world.

Beth knows leadership has occurred when others are actively involved, and goals are achieved through others. Beth sees success as a critical element to the development of people. When a person achieves a goal that person feels good, learns and grows. This is a trade mark of Beth's leadership. There is also a bigger-picture element in a leadership outcome. This involves an unfolding process of constantly seeing how things connect to where you are going and what's important.

### On Relationships with People

Beth has figured a way out of the perceived conflict embedded in her needs for affiliation and for responsibility. Her skills of helping a group to create a common dream, one to be achieved by a collective effort of all members, empowers individuals so much that a deep,

mutual caring results in her relationships with others. This caring is developed through an energy that is released in a climate of shared responsibility, accountability, fun, and learning, is ignited by the common dream, and is fueled by the mutual respect that is developed by the collaborative effort.

Beth has some core values about people which play out in her relationships. She believes that we are all involved in our destiny. That we can do important things when we work together. Everyone's opinions count and are demanded. I expect and need people to be involved. And if you're just open, you can create marvelous things you hadn't even thought of. Beth models her beliefs and her expectations, and she has an amazing ability to bring these qualities out in others.

Despite Beth's obvious success, she is frustrated with people who consider themselves to be victims, but who have no basis for that evaluation, and who avoid taking responsibility for their actions. She distinguishes those who assume this attitude from persons who truly have been victimized; for these individuals she has great sympathy.

I always have felt, in this last phase of my life at least, a pretty strong sense of personal power. I almost become angry with people who perceive themselves as victims and I have great empathy for individuals who

have been victimized. Sometimes I've staff who are in this victim mode and I become very impatient, so I think my sense of personal power is important and goes back through my whole life, you have a responsibility to do what you can do. I am very optimistic . . . that things turn out . . . because talented and committed people tend to make things happen. That is a personal philosophy of mine, and without it I would have been out of my job a long time ago. The individual on my staff that doesn't share those core values doesn't stay around very long. I think about the people I've had to fire and usually it was because of the conflict of values. It wasn't because they didn't have the skills or abilities but rather there was a really big gap in what we thought was important. One person manipulated students and another thought he should be in a higher position than everyone else in the organization and he just didn't stay.

#### On Vision

Beth uses the concept of common dreams as her word for visions. These common dreams create meaning for the people involved and are created by those persons together. She tells a story of one of these common dreams that was formed between a group of high school students and herself when

they were all involved in putting on a play.

I had this gang of students and we were going to do these productions and there was going to be this big hand that would come out of the lights with a big stamp that would say "amateur." And it would stamp "amateur" if we weren't being professional. So the dream was professional excellence; it was, we are going to be the best damn production they've ever seen, and these kids did not know they could do this stuff. Most people in theatre would do a production with 12 kids in it; I would pour over plays and choose one that was real good that had a cast of 50. We'd work and I'd panic about all these kids but pretty soon we're all using the same words. Everyone knew the goal was to be the best, and when it was all over the students were astounded because they didn't know they could do what they did. I don't know that I knew it either, but over the years I think I can see potential in people very well. I think I help it to develop a lot. That is how that common dream came along, and a lot of times it had to do with personal growth and development.

Beth uses the word "we" a lot when talking about this dream-making process. Concepts are important when making dreams come true, Beth explains; concepts create the ideas and images that help people to dream and keep the dream in

their minds. As the dream is created and unfolds, a group memory comes into being; it is made up of meanings, and of connections to some bigger dimension (for example, the personal development of those involved), and is embedded in the common language that is developed and used during the accomplishment of the dream.

### On Change

Beth has a strong underlying belief that change can happen, and empowering others with that belief is a key to her approach to change. "She sits down with her staff or whoever, and they create a picture, together, of where 'we' want to go." Once this is finished, this same group then figures out how to get there. This process is exciting and fun, and things change.

Beth is a realist as well. When she looks at changing she looks at her span of control, and then builds change within that span.

I believe that you deal with your own span of control. I don't worry about the whole university . . . nearly as much as my young staff does, because I have a little world I can control pretty well. We're going to make a lot of impact. We do make a lot of impact.

### On Power

To Beth power is useful both in the sense of personal power and as a tool for empowering others. Empowering means "helping me, or me helping others, or others helping each other, to be able to create a destiny, and to know that." Power is like a hum. It is the energy that is released and felt when a group is making something happen.

### On Teachers

Beth's teachers, some of whom have already been mentioned, included her mother and many others over the years. Beth recognized her years at college as being significant to her leadership life story. "That was the most significant four-years period in my entire life with respect to (learning about) leadership." She would also include as teachers a group of about a dozen colleagues with whom she has worked over the years.

Beth goes on to say that the truly significant people from whom she has learned are women.

I think I believe in the different voice of women's experiences, [and] reality and I'm not sure why. I don't think it is gender-bound, but rather more socialized in terms of women's experiences. Or, it may be my own sense of the importance of women's movement and feminism, may mean I've selected individuals like Susan, Sandy, Mary and others, as my significant

others. For me, the friendships are tied into those key content areas of my life [such as learning about leadership].

John: Sovereign Leadership

### Placing John in His Context

John is 45 years old, married, and has one child. He presently works as a faculty member and an administrator of a service area at a university in St. Louis, Missouri. Previously John has been in various administrative positions at this institution, and been a faculty member at other universities. He serves on several boards of directors, and is very active in his community and in various volunteer organizations.

John was born and reared in the South in a small town in the fifties, in a black family. As a child he spent quite a lot of time with his grandparents.

Something I've learned as an old person is background is really a question of how you use it, because it is a part of what you are and, it is your approach to them that's more important. There are some very contradictory parts to [my up bringing]. One, in a black family, as a child you are to be seen and not heard. On the other hand, children are cherished.



They're treasures . . . it is part of the culture of that farming community that children are valued. They are not only your legacy, but they will carry on whatever it is you've developed. On the other hand, my grandparents adored us, they raised us as you would expect grandparents to. . . . When my mother set dinner she would put us at a different table, when my grandmother set dinner if there was an extra guest they would have to go to the other table. So those were contradictory things within my family.

His father is still a minister in a very orthodox church, "and it's the one which my grand uncle brought to the state of Alabama." As a child of the minister, John was very active in the church. He taught Sunday School when he was 12 years old.

Also our whole life was involved in the church where the children were very crucial parts of that, Sunday School, youth programs, etcetera. But you had no say in what actually was going on in the church. The other part is that as children of the pastor of the church, our behavior was scrutinized by rather keen eyes, so you had to try not to behave as if you were 8, 9, or 10, even though you were, you had to behave as if you were 40.

These early experiences created situations in which

expectations were placed on John by the whole community. "The kids looked up to you and there were things you felt you had to make sure came off."

John's first definition of leadership was influenced by this background. His initial view of leadership was that leaders were

adult, both male and female, because the women in the black Southern communities played an enormously important role and it was quite different from other communities. . . . [Leadership was practiced] in an institution like a school . . . or the church. Those were the only institutions I was familiar with as a black person; others did not exist . . . social clubs, and so on. Being raised in the fifties, there were two very distinctive communities one was black and one was white. . . . My images would be persons who were not necessarily elected or appointed or held clearly visible offices, and positions which other people were responsible to. In my view the pastor of a church, principal of a school. . . [with] the notion that you were called upon to do certain things which is somewhat different . . . [than] leadership by position.

These were the traditional ways John defined leadership. His godmother, however, presented a different view of leadership, one which has shaped John's view into

what it is today.

The only place there was an exception was my godmother. She was from Atlanta, and a very active woman. She had a sense of community leadership. . . . The term civic leader of today would apply to her. She was into everything. It was quite unusual as a black woman.

The godmother became a teacher of leadership to John because when John was around 12 or 13 years old he started accompanying her to meetings. She gave John a different perspective and he responded to her. "I've found my own view of the world has been gravely determined by interaction with key people. I respond more in learning to an individual than any other way one can learn something."

She showed John something very special which today he describes as a sense of sovereignty.

She personally could be a force, separate and distinct from schools [and] churches. Her own will and resources could make a difference. And that there were other ways to get things done outside of fixed institutions. . . . She opened up a whole sense of seeing things. And also a sense . . . which I . . . [call] sovereignty. I think all individuals who want to be successful have to have a sense of sovereignty over something. It is not necessary that . . . [they] be . . . granted this by some higher force, but rather

an internal sense that I am responsible, I have all the resources necessary to do this, and I can call on others to help me, and others are obligated to help me. I wouldn't have put it that clearly 30 years ago, but I remember one day there was a problem with an open sewer near where kids played. People were concerned about it. I told her about it and she picked up the phone and called the president of the bank and said "I'll get him to help me." That was startling to me. . . . This sense that I can do this, I'm responsible for doing this and others will help me because they agree with me. All I need to do is get to them and they will help me. That sense of sovereignty I've come to understand is probably more important in looking at leadership outside of leadership by position.

John's godmother also modeled a sense of social responsibility to the community. If John saw something wrong, or some injustice being done, he was responsible to do something about it. John was astounded by the way she took action and the corresponding feeling that it built in him. "This sense of 'this is mine to try and work on' and 'I shouldn't just let it pass.' She expected herself not to do that." The attitude John describes as his sense of sovereignty is something that is part of John to this day. It is a hallmark of his leadership that he builds this same

sense in others with whom he comes in contact.

Here today if there is something within the institution or community that needs to be done, I don't think I can just look to others to do it. If you are going to invest your own time and own energies . . . you [must] not let it pass.

John's sense of sovereignty is comprised both as a feeling of personal responsibility and a sense of right to call on everyone else. If you feel this sovereignty, "everyone in the institution reports to you" on this issue.

John went to an all-black college in Atlanta when he was 16 years old. It was during the time when Martin Luther King moved to Atlanta. In his sophomore year, John was asked to be a dorm adviser for a

freshmen dorm of 300 guys, all black, and at a very heady time, 1962, in their lives and the life of Atlanta and of the country. . . . At the end of my first week, I got a knock on the door. When I opened it there was a 20-gallon drum of water leaning against my door. They were told they "had" to do this to the dorm advisor. We had a number of riots. . . . They were pillow and food, water, and books and other instrument fights that got out of hand, and turned into fights with fists and bottles. Working with these men was a very interesting experience.

John learned some very valuable lessons about leadership in that position that have influenced him to this day.

If you are going to work with people, you cannot assume control. . . . That experience taught me you are never really in charge. I had the authority to throw them out of the dormitory, throw them out of school if necessary, call the campus guards, but when you're dealing with 18 year olds, it is all very unhelpful. Your authority and power are meaningless because if you use it you lose it and if you tell them, they will use it against you, and they will get you!!! Their repertoire of what they can do to you is much broader than yours, because they have no limits, and you think that you do.

John's challenge was how to work with the dorm members and help them get a sense of what's appropriate in terms of a community. John began to get to know each member of the dormitory, face to face, in his environment.

I got to know every one of them very well, and I didn't have to deal with the riots after that. [One of the things I learned was] working with people is a key aspect of leadership. Also, when they came to me, whatever I was doing I stopped. One of the things I learned about people working is that if they are

reluctant to come to you, and it doesn't make any difference who you are, they are more reluctant if you are in a position of authority, but they are reluctant even if you are their peer. There is something about the inertia of leaving oneself and trying to communicate with another person that has to be overcome, and once that inertia is overcome, if the other person is not receptive, then the inertia is increased. But I just made myself available, when I studied, my door was always open, and I found you build up a certain bonding with individuals. Those were the two things I learned.

To this day John makes relationships that last years with the people where he works, and he still drops whatever he is doing when a student comes to see him. So the leadership lessons of the value of personal relationships and of the power of inertia still are with him.

#### On Leadership

John's definition of leadership is "working with others to make the community beautiful, which in some ways, are small changes within the routine. It also includes people who would see the routine change and permit those changes." He sees leadership success as a feeling that one gets, a sense of exuberance of having "pulled this off as you

originally saw it." Another definition of leadership success is when someone else takes on your goals as his or her own.

#### On Relationships with People

John's relationships are a key aspect of his leadership. They are based on mutuality and equality. The outcome of his leadership is to build this sense of sovereignty in others so they can have the efficacy to accomplish things. He also creates a sense of community that is an extension of his relationships with people. He sees a community as a relationship between a person and the place or institution, and as involved with the need to care for a place, to care enough to want to do something for it. Working for a community is one of the life themes that drives John. He contributes to issues that include children, education, and neighborhood. He works in the community, and outside because an individual is a citizen of the community and it is important to contribute to the community. It's fun, you get to know different people, and you can re-create a community that cares and is connected.

#### On Vision

Vision is a concept, a framework that makes things clear. It helps you connect things and to make sense of



them. Caring for the vision creates a common cause and a sense of energy within individuals, that makes the vision worth getting up out of bed in the morning.

John says that he would rather participate in the writing of a script than go in with a script already written. So his vision-making is a little like a conversation where people come together and write scripts.

### On Change

For change to occur, one must care for an organization, understand the organization's culture, and develop a sense of common cause about the change. Change is embedded in the sense of sovereignty a person has, that whatever one sees as important, one will not let it pass. Change is aligned between your values and the institution's mission.

Change can be as small as putting something into the routine that's not there, or taking something that is routine out and replacing it. Sometimes change is like opening up a different facet of a structure, to make it more open.

John creates change by establishing relationships, and by building respectability and credibility. You don't manipulate. You create a shared sense of what we want to do together.

### On Power

John has a negative connotation of the word power. When John considers power, he thinks about it in the context of two people talking. In this context, power hinders the conversation because the words of the more powerful person take on a valence that makes shared meaning and mutual script writing difficult.

John thinks that every environment has a currency that is valued by everyone. This currency can be knowledge, resources, caring, or anything else that is valued by the culture of the organization. John believes that you can use that currency to overcome an inertia that keeps an individual from interacting with others. To him this environmental currency is a form of power.

Dave: Natural Leadership

### Placing Dave in His Context

Dave is 42 years old, he's married and has two children. He presently is working as an administrator in charge of a department at a university outside of Boston, Massachusetts. Dave has worked at a variety of colleges in the Northeast and the Midwest. In addition, he is active in sports and has volunteered in community and professional

organizations.

Dave did not begin to consider himself as a leader until he was a summer camp counselor between his freshman and sophomore years of college. He thinks that this was the first time he noticed that people began to respond to his influence and decision making. He was influenced at that time by a man named Greg, whom Dave saw as a natural leader. Greg became Dave's role model of what leadership was.

He was head counselor and had a very interesting style, and I think had a lasting influence on me. He is a tremendous leader, but it didn't rest on his position. If he had to, he would enforce something because he was the head counselor, but he was more followed by us all because his style was almost 100% natural leadership. He really brought out the best in people, and had a lot of fun doing what he did. He didn't create a distance between those he supervised; he had ultimate attention and respect. He was a great guy, and people would do anything they could for him.

This kind of leadership model made a lasting impact on Dave. Today he describes his leadership as based in relationships with people. He thinks of his leadership as being natural which he demonstrates through his consistency and personal integrity. He doesn't think of himself as separate from the people with whom he works. He thinks of

his relationships and his leadership as having a family or team orientation.

I never really think of myself as being an authority over but rather the team player that people look to, the quarterback who has the authority, but exercises that authority in a very team [or] family approach.

Being interested in each others' lives, not just in the work place but outside, I think that is reflective of what I learned from . . . [Greg].

Dave believes that he didn't come of age as a leader earlier because his high school experience was different from that of most people.

It was hard for me to develop in the normal ways. I moved to a new high school that my father had become principal of, and as his son among people who didn't know me, it wasn't a natural environment for me to expand and take on normal relationships.

Dave's father's position, and Dave's newness in the high school did not help Dave establish the sets of relationships with people which later became trademarks of his leadership. He felt he needed time to establish a track record.

Dave's father influenced his leadership in several ways. He watched his father lead through his position. Dave's father was unpopular with the student body, yet was

respected. Dave learned to value persistence as he watched his father set a course and stay on it, despite unpopularity. It was in this family background that Dave also learned the values of being of service to society. He believes that one must contribute somehow to society, and to other humans, through teaching or service.

A critical leadership-shaping event happened when Dave was employed as an assistant director at a school in the Midwest. His director did not involve people in decisions that affected them, and was judgmental in his words and actions. Dave learned the importance of involving people in decisions, and that a "judgmental attitude neutralizes respect from others." The experience affected Dave's approach to diversity. Because Dave respects and appreciates differences, he actively seeks out for employment persons who are diverse, and he creates structures that encourage, support, and allow for individualism.

When he became a director of a department at another Midwest university, it became apparent to Dave that he "led people for a job." He wasn't just a manager; he shifted to thinking that his job was the long-term leadership of people and the program.

#### On Leadership

Dave initially thought leadership had a "doing" function, but that has given way to thinking of leadership as a contemplative resource, in which one knows enough to stay out of the way of effective and empowered persons. Leadership Dave proposes, involves having a philosophy of the program, and knowing what it's about, why it is important, and how it connects with something larger. He keeps his philosophy in focus through a "series of discussions that seep into people's unconscious." Leadership provides opportunities for people to learn and become personally empowered. And there are teaching, support, and involvement components in the relationship between leaders and others.

Dave associates leadership with having an impact on other persons or the organization in which he works. It is essential to Dave that impact is seen. He doesn't need to have his name attached to the impact, but he does need to see how his involvement helped to make a difference. He also sees fun as an element of success. In Dave's mind, fun is a way to know if the relationships are working in an organization.

Dave is a strong believer in role-modeling leadership in order to teach it to others. He sees himself in the business of teaching leadership to the students and staff with whom he comes into contact, so his view of natural

leadership based on personal integrity fits right in with his commitment to role modeling.

#### On Relationships with People

Dave uses the family metaphor to describe the relationship he has with his staff or others with whom he works. This means that "they care about each other and take time to know what's going in each other's lives." He has an individual relationship and understanding with each person, and sees each person as unique. There is a sense of mutual respect that is generated in the "family" relationships; it is based on qualities of humanness, support, and non-judgmental attitude.

Growth and development is a theme of Dave's leadership. He models continual growth himself, and he expects and encourages it in others. There is an element of challenge that is matched by support that exists in all of his relationships. This goes both ways. His staff challenges Dave as Dave challenges his staff.

Dave sees staff meetings as family discussions around a dinner table. Everyone comes together to participate in the decisions. Disagreement and challenge are open, and each person is open to the experiences of being challenged and of disagreeing with others.

### On Vision

Dave defines vision as seeing possibilities. He also equates it with having a philosophy of where you are going and why. He creates this sense of organizational vision, a mutual shaping to the visioning process, through continuous conversations he has with individuals and with his staff as a whole.

### On Power

Dave sees power as a dynamic that is played out between persons. For example:

Power is when you have something other people want, or what you have available to you can change other people's lives. In higher education, power is very important and also susceptible to misuse; faculty are very powerful and don't even know it. They don't understand the power dynamic between them and students. Their grades are so important to a student that [they] will almost do anything for a good grade, they will either cheat, or be susceptible to the manipulation from the professor because of that power dynamic. It can also be a useful tool.

Dave distinguishes between the use and misuse of power. For him, power is like a loaded gun that stays in a locked



drawer; it is not stored on top of his desk. It is not used very much, because of the damage that misusing power can do. And when he does use power, Dave tries to protect against its misuse. "It's not done in public, usually within the confines of my office and that exercise of power . . . [is] done quietly, and I hope wisely and professionally, and within the framework of how we work with each other."

#### On Paradoxes and Struggles

Dave's form of leadership allows and encourages individualism because it leads to a dynamic empowerment. This means that Dave's leadership, decisions, and ideas will be challenged by members on his staff. Dave is not immune to feeling defensive or concerned that the freedom he provides for his staff might cause them to lose track of his authority; however, he sees the challenging or testing as a sign of the empowerment of the people he works with. He thinks

that the best people in our line of work are challengers, so if you want to be happy with a bunch of people who wait to be told things the safe way, you may be happy in one way but you'll pay the price somewhere else. . . . Believe me, I have trouble occasionally . . . [with feeling defensive but] even if I had a problem with it I'd probably hide it, because it

actually has gained some respect for me from my staff. It tends to create in them a very dynamic empowerment that we all can gain from.

Dave manages to turn his defensiveness around, and to balance it with the positive contributions that individual assertiveness and challenge give to his staff members, his organization, and himself.

CHAPTER 5  
EMERGING HARMONIES

The individual leadership life stories of the ten interviewees presented in Chapter IV showed some of the different rhythms of their views on leadership. In this chapter, the common themes and patterns reflected in all 15 interviews will be teased out, identified and analyzed as common variables that cut across the leadership life stories.

Those who were interviewed saw their ideas of leadership as based in themselves and their own development. They viewed themselves as leaders and as individuals in a holistic way. It is clear from these interviews that leadership is reflected in the person and the person is reflected in his or her leadership.

None of the leaders interviewed used the word "followers" to describe the people they led. When asked why not, many stated that the word "followers" meant that someone was subservient or below them. These interviewees saw leadership as something they do with others, not over others. Therefore in these discussions, I have chosen not

to use the word "followers" in describing themes and patterns. Instead I use euphemisms like "people with whom they work" or "others."

#### The Moral Dimension

In past studies, effectiveness has often been used as a primary criterion of leadership. Gardner (1990) stated that a criterion beyond effectiveness is needed to identify leadership. "Ultimately we judge our leaders in a framework of values" (Gardner, 1990, p. 67). He defined morality as "the standards by which a community judges the rightness or wrongness of conduct in all fields. Our attitudes toward genocide, rape and torture are elements of our morality" (p. 76).

All the individuals who have been profiled had a moral dimension to their leadership. They were driven by core values that had been shaped in their history, experience and the contexts in which they lived, worked and led. There are common themes to these persons' moral dimension. They are: a respect for life and individuals; a concern for the development of a sense of community; a feeling of connection to something larger than self-interest or organizational interest; a view toward the long term, rather than the short term; an interest in making a difference or an impact so that our society or community or world will be a better

place for humankind; a drive to develop those around them, to release their human potential to become autonomous individuals who share in the leadership and development of others, and a value of being connected with others in mutual relationships and not of placing themselves as leaders above or over others in the practice of leadership.

A variety of words and phrases were used to describe this sense of social responsibility they all feel. Some examples are: "to make a difference," "a responsibility for ethical leadership," "to do the right thing," "to not let a wrong pass," "to contribute to the community, [to] teach, [and] serve," "to have an interest beyond yourself, in pursuit of the common good."

The moral dimension of these individuals created the foundation of the way they led others. Their values affected the relationships they built with people, the direction of their leadership, their need for collaboration, connection, and caring, how and what they went about changing, and how they used power.

The placements of the interviewees in the organizations in which they worked and volunteered suggest that persons who serve at the bottom and in the middle of organizations, and who have this kind of moral dimension and drive to make an impact, can lead organizations, and people within organizations, from any position.

The leaders who are profiled here reflected the kind of social-ethic leadership that was reported by Burns (1978), and is beginning to appear in the literature as the focus on ethics increases in importance (Gardner, 1990; Nanus, 1990; Terry, 1988).

### Relationships

The interviewees saw relationships as a key to their leadership. They did not talk about power, resources, authority, or position with the same intensity that current leadership research suggests as necessary for creating change or being a leader. The interviewees thought of leadership as a dynamic social process which is grounded in the values of respect, equality, and mutuality.

The leadership dynamic is based in one to one relationships. These leaders often talked about the uniqueness of each individual with whom they worked. They did not see others as a group to be motivated, or an organization needing to buy into their visions. Rather, they saw individuals as unique, and their relationships reflected these differences. Sometimes they seemed embarrassed about the individual focus of their leadership, as if this made them soft or unusual; however each interviewee firmly believed that understanding the

uniqueness of each person, no matter how complicated it becomes, is necessary, and makes a critical difference in that leader's effectiveness.

They saw people holistically. They did not separate the person and the professional. For these leaders to lead through a relational context, they felt they must know the whole person with whom they worked. There was a "human quality" to the interviewees in how they talked about working with others. Their relationships were not based on reinforcing separation or distance from others; rather there was an emphasis on connection, caring, and collaboration.

Because their relationships were personal as well as professional, complexity, messiness, and unusual problems resulted. Some individuals, for example, wanted their leaders to be separate and above them, thinking that this is the role that leaders are supposed to play. These individuals were frustrated that their leaders wouldn't tell them what to do, or let them be dependent, or uninvolved. The leaders interviewed here wanted those with whom they worked to be independent thinkers, initiators, leaders, talkers, and to be engaged in a common dream. A strong theme of individual development ran through the relationships of these leaders and those whom they led. The leaders are all very good at moving people from dependency or low self-esteem to autonomy and self-efficacy. The

frustration of the interviewed leaders with people who wanted to be dependent, or "yes men," put them at odds with the traditional "leadership as power or position view", where unquestioned loyalty is the mark of a good follower.

The leaders interviewed had the problem of often being caught between two worlds. The world in which they chose to lead, one based in the mutuality and equality of relationships, did not always match the world in which their organizations existed. Their organizations, for the most part, were traditional ones that reflected roles and functions in which authority and traditional forms of leadership and power are standard. These traditional standards of authority, leadership, and power are based in a separateness and control that is foreign to relationships of connection, empowerment, and equality of the leaders studied here. They found it difficult to have a foot in both worlds. It was a problem for these leaders to describe how they maintained authority and the closeness of mutual, human relationships at the same time. It was as if the words had not been invented yet to describe something this paradoxical.

The humanness of their relationships allowed staffs to challenge their leaders, to fight with them, talk back to them, hurt them, respect them, care for them, and get angry with them. The leaders talked about how they responded to



challenges and anger and the difficulty of staying non-defensive. They often spent a great deal of thought on the timing and tact with which they approached these situations. There seemed to be an intuitive understanding that emerged to tell these leaders when response to a challenge or angry statement was needed. Each response was designed with the uniqueness of the person in mind. The underlying theme of the response was one of development, respect and understanding, rather than control or putting a person in his or her place.

Many of these leaders personally struggled with the apparent conflict between need for connection and the separateness of traditional leadership. This was especially true for the women who were interviewed. The conflict became a significant leadership marker event for each leader, one often remembered 20 or 25 years later in great detail. Each person interviewed worked through the apparent paradox of leading while being connected, or leading with instead of leading over others, although the resolution took time and a lot of experimentation. Most interviewees developed a way of leading that allowed for relationships in which respect, caring, collaboration, and empowerment resulted in a leadership that was based on trust and mutual caring, rather than on authority, traditional power, fear, or control.

These leaders also believed that role modeling is an important aspect of leadership. With the goal of releasing of human potential embedded in their values, these leaders worked to achieve a sense of personal integrity among their visions, their actions and their values. Integrity was then translated to modeling a kind of leadership that develops others to become leaders who can impact society.

#### Focus on Process

Leadership was described by the interviewees as a dynamic process. Decision making, relationships, creating change, leadership, or vision, all were described with respect to its quality, and how the leader interacted with others to achieve an end. The leader interviews were not made up of crisp definitions, or discussions of end products. Outcomes were embedded in context and in stories of how one got there.

The kinds of processes that the interviewees described included such words like collaboration, discussions, openness, care, development, mutual writing of scripts, challenge, feelings, fun, energy, and co-creation. While the product was important to these leaders, it did not have the emphasis that is found in traditional business leadership. Success and excellence are important to these leaders because these outcomes help people to grow. A

person was involved in a successful event would learn, and would develop self-confidence; failing did not have the same positive impact. For these leaders means and ends were reversed. The end was the empowerment of other persons and a high-quality product was the means of achieving that. In leadership studies that are drawn from CEOs and presidents the focus is on the product as the end and the people as the means. Perhaps the fact that the leaders in this study were not CEOs allowed them to see the ends and means differently. Because of the nature of the role of the CEO, CEOs may not be able to take their minds off the product.

This concept of developing people as an end brought the importance of process into focus for these leaders. The way one involves people and works with people directly affects the end product (of developing people); therefore, these leaders took time to create and maintain an integrity between the means and end. That is why they spent so much time talking about the process of doing things. The leaders worked on the premise that the way one goes about creating change, making decisions, creating visions, and using power all can either hinder or help to achieve the end of empowering others.

#### Development and Renewal

Themes of development ran through each interview.

Development was considered on two levels, the leader's own, and others. The interviewees are active, life-long learners. They searched out opportunities to be challenged and to grow. The critical incidents in leadership life stories were associated with personal growth and insights. For these leaders, personal growth and leadership was an on-going learning process, an attitude toward learning to be modeled for others.

They also associated leadership very strongly with development and empowerment of people. In fact they did not seem to separate leadership and development, which seems connected to their interest in achieving mutual relationships with others. A relationship can't be mutual if others perceive themselves as subordinate or dependent on the leader, therefore, these individuals worked to develop a sense of sovereignty, autonomy, empowerment and competence in the people with whom they worked. This is essential to the development of a mutual relationship between leaders and those they lead.

The word development was used broadly, and extends to issues of self-esteem, self-confidence, cognitive thinking, values, relationship skills, and general and job specific skills. The leaders interviewed worked on all of these levels, moving freely among skills, values, and self-concept, simultaneously. To these leaders, all these

developmental issues are interconnected.

### Drive, Meaning and Vision

These leaders created their own meaning of events within the organization. They did not depend on the individual at the top, or on the organization's mission to generate a vision for them. They saw themselves as being connected to a greater purpose, such as "making a difference" or "having an impact" on humankind, and perceived this idea as transcending specific jobs or careers. Their life themes were the source of their visions, and were woven into everything they did.

The leaders interviewed for this study carried their vision with them, and often looked for an organization or supervisor that fit their life themes. When there was a lack of fit between the leader's vision and the president's vision, the leader often saw the president as human with his or her own political agenda or problems. These leaders did not appear to give up their visions under this type of conflict, but rather to look for areas of congruence with the president's vision. If none were found, they continued to work their life themes into their leadership despite the dissonance within the environment.

The interviewees indicated that the drive to lead came from the core values that were shaped for each of them by

history, experiences, context, gender, and cultural backgrounds. Drive and life themes connected their work with something larger than themselves and their organizations, and this connection helped them create meaning for their work and caused others to be influenced by them. The core values were embedded in a world view of humankind as evolving, and of a future that could be co-created by themselves and others.

There were common larger visions that these leaders held. The generally held value of being a contributor to the common good included a vision of developing individuals who could become leaders. The interviewees connected what they did to the positive evolution of humankind in this way, using a sort of grass-roots approach to creating world-wide change. An appropriate analogy would seem to be that of the rock thrown in the middle of a pond, its waves spreading outward in all directions. Perhaps it was because they were not at the top of their organizations that the visions of these leaders of impacting the world were shaped by how they impacted the individuals around themselves. The business of doing their jobs appears to have been just a vehicle for achieving their visions.

#### Connections

The words "connection" and "connectedness" kept

reappearing in the interviews. These leaders saw their roles as making connections with people and between people and ideas, structures, processes, and communities. It may be the commonly held process orientation, but these leaders seemed to have developed a facility for seeing patterns of connections within organizations, issues and people, helping them see how they could work with persons who were different from themselves.

The processes these leaders used, the way they got people involved, and the ways they made decisions enhanced each person's connection with others. They each had become very good at facilitating meetings, conflicts, and conversations about philosophy, and at drawing people out so that connections could be made. It appears that facilitation is a key process skill that keeps this sense of connectedness in focus.

These leaders were also good at creating structures that enhance involvement in decisions, long range planning, problem solving, organizational change, and insuring the development of individual voice. Their structures borrowed from participative management ideas, and went beyond them. For example, fun was included as an important element of a connected structure. There was the analogy made to a sort of hum that is heard or felt in an organization when people feel engaged and connected in what they are doing.

### Power

These leaders were not naive when it came to the uses of power. They each had a healthy respect for the positive and negative impacts that traditional power can have. They made a distinction between coercion and power; coercion generally was seen as the manipulation of individuals against their will, and as negative because it "doesn't work in the long run," destroys human relations, and hurts people. They all had experiences where coercion had been used on them, and chose not to use coercion in their work with others because they see it as inconsistent with their core values.

These leaders varied in their views of the usefulness of the concept of power to them. A few found it useful as a tool for creating an impact; others felt that it inhibited the mutuality of a one-to-one relationship. All of them qualified or redefined the concept of power. Most preferred to use the concept of "empowerment," a term that seems to encompass both shared power and that personal power that connotes for the individual a sense of sovereignty, autonomy, and self-efficacy.

The idea surfaced that feelings of empowerment for the many generated a sense of energy within an organization. Most of the leaders saw that involving other persons in



decisions, developing others, and having a common dream with others created the empowerment of people.

#### Location of Leadership

These leaders differentiated among a manager, a president and a leader. They did not associate leadership with a position, rather they saw leadership as occurring in people. These insights came early for many of these individuals, which might explain why they considered themselves as leaders regardless of the positions held within their institutions.

#### Teachers

All of the interviewees changed their conceptions of leadership as they learned from their life experiences, and although the struggles and issues change, the learning continues. It is this author's view that each person is like the snowflake whose history and experiences can be read in its final structure; the same can be said of these leaders. They have been shaped, in great part, by the presence and absence of teachers in their lives.

The teachers of these leaders taught them a variety of things. Some taught them what to do, others what not to do. They taught them skills, values, and helped empower them.

Many of these leaders had significant leadership teachers within their family and junior high or high school teachers. Many of the leaders in this study who are women and people of different racial and cultural backgrounds had to seek out people who thought of and practiced leadership in a different way; one that fit them better. Some of these leaders mentioned the absence of teachers because the way they thought about leadership was not modeled in their organizations.

Models for the women were often other female colleagues, supervisors, mothers, or grandmothers. The teachers for the six men in the study were men with one exception; Jim was also greatly influenced by his godmother.

#### Change

These leaders saw change as a process, not as something that is forced, but as something that unfolds in the context of relationships. One must not be misled into thinking, however, that change did not occur because of, or was undirected by, these leaders. These individuals were like water wearing away the contour of a river bank. They were persistent. They didn't get caught up in the formal, top-down, change process. Their change was driven by making connections with people, negotiating credibility, finding agreement that arises out of shared values, and creating

decision-making processes that insure diverse participation. They tended not to use the formal power of their positions, but rather their personal power and the empowerment of others to create change.

These leaders were driven to create change in themselves, in individuals, departments, organizations, communities, and the world. In this author's view, creating change was second nature to these leaders, they seemed to need it as a fish needs oxygen to breath. A fish moves through the water to gather oxygen; without oxygen it dies. These persons continued to swim.

#### Uniqueness of Person

Each of these leaders was unique. Some were quiet, others were extroverted and funny; some were intuitive, others were more concrete; some were "thinkers" and others were "feelers." They were diverse in their geographical locations, up bringing, gender, and positions within organizations. Despite these apparent differences, they were driven by a common way of thinking about leadership. Their moral dimensions were similar, and that affected the way they practiced leadership.

#### Leadership from a Care Perspective

The theme of connection and the interest in developing

both their own voices and the voices of others suggest that there may be a gender-related "ethic of care" (Gilligan, 1982) that is at the base of the leadership practices of the interviewees. Participation and collaboration was important to them as vehicles for the development of voice. They seemed personally to have developed in conditions where collaboration and connected learning occurred, so they tended to use those same methods with others. This is reflected by Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986), when they wrote about the rhetoric of debate versus the rhetoric of understanding. The interviewees demonstrated a preference for the rhetoric of understanding. They used processes of involvement both to understand one another and create new visions.

#### An Emerging Voice

These themes reflect a number of issues that were raised in Chapter II, where different paradigms of leadership, power, and organizational theory were identified. The dominant paradigm represents the traditional voice of leadership; in the emergent paradigm, one finds suggestions for a different set of possibilities. The dominant and emergent paradigm reflect a range of possibilities in ways individuals thought and think about leadership.

The individuals chosen as interviewees were selected because of the diversity they represented from our traditional samples. The purpose of this study was to explore if diversity in sampling would lead to different conceptualizations of leadership. Each of these individuals was unique in their thoughts and practice of leadership, and these individuals articulated variations of the emergent paradigms of power, leadership, and organizational theory; however there were common themes within this diversity. The ideas in common presented in this chapter may help us to identify how leadership might be practiced in our complex, constantly-changing world.

CHAPTER 6  
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

In our current research literature leaders have been identified through traditional sampling techniques, techniques in which individuals are selected by positions, reputation, and organizational success. I believe that methodology shapes results, and that these traditional sampling techniques have biased our view of leadership. The background assumptions for these techniques include that of leadership as a top-down phenomenon, in the purview of CEOs and presidents. This bias is extended by the industrial and business orientation of our studies. Most CEOs and presidents are men in their fifties and sixties. Articulated by these sampling techniques is a voice of leadership that is based within the American individualistic culture (Bellah et al., 1985), a voice from leaders who are white, older, and men. Blended in this voice between management and leadership is the need for insuring the organizational survival, and a corresponding drive for product.

The purpose of this study was to explore whether there

are different voices of leadership which are not presently reflected in leadership research literature. It is not the intent of this study to rank one way of conceptualizing leadership over another, but rather to explore the differences. The sample for this study was designed to interview people who tended not to have been interviewed in our published studies. Five criteria were identified to reflect distinct differences from the composition of samples in past leadership studies. An individual was said to reflect diversity if that person represented difference in at least three of these criteria.

1. Positional diversity: defined as not being at the top of an organization.
2. Age: defined as being younger than 50 years old.
3. Gender diversity: defined as being female rather than male.
4. Ethnic, racial, or cultural diversity: defined as representing diversity in one or more of these areas.
5. Contextual diversity: defined as having practiced leadership in more than one field and setting.  
(Examples of fields are education, business, politics, volunteer organizations, and government.)

Individuals who reflected these criteria were identified through personal contacts and referrals. All of them had been observed in a leadership context by the

researcher or the referring individual. A preliminary conversation was held with each individual to assess if he or she met at least three of the five criteria, and perceived himself or herself as a leader. The sample consisted of 15 persons, 9 women and 6 men. An in depth interview was carried out with each selected person, the purpose of which was to collect that person's leadership life story. The interviewees were asked to identify the first time they thought of themselves as "a leader," to describe what it was like, and to continue up to the present. Several follow-up questions were asked.

Each interview was taped, transcribed and analyzed. Ten of the 15 individual leadership life stories were summarized and presented in Chapter IV. Themes and patterns that were reflected in all 15 interviews were described in Chapter V.

In reviewing the responses, one can conclude that there are differences in themes and patterns from our traditional concepts of leadership and in the way the interviewees in this sample think about and practice leadership. In summary, these differences were:

1. The interviewed individuals led through relationships, rather than through structure, position, or power. There was a relational context that is different from what has been reported in the literature to date.



There was much more emphasis on connectedness, care, collaboration, common dreams, and process in these leaders' relationships than on power, individual vision, and product.

2. The view of the interviewees of power is different from traditional views. These individuals described a kind of power that is empowering and developing of self-efficacy. They did not subscribe to the traditional "power over" model where power is associated with control over others. They fit into French's (1988) "power to" and "power with" concepts, developing a person's capacity which leads to an empowerment of the individual and a shared view of power. They didn't see power as something to protect from others; rather, they seemed to think that power is increased when it is distributed and felt by many.
3. They operated as if organizations were dynamic systems filled with complexity, ambiguity, unique individuals, multiple perspectives, and constant change. They didn't think of organizations or people as machines. They may have recognized that their organizations had hierarchical structures, but they didn't limit their interactions or influence within the formal hierarchy. They worked across organizations and linked themselves with others regardless of official positions or

hierarchy. They worked through organizations as if they were designed heterarchically. They didn't see things as having a singular cause and effect; these leaders shaped events and were shaped by them. They provided examples for how leadership can be practiced in a dynamic system. Their ways of thinking about leadership organizations and power reflected the elements of the emergent paradigms described in Chapter II.

4. The interviewees were process oriented. The way these leaders practiced leadership helped them achieve the release of persons' potentials. They were highly skilled at developing participating structures and facilitating involvement. Their actions fit their goals, and their goals fit their actions. Their modal and end values were the same (Burns, 1978).
5. These leaders changed the definition of "means and ends." Products were not ends, but means. The development of people was the end. Products were used as the means of developing people.
6. They wove themselves into leadership. They were in holographic relationships with their leaderships. For the interviewees, leadership could not be understood as separate from the leaders, or from the context in which they led; it could not be studied as a distinct

fragment of the leaders. To reduce leadership to a set of behaviors, without understanding the beliefs and the person behind those behaviors loses something essential in the process for these leaders.

7. These leaders represented a different kind of leadership, one defined within a moral dimension rather than by effectiveness; leadership was defined within a social-ethics context.
8. Change for these leaders occurred on both small scales and large scales. They changed the world through their day-to-day actions with the people with whom they work. They didn't change the world by transforming countries, organizations, or organizational bottom lines, because they weren't at the tops of their organizations. This moves us away from the historic influence of the "great man" theory of leadership. These individuals are not leading countries; they, however, changed persons, who in turn changed other persons and organizations. Along the way, these leaders created pockets within organizations that reflected their socially responsible leadership. They stayed focused on their day-to-day actions by the values and visions they had of a better world. They took the long view.
9. The interviewees represented a different voice of leadership. They added another dimension to our

studies of leadership, one to shift us from the dominant paradigms of organizational theory, power, and industrial leadership, to the emergent paradigms. Searching for other ways to lead outside of the traditional positional- and individual-centered leadership, these leaders present a way to think about leadership that is based in connection with others. They have much to offer our study of leadership.

#### Discussion

The findings from this study have many interesting implications for and findings about leadership. First, the methodology allowed the interviewee to share what he or she considered was related to personal leadership development. This generated a very integrated approach between the individual and his or her views and practice of leadership. It is clear that these individuals see leadership as an integral part of themselves; leadership can not be separated from the person. It is not a tool, not like a hammer that is part of a tool box. Instead leadership is considered an extension of the values, beliefs, experiences, history and context of each person. Each person's leadership is unique, yet at the same time there are leadership patterns and themes that match others' views of leadership.

The second learning drawn from this study is that

leadership can not be reduced to its parts. When leadership behavior is separated from the person's values, something gets lost. Leadership is not seven strategies or four styles. It is a dynamic process which causes one to improvise, change, and respond to the constantly changing, unpredictable conditions of any human system. Leadership is more than the sum of its parts; and needs to be studied holistically. We need to look at leadership as embedded in both the person and the context in which he or she operates.

The third learning from this study is that the values and moral dimension of the person shapes the kind of leadership that person chooses to practice. These leaders' values were based in a social-ethics orientation. They came from family backgrounds where a sense of social responsibility and a giving back to the community was modeled. These values shaped their visions and their perceptions that leadership and development are directly linked. The source and power of an individual's values and the link of those values to leadership needs to be explored. Gardner (1990) suggested that the moral dimension tells us when a leader who is effective has transgressed against universal values, and is as a result not considered a leader. The results of this study suggest that these universal values may include a respect for individuals, an ethic of care, a desire to work for the common good, a

belief that one can make a difference in this world, a belief that humankind can evolve and become better, and an orientation toward development: both their own and others.

In America our present view of leadership, according to the literature available, is embedded in the American culture of individualism, an ego-centered culture, and this study has suggested to me that we traditionally have an ego-centered view of leadership. Leadership is individual; an individual has a vision. It is a lot like the Lone Ranger or Sam Spade approach; one person against many, or a good leader at the top of an organization saves us all.

There are other cultures who are socio-centered. This study suggests that there may be one kind of leadership that is embedded in an individual and a different kind of leadership that is embedded in a community.

The persons who were interviewed for this study had been socialized in a predominantly socio-centered culture. Leadership was defined as embedded in and connected with a community. Gender, race, ethnicity, personal history, and culture each have their place in this leadership style. In this style, the leader leads to disappear, to be replaced, to develop, to nurture, to empower, to right wrongs, to make this a better place to live. Leaders of this persuasion don't lead to be recognized, to be on top, or be in control. They are connected with people; they are not leaders who are

separate from others. These individuals may be articulating a kind of leadership that comes from people with the "different voice" spoken of by Gilligan (1982), the ethic of care.

Although the six men in this study also spoke from a care perspective, there may be a women's way of thinking of leadership that is gender-related but not gender-specific. This gender-related leadership voice probably is connected to socialization. This leadership from a care perspective has not surfaced in the predominate leadership literature. On the contrary, collaboration, facilitation, and development has been argued as too soft, not active or demonstrative enough to be classified as leadership.

This study has taught me to be open to seeing leadership in different ways. My white, middle-class biases, our ego-centered culture, and the leadership literature have shaped my definitions of leadership. This study has shown me that there are probably many different ways to practice effective leadership, and that the dominate view in America is only one of these many ways. More research needs to be done on leadership within other cultures.

These leaders' ideas and practices of leadership fit a very fluid and dynamic system; leadership is discussed as if the organization and the individuals of the organization

were unpredictable, as if life is not controllable, and as if leaders are everywhere. The leadership ideas of the interviewees seem to pace the underlying assumptions of the emergent paradigms of power, organizational theory, and leadership discussed in the literature review. Operating in environments where boundaries shift, multiple realities occur, connection and involvement are key, and fluidness is essential, these leaders may also be the practitioner voices of learning to lead in a world of permanent white water, a nonlinear, turbulent, constantly-changing world.

There may be developmental themes and patterns to leadership. Leadership for all of these people grew and evolved. What they thought of leadership in high school was different from what they thought in college, and that different from present views. Different experiences and ages generated different leadership issues. These issues were not predictable or sequential; rather, they were shaped by each persons uniqueness, history, and experience, even though underlying patterns and themes of their ways of leading occurred.

Finally, leadership is alive and well in all levels of an organization. The reason we may not have realized this before is that our culture tends to look upward for leadership. We need to shift our eyes to our own levels, and downward as well, to see the leadership that exists



within our midst so it can be nurtured and expanded.

### Implications for Practitioners

The primary implication for practitioners is that leadership in the emerging paradigm may be better understood by leaders who represent diversity than by those leaders at the top of our organizations. Individuals who have been successful leading in an industrial background, and who employ a mechanical metaphor of organizations, will have a harder time shifting to the flatter, linking, nonlinear, complex, dynamic organizations of the emerging paradigm. A different kind of leadership is needed in our rapidly changing world. The leaders in this study thought about leadership in a more fluid way than traditional leaders. Their leadership life stories are storehouses of information that help us understand how leadership can work in organizations in the emerging paradigm.

Persons from socio-centered cultures, especially women, may have special abilities to offer organizations; varying socialization and cultures may allow the formation of a fluid and linking leadership to help balance the specialization and isolation that complexity brings to organizations.

Diversity is increasing in our organizations. Diverse

leadership orientations will also appear in the work place, as women and people of color reach a critical mass within those organizations. Practitioners will need the research of this and many other studies to understand and appreciate diverse leadership orientations.

Practitioners will need to examine their own biases and background assumptions of what leadership looks like and who is a leader and where leadership is found. Our current model of leadership is viewed from the top down, practiced by a visible individual, with a set vision, bold strides, focus on product, follower dependency, and leader control. This paradigm is actually a reflection of our present cultural background assumptions. This kind of leadership may not work as well with different background assumptions, that is, with an increase of people from multiple cultures and more women in organizations. It is easy to view another leadership orientation as non-leadership when one judges that orientation through a cultural lens. Practitioners will be challenged to examine their assumptions and to open their minds and operations to see if there are multiple ways to lead effectively.

Finally, practitioners will need to change the metaphors that they are presently using. Metaphors like "change has to start from the top to be effective," "fish rots from the head," "viewing the leader as king of the

mountain," "the leader (meaning the president) has to have a vision," "my leader made me do it," "we couldn't have done it without the leader," "I'm just a cog in the wheel," and "the leader knows the answers," will have to be replaced. New language and metaphors that reflect a common good, trust, empowerment, autonomy, and the belief that anyone can initiate change, and structures that facilitate connections and linkages will have to be developed. Such phrases as "managing change," and "controlling the variables" just don't fit the turbulent environment of today's world.

#### Implications for Future Research

This study was designed to begin to explore how more diversity in sampling would affect our views on leadership. The limits of this study are indicated in the words "begin to explore." We have just scratched the surface of the ways our understanding of leadership can be expanded through studying different individuals in different ways. This study strongly suggests that there are different ways of thinking about leadership, ways that may be influenced by gender, culture, age, diversity of experience, and position within an organization. Future research to expand on the work of this study needs to include these steps:

1. Continue to use leadership life stories as a methodology for studying leadership. This data-

gathering method provided a rich way of seeing how individuals connect their leadership with themselves. The holographic relationship between the individual and their leadership needs to be understood better.

2. Generate further research on how the values and moral dimensions of individuals affect the way they lead.
3. Replicate this methodology with people who represent diverse populations. Possible areas of research include:
  - a. Further research on women and leadership: Is there a different voice that is gender-related?
  - b. Research on individual leaders from specific cultures: Are there culturally based differences in conceptualizing and practicing leadership?
  - c. Research on individual leaders at different ages or who have had different kinds of experience: How do children practice and recognize leadership? Are there developmental themes and patterns to an individual's evolution as a leader?
  - d. Research on individual leaders who work at the middle and the bottom levels of organizations to discover how their leadership is recognized and practiced.
  - e. Research on individual leaders in different contexts to find out if leadership looks differently in family settings, than on children's

- playgrounds, or in volunteer groups as opposed to business situations.
- f. Study leadership from an inter-generational perspective. Can a specific kind of moral leadership be passed from mothers to daughters?
  - g. Study the persons who these leaders identified as significant teachers, and get their views on their own leadership and how it is passed along.
4. Do further research on the connection between ego-center cultures and socio-centered cultures, and the evolution of leadership concepts and practices.

#### Conclusion

This study indicates that there are multiple ways of thinking about leadership and different ways of practicing leadership. Given the diversity of individuals and cultures, no single truth of leadership appears possible. Themes and patterns of leadership can be identified, and the voice of leadership most identified in this study was one from a care and connected perspective. It appears that this voice may be affected by gender and by a socio-centered upbringing.

These findings have implications for those who wish to empower leadership at all levels of their organizations and want to encourage individuals of different cultures to feel

free to practice a different way of leading. There are many further areas of research that are suggested by the findings in this study. This study points the way toward viewing leadership from the perspective of diverse voices with different rhythms and emerging harmonies.

## APPENDIX A

### CONSENT FORM

The following shall serve as an agreement for the protection of the rights and welfare of all participants in the dissertation research project by Kathleen E. Allen

1. The purpose of this study is to examine leadership. The focus of this study will be the experience and observations of the participants on leadership and the practice of leadership.
2. Instrumentation will include in-depth interviewing. Interviews will be held with the participants with their consent and knowledge of the subject of this research. Each participants agrees to volunteer between 4-6 hours of their time for the interview, answer any follow-up questions, and review the summary of their interview.
3. All participants in the interviews shall be informed of the nature and subject of the study.
4. The participation by all individuals in this study is voluntary and may be withdrawn at any time.
5. All participants have had the opportunity to ask questions regarding the prodedures of this study and answers have been provided.
6. There is no agreement between any participant and Kathleen E. Allen either written or oral, beyond that expressed in this consent form.
7. The names of participants in this research project shall remain confidential upon request.
8. Prior premission for the tape recording of interviews or conversations has been obtained.

I, the undersigned, understand the above explanations and, on that basis, I consent to my voluntary participation in this research.

Signature of Interviewee

Date

Signature of the Researcher

Date

Done at

City

Date



## REFERENCES

- Adams, J. A. (Ed.). (1986). Transforming leadership. Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press.
- Barnard, C. A. (1938). The functions of the executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1981). Stogdill's handbook of leadership (Rev. Ed.). New York: The Free Press.
- Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Basic Books.
- Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A. & Tipton, S. M. (1985). Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.
- Berlew, D. E. (1986). Managing human energy: Pushing versus pulling. In S. Srivastva (Ed.), Executive power (pp.33-50). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Block, P. (1987). The empowered manager: positive political skills at work. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (1984). Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. (1983). Educational research: An introduction (4th Ed.). New York: Longman Inc.
- Brown, L. D. (1986). Power outside organizational paradigms. In S. Srivastva (Ed.), Executive power (pp. 289-311). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.

- Campbell, S. M. (1984). Beyond the power struggle. San Luis Obispo, CA: Impact.
- Clark, D. L. (1985). Emerging paradigms in organizational theory and research. In Y. Lincoln (Ed.), Organizational theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution (pp. 43-78). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cohen, M. D. & March, J. G. (1984). Leadership in an organized anarchy. In W. E. Rosenbach, & Taylor (Eds.), Contemporary Issues in Leadership (pp.18-30). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., & Associates (1988). Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Eisler, R. (1987). The chalice and the blade. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Emerson, R. M. (1962). Power-dependence relations. American Sociological Review, 27, 31-41.
- Ferguson, M. (1987). The aquarian conspiracy: Personal and social transformation in our time. Los Angeles: J. P. Tarcher, Inc.
- Fiedler, F. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- French, M. (1985). Beyond power: On women, men and morals. New York: Ballantine Books.
- French, J. R. P. & Raven, B. H. (1959). The Bases of Social Power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in Social Power (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor MI: University of Michigan Institute for Social Research.
- Gardenswartz, L. & Rowe, A. (1987). What it takes: Good news from 100 of America's top professional and business women. New York: Doubleday.
- Gardner, J. (1990). On leadership. New York: The Free Press.

- Gardner, J. W. (1986). Leadership and power. (Paper No. 4, October). Leadership Papers prepared for the Leadership studies program Washington DC: Independent Sector.
- Gibbons, T. C. (1986). Revisiting the question of born vs. made: Toward a theory of development of transformational leaders. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Fielding Institute, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. New York: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Gleick, J. (1987). Chaos: Making a new science. New York: Penguin Books.
- Gorden, R. L. (1956). Dimensions of the in-depth interview. American Journal of Sociology, 6, 158-164.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). Servant leadership: a journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness. New York: Paulist Press.
- Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1985). Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hagberg, J. O. (1934). Real power: Stages of personal power in organizations. Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press.
- Harmon, W. W. (1988). Global mind change: The promise of the last years of the twentieth century. Indianapolis, IN: Knowledge Systems, Inc.
- Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. (1969). Management of organizational behavior (1st ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. (1977). Management of organizational behavior (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- House, E. R. (1978). The logic of evaluative argument. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California.
- Huff, A. S. (1985). Managerial implications of the emerging paradigm. In Y. Lincoln (Ed.), Organizational theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution (pp. 161-183). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Iacocca, L. & Novak, W. (1984). Iacocca: An autobiography. New York: Bantam Books.
- Jamison, K. (1984). The nibble theory and the kernel of power: A book about leadership, self-empowerment and personal growth. San Diego: University Associates.
- Kidder, R. M. (1988, June 13-17). Making the quantum leap: A monitor 5-part series. The Christian Science Monitor, pp. B1-B4.
- Kinsman, F. (1986). Leadership from alongside. In J. D. Adams (Ed.), Transforming leadership: From vision to results (pp. 19-28). Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press.
- Korda, M. (1977, March). Psychodynamics of power. Mainliner.
- Kotter, J. P. (1985). Power and influence: Beyond formal authority. New York: The Free Press.
- Kotter, J. P. (1988). The leadership factor. New York: The Free Press.
- Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (1987). The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Levinson, H. & Rosenthal, S. (1984). CEO: Corporate leadership in action. New York: Basic Books.
- Lincoln, Y. S. (1985). Organizational theory and inquiry the paradigm revolution. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

- Loden, M. (1985). Feminine leadership: or how to succeed in business without being one of the boys. New York: Time Books.
- Maccoby, M. (1976). The gamesman. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Maccoby, M. (1981). The leader: A new face for American management. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (1989). Designing qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- McClelland, D. C. (1975). Power: The inner experience. New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Morgan, G. (1988). Riding the waves of change: Developing managerial competencies for a turbulent world. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Morgan, G. (1986). Images of organizations. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Nanus, B. (1989). The leaders edge: The seven keys to leadership in a turbulent world. Chicago, IL: Contemporary Books.
- Nicoll, D. (1986). Leadership and followship. In J. D. Adams (Eds.), Transforming Leadership: From Vision to Results (pp. 28-38). Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press.
- Oncken, W. (1984). Managing management time: Who's got the monkey?. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Peters, T. J. (1987). Thriving on chaos. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Peters, T. J. & Waterman, R. H. (1982). In search of excellence: Lessons from america's best-run companies. New York: Harper & Row Pub.
- Pfeffer, J. (1981). Power in organizations. Cambridge MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Quinn, R. E. (1989). Beyond rational management: Mastering the paradoxes and competing demands of high performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Rost, J. C. (1989). The nature of leadership in the postindustrial era. Unpublished manuscript, University of San Diego, School of Education, San Diego, CA.
- Schaeff, A. W. & Fassel, D. (1988). The addictive organization. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schwartz, P. & Ogilvy, J. (1979). The emergent paradigm: Changing patterns of thought and belief. Analytical Report 7, Values and Lifestyles Program. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.
- Smith, J. K. (1989, March). Alternative research paradigms and the problem of criteria. Paper presented at the Alternative Research Paradigms Conference, San Francisco, CA.
- Spradley, J. P. (1979). The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Srivastva, S. (1986). Executive power. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Srivastva, S. and Cooperrider, D. L. (1986). Introduction: Ways of understanding executive power. In S. Srivastva (Ed.) Executive power (pp.1-19). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Steiner, C. M. (1981). The other side of power: How to become powerful without being power-hungry. New York: Grove Press.
- Terry, R. (1988). Intuitive leadership: A research project of the reflective leadership center. In T. Hurley III, A. Larsson, & C. Kartes (Eds.), The intuitive leadership project. Minneapolis, MN: Reflective Leadership Center.
- Terreberry, S. (1985). The evolution of organizational environments. In W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, & R. Chin (Eds.) The planning of change (pp. 176-186). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Vaill, P. B. (1986). The purposing of high-performing systems. In T. J. Sergiovanni, & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), Leadership and organizational culture (pp. 85-104). Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.

- Vaill, P. B. (1989). Managing as a performing art: New ideas for a world of chaotic change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Vroom, V. H. & Yetton, P. N. (1973). Leadership and decision making. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press.
- Weick, K. E. (1985). Sources of order in underorganized systems: Themes in recent organizational theory. In Y. Lincoln (Ed.) Organizational theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Yukl, G. A. (1981). Leadership in organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.