

University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

1990-04-06

Education for Christian Leadership

James H. Ford 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

Ford, James H. EdD, "Education for Christian Leadership" (1990). *Dissertations*. 543.

<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/543>

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.

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP

by

James H. Ford

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

Doctor of Education

University of San Diego

April 6, 1990

Dissertation Committee

**Joseph C. Rost, Ph. D., Director
Helen deLaurentis, Ph. D.
William P. Foster, Ed. D.
Fayette B. Veverka, Ed. D.**

ABSTRACT

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP

FORD, JAMES H., Ed. D. *University of San Diego*, 1990. 269pp.
Director: Joseph C. Rost, Ph. D.

There is an increasing number of nonordained catholic men and women trained for leadership and ministry in the United States. What are the perspectives of these women and men on leadership in the church, the nature and purpose of leadership, and education for leadership?

This qualitative study compared transforming leadership with the perspectives on leadership discovered among the 17 participants in the study. The respondents expect to exercise leadership in a church that faces a challenging future. The researcher also outlined those future challenges facing leaders and participants who practice the process of leadership. The author makes prescriptive suggestions on education for leadership based upon the participants' perspectives and the author's theory of leadership. These suggestions include a prominent role for religious educators interested in developing leadership.

The author concluded that there is confusion, among the participants, about any shared meaning of leadership. Attention needs to be given to the transformational character of leadership. There is no clear framework, no guide for clear thinking about leadership which these women and men may draw upon for their personal and professional benefit. Leadership studies must be more

clear about the nature and purpose of leadership and communicate that understanding in theory and in practice. The study showed a need for substantive change in the way persons understand and practice leadership in order to meet future needs. Finally, restructuring education for leadership in the christian community is essential if people want transforming leadership. Thirteen recommendations on education for christian leadership are made in light of the study and in light of the author's perspective on transforming leadership.

Copyright © 1990 by James H. Ford

DEDICATION

To my parents, Ralph and Mary, who have always encouraged me to seek wisdom and develop an altruistic perspective. I am grateful for their constant love and support.

To A. Hardy Roberts who has sustained me in difficult times of personal growth and throughout my pursuit of educational and professional competence.

To Bishop Joseph V. Sullivan, S.T.D. and Sister Mary Joan Marqua, R.S.M. who believed in me from the beginning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Dr. Thomas Groome and Dr. Fayette Veverka for their inspiration and dedication to quality religious education.

To Dr. Joseph Rost for his creative insights into the nature of leadership and his enthusiasm for my work in this study as well as his painstaking attention throughout its evolution.

To George Noonan, Director of the Center for Pastoral Life and Ministry, for his personal support as well as his cooperation in the research process.

To Jean Marie Hiesberger, Director of the Institute for Pastoral Ministry for her interest in the topic and her cooperation in the research process.

To the christian women and men who shared their time, philosophy, history, hopes and dreams for the church, and insights into leadership in the two interviews required of each participant.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Appendices	ix
CHAPTER ONE. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE	1
Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study	6
Need for the Study	8
CHAPTER TWO. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	10
Introduction	10
Religious Education and Leadership	11
Pastoral Ministry and Leadership	17
Ethics and Leadership	27
CHAPTER THREE. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	36
Introduction	36
Methodology	36
Phenomenological Research Procedures	37
Pilot Study	39
Participants	39
Interviews	41
Analysis of Data	43
Human Subjects	45

CHAPTER FOUR. LEADERSHIP AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION	
DEFINITIONS AND POSITION STATEMENTS	46
Introduction	46
Survey of Leadership Theories	46
Toward a Definition of Leadership	55
Toward an Understanding of Leadership	61
Leadership, Leaders, and Ethics	68
Additional Definitions	74
Metanoia	74
Transformation	75
Religious Education	77
The Leadership and Religious Education Relationship	79
CHAPTER FIVE. DEMOGRAPHICS AND PARTICIPANT PROFILES	84
Demographics of the Study	84
Participant Profiles	86
Kevin Murphy	86
Mary Norton	86
Frank Smith	87
Stephen Baber	88
Gretchen Wilson	89
Elizabeth Brusch	89
James Adams	90
Marian Rice	91
John Rice	91
Lee Ann Reynolds	92
Joseph Plummer	92

Edgar Lewis	93
Penny Miller	94
Thomas Miller	95
Angela Fuller	96
Imogene Goddard	97
Rochelle Prince	98
CHAPTER SIX. PERSPECTIVES OF PARTICIPANTS ON CHURCH	
LEADERSHIP	100
Introduction	100
Lack of Leadership	101
Future Leadership	104
Problems Facing the Church	110
Contributions to Church Leadership	114
Summary: Perspectives on Leadership in the Church	115
CHAPTER SEVEN. PERSPECTIVES ON THE NATURE AND PURPOSE	
OF LEADERSHIP	120
Introduction	120
The Relationship of Gift and Trait to Leadership	120
The Relationship of Skills and Situation to Leadership	126
Leadership as a Political Activity	128
Leadership and Leaders	137
Leadership and Change	141
Leadership as a Social and Educational Phenomenon	144
The Relationship of Leadership to Role	148
Leadership and Ethics	152

Leadership and Management	154
Summary: Perspectives on the Nature and Purpose of Leadership	156
CHAPTER EIGHT. PERSPECTIVES ON EDUCATION FOR LEADERSHIP	163
Introduction	163
Religious Education and Leadership	163
Education and Skill Development	164
Developmental Issues and Education for Leadership	166
Leadership Training	167
Leadership Education through Modelling	171
Base Communities and Leadership Education	173
Summary: Perspectives of Participants on Education and Leadership	175
Synthesis of the Participants' Commentary	176
CHAPTER NINE. THE FUTURE CONTEXT OF LEADERSHIP	191
Introduction	191
Future Issues Affecting Transforming Leadership	192
Organizations and Future Leadership	196
Problems Facing Leadership in Transition	199
Summary: A Future Context	211
Human Development	212
Ethics	213
Organizations	215
Leadership	217
Conclusion	219

CHAPTER TEN. EDUCATION FOR LEADERSHIP	220
Introduction	220
Resources for Christian Leadership Education	221
Caveats Facing Education for Leadership	229
Suggestions for Education for Leadership	237
Summary	242
Limitations of the Study and Future Directions	243
Conclusion	246
REFERENCES	249
APPENDICES	262

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1

First Interview Guide

Appendix 2

Second Interview Guide

Appendix 3

Demographic Record of Interview Participants/1989

Appendix 4

Consent Form

CHAPTER ONE

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

*The soul is in greater need of the ideal than of the real.
It is by the real that we exist. It is by the ideal that we live.*
Victor Hugo

Introduction

The documents of Vatican II (1966) clearly demonstrate the right of the laity to ministry. "The laity derives the right and duty with respect to the apostolate from their union with Christ their Head. Incorporation into Christ's Mystical Body through baptism and strengthened by the power of the Holy Spirit through confirmation, they are assigned to the apostolate by the Lord himself" (Abbott, 1966, p. 492).

The inseparable link between laity and church is parallel to the link between the church and the world. There is no longer ground to support a dangerous dualism that would separate body and soul, the mission of laity and clergy, the sacred and the secular.

This natural bond between the church and the world brings blessings and a dilemma. Human and planetary history are intertwined. Science discovered the treasures of the earth locked away for millennia and used new scientific insights for the development of societies, the advancement of anthropocentric concerns, and the assuagement of human needs. Nurtured by the

coming of age of science, the industrial age influenced all facets of life. Our understanding of leadership is influenced by an industrial mindset and undergirded by values formed by a society immersed in a scientific, industrial age paradigm.

Rost (1988) described the leadership paradigm of the 19th and 20th centuries. "The descriptors that scholars have given to the industrial era have all been reflected in the leadership theories developed over the past 150 years. Analyzed individually and in toto, these leadership models were scientific, rational, management oriented, quantitative, goal dominated, technocratic, cost benefit driven, personalistic, male, hierarchical, short term, pragmatic and materialistic" (p. 11).

These descriptors reflect the industrial paradigm that is operative in western culture today. The inadequacy of this paradigm is becoming more clear as the earth itself shudders at the attack upon it by human consumption and rampant materialism. A paradigm shift is needed. A metanoia among those who lead amid that shift is required.

Kuhn (1962) reflected upon what occurs in a paradigm shift. First an anomaly awakens us to new questions. Present economic, religious, psychological, social, and educational inadequacies raise questions as to the appropriateness of present paradigms. A second step follows the presence of an anomaly. This includes a crisis or breakdown of the old paradigm. New problems in our culture are not answered by the values and structures of an industrial paradigm. A paradigm shift is needed. Fox (1988) characterized the process of paradigm shifts with the following insights in which the observer

notices: nature in a new way, a shift of vision, a transformation of vision, a conversion, a map or director for making a map, a switch in visual gestalt (p. 80).

Fox (1988) echoed the caveat offered by Kuhn that resistance will often accompany a paradigm shift. He added that this resistance is accompanied by denial, "the denial that everything is not right in christianity, or in western education, or in our very definitions of what constitute theological education and ministerial training, or in the prevailing worldview of patriarchal religion in general" (p. 81). There are signs of anomalies and the breakdown of old paradigms. The way in which we understand leadership and the way in which we lead are changing. Old wineskins will simply not hold the new wine of a church, institution, culture, and world that is experiencing radical change. Resistance and denial are evident to attentive persons. Leadership is in a paradigm shift that is transformative in nature.

Theory is facing reality in the American Catholic community as catholics face a multitude of changes, the breakdown of its own culture and structures and a shift in leadership. An industrial age paradigm is inadequate to face the challenges and needs of a new millennium.

The shortage of priests is real and longterm and serves as an example of the crisis facing the Church today. It is estimated that the United States will see a decline of 40% in active Catholic priests from 1980 to 2000. This decline is unique to the Catholic community as other christian denominations have a surplus (Hoge, 1987).

Nonordained, catholic women and men in the United States are claiming more responsibility and authority in the catholic church. This is a shift away from a centralized understanding of authority and responsibility located in the clergy to a diversified sharing of power and interest among the nonordained. Rapid change in the spiritual, social, and emotional needs of catholics as well as the growth of an educated catholic population complement and encourage this geographical and philosophical shift. American society is increasingly mobile. Large, stable ethnic populations are quickly becoming history. Catholics who once were part of tightly woven communities, bound by ethnicity or religious culture, have now blended into the economic and cultural mainstream of the United States. As the Catholic population diversifies, it is not uncommon to hear of the consolidation or closing of parishes, the elimination of parochial elementary or secondary schools, and the establishment of team ministries. A majority of religious women are engaged in pastoral ministry rather than classroom teaching. These phenomena typify the pervasive shift occurring in American Catholicism. Dioceses in the midwest and the rural sectors of the country already have nonordained pastors appointed by the bishop of the diocese. Centers for the education and formation of Catholic laity for ecclesial positions, full and part time, are increasing.

O'Meara (1983) and Schillebeeckx (1981) both traced a bottom up approach to the ministry of leadership in the early christian community. This historical right to ministry bolsters nonordained persons who wish to share responsibility in shaping the church and their own future. Today in the American Church there is a renewal

of hope which springs from American nonordained men and women who are increasingly involved in ministry and interested in leadership. Who are these lay people? What are their perspectives on leadership? How do these perspectives compare to the theory of transformational leadership? How should they be formed for this shift of responsibility in the church? These questions are the thrust of this study.

I accept the theory that transformation is at the heart of leadership (Burns, 1978) and religious education (Groome, 1980). Future leaders need to grasp and integrate the character of transformation into their philosophy and practice of leadership. Leadership in the following decades must address a spectrum of issues. Among these concerns are ethics, organizational change, vision and values, and the mutual needs and wants of leaders and followers. Chapters Four and Nine address the importance of these issues and clarify the meaning of leadership. The specific issue of transformation connects all these concerns.

Catholic lay people are responding to the need for leadership. However, much of current emphasis in religious education favors a style of leadership development that deals with strengthening skills rather than with transformation. These programs and workshops attempt to train persons to make decisions, resolve conflicts, communicate proficiently and accurately, and act as advocates. Exploration of the nature of leadership and transformation is unattended.

The dilemma is complex because the nature of the problem is not just practical. The problem of leadership is primarily an

intellectual one (Burns, 1978). New leaders in the church need to address not only the techniques of management and the importance of people skills but the very purpose of education and leadership. The crises of leadership are not simply quantitative but qualitative. The shortage of priests invites us to not only seek solutions to a leadership vacuum but more importantly to question and explore the meanings we give to leadership and how we educate for leadership. Leadership that is going to shape a new paradigm and guide this generation, future generations and the society of which the church is an influential component must be given critical reflection and thoughtful direction.

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study is to examine the attitudes of nonordained American Catholics toward leadership. The question of how the church should educate nonordained persons for transformational leadership will also be investigated. My research describes existing attitudes and meanings toward leadership and education. However, attention to education for transformational leadership among grass roots Catholic leaders will also be prescriptive in nature and deal with the paradigm shift to a postindustrial age society. I propose an understanding of transforming leadership in Chapter Four that serves as a criteria for evaluating the adequacy of other views of leadership. Chapter Ten suggests guidelines that foster education for transforming leadership.

The first research question deals with the perspective and understanding of interested, Catholic, nonordained persons toward present and future leadership in the church. Do nonordained persons sense a crisis in leadership and how would these participants both name and cope with that crisis?

The second research question studies the understanding of Catholic lay people interested in leadership toward the nature of leadership. What do they think leadership means? Where do their perspectives, convictions and meanings originate? A paradigm shift requires new awareness of present reality. Does an anomaly exist and is there an inadequacy extant among the Catholic laity toward the meaning and place of leadership in the Church?

The third research question investigates education. Religious education has a broad responsibility moving beyond catechetics or instruction. It is involved in reshaping how we educate in the faith community. Religious education ought to be concerned with how the church nurtures and educates youth and adults in the dynamic which is leadership. Religious education ought to be a transformational process. The creation of transformational leaders should be a part of that process. The paramount question here is: How do we educate for transformational leadership? Who is responsible for educating nonordained persons in pastoral ministry and religious educators for transformational leadership. Do they share an understanding of transformational leadership as well as the transformative character of religious education?

Need for the Study

There are two basic reasons why an interest in nonordained people doing leadership is important for the contemporary Catholic community. The first stems from a rediscovery of the right to be a leader that flows from the theological basis of baptism. The call and grace for practicing leadership is egalitarian and rooted not only in sacramental theology but in the ecclesiology of the documents of the Second Vatican Council.

The second stems from sociological and statistical reality. There are simply no longer enough priests to respond to the growing number and needs of the Catholic laity (Hoge, 1987). The underlying assumption that priests are leaders simply because of ordination needs to be questioned.

How will nonordained Catholics seeking to be full and parttime leaders as well as those who serve in volunteer positions be supported, educated and formed? An answer to that question depends on our perspectives regarding leadership. The American church today is shaped by American culture, American management theory and practice, the rise and influence of secular religion, and the definitive character of economics upon the landscape of American thought and practice. American Catholics, nonordained and clerical, are formed not only by Catholic theology but also by American culture (Fitzpatrick, 1981). Conversely, the American culture has been and continues to be shaped by the Roman Catholic tradition, its moral orthodoxy and its eschatological perspective. From its immigrant origins to its mainstream maturity, the Catholic

church has helped the American republic develop its pluralist, ethnic character as well as its individualism and economic independence.

Therefore, new studies on transformational leadership offer fresh and challenging, if not prophetic, contributions toward developing new attitudes among American Catholics and reshaping the culture of the American Catholic church. Educational efforts in the development of nonordained leaders are currently informed from management theory and popular leadership models which focus on skills more than values. These efforts have also been influenced by a theological foundation that has not been subject to the insights from professional leadership studies.

A solid, contemporary theological base and familiarity with management tools, such as conflict management and listening skills, are essential. However, too often management skills are confused with leadership. Nonordained leaders in future decades will require a new understanding of leadership. Transformational leadership captures the heart of this new understanding and will require the implementation of effective leadership education if the church is to meet its internal and public responsibilities.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The literature review will cover four major areas. These areas will include current literature on religious education and its relationship with leadership, pastoral ministry and leadership, transformational leadership, and ethics and leadership. Both religious education and transformational leadership are lived out in the public domain and since both have an ethical dimension, it is important to discuss the public nature of ethics in America. The literature that is explored serves as a framework to discuss and understand my perspective on leadership that is established in Chapter Four. I am particularly concerned about the inadequacy of literature on the relationship between religious education and transforming leadership. The literature review also serves to demonstrate some of the inadequacies that exist among those who are thinking and writing about leadership in the church. While I critique some of these inadequacies in this chapter, explanation of my perspectives are outlined in later chapters. A discussion of the topics will be done in an integrative manner.

Religious Education and Leadership

The relationship of religious education to leadership may best be reviewed by examining the topics separately. My purpose is to demonstrate that the manner in which I understand the nature and purpose of religious education and leadership is not widely held by other scholars. This is crucial since it will reveal why there is little currently being written on the relationship between religious education and leadership.

I believe that religious education is a process of faith enrichment that happens best in community, in partnership, in a dialectic process that leads people to a common horizon, the Reign of God. Such a process requires faith, leadership and a prophetic vision of human existence marked by dignity and compassion. The religious person then may not necessarily have a religion. The two terms should not be collapsed. Religion is a way to express personal beliefs and creeds and/or behaviors. Religion is an organized way to define tenets and dogma.

The concept of religious means something quite different. I understand the word *religious* to imply a search for the transcendent, a journey beyond self to the Other. The experience of being religious is an odyssey into mystery and a movement or process in which greater human integrity is realized. The religious person is not concerned with answers. Rather, the religious individual wrestles with questions in a happy tension that is typical of a life lived with an open end, a grand telos. The divine-human partnership is at the heart of being religious (McFague, 1982). As religious beings we are invited to a constant conversion, to a

process of reshaping our meanings, our religion, our society, in a continuing search to grasp and attend to the divine-human and interhuman relationships that unfold in the human experience.

Education is based upon living experience, upon the participation of individuals in social life (Dewey, 1938). Education in particular is more than catechesis. Catechesis establishes a portion of the content of education. Education may include catechesis. The critical mindset is not crucial to catechesis as it is to education. Groome (1980) defined catechesis as the activity of reechoing or retelling the story of Christian faith that has been handed down by previous generations. Education has to do with transformation, with the task of creating an alternative consciousness (Brueggemann, 1978). Niebuhr (1951) included the element of transformation and the value of alternatives when he suggested that Christianity does not stand apart from society but is in the midst of society heralding a better alternative.

Freire (1983) best summarized this liberating pedagogy. He believed that the action and reflection of men and women upon their world in order to transform it is typical of human education. Education is then a humanizing process; those things which affirm the human are educative. Education is about challenging meanings that presently abound, to lead and to be lead out of present experience to new understandings of human existence and of the created universe. Groome (1980) also suggested that a praxis based knowing arises not by standing back from in order to look at, but by active and intentional engagement in lived experience.

Transformation is at the heart of religious education. Religious education is a struggle to transform ideas, persons, and institutions. The process of religious education must deal with living lives that are more than existence (Moran, 1984). It is about ultimate concerns that enrich our existence as individuals and communities. Groome (1980) goes to the heart of religious education when he defined it as: "a political activity with pilgrims in time that deliberately and intentionally attends with them to the activity of God in our present, to the Story of the Christian faith community, and the the Vision of God's Kingdom, the seeds of which are already among us " (p. 25).

The ultimate concerns of persons transcend an absorption in practical goals and interests. Joiner (1989) suggested that results and in particular economic results, are too often the bottom line in business. Leadership in future organizations will raise the spiritual dimensions of humanity. "The fact is that man [woman] is spiritual in nature and has a purpose that transcends economics and since society is made up of humans it too is spiritual in nature" (p. 5). Universal spiritual principles offered by Joiner are the catalyst for value based leadership that will enable leaders to challenge those "negative forces that constantly push for maintaining the status quo or decline. Leaders are the force of change in society" (p. 8).

Religious educators hold an opportunity to tap such universal spiritual principles establishing a new dialogue among communities of faith and inviting organizations to discover new spiritual common ground. Joiner (1989) suggested that some of these universal principles are: The presence of a universal life force within each

person and therefore a shared oneness among all peoples, the need for selfless service and attention to activities that move beyond ego development, respect for the rights of all persons including the right of each person to chose their own destiny, an awareness that human activity has eternal consequences and significantly impacts human history, the transcendence of human suffering, and the importance of solitude and meditation for spiritual growth, and respect for human freedom.

Transformation is also at the heart of leadership. Burns (1978) stated that "leadership over human beings is exercised when persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of followers" (p. 18). Burns also made a distinction between transactional and transformational leadership. The latter occurs when "one or more person engages with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality" (p.20). Burns made an original contribution to our understanding of the nature and purpose of leadership by incorporating the elements of real, intended change and moral character as intrinsic to leadership.

Rost (1988) defined leadership as an "influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect the purposes mutually held by both leaders and followers "(p. 17). Foster (1986) summarized the essence of leadership as the desire and attempt to change the human condition; leadership is the process

of transforming and empowering. A critical framework for leadership is also intrinsic to transformation.

Grob (1984) noted that leadership dries up and becomes the mere wielding of power on behalf of static ideals if it is not nourished by a wellspring of critical process. This critical spirit enables the leader to be an initiator of change, a prime mover of learning. Grob also understands leadership as a dialogical activity. Such a dialectical process is enabling and empowering as together leader and follower move with a new openness toward truth. Bennis and Nanus (1985) described transformative leadership as sensitive to the interplay of the needs and wants of followers and leaders. It creates structures that empower; it is morally purposeful and elevating and moves followers to higher degrees of consciousness (pp. 216-217).

Both religious education and leadership are about transformation. This transformative character is inherent in the pedagogy of Paulo Freire (1970) who insisted that dialogue is an instrument of transformation. He stated that "it is not our role to speak to the people about our own view of the world, nor to attempt to impose that view on them, but rather to dialogue with the people about their view and ours "(p. 85).

Groome (1980) called for such a critical conscience and supported a dominant role for critical reflection in education that is transformative: "Critical reflection is first an attempt to notice the obvious, to critically apprehend it rather than simply accept it as 'just the way things are' " (p. 185). The work of critical reflection ponders the question, why do we think the way we do? Groome

stated that critical reflection is an activity in which we use "critical reason to evaluate the present, critical memory to uncover the future in the present, and critical imagination to envision the future in the present" (p. 185).

Morgan & Ramirez (1983) approached the critical dimension of education through action learning. Such learning is holographic in that it welcomes dichotomies between "subject and object, individual and social, order and change, theory and practice, knowledge and action" (p. 9). The richness of reality is contained in each element of an organization. Action learning is critical because it seeks to empower people to become "critically conscious of their values, assumptions, actions, interdependencies, rights, and prerogatives so that they can act in a substantially rational way as active partners in producing their reality" (p. 9). People are invited, therefore, to construct their own reality instead of simply fitting into it. They develop an attitude that is proactive instead of reactive. Critical theory values pluralism because it enables a linkage between individual and social transformation.

There are many approaches to both religious education and leadership. I cannot examine all of them in this review. However, my opinion is that religious education and leadership are about transformation. Therefore, the religious educator is called to transformational leadership. While the religious educator is devoted to more than leadership education, she or he should consider the practice of transforming leadership a priority. It seems appropriate for the religious educator as transformative leader to be responsible

for shaping the course of pastoral ministry and the development of leaders and leadership in the field of pastoral ministry.

Pastoral Ministry and Leadership

A review of the literature in pastoral ministry will demonstrate a quite different approach to leadership than the processual transformative character that has just been expressed.

Epply (1983) recognized the longing for leadership not only in the public sector but also in religious institutions. Much of what he suggested deals with the need for training in conflict resolution, assertiveness, group process, advocacy, problem solving and managing stress. Ritt (1984) called for leadership that implies getting results in a way that everyone benefits. Ritt wrote that "leadership occurs when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things" (p. 19). While this definition may be what Burns (1978) called transactional leadership, the question of whether transactional leadership is really leadership is debatable. Stott (1985) attempted to blend the management skills that Epply included with several other ingredients. Scott incorporated vision, industry, perseverance, service and discipline as leadership components. The caveat here is that leadership is reduced to an effort of acquiring certain characteristics.

Sauer (1985) raised the issue of values and suggested that the religious leader must support, implement, and continue the institution's values. However, this too conflicts with the notion of transformational leadership. This dilemma over the meaning of

leadership is evidenced by Boyle (1985) who quoted the United States Catholic Bishops Committee on the Parish. Clear leadership, the Committee wrote, "is essential to the development of the parish The foremost leader of the parish remains the pastor " (p. 5).

The nature of leadership is avoided and leadership is seen as residing in position or in the accumulation of certain rank or skills. Futrell (1982) borrowed from the story *Watership Down* to enter into a discussion of leadership. The quality of life in a community is determined by the quality of its leadership. This agreeable concept requires that the concept of leadership in the religious and secular community be seriously explored not as an object or product but as a dynamic. This kind of serious exploration has not been done, and for the most part the nature of leadership remains a puzzle in the ecclesial arena.

Jesus was a nonordained leader. What is striking and relevant about his mantle of leadership is that it was not placed upon him by authorities nor any institution. Rather, his followers recognized his gifts and supported him with their conviction and followership. Schillebeckx (1981) and Perkins (1980) demonstrated from a historical and scriptural stance that this view of Christ's leadership is accurate. This paradigm of christian leadership is just now being recovered amid controversy and resistance.

Instead, the reality of pastoral ministry and leadership is centered more upon management skills. Byron (1980) stated that the leadership task is to move human activity through a complex situation. Wilson (1989) reported about a leadership training program in which women gathered in weekly sessions. The sessions

enabled women to "learn communications skills of listening, assertiveness, negotiation, managing feelings, and conflict resolution. They also learn to cultivate self-esteem through religious practices of centering prayer and meditation" (p. 13). Such sessions do help encourage participants to feel more confident and they further efficiency and productivity. They have a lot to do with people skills, communications, management techniques, and spirituality. Most of these types of workshops and seminars are valuable and therapeutic. Yet, they have little to do with the process that is leadership. Leadership is not linked to productivity nor can it be described as therapeutic.

Kondrath (1985) lamented the prevalence of poor leadership and wanted to resolve this crisis by advocating an emphasis on certain styles. He argued that a more mutual style of leadership is increasing in ministerial leadership due to the increase of female participation. Wrapp (1986) noted that spiritual and temporal leadership requires a general manager and only a priest can fill that position. Wrapp uncovered an interesting problem. He equated manager with leader and priest with pastor. The conflation of these concepts and realities only confuses our understanding of leadership and its place in the social life of the church.

A recent study by Legee (1986) demonstrated the increased participation in the church by Catholic laity. The survey upon which the article was based carefully outlined the participation of laity. However, increased laity participation does not imply increased leadership by laity or clergy. Control of parish life and organizations by clergy or laity does not necessarily indicate the

presence of leadership. The article suggests that the direction of music or of a parish Catechumenate, youth ministry or other important activities are leadership. However, parishes that make efforts to know the needs of parishioners are more apt to practice leadership that is multileveled and moves toward transformation.

Anderson (1986) described christian leadership as building community and not merely performing tasks. Yet, it is still understood as a means by which goals are reached. "Christian leadership is a form of competence in managing the priorities that relate goals to purpose" (p. 2).

Prior (1989) examined the diverse face of ministry in South Africa. Prior discussed five models of church. As communities develop, the issue of leadership emerges. Communities searching for a meaningful notion of church also asked important questions like, "What does it mean to be an ecclesial leader? Need one be ordained? How should leadership be manifested practically?" (p. 30). Such questions ought to enable communities to look beyond task to the heart of leadership. A lack of fear to explore the deeper questions will mean reshaping leadership as well as fashioning change in the way we think about our theological and educational underpinnings. Such an endeavor is risky and may help answer why we deal more readily with tasks and replace leadership with management.

Wingeier (1989) raised some hopeful signs for understanding leadership and the church by examining leadership patterns in Korea. "The predominant norms for the practice of leadership in Korea stem from the kingdom tradition: authoritarian, hierarchical, patriarchal,

stratified." Such insights could well describe the roots of western leadership thinking. However, Wingeier also suggested that there are emerging signs of an alternative consciousness. These alternatives arise from the cultures and religions of Shamanism, Hanism, the Tonghak Movement, Taoism and the Won and Maitreya forms of Buddhism. For example, leadership in Shamanism is "relational, informal, human, service-oriented, humble. There is no hierarchical relationship. . . .Ordinary people and shamans both have a divine quality; they enter into the holy together" (p. 10). In Hanism, leadership is without a division between the leader and follower and is symbolized by the *yin-yang*, the symbol for the harmony and blending of opposites.

Minjung Buddhism "tries to hear in the voice of the people the demands of history and tries to respond faithfully." (p. 13). in this religious philosophy it is from the people that revolutionary energy rises. It is from the followers that a leadership emerges which transforms political and social structures and establishes a new age. These eastern concepts serve well the search for a new school of leadership for both eastern and western cultures. Yet these intriguing ideas appear to not be well formed or shared by a diverse constituency. Rather, they seem to be linked to specific religious groups and beliefs. Critical reflection upon the nature and purpose of leadership is neglected. No clear, common notion of leadership emerges. It is not helpful that everyone thinks the same thing about leadership. It is important there is some shared understanding about the nature and purpose of leadership and that people possess an ability to distinguish between leadership and other activities.

Rausch (1989) traced authority and leadership in the church from a biblical and historical perspective. In this case, authority and leadership are two faces of the same coin. Leadership is associated with office and role. Rulers are associated with leaders. In the Jerusalem community, those who were associated with Jesus were considered as leaders. "A structured office of pastoral leadership developed slowly and not always simultaneously in the different communities" (p. 70). Rausch talked about the need to balance office and charism. "Office is rooted in charism; an office bestowed without a discerned charism may be valid but it is ineffective. Charism challenges office and institution, but unregulated, they can become divisive, even chaotic" (p. 71). Schillebeeckx (1981) and O'Meara (1983) concurred with Rausch in the historical opinion that eucharistic presidency belonged to the one who leads the community. What is troubling in this biblical, historical discussion is that a twentieth century, industrial age understanding of leadership is being retrospectively imposed upon church history. The contemporary confusion which reigns over leadership, its nature and purpose, its identification with authority and management, is brought to our interpretation of Scripture and church history. What may be far more beneficial is to explore whether any distinct understanding of leadership even existed from the time of the Jerusalem community to the present.

Catholic authority figures such as Weakland (1989) called for a global church agenda and leadership that will respond to that agenda. Weakland challenged American Catholics to "take up the agenda of what it means to be a Catholic or universal community of

faith-a world church" (p. 14). However to assume that agenda implies that leadership is equal to the task. Change is a consistent reality and *cooperative* leadership is needed to deal with this new theological universalism. "The old structures cannot support the new challenge of such a call to a fuller catholicity. The papal trips have kept alive the conciliar desire for it but do not, of themselves, provide structures whereby it can become a reality" (p. 15). What can provide new structures for a truly global church is transformational leadership. Again, leadership at the present is identified with authority alone and needs to break out on its own as a distinct reality with a disparate nature and purpose.

Unsworth (1989) noted that pastoral practices that respond to the needs of people are springing up everywhere. No longer are people and communities of faith waiting for the church hierarchy to promulgate. Parishoners are vesting religious, laity and clergy with the authority and perhaps leadership to act in ways that meet the needs of the many. "Walls are crumbling. The institutional church continues to place its emphasis on the preservation of the institution at the expense of the sacramental church. But it isn't working" (p. 11). Leadership is occurring at the bottom or middle. A hunger for leadership lingers and people are grasping for an opportunity to both understand and experience leadership that incorporates change and reflects mutual purposes.

Muccigrasso (1984) approached leadership as a puzzle. The resolution resides in the correct balance of conflict resolution, organizational theory, motivation theory, and decision making. When these are satisfied, "truly visionary and effective church leadership"

will be provided (p. 23). Muccigrasso's comments capsulize the current trend in Catholic literature toward leadership and pastoral ministry.

One who speaks directly and clearly to the question of leadership in the religious context is Greenleaf (1972). Greenleaf researched persons in responsible positions in religious institutions and came to an interesting conclusion. "Most of what they call lead I would label manage, administer, or manipulate" (p. 23). Greenleaf preferred to discuss leadership in relationship to service. But is it enough to equate leadership with service? Service can be performed from a position of dominance, for example, in what the rich do for the poor. Service may be given with good intentions but in an unequal manner, as in what many parents do for their children. Service may simply be some behavior manipulated to look unselfish but in reality it was done for selfish ends. Schneider (1981) used the example of Jesus' footwashing as service done in friendship, the only human experience that is rooted in equality and mutual concern. The leadership process needs to allow for a sense of service that reflects the human dynamic of friendship.

Elizabeth Schussler Fiorenza (1985) reconstructed biblical theology from a feminist perspective and the results lead to fresh and hopeful signs for a new perspective on leadership. She aligned herself with the approach given to leadership by Greenleaf (1977) who fostered the concept of the servant leader. Fiorenza explained that the Markan Jesus "exhorts those who are first to accept fully such persons of low status and to become their servants" (p. 318). She described the call of Jesus to discipleship as a vocation that is

rooted in the passion of Jesus and therefore promotes leadership free of domination. "Community leaders are not to take the position of rulers but rather that of slaves because Jesus gave his life for the liberation of many" (p. 318). Fiorenza turns again to the Markan gospel and to a discussion of the verb *diakonein*. "Those who exercise leadership in the community must take the last place on the community's social scale and exercise their leadership as servitude" (p. 320). These women are understood by Fiorenza as practicing true leadership because they are persons who understand what it means to live under the cross as oppressed persons called to exercise influence that respects human relationships. The meaning of this word emphasizes that women disciples have practiced true leadership demanded of the followers of Jesus.

It is difficult to recapture the feminine biblical perspective of leadership. Fiorenza powerfully demonstrated that as an oppressed people, women have no written history. "They remain invisible in the reality constructions of those in power" (p. 28). While androcentric biblical texts tend to erase women as active participants in history, "they do not prove the actual absence of women from the center of patriarchal history and biblical revelation" (p. 29). The feminist perspective should employ a feminist hermeneutic that encourages critical methods which move the scholar away from androcentric biblical interpretations toward immersion into the richness of a social-cultural milieu which historically shaped those who minister and those who practice leadership.

The liberation and feminist insights of Fiorenza toward leadership among women in christian origins are essential if we are to reshape leadership today as something based in empowerment, human relationship, and transformation. However, it is not enough to identify leadership with service. A true understanding of leadership needs to incorporate the attitude of authentic service but it must also move beyond service to metanoia and transformation.

The Whiteheads (1986) wrote that "leadership is being defined as a system of relationships through which a group acts efficiently" (p. 74). Leaders also create symbols, myths, and rituals which capture the culture and imagination of followers. Keating (1978) addressed church leaders on the application of leadership. He suggested that leadership is "a process of facilitating the goal achievement of an individual or of a group in a particular situation" (p. 16). The dilemma of leadership is addressed by developing effectiveness in learning small group dynamics; handling conflict; improving leadership styles; and learning how to plan, handle power, and manage time.

Hoge (1987) saw the crisis in Catholic leadership as a shortage of priests. He offered a number of options to resolve the shortage. Whether the successful application of his options would solve the problem of Catholic leadership is questionable since the problem may not only be quantitative but, more crucially, intellectual and qualitative. Filling positions with valid and educated personnel, ordained and nonordained, does not guarantee the American Catholic church will have leadership.

Philibert (1986) reflected on the findings of the research done by Hoge. Philibert suggested that the question of leadership is one of how nonordained people will exercise leadership and how they will be trained. It is not a question, he said, of if the laity will be involved for the interest is real. Catholic nonordained persons have an opportunity to shape the meaning of ministry in their church. They also have an opportunity to reshape the direction and understanding of leadership.

The most common area for nonordained people at the present to make commitments in the church is in religious education. An understanding of the nature and purpose of leadership and attempts to design educative processes that foster transformational leadership may begin with these individuals and move throughout the church.

Ethics and Leadership

Transformational leadership involves a change in the human condition. Interference in the human condition is an ethical involvement because it involves processes of changing behaviors, attitudes, assumptions and values. Ethics deals with what it means to be human, with questions of value. Human issues and questions are complex, unique and interdependent. Since the human condition is sophisticated and multifarious, absolutes and simple resolutions are inadequate and ethical dilemmas are more the norm than the exception. It is in this realm that leadership lives. Foster (1986) stated that "transformative action entails making decisions in a moral context" (pp. 26-27). Whenever leaders exercise leadership it

is a moral activity because it involves shaping human life, the structures and culture that in turn both shape and reshape humankind and society. Burns (1978) condensed the ethical dimension of leadership to this statement: "The ultimate test of moral leadership is its capacity to transcend the claims of the multiplicity of everyday wants and needs and expectations, to respond to the higher levels of moral development, and to relate leadership behavior--its roles, choices, style, commitments--to a set of reasoned, relatively explicit, conscious values" (p. 46).

The emphasis in American culture on ethical values continues to rest upon sexual concerns. Morality is reduced to sex, personal moral issues and the privatization and separation of ethics from a public ethos. Leadership must penetrate and transform the dangerous barrier of an isolationist attitude and immerse our culture once again in a rebirth of public philosophy.

Sullivan (1986) suggested that this rebirth of a public philosophy is essential and stated that "a public philosophy develops out of the insight that the quality of personal life is grounded in social relationships, an insight that is embodied in the political act of integrating the various kinds of self-concern into an awareness of mutual interdependency" (p. 208).

Sullivan (1986) believes in the importance of civic responsibility or civic republicanism. Rooted in Jeffersonian democracy, civic republicanism deals with the pursuit of moral purpose and the use of values in an historical context. It has to do with society and how persons relate in that society, with their behaviors and attitudes. Leadership involves the transformation of

that society, its behaviors and values. The ethical dilemma for leadership is to find a balance between the needs and wants of the individual and the needs and wants of the civic community. Such a civic philosophy ought to work toward building a unity of purpose, toward an appreciation of the greater good rather than only an individual good. It means working to establish public solutions to public problems.

Politics needs to be linked so that power is used to empower rather than overpower. Leaders need to have an appreciation for the quality of life by embodying that sense of wholeness and integrity, purposeful vision and desire for substantive change that assures the humanization of our society. Sullivan laid the cornerstone for leaders to foster a civic responsibility which they do when they are able to stand apart from the "community narrative," reflect it back to the society, place the individuals and their narrative into a dialogue with a great, larger narrative. Such leaders practice civic responsibility when they create changes that enable partnership between individuals and institutions, governments and businesses, the private and public segments of society.

Sullivan also tied the American pursuit of economic success with the privatization of our lives. We are in need of a telos, a common end value that transcends the individual and present ethos that sanctifies the pursuit of wealth for its own sake. Kavanaugh (1983) supported the need for a new American ethic and underlined the problem. "Our lack of intimacy, community, personally enduring relationships, our sense of competition and lack of solidarity nudge us into possessing and accumulating things in order to fill the lack

we experience by missing persons in our lives. Our sense of powerlessness in changing the social system and its disordered priorities only serves to confirm and support our economic way of life" (p. 47). Transformational leadership is needed to break the vicious cycle. Religious educators who are transforming leaders are required to make a difference, beginning with the leaven of communities of faith immersed in the values of the Kingdom of God. Such values resist a dominant culture that assails a public philosophy.

Mary Elizabeth Moore (1989) stressed the dangers of a dualistic mindset. Less powerful people, the poor, uneducated, and women, for example, "are often restricted to the privatized sacred realm for their duties and recognition" (p. 385). Religious educators need to challenge the sacred-public duality that fosters an understanding of leadership that is within the grasp of only an elite, the visible and dominant sector of society. Moore drew upon liberation theology and pointed to "the essential role of women in leading liberation struggles, especially for the liberation of women, the liberation of a feminized profession, and the liberation of religious communities from a worldview that dichotomizes the sacred and the public" (p. 387).

The dualistic mindset that segregates and privatizes the realm of the sacred sires an ethical dilemma. The field of religious education is peopled largely by women and is associated with such feminine virtues as nurture, compromise, the value of relationship, and compassion. Such a reality is then complicated because it is part of a cultural context where religion is itself privatized. Moore

reflected that the issue is the "powerlessness and ineffectiveness of the private sacred sphere, and also the powerlessness and ineffectiveness of religious education, when it is the private sphere within the private sphere. Religious education too often becomes the margin of the margins" (p. 398). Leadership practiced among religious educators, especially women, needs to confront this unhealthy dualism and change the way people think so that all reality is viewed as sacred and all reality is scrutinized for its public dimensions. Also, Moore recognized the need not only to transform male-female relationships through language but also the transformation of uncritical approaches to doctrine that foster unreflective and stagnant public life. Leadership that is transformative is required for critical thinking and deep cultural changes that transcend racism, sexism, and closed systems.

Transformed sacred communities are capable of modeling a healthy and prophetic collapse of the sacred and the public. The religious educator and the field of religious education which has experienced marginalization is best equipped to generate human liberation and provide transforming leadership.

Curran (1987) reminded American Catholics that the tension between the public and private sectors of our lives is part of our tradition. It is in such healthy tension that creative responses to difficult problems are born. Curran cited two pastoral letters on peace and on the economy of the United States Bishops. In these landmark teachings, the bishops recognized that social change involves both a change of heart and a change of structures.

The pastoral letter on Catholic Social Teaching and the United States Economy states that "none of us can afford to live a spiritually schizophrenic existence in which our private lives are oriented toward Christian discipleship while our economic activities are devoid of these same values The value and dignity of each person is no mere philosophical or theological assertion, but a living conviction that leads to concrete decisions affecting our society and our environment" (United States Bishops Conference, 1984, p. 377).

Horn (1985) suggested that we need to dismantle the dualistic mindset governing our ethics. We can no longer afford to discuss contemporary issues as "distinct political or social questions but as multiple manifestations of world views in fundamental conflict The important point is that until we see the modern values crisis in terms of world views in conflict we will continue to attack symptoms or manifestations of the problem" (p. 183). The assault needs to address those presuppositions which cause the crises. Meanwhile, the hegemony of an industrial age society is collapsing and with it a sequestered and exclusive ethical approach to national and cultural realities. A public ethic is no longer a western, national concern but must incorporate an openness to the resources and the problems of a world society that is interdependent. The world is a complex hologram and a public philosophy needs to mirror that actuality.

MacIntyre (1984) reminded us that ethics is not a static reality but is rather a dynamic, a process that is primarily interdependent and not centered upon self-interest. He said that

virtue rests on character and character rests on the meaning of life, our end values, a telos. Our present culture has allowed individual roles to define culture. Persons are identified by their roles and these roles are separate from a person's sense of self.

This bifurcation of the individual can be seen on a larger scale in society, where society is separated from an end purpose. Leaders have the responsibility to establish unity in the human condition, a unity that moves even beyond our anthropomorphic self-interest. Leaders who bear the ethical banner need to fashion change that will inhibit emotivist mentalities and help move leaders and followers to a higher ethical existence, marked by justice and dignity.

Seymour, O'Gorman, & Foster (1984) stated that a primary task of the religious educator is to shape and to exercise the imagination. This responsibility is based on a belief that Christians are called to be co-creators and that the "true fruitfulness of our imagination is attained when we reshape both ourselves and our environment, to the mutual enrichment of both" (pp. 141-2). He called upon the church to exercise a public pedagogy and to hold a public posture. Seymour invited those who exercise leadership in religious education to beget a medley of images, symbols, rituals, language, and narratives that will establish a public paideia.

Hollenbach (1989) revisited the issue of common good and viewed it as interesting not only to contemporary philosophers and theologians but also to those in business, economics, and sociology. "The common good of civil society is that measure of the communion of persons that is achievable in history These are the social, political, economic, and cultural conditions that make it possible for

persons to participate in the life of the community to a degree that respects at least the most basic demands of their personhood" (p. 88).

Hollenbach (1989) calls for the republican tradition of the common good shared by Bellah et al. (1985). The common good, however, needs to be a shared experience rooted not just in theology or philosophy. "None of the concrete forms of human community in history, be they familial, associational, economic, political, or religious, are capable of embodying the *summum bonum*, the full human good" (p. 93). Such an appreciation for the common good necessitates an understanding of human existence that supports interdependence and communion of all persons in relation to each other and the ultimate good. "Sustaining a social order governed by a pluralist-analogical understanding of the common good and human rights will call both for significant social change and for a renewal of public virtue" (p. 94). Leadership that lives an ethic needs to incorporate this renewal of the common good.

Rost (1989) distinguished between the ethics of the leadership process and the ethics of leadership content. "The ethical standard of any leadership relationships would be stated this way. 'The leadership process is ethical if the people in the relationship (the leaders and followers) *freely* agree that the intended changes *fairly* reflect their mutual purposes'" (p. 11). Rost outlined the inadequacies of present and past ethical systems such as utilitarian ethics, rule ethics, social contract ethics, and ethical relativism. What emerged were the insights of Sullivan (1986) and MacIntyre (1984) and Bellah et al. (1985) that rally around the ethic of civic

virtue. Rost summarized that, "this new language of ethics must center around an integrated concept of the common good, of our social ecology as a community. Only then will leaders and followers begin to make some moral sense out of the changes they propose to transform our organizations and societies" (p. 31).

The literature is scarce or nonexistent when it comes to blending the approach to religious education, leadership, and ethics that I have expounded in this review. Current literature does not link religious education with transformational leadership but that link is necessary. The responsibility of educating for christian leadership is a responsibility that will be met when religious educators establish that link and act upon it.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to examine the attitudes, beliefs, concerns and underlying assumptions of nonordained Catholics toward leadership. The data reveals a need to reshape existing perspectives toward leadership and those who lead. I offer insights into what is required to frame an educational approach to transformational leadership in the christian community using data from the study.

This study is embodied within the naturalistic research tradition. Such qualitative research involves the use of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Naturalistic research is from the bottom up, it is descriptive and focuses on the natural setting as the direct source of data (Bilkin & Bogdon, 1982).

Methodology

I offer insights into the meanings which participants in the study give to the concept of leadership. The research probes into the richness of the participants' human experiences.

Human experience from the phenomenological perspective does not necessarily need a social context for interpretation as it does

from the ethnographic perspective (Tesch, 1984). Taylor and Bogdan (1984) indicated that since reality is socially constructed, the phenomenological research paradigm suits exploration of that reality. A phenomenological researcher attempts to look at how people define their worlds by exploring what people say and do. The researcher is immersed in the participant's perspective and emerges with a thick description of that experience. The effort to immerse oneself in a particular subject distinguishes phenomenological research from ethnography which is immersion into an entire culture (Agar, 1980).

The qualitative thrust of this study is more phenomenological than ethnographic. I seek to understand what the informants are experiencing, how they make meaning from their experience and to what extent they construct a structure and perspective concerning the phenomenon of leadership.

Phenomenological Research Procedures

Brenner, Brown & Canter (1985) suggested that qualitative methods should enable more intimate familiarity with social life by a detailed and dense acquaintanceship. Such methods include participant observation, intensive interviewing and field work. The idea is to get close to the data. Interviewing is a means of discovering what kind of things are happening. It is a process to explore with an open mind certain phenomena and to "let the things speak for themselves" (Tesch, 1984). Tesch observed that the interview is not simply a question and answer exercise, "it is an experience of immersion in the phenomenon, of intense reflection"

(p. 29). The indepth interview is unstructured, of variable length and may be extended into repeated sessions. The respondent in the interview is allowed to steer the conversation. Thus, the interview is substantially different from the questionnaire (Hakim, 1987). Mishler (1986) described the interview as a "speech event" (p. 35). The interview is then not a matter of discovering a product but a process of mutual discovery and confirmation of meaning. The interviewer does not attempt to manipulate the respondent but together they construct the meaning located in the raw data of human experience. The interviewer empowers the respondent and affirms the validity of his or her own experience.

Both Rossing (1985) and Tesch (1984) remind the researcher of keeping track of personal bias. It is crucial that an effort be made to be aware of presuppositions and assumptions or ways in which the researcher's own views are shaping a study. The researcher needs to be conscious of the way in which the present view of reality is used as a interpretive tool in recalling past experiences. What is important is for the researcher to eventually analyze the data with a critical eye as to how the data were collected under shifting perspectives.

Validity, reliability and generalizability are of concern in qualitative research. Validity and generalizability are addressed through the process by developing a grounded theory, using thick description and triangulation.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was completed in 1988. This study employed a suitable interview guide. Three persons were interviewed using the interview guide, field notes, and audiotapes. The interviews were two hours in length and included two women and one man. All three participants had made some commitment to leadership in the church, were nonordained persons, and were currently involved in leadership activities at the time of the interviews.

A guide was used as an aid in assisting the participants during the interviews. The guide was not followed strictly. Analysis of the transcripts was completed and units of meaning and general themes were extrated from the data. Results from the data analysis and the interview guide were evaluated. The guide was refined before it was used again in the field.

Participants

The usual number of participants in a phenomenological study is between 10 and 15 persons (Tesch, 1984). Seventeen women and men were interviewed in this study. Chapter 5 offers a statisical summary of the participants. A qualitatiave participant profile is also provided on each participant. My own observations and reactions to each of the participants is included in the individual profiles. The resource for these profiies flow froms the data which yielded information on the personal and professional background of each participant. What is important is the potential of each interview to aid the researcher in developing insights into the area of social life being studied (Taylor and Bogdan, 1984).

Two sources are available for participant interviews. The first is the Institute for Pastoral Life located in Kansas City, Missouri. The Institute is a national center for ministry training and resources. Participants from approximately 30 Catholic dioceses in the United States partake in two programs offered by the Institute. These two programs focus respectively upon assisting dioceses in the development of lay ministry programs and the training of pastoral administrators.

A second source is the Center for Pastoral Life and Ministry which is sponsored by the Catholic Diocese of Kansas City-St. Joseph. There are five general programs offered through the Center: (1) a master's degree in pastoral ministry or religious education, (2) a two year leadership development program for nonordained men and women, (3) developmental programs for directors of religious education and catechists, (4) a program for the development, continuing education and support of RCIA [Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults] teams, (5) and a leadership component for parish staffs and councils. Those who participate in the programs are professional, volunteer, nonordained men and women of the diocese.

The directors of the Institute and Center selected a pool of possible participants for the study. The institute had an enrollment of 154 people participating in their two programs. The Center had 91 people enrolled in the two year leadership development program. Participants were chosen because of their geographical diversity, varied ethnic and educational background, availability, and partial completion of their chosen program. The participants who were

selected had completed all or at least half of their training in ministry and leadership. I anonymously chose 17 participants. The purpose of this anonymity was to help prevent any researcher bias from being incorporated into the selection of the participants for this research. I had previous educational contact with all of the Center participants. The anonymity enabled me to gather a wider scope of perceptions toward ministry, education, and leadership than my own in the collection of the data. The Center director knew the participants at a greater depth since I had been away from their development for two years. The Institute participants were totally unknown to me and I had to rely upon the knowledge of the director of the Institute. I asked for a diversity of people who would give me a spectrum of ideas existing today among nonordained persons in ministry and leadership training. There is the possibility of participant bias by the two program directors in the selection process. However, I felt that their opinions and knowledge of the participants were of significant value and enriched my own opinions and knowledge of the possible participants. It was important to me that the final participants in the study had given some significant thought to their approach to ministry, education, and leadership. This background stimulated conversation and helped to clearly establish the current tone of trained nonordained persons toward leadership.

Interviews

I interviewed each participant twice for approximately four hours. This was the total time for each person given to each person.

The second interview took place after a rough draft of the analysis from all 15 initial interviews had been completed. The respondents were given opportunities to affirm or question the analysis of the data from their interviews and the general summary that analyzed the data from all interviews provided by the researcher. Data received in the second interview helped validate the assumptions, interpretations and conclusions developed by the researcher; or they provided different interpretations and new analyses.

An interview guide was used (see appendix I & II). However, the discussion was open ended and directed by the appropriate interest of the participant and the dialectic nature of the communication. Qualitative research is understood as an individual's own accounts of his/her attitudes, motivations and behaviors. The indepth interview was unstructured and of variable length. The interview allowed freedom for the respondents needed to steer the conversation (Hakin, 1987). Creating an environment for open and healthy communication was essential. Therefore, the researcher practiced reflective listening using attending and empathic skills, paraphrasing, and responding to both content and feelings (Bolton, 1979). Use of nondirective interviewing was essential to avoid bias.

Field notes were used both to record the responses, nonverbal reactions, feelings and contextual influences of both the respondent and the researcher. Notes also recorded the assumptions and biases of the researcher. The interview sessions were audiotaped with the permission of those interviewed. The purpose of this was to allow accuracy in data collection, interpretation and analysis. Audiotape

recording also allowed maximum interaction between the respondent and researcher.

Analysis of Data

Steps for data analysis of interviews are outlined by Hycner (1982) and Mostyn (1985). Audiorecordings were transcribed from each of the interviews. The researcher listened to the tapes and read the transcriptions and field notes, noting personal assumptions and presuppositions through bracketing. Units of general meaning relevant to the research questions were deduced from the data. Clusters of meaning were gathered to discover certain themes. A summary of each interview was provided and used in the second interview. Participants had the opportunity to challenge, clarify or question the data of the first interview or my summary of that interview. Chapters 6, 7, and 8 correspond to the three research questions. These research questions are explored in the chapters using the thick description given by the participants which illuminated their attitudes toward their (a) present perspectives toward leadership in the church, (b) perspectives toward the nature and purpose of leadership, and (c) perspectives toward education and leadership. Each chapter is subdivided according to the themes that emerged through the interview questions and responses.

Units of meaning were assigned color codes which designated their relevance to the three research questions. Additional color codes were later used to delineate units of meaning that supported data themes. These codes organized the data for recording in the chapters. Some of the data was interpreted by the researcher as

irrelevant because it related neither to the research questions nor to the emerging themes.

Chapters 6, 7, and 8 include a chapter summary. The intention of this summary is to capture the core thinking of the participants about the content of the themes examined in a specific chapter. I made an effort to only clarify the remarks of the participants and not compare their ideas to my theory of leadership. The chapter synopsis served as the basis for the general summary at the conclusion of Chapter 8. This final summary does include my reaction to the positions taken by the participants about leadership and education as they are placed in dialogue with my approach to transforming leadership. This explanation outlines the steps used for analysis of the interview data.

Once the attitudes, behaviors, motivations and assumptions of the respondents toward leadership were analyzed and common themes presented, the task began of relating the research data to education. As researcher, I suggested what needs to be affirmed and what needs to be challenged in the data so that a more creative and crystallized approach might be taken toward education for christian leadership. A crucial concern for me was to compare the results of the research data on leadership to transformational leadership.

The whole process of data evaluation is capsulated in the following stages: (a) interviews, (b) descriptive analysis of interview data, (c) a vision of transformational leadership, (d) a critique of participants assumptions about leadership in light of transformational leadership, (e) recommendations for educational practice.

I believe that these stages directly deal with the research questions set forth in the purpose of the study portion of this dissertation. Perspectives of nonordained persons toward present and future leadership are explored. The understanding of these participants toward the nature of leadership is investigated. Recommendations of educational practices rooted in both the research data and transformational leadership theory are examined. These stages are both descriptive and prescriptive in nature, reflecting the dual intent of this research. I then placed the research data in dialogue with current leadership studies on transformational leadership as a critique of the research. Educational recommendations were constructed.

Human Subjects

Research should be ethically responsible. Therefore I have safeguarded the rights and welfare of human subjects involved in this study. This was accomplished by the use of a consent form.

A consent form was created by the researcher and included a brief statement of purpose for the study, the extent of participant involvement, and a statement indicating that participation is voluntary and confidential. The consent form required the signature of both the participant and researcher. A copy of the consent form is attached to this study as Appendix 4.

CHAPTER FOUR

LEADERSHIP AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION:
DEFINITIONS AND POSITION STATEMENTS

Introduction

It is important to spend some significant time to clarify the position I take on a number of issues. This entails offering definitions and explanations so that data analysis in the following chapters may be placed in an honest and clear dialogue with my positions. This chapter presents six topics that clarify my position on leadership: I survey leadership theories, offer my definition of leadership, move toward a working understanding of leadership, briefly disclose my perspective on leaders and ethics, present additional definitions that reflect my perspective on these terms, and introduce the relationship between leadership and religious education that I espouse.

Survey of Leadership Theories

Rost (1989) summarized the descriptors of traditional leadership theory as "scientific, rational, male, management oriented, quantitative, goals dominated, technocratic, cost benefit driven, personalistic, hierarchical, short term, pragmatic, and materialistic" (p. 10). In making that statement, Rost (1989)

analyzed "the deterministic, trait, and empire building theories of the past century; the Freudian, Darwinian, Weberian, power driven theories at the turn of the century; and the rational management, therapeutic, group, systems, situational, and human resources theories of leadership of the 20th. century" (p. 10-11). These concepts uphold skill development, use a management lens to understand leadership or suggest some form of contingency theory to explore leadership. Rost (1989) called these theories and models, the peripheral elements of leadership: "The theories they have developed have been concerned with the peripheries of leadership: traits, personality characteristics, born or made issues, greatness, group facilitation, goal attainment, effectiveness, contingencies, situations, goodness, style, and above all the management of organizations--public and private" (p. 1).

All of these concepts, I suggest, are rooted in a logical positivist perspective. Such a view gives prominence to a rational model of interpretation, is rooted historically in the industrial age, is technocratic, and understands the human person as a machine. That which is known as real is that which is useful. Certainly, advances in organizational theory have allowed for an approach to organizational development that values the human person. However organizations are still more likely served by the human element instead of men and women being served by the organization. Profit and the security of organizations are the bottom line.

The notion of leadership that flows out of these concerns focuses on content rather than process, is reactive not proactive, and is hierarchical. Wants and needs often reflect only those of the

organization. Leadership is positional. Roles for leaders are aligned with those of management. These roles favor control and production according to specific guidelines and goals.

Some specific examples will illustrate the development of these traditional theories of leadership. Selznick (1957) suggested that leadership ought to be concerned with values and ways to institutionalize those values. His insights opened the door to think again about leadership beyond office or position. However, the mainstay of traditional leadership theory has been concerned with such concepts as the "great man" approach to leadership that places emphasis on personal charisma and discussions of nature verses nurture issues, such as the question of whether leaders are born or made. Cohen (1990) drew upon the example given by General Patton to define leadership. Patton defined leadership as the art of getting your subordinates to do the impossible. Cohen built his contemporary leadership philosophy upon what he terms as the combat model of leadership. Cohen (1990) defined leadership as "the art of influencing others to their maximum performance to accomplish any task, objective, or project (p. 9)." Such an approach does not really distinguish leadership from management as Cohen claims. This definition allows for manipulation of "subordinates" and connects us once again to the industrial paradigm and its values. However, the attempt to associate leadership with an art does move us beyond the trait and charisma discussion.

Bass (1981) revealed that the trait theory was abandoned in favor of behavior modifications. This in turn, led to Fiedler (1967) and Hunt (1984) and their contingency theories in which leadership

is a matter of matching task with leader style and maturity level. Vroom-Yetton (1973) and House (1971) used path-goal theories and decision making models of leadership to help the organization reach its goals. Kellerman (1984) interpreted leadership as a political act that saw followers as objects of competition while the leader simply makes things happen. Tichy and Devanna (1986) viewed leadership as a drama in which organizations become self-renewing. Schein (1985) connected culture with leadership and believed that the value of leadership is in its ability to expose and shape an organization through culture. Leadership in this context deals with cultural expressions, the meanings we place on events and structures, assumptions, organizational values, beliefs, and rituals.

Peters and Waterman (1982) in *Search for Excellence* unleashed the discussion of leadership and management. Kouzes and Posner (1987), Kotter (1988), Peters (1987), and Waterman (1987) are typical of the relationship between leadership and management. These authors view leadership as excellent management. A hierarchical design is still in place that encourages the idea that the leader alone is the one "in charge." The leader may be sensitive to the need for change and listen to followers. Yet the buck stops with the leader. In this understanding, leaders are excellent managers who encourage people to be their best. Followers are inspired and work with leaders to further the goals and purpose of the organization. Kouzes & Posner (1987) claimed that leadership development is really self-development. "The mastery of the art of leadership comes with the mastery of the self" (p. 298). The excellent manager is the effective leader. Kotter describes

leadership (1988) as "the process of moving a group of people in some direction through noncoercive means" (p. 16). Peters (1987) described leadership: "As concerned with breaking down functional barriers, is captured in the vision and example of the leader, is visible management or management by wandering around, and is that which acts to reduce information distortion"(p. 422).

Deming (1989) claimed that "the aim of leadership should be to improve the performance of man and machine, to improve quality, to increase output, and simultaneously to bring pride of workmanship to people (p. 248). He described the job of management as leadership and that "management must work on sources of improvement, the intent of quality of product and of service, and on the translation of the intent into design and actual product (p. 54). Leadership is really good management in that context and is associated with good products and a profitable bottom line. Leadership is connected to the values and purposes of the industrial paradigm. It is not a process but rather bound to tangible goals that reflect Western, capitalistic ends. Rost (1989) explained the management approach to leadership. "Leadership delivers excellent organizations, excellent products and services, and excellent people in the organizations. The major result, of course, is an excellent bottom line. In sum, leadership is excellent management" (p. 33).

Attempts have recently been made to make distinctions between leadership and management. Zaleznick (1989) referred to management as concerned with bargaining, emotional and technological control, and human relations skills whereas leadership responds to commitment, creativity, concern for others and

experimentation. Bennis (1989) focused on leaders as the key to a new approach to leadership that would separate management from leadership. Leaders convert followers to leaders; and elevate motives; and are concerned with integrity, openness, sustain a vision and are distinguished from those with authority by their imaginative use of power. Bennis & Nanus (1985) attempted a distinction between what leaders do and what managers do. However, this effort examined the results of leadership and management not the nature and purpose of leadership. Nanus (1989) continued the effort to distinguish leadership from management but the result was simply a collapse of the terms. Leadership is described as the *management* of meanings, trust, self and attention. Leadership is effective when certain megaskills are practiced that encourage change, organizational design, and vision. Nanus (1989) described these *megaskills* as a family of interrelated skills essential to creative leadership for the future. These efforts do not define the purpose of leadership or distinguish it from management. However, the authors did establish a global mind set, far sightedness and an appreciation for interdependence as qualities necessary for future leadership.

Attempts to break open the concept of leadership and distinguish it from other processes continue to fail. No clear definition of leadership emerges from all the clatter and movement of these efforts. Part of the reason for this inability to clarify and move toward a new understanding of leadership is the continuing connection to effectiveness and efficiency that is part of the industrial paradigm that still shapes our thinking.

Kuhn (1962) discussed how the existence of anomalies challenge present paradigms. He noted that insecurity and resistance accompany a shift in paradigms. The world community today experiences political, environmental, and spiritual insecurity. There is resistance to some existing governments and institutions. Political crises, dissatisfaction with current materialistic values, inadequate philosophical frameworks and scarce physical resources challenge present paradigms and throw into question their viability.

Harman (1979) claimed that people now use the term dominant paradigm to refer to "the basic way of perceiving, thinking, valuing, and doing, associated with a particular vision of reality" (p.24). Harman (1979) also summarized the industrial era paradigm using the descriptors of industrialization, the scientific method, a belief in unlimited material progress, and the predominance of pragmatic values. He presented an argument for the failure of the industrial paradigm. "This threatened breakdown of the industrial-era paradigm can be summarized as comprising five fundamental failures: (1) It fails to promote one of the most fundamental functions of a society, namely, to provide each individual with an opportunity to contribute to the society and to be affirmed by it in return. (2) It fails to foster more equitable distribution of power and justice. (3) It fails to foster socially responsible management of the development and application of technology. (4) It fails to provide goals that will enlist the deepest loyalties and commitments of the nation's citizens. (5) It fails to develop and maintain the habitability of the planet" (pp. 25-28).

I agree with Rost (1989) that the industrial-era paradigm is inadequate.

If this analysis is accurate--if leadership thought and practice have taken on the dominant values of the industrial era--then a profound transformation of leadership thought and practice must take place in the postindustrial era if the needs of the people living in that era are to be well served. Indeed, it could be argued that the crisis in leadership today-- a time of transition between eras--is that our leadership paradigm is still so oriented to the industrial paradigm when much of our thought and practice in other aspects of life has undergone considerable transformation. We will not resolve that crisis in leadership until scholars begin to think radically new thoughts about leadership, until scholars begin to make quantum leaps in leadership theory, until scholars develop a new school of leadership based on the values of the coming postindustrial paradigm and serviceable to that era (pp.11-12).

This industrial age paradigm does not foster transformation. Instead, it is concerned with the management of change, the status quo, production, the continued predominance of the scientific method, and exaggerated reliance upon technology.

Burns (1978) brought a transfusion of thought into thinking about leadership. His understanding of transformation and leadership was revolutionary. Yet problems remained as Rost (1989) critically reminded us that Burns failed to distinguish leadership from

management, to develop a case for transactional leadership being leadership, and to define the noncoercive nature of leadership (pp. 7-8). Burns also links moral development with transforming leadership. This link creates a multitude of problems. A major concern is the question of whose morality will prevail or is appropriate? This does not imply that leadership is without an ethic. Leadership can exist even if it fails to raise the follower to a higher level of morality. People must be able to recognize leadership without allowing certain individuals or groups to limit a definition of leadership to only their understanding of what is moral. People ought to have a clear definition of leadership available to them which allows the common majority to practice leadership, analyze leadership when it is identified, and be able to recognize and distinguish leadership from other experiences and processes.

Foster (1989) helped to reconstruct leadership. He described leadership as being educative, transformational, ethical, and critical. The follower-leader relationship is socially responsible. The purpose of leadership is social change and human emancipation. A major contribution is his insight that leadership does not reside in the individual but rather in the community. The concept of transformation is reborn in the effort of Foster to reconstruct leadership. Change is transformational when it is morphogenetic and enables people to change or reorder their social reality. The critical nature of leadership is evident in such an endeavor. However, change must be empowering and not dehumanizing for leadership to be experienced.

Foster (1989) discussed the content of leadership eloquently. Yet, leadership understood primarily as content may lead to an elitist understanding of leadership, a reality that is not within our common grasp if it does not concretely establish human liberation and the ideals of social justice. Foster clearly sets leadership apart from management and previous theories by calling for a reconstruction of leadership that is based in critical theory and human liberation.

Rost (1989) offered an understanding of leadership that distinguishes between the content and process of leadership. His definition is clear and moves away from traditional ties to logical positivism and a scientific framework of social interpretation. Product gives way to process; transformation and real, intended change are central; the relationship between leaders and followers is essential, mutual, and noncoercive. Rost (1989) broke away from both traditional and contemporary theories and presented a clear and innovative approach to leadership: "Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes" (p. 16). This definition and perspective toward leadership forms the basis for my own understanding. I basically adopt this definition as my own with some modifications and additions.

Toward a Definition of Leadership

I offer the following definition and explanation as the basis upon which I examine leadership. *Leadership is a dialectical process which involves an influence relationship among leaders and*

participants who intend and move toward real changes that reflect their mutual discernment.

Leadership is a human and a singular activity shared by leaders and participants. Leadership is practiced by both and is not the responsibility of only one half of that equation. Participants or followers do not do followership, they do leadership. Leadership is practiced by leaders and followers in the influence relationship. However, the relationship is not equal. Rost (1989) described the unequal influence relationship that is leadership. "The relationship is inherently unequal because the influence patterns are unequal. Typically, leaders have more influence because they are willing to commit more of the power resources they possess to the relationship, and they are more skilled at putting those power resources to work to influence others in the relationship. However, there are times when followers may exert more influence than leaders in the relationship. If one or a few followers cause this influence pattern to develop, the follower(s) becomes a leader" (p. 26). I suggest that leaders and participants who practice leadership ought to be transforming agents.

Leadership is dialectical. I mean by this that leadership is about processes that engage reality in ways that affirm, refuse, and move beyond present ways of knowing to a new level of knowing. Leadership that is dialectical is then rooted in praxis, in processes of ongoing reflection and action. Leadership encourages the questioning of basic assumptions. Argyris (1978) called this double loop learning. Morgan (1983) described this form of learning as that "which rests on an ability to challenge and change values, norms,

policies, procedures and other 'theories in use' that underlie one's mode of operation" (p. 6). Morgan also described such learning as action learning. Action learning has as its aim to create community that can learn to free itself from its experience. It is democratic and heterarchical, pluralistic, proactive and empowering, links the individual to social transformation, and strives to integrate different kinds and levels of understanding. By using the term *dialectical*, I mean that leadership is about these *learning* processes.

Leadership is a process. Leaders and participants are concerned with the content of real, intended changes. Aligning leadership with content limits leadership to what certain individuals define as specific content or interest. When leadership is seen as a process, it not only allows leadership to be practiced by many but also allows leadership to be recognized and analyzed in the present because it is not connected to achieving a specific product. Leadership as process moves us beyond the boundaries and limitations of an industrial paradigm.

Leadership comprises the use of influence. This implies that power is used as empowerment, not as something exercised over others. Leadership as influence is not power wielding but rather it is mutidirectional and interactive. Leadership influence is political. I understand political (from the Greek term *polis*, city-state) to mean that leadership involves the use of persuasion in the midst of the interaction of communities of citizens who engage in processes of forming a participative society, a way of forming the manner in which we live together.

The concept of relationship uncovers the human dimension of leadership. Leadership is a human activity, therefore it has ethical implications. The leadership relationship must not be coercive or in any way reflect a Machiavellian interpretation. Relationship also reveals that leadership is a dynamic. It is ongoing, changing, alive. To say that leadership is a relationship is to reveal that it is a process that often defies the status quo because it is a movement.

Leaders are one half of the leadership dynamic. They relate to participants not as teacher to student but engage a shared activity that is flowing and moves between the two in ways that respect the learning status of both leaders and participants.

The word *participants* suggests that the relationship is voluntary. Leadership requires participants. Passivity is not part of leadership. Participants in the leadership process are not objects but subjects, co-shapers of their own history, culture and social reality.

The relationship is mutual. It is a discernment process that recognizes the interdependence of leaders and participants, is collaborative, respectful of person, forms community, avoids dehumanizing activities, as well as recognizes and discerns the wants and needs of leaders and participants.

When I suggest that leaders and participants move toward change, I mean that the process is a striving, a movement beyond the present condition of knowing and acting. It is not necessary to realize a product, to accomplish a specific, concrete goal. It is the process, the intention, that counts. The process that moves toward

real, intended changes is an unfinished endeavor. This movement toward real changes is what I mean by transformation.

The changes that leadership intends are more than singular because of the interconnection of reality. No reality is isolated and when one corner of human reality is changed, it affects the whole. Change is holographic. To change means to alter, to make different in a pluralistic sense. Real change is transforming. Leadership is transformational. Change in the leadership process is significant and substantive, not merely seeming. Real change is not about the rearrangement of reality but its reconstruction. Such change is intended in the process that is leadership. It is, therefore, deliberate and consciously held with conviction and commitment.

Leadership is made present when all five elements exist: (a) a dialectical process, (b) an influence relationship, (c) among leaders and participants, (d) who intend real changes, (e) which reflect their mutual discernment. The elimination of any part of the definition nullifies the process that is leadership. At that point, something else exists, management, manipulation, the use of authority, etc.

While leadership is a process, leaders are often concerned with content. Rost (1989) stated that the changes that leaders and participants intend are filled with content: "organized facts gathered in patterned ways, conceptual frameworks that help to make sense of the data, rational analyses of various proposals based on some personal and/or professional criteria, and ethical judgement of the value of alternative proposals based on some more criteria" (p. 12).

The content which leaders and participants intend will vary. The content which is their concern does not determine leadership. What is needed are transforming leaders who will practice leadership in such a way as to transform leadership itself. Leadership that is understood as process and not content may or may not realize certain goods or specific content. What leadership ought to be and what it is are sometimes two different things. For example, persons may practice leadership using the criteria I suggest in the chapter but the changes that are intended may not be changes that are in accord with the ideals of the church or society. Again, what is needed are transforming leaders who will practice the process of leadership (an ethical endeavor) in such a way as to transform leadership itself. Leaders and leadership are two realities that should not be collapsed. This collapse is often the case. When it occurs, leadership is seen as content, not process. This happens because the specific interests of individual leaders controls leadership. Leaders become interested in reaching their vision or goal and leadership is tied to the goal of the leader. The process of leadership is lost. At that point the pitfalls of an industrial age paradigm emerge to cloud our thinking and prevent us from moving beyond ourselves to a new paradigm, fresh values, and novel insights that will enable us to live purposively in the 21st century.

I am indebted to Foster (1989) for his insights into critical theory and its relation to the content of leadership. His insights help form my understanding of transforming leaders. I offer that transforming leaders ought to be ethical, educative, critical and

transformative. They engage in a dialectical process which involves an influence relationship among leaders and participants that intends and moves toward real changes that reflect their mutual purposes and value human emancipation, social change, and the pursuit of an achievable common good.

Toward An Understanding of Leadership

Leadership needs to be focused and that focus is provided by leaders and participants who have end values. These values give shape, purpose, and direction to leadership efforts. Leaders and participants will, of course, have different values. Neither leaders, participants nor leadership are value free. Since leadership is essentially a relationship, I believe that the value of human dignity must be paramount. The leader-participant relationship is also one that is respectful of mutual rights and duties. This mutual respect of rights and concern for mutual needs requires that attention also be given to the virtue of justice.

Leadership content focuses on end values which concern human well being and the uplifting of human persons and society. Therefore, the value of human freedom is important and must be considered by leaders and participants as a value that ought to be upheld, fostered and protected. Freedom is operative at all times even though it is limited for various reasons. Freedom is the limited capacity to determine who we shall become. Leaders and participants who practice leadership strive toward their full potential as human persons.

Leaders and participants are invited to value human dignity, justice and freedom. These values do not exhaust what is needed but form a kind of cradle for leaders and participants who wish to make moral changes to both practice leadership and reflect upon the experience of that activity.

These values of justice, human dignity and freedom move toward shaping an ethic in the leadership process that does not allow leaders and participants to use persons as a means to an end. Authentic leadership respects people and gives primary value to human needs. Such leadership is collaborative. Leadership carries a notion of human service. However, it is not the same as service but goes beyond it. The leaders and participants may desire to serve. In leadership people *intend real changes* that reflect a mutual discernment. Greenleaf (1977) referred to servant leadership. I briefly discussed the viability and caveats of servant leadership in Chapter Two. Certain reflective questions flow out of the praxis character of servant leadership: Do participants grow as persons and move toward adulthood? Do participants become healthier, wiser and freer individuals? Do participants become more themselves or do they simply remain in some preshaped role? Do participants become potential and actual leaders? Do participants move to a greater understanding of their interdependence and responsibility? In summary, servant leaders and participants assume leadership as a personal responsibility, they embody their vision and values. These leaders and participants are dialectic. They listen to one another more than instruct so that they may

affirm their mutual giftedness and encourage each other to move from reflection to action and toward an achievable common good.

Leadership is intrinsically linked to society and is a necessary part of all institutions and organizations. This link to society is a basis for the political nature of leadership. Some of the political concerns of leadership include enabling people to deal creatively and critically with their social reality, and to deliberately influence how people live their lives in society.

The political nature of leadership requires that leaders access power resources, actively compete for followers and utilize conflict to respond to the mutual wants and needs of the leader and followers. Leadership is eminently political because it is a matter of influence, a deliberate, intended, and planned intervention into people's lives.

Political leadership requires power. All true leadership employs power, not as an end in itself but uses it to empower followers. It is generative. Leaders understand that power wielding is not leadership. Western society is restricted by the concept that the more power a person keeps, the more one has. Leadership, on the other hand, holds to the principle that the more power a person gives away, the more one has.

The goal of this shared power and employment of power resources is to co-create a more rewarding present and to realize the long term goals of the leaders and participants, goals upheld by the visions of both leader and participants, goals mutually shared, shaped, and determined.

Leadership puts a priority upon trust. This element of trust enables leaders and participants to use power and power resources not over people but rather with people. It is this element of trust that allows leaders to enter the lives of participants, to extract those generative themes that permit leaders to respond to authentic needs. Trust is valuable because leaders and participants can build levels of identity wherein human values are honored. When this occurs, credibility is fostered and human well being is sought.

The political and relational nature of leadership reveals that leadership has a social context. Leadership, and those who practice it, are influenced by culture. Culture itself may need to be changed so that society may move toward the mutually discerned end values of the leaders and participants. Changing culture is a difficult and a long process. Perhaps the more modest reality is that leaders and participants can only reshape culture.

Leaders and participants do have to intend change, change that is substantive. This sets leadership apart from management and service. This intended change is real in that it is historical and ought to be concomitant with the leaders' and participants' mutually discerned purposes, goals, and visions. Leadership that moves toward significant change is transforming. A transforming effect is seen in the leader, participants, culture and society. Leadership that is transforming attempts to change the human condition, to elevate it. Transforming leadership questions the status quo and moves people toward motivation and ethical maturity. Such a journey helps people reflect upon their own traditions, set of beliefs and values, and places them in dialogue with a greater vision, a broader

tradition and narrative. Transforming leadership challenges and changes, bringing leaders and participants to new insights about themselves and their social and cultural context.

The nature of leadership as I have been describing it suggests that it is in conflict with present Western culture. Our culture places an inordinate value upon private concerns and approaches. This excessive and solipsistic attitude leads to hoarding of resources, private solutions to public problems and economic efforts to resolve crises that stem from a lack of virtuous leadership. Transforming leadership requires real change in culture. It requires leadership that embodies the virtue of justice. Leaders and participants who practice leadership herald a new appreciation for the common good and partnership between individuals and institutions, governments and businesses, as well as the private and public sectors of society. Transforming leadership does not allow for private solutions to public problems.

Leadership is, therefore, an ethical endeavor. This ethic is rooted in virtues and values. Ethical leaders and participants seek to establish a just society that cares for the needs of the least capable and resourced. Living in the tension between the needs of the individual and the needs of society is both the challenge and dilemma of ethical leadership.

The content of leadership ought to address such issues as what kind of society do we inhabit? What does it mean to be a good person, to create and sustain a good society? What values ought to shape us and what are the enculturating values of our present society? How may we ethically change our society and culture?

Leaders mobilize participants and resources to respond to these questions.

The movement and change that results ought to allow growth for participants and institutions alike. Ethical leadership is mindful of developmental issues as it moves leaders, participants, and society toward a moral existence. In this sense leadership is a mutually educative experience for leaders and participants, for both are invited to engage ultimate moral values and goals and unmask those elements which distort the person and the telos.

Another way to examine the elusive reality of leadership is to refer to what leadership is not. Leadership is not a formula that one places upon a situation. Such a notion is too static for the dynamic process which is leadership. It is not management because management is about control and leadership is about change. Accumulation of skills does not equal leadership, for leadership transcends skills. Leadership is not the imposition of ideas, technologies nor the manipulation or power wielding over persons. Leadership is more than bargaining or the machination of wants and needs exchange. Neither is leadership an orchestration or facilitation of events. Leaders and participants shape events: they don't manage them. Leaders and participants intend and initiate change. This may produce healthy conflict. Leaders and participants do not manage conflict. Rather, they may cause people to question, experience tension, and be immersed in creative conflict.

An additional approach to understanding leadership is to examine its effects. Authentic leadership may occur at any level. It is not hierarchical. Leaders and participants do leadership together.

However, the influence in the relationship may be unequal. At times the participants may exercise a greater leadership influence than the leader. The opposite may also be true, that the leader may at times exercise unequal influence in the relationship. What I am suggesting is that leadership is not an elitist activity. It belongs to society. Leadership is a community activity.

Authentic leadership is not prejudiced. If persons are unjustly excluded by "leaders" from leadership opportunities, I maintain that leadership itself has not been exercised. Leadership needs many different voices to fashion real, significant changes at every economic, human, spiritual and political stratum.

A crucible for the ethical content of leadership is to examine the effect of leadership upon the least significant in society. Are the lives, human conditions, and cultures of those persons elevated or changed? Are leaders and participants emerging from these marginalized segments of society due to leadership behaviors that incorporate the needs and wants of the least among us? Ethical leaders and participants who practice the process of leadership ought to make a difference in these arenas.

Leadership is an art, elusive and complex. Our understanding of the process is evolving. An understanding of leadership, leaders, and participants is being shaped by study as well as by practice.

Perhaps by distinguishing leadership from other forms of behavior intended to direct the activities of other people, we will uncover some of the core aspects of leadership. However, it still remains elusive and complex because leadership is embodied in leaders, persons of integrity and vision who are themselves

complex, human, and fashioned to a great extent by social systems. So often the confusion is amplified by making no distinction between leaders and leadership. Transforming leaders and participants inspire us because they are able to transcend those systems, reflect them back to us and lead us together toward a higher and more meaningful existence.

Leaders and participants need to strive toward being whole persons, individuals who develop their capacities for reason and intuition, for thinking and feeling. Leaders and participants have vision yet that same vision requires a recognition of limits, their own and those of their resources. Leadership is vision tempered with reality. It is a dynamic, an interactive process that changes and is changed because it is a human endeavor.

Leadership, Leaders, and Ethics

I believe that all creation has a telos. This telos is the Kingdom of God and is marked by such values as human dignity, freedom, and justice. I am influenced by the christian understanding of justice which links it to the concept of covenant, the relationship between the individual and the community. I hold that justice is also rooted in an understanding of rights. These rights of the individual and the advancement of the common good need to constantly struggle to find a balance. My understanding of christian theology influences me to consider that there is a hierarchy of rights. For example, spiritual/emotional goods take precedence over temporal superiority, and the common good takes precedence over the advancement of individual goods that disregard the needs of the

least in society. Christian ethics is not limited to a love ethic. Christian ethics should create and sustain systems and communities that value human dignity, human freedom and the inculcation of virtues such as justice and compassion. I do hold a christian approach to ethics but that does not mean that ethics is limited to christian perspectives. It seems appropriate that christian ethics ought to appreciate and be informed by other philosophical and religious concepts. These values of human dignity, freedom, and justice help form my own vision and ethic as a leader. They also formulate the particular kind of leadership that I would like to see operative in the church. Christian leaders and participants who practice leadership *ought* to mutually discern changes that encourage values which hasten the Kingdom of God in its fullness. However, it is possible that leadership could be practiced and bring forth changes that are unethical or immoral. Leaders and participants may practice the process of leadership in an ethical manner and make unethical changes. Leadership would still have occurred. This is why I suggest that leaders and participants *ought* to practice leadership that encourages ethical and moral changes.

Rost (1989) clearly distinguished between the ethics of the leadership process and the ethics of leadership content. Some of this distinction is addressed in the literature review. I support this distinction. The issue of ethics in the leadership process revolves around how influence is exercised in the leadership relationship. The issue of ethics and the content of leadership involves moving beyond traditional frameworks for ethical decision making. It implies moving beyond past ethical systems that are unable to cope

with the joint public and private dilemmas of our present age. The concept of civic virtue and the common good as suggested by Sullivan (1986), MacIntyre (1984), and Bellah (1985) form the basis for ethics and leadership as we approach a new century. As Rost (1989) suggested, "leaders and followers are dealing with not just their individual interests mutually accommodated but the public interest mutually developed; not just their own goods mutually attained but the common good mutually integrated into their individual goods; not just their own private purposes mutually pursued, but the community purpose mutually transformed" (p. 30).

It is possible for persons who practice the process of leadership to make unethical or immoral changes. Rost (1989) made a significant point: "It is terribly important that we not confuse what leadership is with what leadership should be" (p. 18). The concept of ethical and unethical leadership and the concept of leadership and nonleadership are not the same. "The two concepts are not on the same continuum but on two different continuum that intersect as a cross. This model makes clear that some change processes can be both leadership and ethical, others can be neither or can be one but not the other" (p. 18). The ethics of the leadership process does not guarantee that ethical changes will follow. The ethics of the content of leadership ought to be formed by the leadership relationship. Responsibility for the ethical content of leadership is a shared responsibility, fostered by mutual purpose and discernment, and informed by the common good.

What I am concerned about promoting in the following remarks is a specific dimension of leadership, one that promotes an ethical

process and content for leadership. I am concerned about encouraging what leadership ought to be or should be. In reality, what leadership should be and what leadership is may be two different experiences. Some people may practice the ethical process of leadership and intend changes which I find unacceptable. Leadership may still have happened. Some leaders and participants may not possess the values that I admire or would encourage, but they still practice leadership. My hope is that the practice of the process of leadership and a new awareness of the force and necessity of the common good will influence ethical leaders and participants to work toward ends that promote a strong ethical frame.

Leaders and participants who wish to develop the ethical process and content of leadership are concerned about human behavior. Persons interact with one another in a social and physical environment. It is difficult to build a healthy, ethical ecology that respects these complex relationships. Leadership is concerned, in part, about the transformation of human behavior. A portion of the responsibility of leaders and participants is to possess and embody a vision. That vision is shaped by certain virtues which in turn help create a narrative for a community or an organization. Organizations ought to be moral agents, vehicles for transformation. Narratives that inculcate an ethic assist these organizations and communities to resolve moral dilemmas.

Leaders and participants who practice the process of leadership in contemporary American society are challenged to move beyond economics as a basis for decision making. To transcend

economics implies addressing the implications of joining ethics and leadership. Leaders and participants must address the content of leadership (proposed changes) and should attend to issues of a wider scope, issues that may seem elusive and even philosophical. For example, what is the common good? What is the responsibility of society to the marginalized, such as, women, the poor, gay and lesbian persons? What is the relationship between human society and the created world? What ought to be the relationship between cultures and civilizations in the 21st century?

People do not exercise leadership to use persons to achieve ends. Instead, power is employed to empower others. Power over others implies a kind of manipulation that is not appropriate or ethical. This is why the leadership relationship is modified by the adjective, *influence*. Influence implies a noncoercive yet complex human effort. Influence is exercised among leaders and participants in an *unequal* but nonmanipulative manner. Manipulation or power wielding is antithetical to leadership and the ethics of the leadership process.

Leaders and participants demonstrate an ethical dimension when they involve themselves in the interplay of work, leisure, family, political and cultural frameworks. This interplay involves a dialectic between ideas and persons that enable individuals and organizations to make successful transitions through stages of development toward higher levels of human excellence and well being. These dimensions of development seek to respect the psychological, physical, and spiritual development of individual persons but should also seek to establish a just society that cares

for the needs of the least in a culture. This also requires a new sensitivity to a world culture that ought to resist anthropocentric attitudes that weaken an already struggling universal ecology. Living in the tension between the needs of the individual and the needs of society is both the challenge and dilemma of ethical leaders and participants who practice the process that is leadership.

Ethics and leadership are both personal and public in nature. It appears that a clear, common ethic has diminished in the landscape of our public consciousness. It is the responsibility of people who do leadership to embody, evidence, and clarify an appropriate ethic. Leaders and participants are educators for they communicate an ethical consciousness through their own integrity and purposeful activity. Such ethical activity is causative for substantive change in society, change that fosters human well being and transformation. Such change will be enduring in that our public consciousness cherishes the values which cause those changes. *Ethical* leaders and participants personally integrate virtue and end values and in doing so help persons and communities act their way into new ways of thinking. This public nature of leadership and ethics requires both the advancement of self-esteem and the ability to use conflict in creative ways that foster collaboration.

Ethical leadership is, at times, prophetic for it may require challenging mainstream concerns and the systems which nurture those concerns. In America, for example, ethical leadership should challenge rampant consumerism, excessive capitalism, adultism, militarism, anthropocentrism, and the idea of morality by the majority. Our culture places an inordinate value upon private

concerns and approaches. This excessive and solipsistic attitude leads to hoarding of resources, private solutions to public problems and economic efforts to resolve crises that stem from a lack of virtuous leadership.

The relationship between ethics and leadership is inseparable. Ethics is part of the content and process of leadership. Leadership is something other than itself if it is void of an ethic. In summary, ethics and leadership converge when leaders and participants influence real change that heralds a new appreciation for the common good and partnership between individuals and institutions, government and business, as well as the private and public sectors of society.

Additional Definitions

Metanoia

McBrien (1980) suggested that the Greek term, *metanoia*, connotes a change of mind, "a turning away from his or her former consciousness, now recognized as wrong, and striking out in a completely new direction" (p. 917). Such a reorientation of one's life is initiated as a response to faith in Jesus Christ. McBrien (1980) used Lonergan to explain the conversion concept of metanoia: "There is a change in oneself, in one's relation with others, and in one's relation to God. Conversion, then, is the transformation of the individual and his or her world" (p. 962).

What is at issue here is the emphasis that is placed upon faith in God and the change that takes place in the individual. Emphasis is

upon the individual and upon the intellectual, moral, and religious change within the individual.

Transformation

Transformation, as I understand it in relation to leadership and leaders, is more pervasive than metanoia. Moore (1989) discussed the difference between conversion (metanoia) and transformation. Transformation has a larger meaning than conversion. Transformation transcends a change of consciousness but also leads to a new orientation that recognizes "social connections and a new sense of responsibility within the community" (p. 29). The result of this transformation is "a new sense of relationship to persons and social phenomena" (p. 29). Change that is transformational questions basic assumptions and challenges a culture. It includes the effects of conversion but does not depend upon nor necessarily include religious faith. Leadership that is transforming is a mutual effort among leaders and participants, and involves the organization, community and context.

Transformation is about questioning those basic assumptions and governing variables that shape our thinking. It is concerned with shifts of power and is precipitated by both external and internal forces. It is morphogenetic, radical, and revolutionary. When I say *morphogenetic*, I mean that a change in the core, mission, and purpose is intended or a sharply new understanding of that core, mission and purpose is set forth. Smith (1982) discussed morphogenetic change as that change which deals with the relationship between relationships, not simply change within a

relationship. Transformation is nontherapeutic, but it demands resocialization that itself promotes processes of cooperative adult learning. Morphogenesis is a result of critical inquiry in which an individual and organization are transformed in its genus.

Transformational change may require moving to a new paradigm, not simply orchestrating a change within a present paradigm. It occurs on a multilevel, multidimensional scale.

The real changes that I refer to in my definition of leadership is what I mean by transformation. In that same definition, I mention that leadership involves an influence relationship among leaders and participants who *intend and move toward* real changes. One does not have to realize those changes nor does the transformation have to be complete. It may be that the morphogenetic change experienced by a society or an organization has occurred over a long period of time, even over years. Leadership may happen even if the transformation or morphogenesis is incomplete. Leadership is not a rare activity. The opposite ought to be the norm. Leadership should be happening everywhere and ought be practiced by nearly everyone.

Transformation leads to a new way of thinking, behaving, and conceiving reality. It is concerned with those critical thinking processes that bring about a cognitive redefinition of a new mission, vision, or purpose.

Transformational change goes beyond planned and adaptive change in organizations. It goes beyond altering procedures, processes, and structures as suggested by Lewin (1951), Staw (1977), and Weick (1976). Transformation deals with long term change. It employs a critical mindset that renders a status quo

approach to reality unacceptable. Transformational leadership is necessary for transformational change. Transformational processes are resocializational processes that create a change in the way people understand and construct our reality; create and educate our worldview; reconstruct our approach to life as a community of children, women and men; and develop a clear understanding of those economic, cultural, and international forces that form our environment and our future.

Religious Education

My position toward religious education is offered in the literature review. However, I want to extract some of the key concepts here for purposes of clarity and summary.

I believe that the experience of being religious is an odyssey into mystery and a movement or process in which greater human integrity is realized. The religious individual wrestles with questions in a happy tension that is typical of a life lived with an open end, a grand telos. As religious beings we are invited into a process of reshaping our meanings, our religion, our society, in a continuing search to grasp and attend to the divine-human and interhuman relationships that unfold in the human experience.

I hold that education is based upon living experience. Religious education, in particular, is more than catechesis. Education has to do with transformation, with the task of creating a alternative consciousness and presenting better alternatives. Freire (1970) best summarized this liberating pedagogy. He believes that the action and reflection of men and women upon their world in order to

transform it is the real purpose of human education. Education is then a humanizing process. Education is about challenging meanings that presently abound, to lead and to be lead out of present experience to new understandings of human existence and of the created universe. I believe that transformation is at the heart of religious education. Like leadership, religious education is a process that intends real changes. Religious education is a struggle to transform ideas, persons, and institutions. The process of religious education must deal with lives of people. Life is greater than existence (Moran, 1984). It is about the ultimate concerns that enrich our existence as individuals and communities. Again, there are common links between the nature and purpose of leadership and religious education in the value that is placed on process, relationship, intention, proactivity, and the political nature of both processes. I believe that religious education is a process of faith enrichment that happens best in community, in partnership, in a dialectic relationship that leads people to a common horizon. Such a process requires transforming leadership.

I am most comfortable with the approach to religious education offered by Groome (1980). He goes to the heart of religious education when he defined it as: "a political activity with pilgrims in time that deliberately and intentionally attends with them to the activity of God in our present, to the Story of the Christian faith community, and the the Vision of God's Kingdom, the seeds of which are already among us " (p. 25).

The Relationship between Leadership and Religious Education

The relationship between these two processes will unfold more concretely in the last chapter of this dissertation. However, there are a few basic connections that I want to explicate briefly.

Transformation is at the core of leadership and ought to be at the core of religious education. In reality, religious education could take place without real, intended changes. Religious education ought to create an atmosphere and attentiveness to transformation. Transformation extends to persons, communities, institutions, societies, cultures, and values. The real, intended changes reflect authentic transformation which illumines and directs leadership. The transformation should also illumine and direct religious education.

Leadership is a process and religious education is a process. Both the process that is leadership and the process that is religious education have ethical dimensions. The content of leadership with its teleological purpose and the content of religious education with its teleological purpose uphold the humanization of our lives, cherish the value of the human relationship over objects, products, and materialism, and engage the struggle to move toward social justice and an attainable common good.

The leaders and participants who practice leadership and the religious educators who practice religious education must deal with bridging private and public sensitivity. Religious educators have a special responsibility to practice leadership and in that process to transform both individual and societal domains. Religious educators, by practicing leadership, educate for and about

leadership. In fact, the practice of leadership by religious educators is essential for moving the church and society toward a common good, the Reign of God, and a teleology that enables children, women and men to live together and in unison with all creation in an age of transition. The practice of leadership by religious educators is necessary to nurture life in the 21st century. The practice of leadership by religious educators who are transforming leaders and participants is key to moving humanity to a more meaningful existence in a less anthropocentric and more interdependent world.

Schooling is akin to management. Moore (1989) indicated that a schooling (and I would add, catechetical) model of education has been formulated around managerial and industrial concepts. I understand religious education and leadership to transcend those concepts. Both religious education and leadership ought to guide us through that transition that will herald the dawn of a new paradigm and the passage of industrial based values. Moore stated that the purpose of education is: "To enable persons, or collective groups of persons, to take informed responsibility for the social order of which they are a part. This requires an awareness of their needs and problems, a growing appreciation of the resources and value of corporate life, and learning how to participate in the social order in order to bring about needed change and to envision long-range goals that will benefit the majority of the human race" (p. 18). These requirements are also necessary for leaders, participants and the process of leadership, for religious educators and the process of education. Ethical leadership that is transformational helps accomplish the purpose of education as Moore described it.

I believe that the purpose and nature of leadership and the purpose and nature of religious education are separate. My intention is not to collapse them. Rather, I wish to show that religious educators have much to gain from the study of leadership. While leadership may be practiced by anyone, religious education is practiced by persons of faith, usually in the context of a community that holds similar values and beliefs shared by the leaders and participants. Religious education directly attends to the activity of God in our lives. By definition, the process of leadership does not deal with religious concerns or does not acknowledge God's activity. Of course, God's activity is not excluded because the person of faith cannot dictate the realm of God's activity. The relationship formed in religious education is a relationship that includes and recognizes God as an active partner in the dialectical process. Leadership does not recognize that partnership. Religious educators in some situations may practice leadership but not religious education. By definition, religious education does not require leadership. But religious education would benefit by the process and practice of leadership. The element of real change, and therefore transformation, is essential to leadership. Real, substantive change and transformation are essential to the understanding of religious education that I espouse. However, I do not believe that the understanding of religious education that I present in this study is a norm. The concept of transformational change presented in this chapter needs to be included in the definition of religious education. It is not enough to imply or assume that transformational change is an essential ingredient in the nature and purpose of religious

education. Such assumptions encourage misunderstanding. Some religious educators may admit that the element of change is important to religious education. However, other religious educators may not go so far as to include the degree of change that I suggest in the term *transformation*. Religious educators who practice leadership have an opportunity to make transformational change a clearly essential element in the nature and purpose of religious education.

Religious educators would benefit in knowing what leadership is, what it is not, and the nature and purpose of leadership. My hope is that they become transformational leaders who practice the process of leadership. Religious educators who practice leadership, who analyze and evaluate leadership, and who nurture and educate for christian leadership greatly assist the process of religious education. Religious educators who practice the process of leadership and act as transforming leaders draw from the well of an alternative consciousness instead of current trends in business, management, organizational development, utilitarian ethics, an emotivist mentality, logical positivist goals, and a culture whose bottom line is materialism, the regulation of resources, excellent management, and the exercise of adroit, executive administration. Religious educators carry the responsibility to reveal in word and deed, the meaning and implication of leadership to the laity and clergy of a congregation, as well as to base communities, corporate organizations and every other human institution in the nation and the world.

Religious education and religious educators have experienced marginalization. This is partly due to the fact that most religious educators are women and partly due to the fact that both theology and religious education are seen erroneously as a private concern. Nevertheless, from this place of potential liberation, transforming leadership is likely to emerge in ways that foster transforming leaders and religious educators who are sensitive to the wants and needs of people. The religious educator who practices the process that is leadership stands as a mentor to potential leaders. Leaders and participants together practice leadership. When leaders and participants mentor, they educate. These transforming leaders and participants begin to heal a broken world as they welcome gender, religious, and cultural differences. When leaders and participants practice leadership, they begin the processes that mends the rip between the sacred and secular.

CHAPTER FIVE

DEMOGRAPHIC AND PARTICIPANT PROFILES

Demographics of the Study

Seventeen persons were interviewed as part of the research. The questionnaire used to gather demographic data among the participants in the study is included as Appendix III. Qualitative and quantitative data about those interviewed are summarized below.

Geography

All participants live within the United States:

*2 out of 17 (12%) live in the south

*11 out of 17 (65%) live in the midwest

*1 out of 17 (6%) live in the north

*3 out 17 (18%) live in the west

Urban-Rural Locale

*7 out of 17 (41%) live in rural or semi-urban areas

*10 out of 17 (59%) live in an urban area

Age

*2 out of 17 (12%) are in their 30s

*11 out of 17 (65%) are in their 40s

*4 out of 17 (24%) are in their 50s

Gender

*8 out of 17 (47%) are male

*9 out of 17 (53%) are female

Marital Status

*1 out of 17 (6%) is single and never married

*16 out of 17 (94%) are married and never divorced

Race

*16 out of 17 (94%) are white

*1 out of 17 (6%) is black

Education

*2 out of 17 (12%) completed high school

*3 out of 17 (18%) complete college

*12 out of 17 (71%) completed graduate studies

Religion

*15 out of 17 (88%) were Roman Catholic from their infancy

*2 out of 17 (12%) became Roman Catholic as adults

Employment

*3 out of 17 (18%) are employed by an organization operated by the catholic church for the first time.

*9 out of 17 (53%) have always been employed by an organization operated by the catholic church.

*4 out of 17 (24%) have never been employed by an organization operated by the catholic church.

Volunteer Work

*4 out of 17 (24%) are presently doing volunteer work in an organization operated by the catholic church

Leadership Education

*15 out of 17 (88%) have had some form of leadership training

*2 out of 17 (12%) have not had any leadership training

Participant Profiles

Kevin Murphy

Kevin comes from a Irish catholic family in Brooklyn, New York. He was ordained a Marynoll priest but left in the 1960s. He then began working for the State of Illinois and later with the Jesuit community's volunteer corp. He is now employed by a diocese in Colorado and directs an office of christian formation. He is married and has three children. He says he "wanted to work on behalf of the poor and to live the Gospel much more by doing than by talking or preaching." The themes of humility, service, justice and involvement filter through his life. "We will have practica that will get people in touch with their vulnerability and get people in touch with poverty so that they can interface with those realities and get a whole experience, not just the intellectual stuff."

Mary Norton

Although Mary resides in a small college town in Missouri, she brings with her a strong catholic background from Wisconsin. She is

married and is involved in music as a professional and volunteer. A two year program for lay persons in ministry has given her the tools she needed to take strong positions within her community and church. "I have said to people that no matter what happens there is no going backwards from this point. I have to go forward no matter what happens, and it is very painful at times. I have discovered that I am more of a leader than I thought I was." She works as a volunteer with the Newman Center, a catholic organization on college campuses that serves young adults. She also vounteers in her parish as a youth minister, religious educator, and musician. A commitment to the social justice teachings and liturgical mission of the church characterize her ministry and interests.

Frank Smith

Frank comes from a large New England family and worked with youth in Connecticut. He holds a Master of Divinity degree from Yale University and is married with three children. He is currently employed as a director of a ministry center in the midwest. Frank is committed to fostering leadership among non ordained persons in the church. A balance between a strong intellectual and pastoral approach dominates his style. Frank eagerly questions and challenges ideas. He is ready to initiate change. "The church is a symbol of hope for people. When the church is progressive in social justice causes, it empowers people to have control over their lives as well as have dignity."

"As a youth minister, I learned that I really liked trying to develop ways to get people to do things, to encourage and support

them as they learned to develop on their own and minister to others." He goes on to say that "what we have in human beings is the potential to really unleash things that can make the society a better place to live." He describes admirable qualities as: "The sense of dedication, that sense of mission, that sense of enabling others." These qualities also typify his own professional and personal stance.

Stephen Baber

This participant lives in Texas and directs an office of continuing education for a catholic diocese. He has taught as a seminary professor and now coordinates efforts at training parish pastoral administrators. Stephen is married and holds a doctorate in theology from the Angelicum in Rome. It was a "conversion experience" on a youth retreat that spurred him to become involved in adult education and ministry training for the laity and clergy. Stephen is relaxed when engaged in dialogue, willing to listen to another opinion and is ready to challenge or question his own or other's positions. Education is very important for Stephen. He believes that education of the laity is what will give them "competency" in order to compete with the emphasis the church places on "office." The laity are a lot more use to "polishing those skills necessary for leadership" than their ecclesial counterparts. It is not "a sign of failure for a lay person, if you have to brush up on something or go find out how to do something or watch someone else do it." Dan was always ready to contribute intellectually and draw me into dialogue during our interviews.

Gretchen Wilson

Gretchen lives in a northern Missouri community, is married and is employed by the catholic church. She also spends a substantial amount of time in the volunteer ministry of her parish community. She always held some kind of position of responsibility while growing up in that geographical area. Her parents, especially her father, encouraged her in these activities. She likes to be in control. Yet, that is not required for her to be involved in any church activities. She participated in a two year ministry training program and this has given her more confidence and interest in enabling others to participate in parish ministry.

Elizabeth Brusch

She was encouraged as a youth to be active and involved by her grandmother as well as by her parish priests. One of the priests hired her as a teacher when she was a teenager. Her husband is very supportive and "thinks I can do anything." Elizabeth appears very confident but says that "I know I don't have as much self-confidence as people think I do." She "likes change a lot and gets a big charge out of getting other people to grow and change." She worked for 15 years for a national publishing company before taking a new position in a large city in the midwest. Her intelligence and confidence are required as the coordinator of a national training program for lay catholics interested in ministry and leadership. She demonstrated herself as a professional and articulate woman during the interviews. Elizabeth welcomed new ideas but remained confident in what she viewed as important concepts crucial to her philosophy.

James Adams

James' parents were quite active in the Presbyterian Church. However, as a youth, he resisted such involvement and in college "took a nose dive away from the church, and called myself an agnostic." He was married at age 21 and grabbed hold of the American dream "to be a millionaire." "I learned to motivate people by my involvement in the Jaycees." James described himself as a workaholic and a drinker at that stage in his life and not a real "Christian model" for his children. After losing employment, he began to reevaluate his life and started his own business. "I was always a good employer in business." He learned about sales from a man who also taught him that "you were not successful in sales unless you were selling something that was good for the people to buy." Today, James is still self-employed and very involved in the church. He is looking for ways to incorporate faith into his business. He works as a volunteer in social justice ministry and is active in forming small base communities. He is also attempting to help renters in his low income housing project assume responsibility for the management of that apartment complex. James is still very active but uses his time and talents to help others develop as faith-filled human beings. He is at ease when revealing his past and present interests. James is willing to share both his convictions and weaknesses. His openness to learning and natural humor are very refreshing.

Marian Rice

Marian was born in a "really catholic community." She joined a religious community right after high school. She has always been involved in some activity and responsibility in the church. She described herself as nonconfrontational except when the church began to affect her personally. At that point she has no problem challenging an issue and asserting herself. She left the religious life as a nun and married. "Well, I think our choice to marry was really going against the church. It challenged the leadership."

Marian is a reflective person, intelligent, and has strong convictions. She teaches high school, volunteers in her parish community and is the mother of three children. Both she and John (her husband) took ministry training.

John Rice

John was an ordained priest and worked for ten years in parishes and schools in the upper midwest. He says that he had "all these administrative skills but my personal interest was in counselling." He earned a counselling degree and worked as a therapist. Upon leaving the priesthood, he married and then worked as a manager. Today he is a director of personnel and planning for a catholic diocese. He has also taken graduate courses in administration at a local college. John is very articulate and ready to offer an opinion. His interest in people is evident as is his skill as a listener. John is struggling with the meaning of leadership and made a shift in the way he thinks about leadership during the course

of our two interviews. His personality is warm and invites trust and dialogue.

Lee Ann Reynolds

She described herself as a "backpew" catholic eight years ago. However, she was active in a number of other activities such as music, cultural organizations, and education. A priest invited her to take on responsible roles in her diocese and she accepted. She is now the director of lay ministries for this western diocese. Lee Ann is married and recently her husband converted to catholicism. It was the act of invitation that hastened her involvement and interest in leadership in the church. She attempts to carry on that spirit of invitation as she works to involve other lay persons in ministry. "I am doing what I am now because other people believed in me and continued, no matter what, to support and gently encourage me." Lee Ann is a no nonsense type person who values her own identity and interests. She has made a serious attempt to balance her work and her life. Unafraid to voice her own opinions and fight for what she believes, she exercises her feminine power and perspective. Conversation is easy but one has to encourage her to explain the meaning under her statements.

Joseph Plummer

After attending a parochial elementary school in Michigan, Joseph entered the seminary. However into his college years, he longed for the life that his large family had shared. He had grown up in a home of nine children in which there was an atmosphere of

togetherness. "I thought about living a life alone as a priest and having no one around to bounce things off, to share life. I always had this urge to help others and leaving the seminary even increased my interest in being a leader."

"Later, I saw a need to help a lot of people who were struggling financially. Therefore around 1960, I began a credit union and was the first president." About five years later at the invitation of a parish priest, Joseph began a teaching career that has lasted for 23 years. He also works as a volunteer in a home association, as a member of the township fire department board, and various governmental bodies. Encouraged by a religious woman in the diocese, Joseph became involved in an evangelization program. He will now begin work full time as a director of the evangelization program in a Michigan diocese. Responsibilities will include working with adults and developing other lay persons for leadership.

Joseph is very energetic and committed to his own large family and many responsibilities. His excitement about his new position is catching. He is a very warm and sensitive individual, eager to learn, and open to learning new ideas. Several times in our interviews he became so involved in discussing events and ideas that were meaningful to him that he almost cried. He is able to balance intellectual approaches with a depth of emotion and care.

Edgar Lewis

A softspoken demeanor does not inhibit the articulate convictions that Edgar politely and with humor offers in conversation. He is a married black man who enjoys family life. He

and his wife also serve as a foster family for needy children. Edgar holds a Masters degree and works for the State of Kansas. His eagerness to learn marks his profession and participation in a variety of educational programs offered by the church.

His involvement with the church began over ten years ago when he took an interest in a spiritual development program in his local parish. That interest lead him to become a catechist and youth director. Edgar is involved in a renewal program for inner city parishes dealing with issues of housing, drugs, and city government. "I think that if nobody had invited me to become involved, I probably would not have done it."

Edgar has become involved with the National Black Catholic Caucus. He was recently a co-presenter at its convention and is working to establish a lay leadership training institute for Black catholics.

Edgar comes across as a very intelligent and concerned individual. His conversation always turns to the practical, to hard work, to commitment and to the hope that is all around him. He advocates change. Yet Edgar is very aware of the difficulty change brings to a situation and the difficulty many people have in changing themselves, their ideas and structures. Difficult things do not discourage him. Rather, they energize him.

Penny Miller

Penny is a quiet individual who works as a registered nurse on the night shift at a hospital in her community. She finds time to serve her parish in a variety of ways and be a mother to six children.

She is married to Thomas. "Both of us came from backgrounds where church was very important in our families." "My parents were involved in the church so it was a natural thing. I went to catholic schools and received my nursing education as a catholic college. Moving from Massachusetts to here was a significant event in our lives. The only things I could identify with at that point was the church. I had to get aligned immediately with the church when so many of our neighbors and friends here were not catholic."

Another significant event was when they were asked to help found a new parish. "I remember getting all the children ready for our first Mass in the new parish. I sat them all down and just said today we are going to have a special opportunity. You are going to be at the first Mass for a new parish and how exciting it would be. Forming a new parish would be fun, a lot of hard work and thrilling."

An attitude of, "roll up your sleeves and get the job done" is evident in Penny's personality. The interviews were always accompanied by a dinner invitation in their home, even if it meant she was going to have to go to work after the interview or get up early to prepare the meal. Her generosity and concern, love of family and community weave themselves through her activities. Penny and Thomas are an ordinary couple who do extraordinary things.

Thomas Miller

Thomas carries a constant smile and is always ready to warm you with his humor. He loves to tease and loves to be teased. He is a gentle man who places a priority on building community and seeking

the involvement of others by his words but, most of all, by his example.

Thomas and Penny are involved in religious education, marriage and sacramental preparation for engaged and young couples, and the Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults (catechumenate) at the parish level. "I think there has always been someone there that gave me the encouragement that I could do anything. Of course, Penny was there too, giving me that encouragement. It is very important that somebody else thinks you are capable of doing something. You want to get involved. The key is letting someone know that he or she can do it. I have to be told that I can handle something and be given a little encouragement."

"I see myself dropping things now that are superficial. I used to listen to a sports oriented radio station all the time. Now I am listening less because there are so many more important things in life than learning about sports."

Thomas exudes common sense and a readiness to participate, learn and encourage others. His natural ability to make friends, enable him to be a stranger to no one and a friend to all.

Angela Fuller

Angela is married with four children. She was a social worker in a child abuse program with a M.A. in counseling and pastoral care. For some time, she "felt called to ministry and contemplated that possibility." Angela served as a pastoral administrator for two parishes and is now diocesan director of ministerial development in a far west state. She looked for a leadership training program that

matched her current responsibilities. It was that search that brought her to the Institute for Pastoral Life. "I think what has happened is that I keep getting put in leadership positions even though that is not what I seek. It keeps happening. It is not intentional."

Angela mentioned that in her two years as pastoral administrator she became "burned out The parishes were not prepared for her leadership position." In both interviews, Angela seemed very tired and reluctant to share anything that was not necessary. Our conversation also demonstrated that she was very interested in her work and committed to developing herself to assure professional success.

Imogene Goddard

A graduate of the Santa Clara University in California, Imogene earned a degree in theology and subsequently worked in midwestern and western states. She now works in a diocesan position in a southern state.

"I was excited about the ideal that the church was looking at the value of the lay person. I had previously felt that the church considered lay persons as temporaries, a kind of band-aid until the wound of a lack of priests passed." For the previous four years Imogene has worked for a diocese in the midwest and found it frustrating. "I have seen some possibilities, but then I realized that they cannot become actual in the United States until some attitudes are changed. I think priests are starting to do some good things because they are realizing they cannot do everything."

Imogene described herself as an affliater in a church where everybody does their own thing. "I got into ministry because I wanted to affiliate, collaborate and be part of a community where the diversity of gifts would be shared. At the same time, I have not found a spirit of collaboration in the institutional church and that has been a frustration. I think collaboration is at the heart of lay ministry. I just don't see collaboration among those who exercise leadership in the institutional church. Maybe we have formed our leaders more with the mind than from the heart."

Imogene is a very pleasant person. I would describe her as a *feeler*. She is quiet but runs deep, has clarity of thought, is relaxed and open to people. An educated, feminine perspective is evident in our conversations.

Rochelle Prince

Rochelle is married and has three children in their teens. Her father had a great influence upon her involvement in the church because of his own commitment. "He was a servant leader. He was the kind of person that took the back seat but was always invited to all the big benefactor's events. He would not feel comfortable among those people, as he was a benefactor in a whole different way. So many people thought he was a saint. I also think that the nuns and teachers in college helped me to be a leader."

Rochelle and her husband felt their home parish was not the kind of church they wanted so they switched parishes, and she began volunteering as a teacher and youth group coordinator. Returning to their former parish, they began using new skills and taking some

control over their lives. They work now with the parish confirmation program and the catechumenate.

Rochelle also became involved in her parish because of the invitation of a friend whom she respected. That friend has assisted her in ministry and encouraged her to participate in diocesan training programs. Rochelle has strong convictions, a generous and easy personality. Her quiet approach in no way diminishes her confidence and concern for persons, issues and the building of community. She speaks up when it is necessary and makes a significant difference. The interviews took place both times in her home over lunch and would often extend beyond the limit. Her warmth and kindness encouraged people to engage her in conversation.

CHAPTER SIX

PERSPECTIVIES OF PARTICIPANTS ON LEADERSHIP IN THE CHURCH

Introduction

The three major areas of analysis flow from a discussion of the (a) perspectives of participants toward leadership in the church, (b) perspectives of participants toward the nature and purpose of leadership, and (c) perspectives of participants toward education and leadership. Each of these three areas of analysis are subdivided into themes which arose from the interview data.

In this chapter, I have presented certain sections of the interviews that pertain to each of the themes concerning the participants' perspectives on leadership in the church. The participants responded to these issues: Lack of leadership, future leadership, problems facing the church, and contributions to leadership. Chapter seven deals with their perspectives on the nature and purpose of leadership. Chapter eight presents their perspectives toward education and leadership. Each of the chapters ends with an analysis of the information gained from the interviews.

These three perspectives are subdivided in each chapter into several themes. Under each subheading, I give the responses of the participants to the issue in their own words. I have made minor adjustments in their statements to convert spoken English to written English. The statements were not always made in response

to a specific question. I give the statements of each participant in the same order as the participants were described in Chapter Five so as to attach any importance or lack of importance to the statements of any particular person. This was also done to allow the reader to refer back to the biographical sketch of the person given in Chapter Five.

Lack of Leadership

Kevin Murphy: The catholic bishops have shown leadership in recent pastoral letters on the economy and peace. However, you have an enormous amount of pressure now coming from a very strong group, the women, who are talking about ordination. We have not resolved the issue of ordaining married males. So all that is threatening, and I personally see groups in the church retreating due to a lack of leadership. There is very little leadership coming out of the ordained ministers in the parishes. I see the laity running parishes very effectively and parish councils running parishes and the priests in retreat. The notion of leadership that exists in the church is associated with lack of change.

When I say church leadership I want to start at at the level of bishop. I think one of the primary requisites to be appointed or selected a bishop is that a person does not rock the boat nor take a strong stand. If you have many statements or tough decisions that are the kind that carry a possibility of change, you are not seriously considered as a candidate for the episcopal body. The nature of a bishop is one who does not rock the boat. Leadership is about initiation and looks at change. I find that a crisis exists in a whole

system that basically honors orthodoxy and not the review of policies.

This lack of leadership reveals the need for a super leader. What would save the church is a prophet rather than a good leader. The structure is set up in such ways that the bishops are out of touch with their constituency or with members and followers, or with other leaders. You are automatically isolated in the Roman Catholic Church. Leadership may occur at a parish level, or a diocesan level or even at the universal level, but it is not having broad influence.

Mary Norton: The hierarchy has a problem. I think the bishops are scared. Of what they are afraid, I am not sure. They may be scared of losing control. Meanwhile, the laity are becoming more of a thinking laity, while the clergy are concerned with administration.

John Rice: The church is aware of the need to shift priorities in society and in the church. Institutions need to be aware that the way leadership used to function as part of an office or the authority is no longer going to be satisfactory. The church is starting to take some steps to look at that.

Some priests are being put in low profile positions rather than being placed among large populations where they would have influence. Other priests are being sent away to be retrained. There is a premise here that this leader needs to be retooled in order to work as a leader in the new church. In reality, there needs to be more thought given to all the dimensions of leadership other than just learning a couple of skills and then coming back to be an effective leader in a whole new culture and institution.

Gretchen Wilson: I think there is a crisis in the church because there are priests who think that they can do everything. They don't want to turn things over to other people. There may be a real problem over the issue of power and authority between pastors and lay parish administrators.

Lee Ann Reynolds: I think that it is a greater risk to be a leader now and so a lot of people are more hesitant about moving into leadership. The criticism is so great, the risk is high; it's costly to be a leader. There is so much in term of politics that affects a leader too. It is so much more messy these days.

The crisis in leadership will have to reach rock bottom before we really do anything dramatic. I mean that seems to be the trend in history. Things really seem to fall apart before something new comes about, and I think that is going to happen in the church, in particular. I think that the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, in terms of leadership, probably will reach rock bottom. In terms of what we are accustomed, I think we will absolutely fall apart. We will have to find new models. We will have to go all the way down and then rebuild good leadership and new models that will help us reconstruct leadership in the church.

Joseph Plummer: I feel that a lot of times the real gifts of the lay leaders are being hampered from working freely among the people of God, among the church as the people of God simply because when a person who is not ordained steps into the parish, a lot of the priests feel threatened that this is our territory. As a result, they do not allow these people to do what they really can and should do based on their ability and the gifts that they bring to that position.

I think we need to help priests to see this not as a threat but as a means of bringing about a closer community. I think as leaders and trainers of future leaders we need to be sensitive to this. I also have a feeling that there is some of this clerical attitude on the part of some laity. That has got to go. I think we need to internalize the Gospel and from that commitment, learn our total mission.

Future Leadership

Kevin Murphy: New training programs ought to be created to help develop strong leadership in the church. I should see male, female, married, celibate, and vowed persons exercising leadership, whereas right now only male, ordained folks are doing it. I think you will see married couples, sisters, priests, deacons, lay people all coming together at a regional meeting, whereas now you see 95% of the folks wearing collars.

Frank Smith: Leadership in the church ought to help people to keep one's eyes turned towards a vision, whether it be theology or philosophy. There needs to be some overarching goals that a group does work towards, consciously or unconsciously. We have to keep something that we are striving to achieve before us: Our ideals, goals, purpose, the kingdom of God on earth. Also, I think we can draw from process theology in the sense that it encourages us to know ourselves as co-creators, that we are sharing things with others and that there is a constant interchange. But there has to be something out there pulling us, drawing us toward it.

I think generally we are going to see a very realistic participation of people in the church and an exercise of authority and

leadership over their own lives, but not independent of the collective. This new style of leadership will become part of the structure.

Stephen Baber: On my best days, I see a structural change in the church that expands not only the leadership pool, which will open up to married men and women, but the creation of new kinds of offices. Along with those offices, new understandings of offices will emerge. We have to be open to receive the leadership of different kinds of people. The burden of leadership has to be shared and much wider than it is currently experienced. We will have to experience some pretty radical change. This radical change will be in the structure of leadership and will require a lot of upheaval. At times I think it is not possible for people to change, whatever their position in the church.

Here is a true story of how change and leadership might take place in the future church. There was a parish which lost its priest. After that, there was no new priest sent, and little support was given the community from the institutional church. No bishop ever visited the parish. Once a week, sometimes less, a visiting priest would celebrate Mass. Over the long term, people began to see that their children and grandchildren were just not going to be catholic. This produced anxiety among the people, and facing that prospect, they began to be open to the idea of a nonordained person to live among them and be their primary minister. That kind of scarcity or pain creates a new openness.

Here is another story. When a priest left the ministry in a particular parish, the diocese hired a permanent deacon to take his

place. Initial reaction from the parishioners was that this was going to be a temporary remedy. Some of the parishioners thought that when the deacon came, he was accepted because at that point in time, almost anyone would have been accepted because they missed a permanent minister. The parishioners grew to really cherish the deacon. Later, the bishop called and said that he was now able to send them a priest. Now their reaction was: "Wait! We want to know who he is before we say yes."

People are open to new forms of leadership when they experience need and have been provided a positive experience of leadership. There are growing ideas among the laity of a kind of leadership that will lead us into a new age. At its center is the idea that leadership must be much more collaborative, much more mutual than paternal. It is about helping people mine their own treasures rather than handing them things.

James Adams: I envision that in 10 or 20 years we will have lots of base communities. In these communities we will really know one another and be aware of mutual needs and together work for a community model church. The church will have to change its policies toward women or see a further shrinkage of priests. The laity will become much more involved as leadership takes on the responsibility of building community. The truth of the matter is that we have the responsibility as Christians to shape our faith and our lives. That effort may also mean the reshaping of our beliefs.

John Rice: Something that is really causing me some fright right now, as I think of the planning process in the diocese, is the horrendous danger of saying every time a priest dies, gets sick,

retires, or quits that we have to close a parish. What a destructive approach that would be if that is the only premise that we have before us. I have heard that view many times as the people in parishes discuss the future. That is not the way to go. This, of course, has a big impact on how we train the nonordained to be placed in roles or positions of authority. There would have to be a transformation. Whether we like it or not, or support it, the celibate male cleric is still going to be identified as the leader in the church.

John Rice: We need persons like Pope John XXIII to help us make a shift in those who lead. Here was a man who was elevated to the most powerful leadership position in the Catholic Church. What he did was to take a profile which was lower than his followers, taking off the robes and rings and walked among the people rather than being carried aloft. That was an interesting reversal of things.

Marian Rice.: We were talking recently with a couple about potential leadership. One of the things we reflected upon was the need for community affirmation of potential leaders. There needs to be a listening process with others who share the same vision. You need to further hope and inspiration. One thing I envision would be that the leaders within the parish structure would be called forth from the people rather than appointed, including the priest.

Gretchen Wilson: The key of developing leadership for the future, especially leadership that comes from the bottom up and the grass roots, rests with a shift of responsibility. There needs to be a shift for the responsibility of building parish community life from the pastor to the community itself. The most important thing that

needs to be done over the next few years in the church is a lot of discussion.

Joseph Plummer: I have given some thought to future leadership in the church as I am preparing myself for that work. I have been doing a lot of reading where the different trends are going into the church, and I see the institutional church dragging its feet. It is way behind the people of God. I see a lot more educated people out here with gifts, gifts given to them by God, unable to use them because the institutional church is dragging its feet. As an ex seminarian, I know a lot of priests. I know of lot of them who have left. I recently got a letter from one of those priests. He tells of priests who have left banding together and asking their fellow priests, still active within the structure, to help them. Those who have left are saying: "Here we are, we are trained, we have gifts, we are out here, we want to help. So do whatever you can, but do not forget us just because the institutional church has said no." Then I hear about the shortage of priests. I hear about no liturgy. I see the institutional church dragging its feet. This whole thing is very sensitive to me because of the issue of leadership and the meaning I place on being a christian.

Lee Ann Reynolds: When there are finally communities without priests, the institutional church is going to say "Okay, it is time to get someone else." There is no guarantee that the situation will be better. I would like to see more options. I really think that, in the long term, the laity will move more into leadership. You know where we have small clusters of people who have a leader, and that leader

is not going to always be ordained. In terms of leadership, I would consider our position as pre-Vatican II.

Angela Fuller: I see the laity beginning to assume leadership positions because that is going to be essential with the number of priests in decline. There is going to be a real struggle on the local level because lay persons are assuming responsibility. We still have a hierarchy that is making the rules and telling us what should be done. I think what is happening already is that the higher up and local leadership are developing separately. We will have a split personality church.

I think that we have to develop the spiritual and holy in the church. That is one of the major differences between leadership in the church and leadership out there in the real world.

Rochelle Prince: I think the future is exciting. I hope it is exciting. I see a lot more lay persons being involved in the church. I see a lot more women being involved, and I see a need for a lot more training for people. The average person needs more skills. I have had such a wonderful experience in my training, knowing more about myself and increasing my confidence. My training has helped me say that I can be a leader. Not only can I be a leader but also other people out there can be one too. I think there are a lot of people really willing to learn about leadership skills. I feel that education is so valuable because there are so many new ways of looking at the church and the role that you, as a lay person, may assume.

Problems Facing the Church

Stephen Baber: Leadership in the church now is very problematic. This is so because I think we have, to a large degree, divorced charism from office. It seems to me that leadership definitely has a charismatic element in it. We are now in a position in the church where the chances of a happy marriage between charism and office are dramatically minimized. We are structured in such a way that we do not have a lot of choice about our choices of those who can exercise leadership. Right off the bat 50 out of 100 persons are eliminated due to gender. Then out of those, only celibate persons are eligible. So that out of a pool of about 100 persons, only 10 people could actually fit the qualifications. The chances of a particular officeholder matching up with a particular community in which the charism and need are coordinated is pretty slim. We don't have a good system or good atmosphere for that kind of leadership.

John Rice: The church is an organization. The ordained are still the ones perceived to have all the power. People still look upon that role and say that the priest is the leader. Yet, we find that there are declining numbers with the skills needed to meet responsibilities. We face an information glut. The laity are well educated and able to cope with this reality. Even if lay people were placed in these roles, they would not be easily accepted and probably would not even feel they are worthy. My goodness, it has taken us 20 years to accept the practice that a lay person can distribute the eucharist.

The church and other organizations in existence today are dysfunctional. I think we have to become comfortable with pointing out and talking about that dysfunction. I don't think we are good at doing that kind of thing in the church. We are not going to become better until we own the dysfunction and are able to talk about it comfortably. We need to say we are a part of the dysfunction and now let's start moving towards a cure. Until we can do that we are not going to make that jump from the old to the new.

Marian Rice: So many people are appointed to be a leader, appointed to a position of authority. Then they say that they have leadership, but what they really are saying is that they have authority. They don't even function as managers, they just have authority.

Lee Ann Reynolds: In terms of vision and where we are going as a church, I look at some of the leaders at the national level and it is frightening. Some of those recently appointed do not have the qualities necessary for leadership. They are missing a whole piece. They have all the administrative stuff, but they do not have compassion. They don't have the human element. I know it is real tough to find people who have both. I see us moving into a more conservative style that is not personal. As long as we hold on to the idea that the main leaders have to be ordained, it is going to get more impersonal. Priests are going to be sacramental coke machines due to the shortage of priests. I do think there are double standards right now for leadership when we look at lay persons and ordained clergy.

Joseph Plummer: One of the characteristics of the Catholic Church in this country is that we are self-centered. We are the victims of individualism and everything is: "What do I get out of this." We have got to turn that attitude around. We have got to say: "What can I do? There are a lot of hurting people out there and I have got to show my concern, my care for them." We have to ask how we can affect others, get them to share the Good News, the change that has made a difference in my life. In that sense, I think we will be helping to turn the institution upside down.

Angela Fuller: Today, leadership is the clergy. Leadership has to do with control in the church. In my experience, priests are content to do things the ordinary way. Lay persons are concerned about people. We say we are developing ministers rather than using the term *leaders*. We are avoiding a definition of leadership.

Imogene Goddard: My problem with leadership in the church is that there are a lot of people--priests and bishops--who have been in control and don't want to let go of that control. It is a kind of trickle down leadership. The clergy gets afraid of losing leadership or is threatened and so it seeks more control. Leadership in the church should not involve control as much as it involves direction or guidance.

I also think that lay people experience different needs. A religious sister could get frustrated and say that she is leaving a situation. She would still have food on the table and house and clothes and no bank is going to repossess her car. Whereas a lay person does not exist in that security. Lay leaders have to deal with that kind of thing. We need to work to see that salaries are

adequate. When we were writing guidelines for lay parish administrators, one priest said it only cost him \$30.00 a week for food and he was sure nobody else needed more than that sum. He said priests only eat baloney sandwiches. Well, he also went out to parishioners homes several nights a week and ate lunch at the cathedral with other priests. He figured that if you gave a lay person \$40.00 a week, that was generous.

Lay persons in the church today are not able to make decisions. Our opinions are not even taken seriously. I don't think that the catholic church should be democratic. I just think that we cannot put all the emphasis on leadership upon the hierarchy. If you had the Baltimore Catechism as a kid, there was one of those sketches of a man and a woman. Standing next to them was a priest and a sister, and that is better. I think we are at a time where we cannot say that any more. I think we have to say we are all God's children.

I am afraid that the powers that be--from the Pope on down--desire to keep the old boys' club as the basis of all decisions and directions. I can hear them saying, "we are sorry we have given you women a rough time. We will be nicer to you because you are so sweet." They call it a new partnership and sharing responsibility and the history of redemption. Yet, they cannot share the decision making. The male, celibate, ordained mind operates alone. That is what frightens me. I see the need for the church to develop and extend itself. The hierarchy needs to not just view lay persons as helpers but as full participants in the revealing of the Kingdom. At the same time I see a lot of ministries closing because there is no one to staff them. Newly ordained priests are far too clerical. It

seems like we are moving backward. Hopefully, all this will change and I hope there is not a division. A good family and community experience may help change things. We cannot put someone into a strong leadership position just because he is a priest or she is a sister. Put people in those positions who can do the task.

Rochelle Prince: I am reminded of when we went to the women's conference on the pastoral letter on women. The church should be out front on these issues. For example, it seems that society is dictating what the church says about women.

Contributions to Church Leadership

Lee Ann Reynolds: The ethic of Jesus presented in the Paschal Mystery, how we die to ourselves, is inspirational to me. I like the fact that Jesus came across as ordinary but led people beyond their boundaries. I like his style of relating to ordinary folks and drawing their needs to himself.

Joseph Plummer: As I see christian leadership, we have got to be concerned about inner change, conversion, metanoia. I think we have to be concerned about our interior commitment and change.

Imogene Goddard: The difference between working in the church as a leader and working in business as a leader is that the model that Christ gave us is the model of family, of shared responsibility, and the sharing of love and respect. We need to nurture a community of faith that reveals the kingdom of God through the process of our work. The goal of IBM and its staff and managers is to accomplish a task and that is wonderful. The task of the church is a different one.

We need to enable people to recognize their abilities and gifts at the local level and then throughout the entire church. Collaboration is working together with everyone with a kind of understanding that requires equal respect and dignity.

Summary: Perspectives on Leadership in the Church

There are several concerns on the participants' perspectives on leadership in the church which developed from the interviews. These concerns revolve around the role of the clergy, hopes for the future of the church, the association of leadership with office and authority, the importance of small communities of faith, leadership as talent or skill, and the need for quality education.

Lack of leadership in the church is often concentrated on the clergy and its inability to communicate. There was reaction against separate standards of leadership for the clergy and for the nonordained. The separation breeds indifference among some and anger among others. These participants called for a more human understanding of leadership that meets the real needs of people. The crisis of leadership appears to reside, in the opinion of the participants, within those assigned to office and position. The structure needs to change to enable leaders to influence and recreate the institutional church and provide for greater responsibility and participation by the laity. The clergymen are becoming managers, while the laity is interested in leadership. A participant said that the clergy is concerned with administration. Another participant observed that it is no longer satisfactory to associate leadership with authority. Yet, some participants often

referred to those who hold office and authority as people who exercise leadership.

It is insightful that one participant noted a split personality occurring in the church. Nonordained persons are those concerned about the needs of people and are closest to them. The clergy are viewed as more distant and concerned with administration and management. There needs to be, in view of the participants, a loosening of control over decision making. Lay persons ought to have their ideas and opinions taken seriously. A concept of leadership that is associated with office does not allow for lay participation and leadership to be taken seriously.

Two of the participants commented that it is necessary to deconstruct the institutional church before we can reconstruct it with a new and appropriate form of leadership. Even the participants who were most supportive of the institutional church, noted that the church is dragging its feet, falling behind an increasingly astute and insightful catholic population.

The future church will have a richer complexion of participants. These participants will practice collaboration and see themselves exercising leadership in a mutual manner. These new leaders will influence the direction of the church. It is need for change that will bring about new directions. Openness to that change, over time, will become a part of the structure in itself. Change needs to be understood as an ongoing effort, an expected and welcome reality.

Ideas are changing and approaches to leadership are also changing. It becomes increasingly clear, when reflecting on the

interviews, that there is new interest in leadership, a new interest in change. We are in a time of transition, both in the practice and thought about leadership.

Yet, leadership in the minds of the participants is still connected to authority, office and role. The participants seemed to dislike associating leadership with authority. However, they seem almost resigned to that reality, and they could not break away from that notion in their talk. It was difficult for the participants to clearly define leadership and distinguish it from authority or office.

Leadership is often associated with what a person does or how they accomplish a task rather than what a person thinks or intends. Some participants challenged the drive to accomplish tasks as essential to leadership. For a number of the participants, hope for change in attitudes on leadership appears to rest not with those in authority but with the local parish community. A participant viewed small communities as a way to reshape the way we think about faith and the way we build relationships in those communities.

Base communities will serve as a breeding ground for potential leaders and a new understanding of leadership. A close knit community will have to deal with the role of women and their relationship to authentic leadership. One of the purposes of leadership needs to be the building of such communities. Not enough is being done to combat the effects of American individualism. The participants shared their hope for the church in the existence of small communities. However, our American culture, which the church has all too well incorporated, often works against community building.

Attention to enabling nonordained persons to recognize their gifts and talents arose constantly in the interviews. Affirmation in their giftedness was repeated over and over again. The development of leadership in the statements of the participants seemed to reside in this emphasis on gift discernment and affirmation.

Models for leadership need a back to the future twist. The model offered by Pope John XXIII which fostered an ecclesiology from below and a spirit of collaboration needs to be revisited. As a participant added, there needs to be a lot of discussion. Such discussion ought to clarify how we train nonordained ministers for leadership and how to cope with organizational dysfunction in the church.

Local, quality education and training of lay persons are necessary for the future church. The experience the participants have had at the Centers has been generally a positive one for them, and they wish the same for their colleagues and friends. Education and training for the nonordained bring hope in the midst of concern and crisis. However, the church needs to allow other values than those of the society of which it is a part, to shape and inform its culture for future generations.

The participants are genuinely convinced that change is necessary for the church as it faces the issue of leadership. Change is not viewed as essential to leadership nor is the meaning of change well developed. The relationship of change to leadership, among the participants, is casual not essential. However, these men and women seemed delighted to initiate those changes necessary to orient the future church.

Confusion about leadership in the christian community, in this chapter, is evident to the researcher. The participants are not confused, for example, about their feelings or reactions to their ecclesial environment or dreams for a better church. If the study explored the centrality of the eucharist or the value of collaboration, the researcher would expect accord and clarity. However, any shared concept of leadership is vague and inchoate. The participants talked about certain qualities that they value such as closer community, the pursuit of new ideals, the rebuilding of models for leadership, collaboration and shared decision making. Yet there is no cohesive understanding of leadership nor any overt call to explore the nature and purpose of leadership as it may exist in the present or ought to exist in the future. Attention is given to some qualities, such as compassion or collaboration, surrounding leadership rather than the purpose and nature of leadership. No doubt, confusion about church leadership is connected to the state of confusion about the very nature of purpose of leadership. This disarray is documented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER SEVEN

PERSPECTIVES OF PARTICIPANTS ON THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF LEADERSHIP

Introduction

This chapter is crucial because it demonstrates the perspectives and confusion that exists among the participants on the nature and purpose of leadership. These are the concepts that shape those interviewed and their approach to leadership and education. The areas that are explored include: Leadership and traits, leadership and skills/situations, leadership and politics, leadership and leaders, leadership and change, leadership as a social phenomenon, leadership and role, leadership and ethics, as well as leadership and management. A summary of the interviews concludes the chapter.

The Relationship of Gift and Trait to Leadership

Kevin Murphy: I think leadership is a calling for folks to share a giftedness with others. I'll put it in different terms. A coach's role as leader is not to go out on the court and do it himself. It is to bring out the best thing in the players. The coach provides training,

works with you, motivates you and provides discipline so that you may demonstrate your abilities for the sake of the enterprise.

Ronald Reagan, for example, was elected by the people. However, if they had been aware of the national debt he accumulated, they would have voted him out of office. It was his homey, friendly, and warm leadership style that enabled him to sell the people a bill of goods that was more in tune with what he wanted.

Frank Smith: We can really contribute to the emergence of leadership or at least its identification. I think that many people have the gift of leadership and we need to affirm it. We need to allow it to evolve, not for our own end. In theological terms, it is discovering God given gifts and utilizing those gifts for the good of others.

Stephen Baber.: Leadership is a combination of qualities, charisms and skills. You simply have the charism and develop the skills. You must inspire and help people connect with their own gifts. There is a certain level of leadership that does require inborn gifts, innate gifts. I think then there are also those persons who have leadership gifts, but they never developed the skills necessary to flesh those gifts out. A group may exist without any of its members having the right combination of gifts and skills. On the other hand, members of a group may have all the gifts and skills needed for leadership but not have vision. If that occurs, I don't think leadership will happen.

Elizabeth Brusch: I have tried to nurture certain qualities in my daughter which I think will help her be a leader. Most of these

efforts stem around selfimage and selfconfidence. I have this friend whom I consider a leader. This person is a good listener and totally committed to helping other people grow and change, and she is good at it.

John Rice: There is a subjective side to leadership and that relates to style. Style enables a leader to implement that which he or she sees as an objective. I think if an organization cannot complete a task, then somehow leadership is missing. In the church, individuals in positions of power need to be trained in some new skills and abilities. For example, they need to know how to relinquish power, to let others become involved, how to elicit a people's charisms and how to allow them to use their gifts.

Gretchen Wilson: A friend of mine is a good leader. She has got natural instincts for it. It is just a natural thing. That kind of ability is developed in some persons. I don't think everybody wants to be or can be a leader. Maybe we have to find out where they can lead. Everybody cannot lead in every situation.

Lee Ann Reynolds: I don't think that everybody has the gift or potential for leadership. I think a lot of leadership qualities are inherent. I have met people I just don't think can lead and they usually are aware of that lack. I have also met others who are natural born leaders, and those qualities come from way back. You can only teach the skills.

Those persons who are acclaimed as leaders in the church, the corporate world, and government don't do enough. I think they lose sight of the ability to really reflect. I think they get caught up in some of the power and so much of what goes with being an

acclaimed leader. Some of the other, lower paid leaders take time to reflect and they are not as highly acclaimed. In our program we train people for leadership and we mix these potential leaders who are able to reflect with others who have expertise.

I don't think everybody is cut out to be a leader. If I am not cut out to be a leader and if I have been in a leadership role, I would have a hard time keeping followers. There is some confusion about who is a good leader anymore and who are the good models. Do I want to continue to be a leader just for the sake of being a leader or do I want to be a leader because I can maintain good values, integrity and all that kind of thing? I think that is part of the crisis.

I am a strong advocate that the greatest thing we bring to leadership in ministry is ourselves. I am looking for qualities rather than skills. I am not real impressed with skills alone. I am not real impressed with degrees. The qualities are much more important.

Joseph Plummer: The leader is the one who sees needs, determine goals and objectives and set time lines. She/he has to be dedicated, persevering, and willing to learn. When these are missing, it just does not work. I have had lots of classes in leadership training and these qualities keep floating around.

In christian leadership, I see the importance of the spiritual. I think all of us need to develop our personal spiritual life. I feel, for example, that I have the commitment but the sense of direction has to be clear. The skills and abilities and everything I have learned will be easy for me to teach but leadership has to start with personal spiritual growth.

Leadership is also a left and right brain activity. You have to teach the whole brain and try to use the visual and the thinking processes together in our training programs. We had left some people turned off because we had just been concerned about the cognitive side of learning. We also have to be concerned about sharing a common vision, a sense of where we are coming from and where we are going.

Thomas Miller: Leadership is service, discipleship and working together. It is having a heart for the concerns of people. It is not necessarily being out front but working towards a goal by your action or example. I still think that so much of leadership is an inherent trait. So much of leadership is abstract and has to do with traits. You can look at babies in a nursery and see that some of them are cranky and jittery. There are some with their eyes wide open and they look all around. You can always tell which one will be hyperactive, which ones will take initiative.

Edgar Lewis: I think the thing that distinguishes leadership, the thing that separates the person who is a leader and another person with the same abilities who is not, is the drive to want to do something with his/her abilities. It is the ability to sway people with words like Jesse Jackson, the ability to touch people where they are, and the ability to touch a cross section of people and not just focus on one group. It is the ability to present oneself well. Leaders have no personal shame nor self-doubts. They are able to make others be at ease.

One thing that helps is that they don't isolate themselves. I think of one of the things that Emmanuel Wheaton did a few months

ago. He spent some time out on the street at night in the rough areas of the city as a street person. Some city leaders would not do that kind of thing. Leadership is sharing yourself and leaving yourself open to risk and response from others. In most cases, leadership occurs because someone else simply opens the door. For example, I have been a leader in situations because people have accepted me as a leader.

Angela Fuller: Hitler, for example, was a leader and a dictator. A dictator is a leadership style verses a democratic style of leadership. A leader is someone who steps away from the rest of the group and takes charge. Hitler took charge as a dictator. We think about our leaders in this country as being democratic in their leadership.

Leadership is a trait within individuals. I also think that individuals have to recognize that they have the ability to be leaders. What we need to do is help them assume leadership positions.

Imogene Goddard: Leadership is a gift. I think that leadership might be exercised in different ways in a group. You look at a group and say, "Joan is our leader in communications, Jean is our leader in spirit and motivation, and Hugh is our leader in finances. Mary is our leader in preparing everything or Ron is our leader in finding other people." Then there is someone in the group who has a higher office and tries to pull all these things together but doesn't possess all of the gifts. Yes, leadership is a gift but is really a lot of gifts. I don't think it is necessarily an innate gift. I think it can be taught. I learned to walk. However, there are some people who could never

be leaders. Some people just cannot relate to other people comfortably and handle them. A leader has to be somebody that likes other people and there are a lot of people that do not like people. There are people who should not be leaders. You have to get a kick out of doing it.

The Relationship of Skills and Situations to Leadership

Kevin Murphy: There are many different qualities and many different forms of leadership styles.

James Adams: I think you have to have some basic skills. I don't think you have to be well educated. You have to be able to communicate.

Elizabeth Brusch: You need a task in order to have a reason for the leadership relationship. If you are at cocktail party, there is no task so there is no reason for leadership in that group. If you have the same people come together around a task, the very same people can bring forth leadership.

Different kinds of leadership are required for different situations. I do think there is a lot of truth in leadership being situational. In the Marines you need a special kind of leadership than as a line manager in a manufacturing plant or in a nomadic tribe in the African desert.

John Rice: I think frequently in church structures, individuals are called or appointed in certain roles and confronted with the fact that they do not have the necessary key skills. I would lean in the direction that leadership requires a combination of that which is innate and that which is learned. I believe leaders need listening

skills, decision making skills and the ability to resolve conflicts that surface. Most of those are not innate but learned skills. You may be a very effective task master but not a very effective leader.

Joseph Plummer: Our job in leadership is to recognize and discern the gifts people have for specific jobs, help people find their strengths and gifts they bring from their different experiences. I think some people have been trained for leadership roles in industry and they are better prepared for many leadership roles in the church. I mean I would just give a little twist to it but generally capitalize on the skills they have already developed.

In my diocesan leadership training program, people are given the basic leadership program in how you conduct meetings and things like that. The content will be geared to their specific ministry.

The training that I have received has recently looked at program development. There is some leadership in the program. For example, we learned how to conduct meetings and how to train people for conducting meetings. This has been getting at the mechanics of leadership. It is pretty much built into what we learn. We are going to look, for example, at screening people for leadership. I think there is something to developing the mechanics of leadership like goal setting. I really feel these are important aspects of leadership. We have been working on some of those areas and attempting to improve our own skills at setting goals, doing evaluations, developing resources, and training leaders.

Rochelle Prince: Leadership is something that is learned and it takes many skills and some definite training. I think of leadership as something associated with leaders, as something centered in

persons. There are different styles of leadership. In different situations, there are different styles. Yet, I think there are some common elements to leadership.

I think that really trying to be sensitive to each person, where they are coming from, is very important. I mentioned openness earlier in the interview. I had a few skills when I was on the school board, but now I have developed these skills of how to include people. Listening skills and attending skills are extremely important so that everyone gets involved in a conversation. I really don't think you can be a leader without those skills. For example, you need to know how to gently call someone else forward when the conversation is being dominated by a certain individual.

Leadership as a Political Activity

Kevin Murphy: A leader tends to be more of the visionary while the manager tends to the care of the day to day operation. Most leaders have a vision and also know how to get there. Knowing how to get there is part of leadership. Leaders know how to recruit the right people, how to work with people, refer people, and motivate people. Leaders know how to manage people. There is a lack of leadership if the leader does not know what is going on.

Mary Norton: Leadership means working in a convincing manner that is not coercive. I really think leaders need to respect others' opinions.

Frank Smith: Leaders will be enmeshed in the political. Otherwise, they will not be an effective leader. Human dynamics and the use of power and influence may not always be noble but that is

the reality of human beings when they interact. Some kind of politics will develop. I think politics is always intrinsic to leadership. A person can be Machiavellian and be a leader. Leadership can be manipulative. Whatever the motivation of the leader, he or she can still open up new avenues for people, can still move them from point A to point B.

The leader is also one who is dependent upon the people whereas people don't have to be dependent upon the leader. They can switch. I think that you can have a leader that is not tapped into *all* the desires of the people and still lead them. But, the distant king is not a leader.

Stephen Baber: The vision of the people should not be substituted for the leader's own vision. I think of a friend of mine, an academic and professional who has spend a substantial amount of time developing leadership skills. Yet I think her leadership is very much hindered by the fact that people are not confident that she is really open to them. I also think of a person who is able to persuade people about certain points of view, not in a covert way nor in a deceptive manner. She elicits people with approval or disapproval. That is one way she exercises influence on people. She says that she has no power but she has enormous power.

I think leadership is a form of power. Power itself can be coercive, but leadership isn't coercive. I know of a pastor who was good at not being coercive. Now he has a major diocesan position as well as being pastor. His influence has dropped dramatically because I think he is now inclined to influence people through fiat rather than persuasion.

Politics has to do with how people organize themselves and live together so that there is a sense in which every human act has a political implication. I mean leadership is more in the realm of the human act. Politics would be more in the realm of human structures. When people exercise leadership, they affect the way we are with each other. I think even when you are exercising influence and it is directly affecting a group of diocesan or department heads, there is some kind of ripple effect.

The leader is one who is able to persuade people toward a vision. However, I think we are moving away from a concept of leadership that puts the leader out in front of the huge mass of people like Teddy Roosevelt, Andrew Carnegie, FDR or Hitler. We are moving toward a more subtle approach, one that is a craft.

James Adams: I would say that Ghandi was a leader because he was able to shape his situations and their consequences. One of the goals of leadership is to gain consensus and in order to accomplish consensus, you have to learn diplomacy. You have to sneak up on people, open them to some other ways and direct them about another way of doing things.

Elizabeth Brusch: There is politics in every group. There is a political relationship between the bishops, for example, and our organization. That relationship impacts on our policy and future interactions. Politics is just a part of the fabric. Politics is how you figure out what is going on and what to do with it. Part of the politics is deciding when something is worth fighting for, when it is not, and which battles you want to win. Everybody does not have to win all the battles all the time. Yet you must have some clarity

about what is important and the ability to fight for it beginning with reason and negotiation. Sometimes I lose those steps and just get angry, my stubbornness comes out. I think power is something earned by the leader. It is not given. I think in every group, the group members figure out who has the power and who they are going to let have power. You don't just come into a group with power, you come with authority.

John Rice: I see a positive side to politics and that is the activity of winning people over to a point of view that you consider for the common good and of an ethical nature. That is essential. The negative part also exists when decisions are made without any consultation and the decision comes down from on high and everyone is expected to support it. When that occurs, it is bad leadership.

Gretchen Wilson: I think you can have authority and not leadership. Building a working relationship is very difficult. For example, in our cluster group, when I first went in everyone was so self-defensive. It was going to take a long time to ever have any kind of relationship. For everyone it is scary because you don't know exactly what will happen.

Lee Ann Reynolds: I really believe that if I am a good leader then I can work myself out of a job. If I have not done that and there are not other people that are coming up and getting confident and learning things, then I have not lead but dictated. So I think the word *enablement* is appropriate. Leaders in my mind are people who are very relational.

The negative part of leadership is seen in those people I knew who were power seekers and so competitive. I won't be like that. I

did not want to use the title "director" because that was negative to me. All I want to do is make a quiet and holy difference.

The leader is one who is able to draw followers. His or her leadership style would need to be such that followers would be attracted to the person. A good leader uses politics to draw followers. For example, I know my strengths in the area of public relations and working with people and put those to use in ways that are not going to hurt anybody but instead, draw people into doing something. In a positive sense, a leader has to put his or her charisms, behaviors, and actions before the public. In a negative sense, a leader plays games behind the scenes and manipulates to get things accomplished.

One of the obvious measure of leadership is numbers. I mean if Gorbachev gives a talk and there are 5,000 people and Reagan gives a talk and there is nobody then the numbers speak. It means people are following. Another measure is if the leader's goals are being realized. Leadership happens if people do what the leaders are trying to delegate. When the leader gets a response from the people, it indicates that he/she is the leader and the others are followers.

Joseph Plummer: I think there is a relationship between politics and leadership, and I see it in the church. There are social issues that go beyond the church. The church needs to exercise its influence and ethics. We need to keep good leaders in politics.

I used to be concerned about doing the best I could to get the job done. Now I am beginning to see that it is not enough. I am expected to use my gifts and talents not for my personal good but for the service of those with whom I am working, no matter within

or outside the church. It is a whole new responsibility. My whole idea of power is that all power is given to us from on high and we only share it. We are empowered to do things, but ultimately the good Lord gives us the power. We may be gifted in one area, but that does not give us power over someone else. To me leadership that empowers others is more powerful than leadership that concentrates power and uses power to control. It is much more effective because it empowers others to put tremendous force behind what they are doing. So we need to learn how to delegate. We need to look at what our own limitations are as leaders and capitalize on what others bring to leadership.

A real test of whether something is leadership may be based on enabling those who are trained to release their gifts, abilities, and skills. It is important to recognize and call forth those gifts. In fact, I would have never gone into teaching had somebody not called me forth, the same with my present job. My talents were recognized by someone I respected, and that person was able to identify certain characteristics that I had not given much regard. I feel when people can do that kind of thing, they have real leadership ability.

Thomas Miller: Leadership is not doing everything yourself. It means being identified as a person that people can look to, depend upon to carry out responsibilities and motivate people. Take a look at the word *leadership*. It implies taking the lead, being a gate opener and not a dictator. The leader does not tell everyone what to do but gets others involved and tries to move people along and not manipulate them. Leadership means being part of a group. You do not have to be on the top all the time. It would be nice if it got to the

point where they are all leaders in a sense. You can be the leader one time and someone else can be the leader another time. So leadership is not a permanent type of designation.

People get burned out because leaders control more than lead, they turn everything around to get what they want, not what the followers want. They are not listening to the group.

Penny Miller: I am a supervisor at work and in that setting, I influence a lot of people. I think that is the same as being a leader. I think, first of all, you have to get people involved at a base level which would include approaching people and seeking them out and asking them to become involved. Ask them to be on a committee. Make them feel like they have a vested interest in what is going on around them and then they will want to do more.

Edgar Lewis: In leadership, I think you have to think of the relationships you have with people. For me, leadership and politics means that you know who is willing to contribute. You know who is willing to support and accept your ideas. You know what people are willing to respond to you. People either accept or reject your game plans.

The effective leader will recognize if he/she has power or not. The effective leader will recognize when power is abused and when power is shared with others. An effective leader will share some of the power to make the group stronger. At times the abuse of power by a person can be construed as leadership by a leader and followers.

I think you have leadership if people are willing to follow you. It is the people, the followers, that determine if something is leadership.

Angela Fuller: Leadership to me is enabling, being pleasant to people and enabling them to function and assume responsibility to the best of their ability. I don't know if everybody has the ability to be good leaders. I think leadership is a thing we can develop in people to a certain extent. Some people have inborn traits for leadership, and some do not have them. We can develop those traits to a certain point. I am not sure whether they can ever be great leaders.

Rochelle Prince: I used to think that leadership meant being the person up front of a group telling others what to do. Now I think of it in an entirely different way. I think everyone can be a leader. For example, at our parish council, our job will be not to do all the work but to enable the members of the parish to find a place where they are comfortable and do something that makes them feel good about themselves. So I see leadership as enabling others.

I see myself as a leader because I enable others. I might not let go often enough sometimes. That is one thing a leader does need to know, that is, when to let go. I also stick with something and am accountable for it to others. So, I guess I would consider myself a leader.

i think it is important for leaders to influence others. I have noticed in myself, and people have affirmed this, that I can call people to see different sides of issues. I can call them to see things about themselves that might not be real pleasant, without intimidating them or making them angry. I think that is influence and it is important. Good influence does not pressure someone into thinking the way you do as a leader. Influence means saying that I

have thought this through and I feel it is right and important and I would like for you to think about it. You have to be confident about yourself. You have to make others feel confident that your decisions are well grounded and good and they can trust you.

I think leadership draws people. It draws people in when they may think that they have nothing to say to an issue. I think we all have something to offer to each other.

For example, in our Catechumenate, after the Holy Saturday Vigil, a group of parishioners organized a party and got everything together. You see that you have had a part in bringing all of these people together for a real celebration and you know it would not have happened without you. You know you had an important role to play in the parish. Leadership first takes inviting people.

I also try to remember my experience in our training program. The facilitators were always open to our needs. My impression of our facilitators was that they really valued us and what we had to say. They did not just say, "this is the agenda for today." They involved us in our own education and that said we were important. I have always thought of these facilitators as leaders for that reason.

Imogene Goddard: In my former diocese, a situation existed in which there was poor direction and poor leadership. There was really no plan of what we were going to do within the ministry. Of course, the church wanted people to help. Those in authority positions did not know how to motivate people. You know in management they talk about what motivates people. There are three things that motivate and excite them, give them satisfaction and

keep them going. The motivations are a desire for power, a desire for competition and a desire for affiliation.

Leadership and Leaders

Kevin Murphy: I associate active leaders with those who perform leadership roles. In our training programs, we look for persons to be leaders who hold leadership positions such as catechist and eucharistic ministers. Leaders are also those who desire to grow in their process of self-actualization. Leadership means the enabling of other people towards self-actualization so it is not necessarily self-oriented. Leaders also are the ones who do the right thing.

Mary Norton: Leaders need to be more feminine. A leader should be caring, passionate, nurturing, healing and a person who values being attuned to the needs of people. There is a crisis in leadership. Real leaders know people, know a little something about how they are living, something about the problems and pressures of their lives and are willing to speak to them about those needs.

Leaders move beyond the status quo. Jesus did not uphold the status quo. Some bishops see that their duty is to uphold Canon Law and uphold what the Pope says they should do. This is not leadership.

James Adams: I have trouble separating leadership from the skills leaders need. A leader is able to get everything done in an orderly fashion and when they accomplish that, they are leaders.

John Rice: Seldom do I see an effort from leaders to understand the wants and needs of followers. To put it in business terms, I don't think church leaders put themselves in a position to

study the consumer. You are forced to ask, for example, why don't catholics contribute financially? It is almost as if the leadership does not care. I would have to ask, why should catholics contribute [financially] to the church?

Gretchen Wilson: If you are trying to lead a group, you have to see where the group wants to go. Sometimes the group does not want to go to the same place that you had planned. Generally, the person who ends up the head of a spaghetti dinner or head of the pancake breakfast or parish anniversary committee is a leader because they are accomplishing a goal. I don't think that if they do it all themselves that it is leading. Leaders just don't make lists of activities for other people to accomplish.

Edgar Lewis: Persons need a chance, an invitation to lead. In my own church, until the people said, "Give us a chance," nothing happened. We have new leaders because they are being invited into roles and positions. You need persons that are self-actualizing, who are able to realize their own potential and move toward that potential. If you have a person who has not had inner transformation, they are not going to be able to realize their potential as leaders.

Angela Fuller: Well, a bad leader is one who does not enable people to assume their responsibility by simply doing all the chores themselves or telling people how to do everything. They assume that their way is the only way to do something. It is a rigid kind of leadership. Hitler, for example, had some traits that drew people to him. People followed him so he was a leader. Hitler set his own goals and moved people toward those goals. A better leader would

find out what the needs of the group are and together they would arrive at a goal. I think that a goal should not be the leaders agenda alone. A leader would not say that this is the goal that we set, but rather get people together for some planning and structure. The leader steers people toward a goal.

I see a crisis in the leadership appointed by the hierarchy of the church. The crisis lies in leadership identity given to those appointed and the leadership identity given to lay leaders who are trying to establish their place in the church. The appointed leaders are there by default. There also is the emerging leader who is trying to establish a place in the church. The appointed leaders are leaders because that is what they are told to do, it does not mean they are really leaders. They are just put in leadership positions. Emerging leaders are for the most part, natural leaders. I think when we are in a group of people, natural leaders emerge from the group. I have been reading lately, and I truly believe, everybody has some kind of leadership potential in some area.

The heart of leadership is having somebody in charge. Somebody has to hold it all together, to lead the way, to accomplish a task. Leadership happens when someone takes charge and gets things moving. Otherwise things just won't happen. Somebody has to get the ball rolling.

Rochelle Prince: You have to interact with people to be a leader. My son, Jeff, was told by his coach that he is a leader. I tried to think what that means. The coach said he is one of the very few boys he had seen elected twice as captain by his peers. The reason was that the team knew Brian did his very best and drew the

players together in a cohesive manner. I think he was respected. The leader has to be a person that is respected.

I remember a nun who I thought was a leader. She was not always liked by everyone but she was always respected because she could draw people together to get things done. She just had a knack and the confidence. A leader has to have confidence in himself/herself and a spirit. I know all leaders are not christian. However, a leader has to have the spirit of good for all, of trying to accomplish good for everyone.

I think of my husband as a leader because he works with people to get them involved. He has taught me sensitivity to people. He will call people forward who would never come forward. He would say things like, "I saw you at church and heard you were interested in music or that you play the guitar. Come join our music group sometime." He has involved more people that way. His leadership calls people to be better christians. He really enables people. He would start these soccer programs in the parish. People would learn to trust him and then he would invite them into the Catechumenate. He is really a background person, not someone who would sit on a council. He has a lot of leadership qualities.

Imogene Goddard: My idea of leadership in the church is that of the shepherd, the idea of a guide. Some people would need very specific directions. Other people want a guide that says: "I see so much creativity in you. I'll help you move and meet you at a certain point and we will talk about where you want to go from that point." That approach uses the idea of discerning gifts. Leaders need to

know where people are in their development, what motivates them. My instinct is to help people know what is behind their intentions.

A good leader has to know what is needed and therefore the leader must listen. A leader in a parish is involved with the community and listens to their needs. A good leader is aware of people's emotional and spiritual needs. Such a leader is aware of what is going on both inside and outside a community. They are practical.

I consider Alice, a friend of mine, a leader. She is a clear thinker. She has lots of good ideas and is close to the deep interests of her people. I think she encourages and challenges. I think good leaders make you feel successful. Students need to be challenged. They also need to feel smart. The same is true for jobs. People need to do their work and feel that they satisfy people. People like to be successful. A good leader has to be somebody that helps direct a person toward success and satisfactory performance.

Leadership and Change

Kevin Murphy: Someone who practices leadership, motivates. It is someone who gets you out of this chair and into that chair. Maybe they are creating the environment or things that happen. The leader enables other people to move forward. Leadership is about initiation and change. One of the qualities of leadership is to move people without ostracizing them.

Mary Norton: The core of leadership is the ability or willingness to get things moving. I don't even know if it needs to be

toward a specific goal but the ability to help others see what they might do or become.

Frank Smith: Leadership occurs when people take the initiative to act on what is necessary or to move people forward. Leaders are people that know how to move things even if they don't know where they are moving them.

Stephen Baber: Change is a constant. In my judgement everything is moving in one direction or the other. To some extent even standing still requires some kind of motion. I suppose that if it is a constitutive aspect of reality, then it is a constitutive aspect of leadership. In some sense, I guess the change would be in relation to the stream that was flowing around it.

James Adams: I learned in my early life how to motivate people, and I developed some leadership skills. Leadership is the ability to motivate other people in whatever direction. The best part of leadership is when you motivate somebody so she/he can want to do something. Motivation means to move. In the case of the leader, it means to move people toward the goals and intentions of the leader.

I am learning about a new concept of leadership. My faith and justice group is experiencing group leadership in which their planning is open ended and subject to a lot of change. Change within our group is part of the leadership concept. While it is not my concept of leadership, it sounds a lot more comfortable. I am learning other ways to influence people instead of just telling people what I want them to do.

Elizabeth Brusch: The mayor of our city is not a leader. I see a lot of areas, like the schools and the convention business, where there is no vision for the future. He is in all the parades and kind of goes through the motions. I see him on television sitting on the city council so he has the mechanics, but he does not impress me as a leader. He is not taking us anywhere.

Marian Rice: I would say that a leader would be one who needs to be reflective and consider several views, what their vision would be, how they see the world, and then be willing to confront what prohibits achieves the vision. I think leaders change structures. I think you also have structures which are good and then leaders bring forth the talents, energy and power of people who are already involved.

Lee Ann Reynolds: I see change as a part of leadership but not real essential. I see a leader as a person that moves some group of people to a new place in the positive sense, a better place. That is what I hope leaders are doing.

Joseph Plummer: Leadership, in the nonchurchy sense, does not have to be so aware of change. Change is one of the things that is a real challenge to christian leadership. How do we as christian leaders impact others?

Angela Fuller: Change should be an important issue for a leader, an effective leader. However, the core of leadership is being in charge.

Rochelle Prince: I think change is real important. I value most those leaders who are open to change. In the past, I thought that a person who leads was someone who knew the right answer and the

right thing. The leader was someone who told everybody what to do and convinced them to follow along. You have to change to grow. I respect those theologians that are open to change. I guess when I think about leadership now, I think of someone who says, "maybe our opinions are not the only ones."

Leadership as a Social and Educational Phenomenon

Kevin Murphy: There are a lot of people that went to their deaths over ethical issues. I think for the common good of society, we need ethical leadership. For example, the abortion issue raises ethical questions. Most people would say they are not in favor of killing. But somehow they can justify the killing in certain circumstances. So when we get involved in ethics we really get involved in a heated debate on the meaning of ethics.

Mary Norton: The nonpayment of musicians in our parish finally came to a head due to my bringing the issue forward. It really was caused by my moaning and groaning, which is my style. I just insert the needle and keep it turning until something happens. Finally, it did. The people in the parish saw the need for somebody to do music and at least the instrumentalist was worth some pay. That really was not leadership. There was no organized protest or anything like that. But maybe it was leadership in that people were talking to each other and I helped them to see both the need and the injustice that existed.

Frank Smith: You have to keep turning towards a vision. There are overarching goals that a group works toward consciously or unconsciously. I think in the christian context, you can sit down and

critically reflect and understand why you are thinking a particular way. For example, the Berrigan brothers were raising people's consciousness and empowering people to move out of the status quo and into a new place. We are going to see a very realistic participation of people in the church and in the exercise of personal authority over their own lives. However, that authority will not be independent of the collective. I don't think it is going to be a narrow concern just for individuals.

Stephen Baber.: My first impulse is to say good leadership, the most effective kind of leadership, is self-critical, self-reflective, informed, and intentional. I believe we are having a crisis of leadership and that it has to do with the fact that we are in a transitional era. We are not as clear about what leadership is suppose to be and do. It's job description is being changed. I think we had a good deal of unanimity about the meaning of leadership. The illusion of leadership is becoming harder and harder to sustain all the time, and more cracks are breaking into our previous understanding of leadership. The whole thing is kind of collapsing as far as a global vision of leadership. For example, for most of their lives women were educated to think that no matter what, they could not be leaders. Leaders were always men. Our discovery is that in fact they can be leaders, and leadership is not limited to gender.

James Adams: I used to think that everything had to be productive. I am making a switch in my thinking and much of it has to do with rethinking my attitudes toward possessions. My wife and I owned a large home just for ourselves. Our children are grown. For a while we chose to open our home to friends who needed a place to

stay. Now we plan to sell the home and acquire a much smaller house. I understand my real estate work as an opportunity to help others learn how to manage property.

In our faith and justice group, we try to live social justice and do whatever we can to band the community together. It is a different form of leadership than I have previously experienced. It is a group effort and like setting out for the new world without a rudder. We all want to each assist the community in ways that we feel called rather than saying, "you be in charge of this or that effort."

John Rice: Life for most people goes beyond accomplishing tasks. So I think that the leader is one who not only gets a task done but also tends to some of the more human elements that occur within a group or organization. For example, someone may ask: "What are Susie's needs? We know she is struggling with something."

One transitional issue that needs to be addressed is the role of women as leaders, women who are actually involved with leadership. The introduction of feminine qualities into an institution, organization or business is very important and those organizations need to realize the positive contribution of feminine qualities.

Joseph Plummer: Leadership is a process because it is an ongoing event. I don't think it is something we arrive at and then we are there. We have to grow with people and constantly move in their direction. We fail in leadership when we start out to accomplish a vision and then miss the target. Maybe it is a planning failure rather

than a leadership failure. What is really necessary is a shared vision that will enable leadership to accomplish its aim.

In America, we have to confront individualism. Many people ask the question, why come to church? What is it going to do for me?

Thomas Miller: Some people think no one but a priest or nun can give a homily. Leadership is questioning why some people feel that way.

Lee Ann Reynolds: I think that a leader who is balanced has reflective abilities. I think that is real important so that people can stand back and critique and also again understand the why of their thinking, why they have certain expectations. They may say, "okay, I think this way because I came from a dysfunctional family." When we are able to do this, we are healthier leaders.

Rochelle Prince: Leadership requires people to have a vision. This vision is not centered on a particular project or event. Leaders need to have a broad vision. Leadership requires people to be open to all aspects of what people are saying. You need to lose yourself for the other. Leaders are people that can stand back from a group or an issue and be able to look at the whole view. Leaders are able to evaluate and think about things from a lot of different perspectives. It is important not to pressure people to think as you do even though you are the leader. I think that is very hard to accomplish especially if I have strong feelings about an issue. I can go into a group and have my own definite opinion. However, if I am open and listen to other people, my opinion may change or maybe it will remain. I will be able to see the other side and the issue might change. This is

about more than just changing your mind over an issue. You really change. You change your goals, your whole view of something. At times it is a problem because I am not always willing to risk being a fool or whatever. I want things to be perfect or want to be certain I am saying the right thing.

Imogene Goddard: Collaboration is so important. Real collaboration is an understanding of equal respect and equal sharing of responsibilities. In social collaboration we need an environment where people can fail or succeed. In the church we create situations where people are not able to succeed. I think that women are more relational and men are more independent. In leadership men will strive for independence and women will strive for stronger relationships. The male attributes of leadership are to pursue what they desire. Women are more collaborative. A woman is the heart of the family and has natural skills. It is a shame final decisions in the church about leadership are made only by ordained men. Leadership becomes a narrow experience.

The Relationship of Leadership to Role

Kevin Murphy: Something that I am looking for in people who say they are looking to be christian leaders is not only personal qualities but actual time spent in some leadership position in the parish or in their profession. I look for something in which they are active leaders who are performing leadership roles.

Frank Smith: A person who steps into a role is not necessarily a leader. He has been given a position of authority and we traditionally say that is leadership. A leader will have to be

determined by how he exercises the office or authority. A case in point is Archbishop Fulton Sheen. He was given the Diocese of Syracuse. It was a miserable flop. He was not well loved, and, I think, resigned the office before retirement after a stellar career in television. Fulton Sheen was a leader but was put in the wrong job, after which he was no longer a leader. Just because you are a leader here does not mean you will be a leader there.

Stephen Baber: I think there is a relationship between role and leadership. It is at the core of the problem. The relationship between leadership and office is too restrictive. This is true partly because the office is too restrictive and partly because leadership is too tightly connected to one office.

James Adams: I guess there are different forms of leadership. One of them would be the office of Bishop. His leadership is based in his office. Then there are people that are able to lead without the benefit of an office. They do it by inspiration. They inspire confidence in their followers.

Elizabeth Brusch: I was a classroom teacher, and I have seen kids elect a class president but they really did not follow this kid. Another kid was really the leader and had the power. The child who was elected had the title and was going through the motions but really was not the leader. So having a role does not really constitute leadership.

Lee Ann Reynolds: I would like to see the horizontal model instead of the vertical model of leadership. I think we can lead side by side rather than leading from above.

I definitely think that leaders have to realize goals and see a product. That is the measurement. I need to see that I am producing something and that is one's measurement along the way.

Joseph Plummer: Some jobs require efficiency and therefore need leaders that are efficient in a position. There are actually two types of leadership and both of them are going on constantly. You have the CEO, who is the person that gets the job done, gets the policies out, gets customers in and out. Then you have the other type of leader in the background doing the thinking and planning. People are leaders in the sense that they are in leadership positions. In some cases they may be effective and in other circumstances they may really not be effective leaders. I would say that the really effective leader is the one who gets the job done. However, sometimes another person could be a leader but that person is not in the right position. In other words, they are not where they can use their abilities and talents to the fullest.

Edgar Lewis: A leader needs to realize goals as well as having a perception of where he or she is going.

Angela Fuller: I see myself as a leader because I am in a leadership position. Just because you are in a position does not necessarily mean you are a leader. I think you have to possess certain qualities. One would hope that people are hired because they have leadership qualities but that does not always happen. People in leadership positions need certain skills like enabling, communication, relating to people and organizational skills.

Also essential to leadership is to see the task accomplished. That does not mean that leaders have to accomplish it all by

themselves. I guess that is where enabling enters. Enablement means to work toward a goal, to stimulate people so they may see the importance of a goal and reach it.

Rochelle Prince: Leadership in the past meant a person stood in front of the group telling it what to do and think. Now I see leadership more as facilitating in such a way that all people are drawn into the group. You would not necessarily be the only one talking. You would elicit responses from people and be open to those responses, no matter what the responses. A leader is always conscious of the presence of the person.

Imogene Goddard: A priest should not be considered automatically a leader. The best leader in my last parish was the school janitor. He empowered people. He gave everybody dignity. I ran a religious education program every morning before regular classes. There was a bully in the fifth grade. Well, one Friday, I knew a little boy was supposed to be an altar boy and he did not show up for his duty. I asked him why. He told me with tears in his eyes that Brian (the bully) said he could not be an altar boy. The class bully was intimidating everyone. One day I found Brian fooling around with the window blinds. He threw kids against them and broke them. So I took him to the janitor. The janitor told him it was a lot of work to fix the blinds. He told the boy to get a school pass and come back and together they would fix the blinds. They worked together for an hour and a half until they finished. The janitor put his arm around the boy and told him again about not damaging the blinds. The kid left making up for his misdeed, learned a skill and ability, stretched his understanding, and felt good about himself. He

recognized what he did as wrong but was changed in the end. That is a good leader. I don't think leaders are necessarily those who are appointed.

Leadership and Ethics

Kevin Murphy: I don't see a necessary connection between ethics and leadership. I would like to say yes, but I think of Hitler or Mussolini or Stalin. Hitler, for example, had a vision and was focused. He moved a nation in one direction which was horrendously unethical. He had a police system and a way of managing that created a country that just went in one direction.

Oliver North, for example, said he was in contact with Reagan. Reagan says that he can't remember. He is just not going to testify at North's trial. A kind of leadership exists when you get people to do or not do something. I just find a lot of leadership not being terribly ethical.

Mary Norton: Leadership is furthered by the example that we give. The core of that example, she says, must be a sense of integrity.

Frank Smith: I think if you want to talk about the notion of leadership there are so many varying ethical systems in our world. The ethics operative in every culture of this world and in every corner of it are different. So I would hate to say that there is an ethic, specifically our Western ethic, that would apply to all. That is why I would not know how to respond to the idea that there is some ethical system always operative in all leadership.

Stephen Baber: It seems to me that every human act has ethical content so I think there are some kind of fundamental ethical norms. Therefore, it is possible that these ethical norms could be violated.

James Adams: I think some of our leaders have lead us down the rosy path to drugs and a lot of other things. Our American dream today is unethical. The American public thought Reagan was a leader, yet I think what he did was unethical. Hitler was a leader, and what he did was unethical. Reagan had his code of ethics, it just did not include certain things. He seemed very ethical and very moral and wanted to do everything right. In America, Falwel is considered a great religious leader and he has a lot of people following him--the moral majority.

Elizabeth Brusch: I think leaders shape ethics. I think they model it and in modeling it, they shape it. Where does ethics start and when is it not yours anymore? Somehow I think the leader has to embody the ethic that the group wishes to attain. There is a similarity of ethics. Now that situation might be real different from another group which has different leaders and different followers. They can even have opposing ethics. Yet there needs to be some similarity between the ethics of the leader and the ethics of followers.

Lee Ann Reynolds: I see the objective of ethics coming out of the employee and employer relationship. In the church, there is an ethic that is inherent. It is the ethic that comes from Christ. I guess the key for me is integrity, the integrity modeled by the

leader. Another important word for me is dignity. I mean the dignity placed upon the followers by the leader.

Edgar Lewis: I would hope that there would be an ethical dimension to leadership. Yet I don't think that always goes hand in hand. There are situations where ethics takes a second row to power or getting something accomplished. There is a tendency for ethics to fall to the side because of the need of the leader to be important rather than to be of service to people.

Thomas Miller: There are examples where people have no sense of moral leadership and they are leading people. I think Hitler was a leader as a lot of people followed him. Yet he had something that got people to do what was not morally right.

Angela Fuller: In one of our classes, the presenter said that intimidation was necessary to get people to agree with you. I was thinking that such an idea was against my idea of ethical leadership. If you are really going to be a leader, then you have to be ethical.

Rochelle Prince: For me, a leader has to have ethics. Definitely in church leadership, ethics has to be a part of leadership. I would like to not separate the two. For me to consider a person a leader, the person has to be ethical.

Leadership and Management

Elizabeth Brusch: I see management as the skills required to expedite your leadership. When I discovered I was a leader, I also discovered that no one had told me how to manage. Ideally, you have to be a good leader in a management position but I think we have learned a lot about how to manage but not so much about leadership.

The most effective managers have the qualities of leadership and are leaders. We have learned a lot of mechanical things that can help a leader be a good manager and develop management skills. I think that the more people learn about leadership and management and how groups work, the more they can be more effective leaders and managers.

Thomas Miller: For example, it's very possible that people involved in such areas as the Jerry Lewis Telethon at the 7-11 chain stores are practicing good leadership. But in other areas they are simply practicing management. Management is concerned about the bottom line. You may practice leadership in one particular aspect of a day and in another you are not practicing leadership. You have to look at the meaning of leadership.

Lee Ann Reynolds: Management is leadership. Maybe I should say that leadership is competent management. Administration is concerned about tasks.

Imogene Goddard: One of the things we lack in church leaders is good management skills. At some point, we need to talk about priests and seminarians getting strong management skills along with classes in family counseling and things like that. Management has to do with how you make expectations clear. It is concerned with evaluating workers. I understood management skills in classes by looking at different scenarios and responded to how I would act in a particular situation. How would you deal, for example, with an inept secretary if the parish loves her. One has to know the basics like clear expectations, a clear understanding of evaluations, affirmations, redirection, guidelines for determination, and means

of arbitration. I think that for a leader to be a good mentor, he/she must have good management skills.

Angela Fuller: I think of managers in the business world. There a manager is a person who manages people rather than leading. An office manager has folks working under her/him and sees that those people are doing their job. Whereas the leader is the person who sees a goal and helps people move toward that goal.

Summary: Perspectives On The Nature and Purpose of Leadership

Remarks by those interviewed on the nature and purpose of leadership included issues of style, the relationship of followers to leadership, the connection between goal and leadership, politics and manipulation, change and leadership, authority and leadership, and management as leadership.

The participants related leadership to the idea of having a successful style. Successful use of a personal leadership style was often seen as essential to accomplishing a personal or organizational task. A few participants felt that it was necessary for leaders to go beyond the concern of task to the humanization of those tasks. Many of the participants viewed leadership as a combination of learned style and natural trait. Many connected having the gift of leadership (trait theory) and what is necessary to affirm the trait. They saw leadership as a combination of qualities, charisms, and skills.

The success of leadership is rooted, in view of the participants, in the leaders. It is the leadership style or quality that makes a person a leader and this style or quality may differ

according to the individual. A participant noted that there are two styles of leadership operative in the church, a positional style and emerging style. Positional leadership is associated with dictates, and emerging leadership with collaboration.

There is a division on whether leadership is a trait or learned. Some indicated that without traits that are inborn, a person cannot really be a great leader. As the participants stated, some people are just not cut out to be leaders. The image of a baby nursery in which children already exercise some of these natural traits was used. The idea that some people were leaders and others were not leaders was obvious. Leadership became a matter of connecting the dots. The leader is the one who matches the gifts that he or she affirms in others with a specific task or position. It appears to the researcher that several of the participants were associating the right position for a particular leader with leadership. In other words, the position determines leadership. Filling the right position with the right person determines leadership practice.

Throughout the interviews, a leader is someone who works well with people, shapes vision as well as situations and consequences, refers people, motivates them, and knows how to manage persons. Leaders are those who enable others to do a job well, accomplish a task, or secure a sought goal. The issues of enablement and empowerment were constant but almost always associated with leaders helping others realize a certain concrete goal. Reaching the goal, whatever that signifies, becomes the all important purpose of leadership. Leaders are successful if they are productive. Leaders must have followers. The influence of an

industrial emphasis on productivity is seen in the attitude of the participants toward followers. The more followers, the more successful the leader in practicing leadership. A participant said that one of the obvious measures of leadership is numbers. The issue of goals is resurgent and dominates over any lasting concern over the relationship between leaders and followers. Realizing goals and objectives seems to consume most of the participants in the study.

I do not wish to give the impression that there is no concern for followers in the statements. A real advertence exists in the interviews for the relationship forged by the leader and followers. That relationship ought to be human and healthy, respectful and compassionate. The ethics of leadership appears to be rooted, in their opinion, in the leader follower relationship. Leaders need to communicate and listen well. According to most participants in the study, leaders ought to avoid controlling or manipulating followers. The bottom line for leadership is not the relationship of leaders and followers but whether a leader is effective in realizing a vision. For example, one participant said that if an organization cannot complete a task, then somehow leadership is missing. Another participant suggested that the leadership style of an individual would need to attract followers in ways that would not hurt anyone. She reported that in a negative sense, a leader plays games behind the scenes and manipulates to get things accomplished. A test of leadership, according to the participant, is whether the leader's goals are being realized. She concluded that leadership happens if people do what the leaders are trying to delegate. On the one hand,

goals are important and on the other hand, the relationship is also important. The participants have not thoughtfully considered how these two concerns ought to exist in the practice of leadership.

Many of the participants reacted in a negative manner to leadership as competitive or controlling. When leaders only concern themselves with converting people to their way of thinking, he/she considered that bad leadership. Bad leadership is still understood as leadership.

A division existed in the statements over the issue of politics and leadership. Some believed that manipulation of some sort is needed in the leadership effort. It cannot be avoided. This was a contradiction to their understanding of ethics and leadership and demonstrates the confusion that exists. Others rejected any form of manipulation in favor of mutuality and persuasion. Both male and female participants shared this last view. Some saw politics as necessary in order to build working and meaningful relationships. Aware that only some battles are worth the effort, a leader must be politically wise. Politics helps focus on common good.

The leader is not one who stands in front of the longing masses but one who emerges from the midst of the crowd. Leaders are often referred to as the persons who hold roles. Almost always, the leader ought to know the needs and problems of the followers. The ability to draw followers out is viewed as intrinsic to leadership. Often the participants talk about collaboration and enablement as necessary for leadership. Yet, the bottom line is still having someone in charge, moving toward the goal of the leader. There is no understanding that leadership is something practiced by leaders and

participants. The interviews reflected the notion that leadership is something done by leaders. Many of the participants believed that if the person who leads changes, leadership changes. That attitude places the responsibility for shaping the nature of leadership upon the leader. Whatever the leader considers leadership becomes leadership.

The ability to move people is a strong part of leadership. This requires a vision. This vision is one set by the leader. Change may be a consequence of the vision and also challenge the status quo. Those interviewed felt that change is all right. The concept of change set forth in the statements views change as growth, motivation, influence and may involve organizational restructuring. Although change was seen as a good thing, it was not strongly voiced as essential to the meaning of leadership. Creating followers and goal accomplishment are far more important.

A few participants believed that justice, raising consciousness, and self-criticism were essential ingredients of leadership. The concepts of leaders who question and have a reflective ability is present but not frequent in the statements of the participants. However, only a few described these qualities as important for leaders. Some of the participants thought that leaders ought to challenge assumptions and enable people to think independently, instill a broad vision of reality and moves us beyond specific goals. Once again, others strongly attach leadership to helping people reach their goals. Leaders ought to help people realize their gifts and talents. What is important to clearly grasp in the interviews is that the concern, for *helping* people comprehend

their gifts and talents, becomes almost a therapeutic responsibility. Rather than challenge, leaders ought to nurture.

The traditional ideal that leadership resides in the role was challenged by some participants who would like to move away from that approach to leadership. They did not see office and authority as equal to leadership. However, most examples of leadership were those associated with someone who holds an office.

Some participants seemed hesitant to connect ethics and leadership. The question of imposing our ethics on everyone led to this hesitancy. Often the discussion of ethics was not about leadership but rather about the leader. When the participants turned to ethics, discussion focused on the ethical patterns of the leader, not ethical leadership. That is why it became difficult for participants to talk about ethics as part of leadership. What they were really talking about was ethics and leaders. Ethical behavior would vary according to culture and situation. Leaders had to value integrity and should model their ethical persuasion. The connection between leader and leadership really becomes unclear when the issue of ethics is considered. Some participants did not want to separate ethics from leadership. They had a difficult time with leadership that is practiced by unethical persons. Some of those interviewed felt that leaders must do the right thing.

Good management is leadership. The concepts of leadership and management among several participants are interchangeable. One participant simply identified leadership as competent management. Many participants supported the idea that church leaders need more management skills and that having those skills would mean that the

church will have better leaders. Some participants connected leadership with goal accomplishment while management has to do with organizing and directing people.

A reading of the interviews in this chapter demonstrates the real mixture and inchoate understanding that exists about the nature and purpose of leadership. The participants articulate what they like about persons they judge as leaders or demonstrate their appreciation for certain qualities of leaders. Leadership is much more elusive and subjective. No shared understanding of what it takes to constitute leadership emerges from the data. The men and women who are the participants in this study are probably those who will be called upon to practice leadership in the church and in our society. While they are interested in understanding and practicing leadership, there is no agreement on what is the nature and purpose of leadership. There is also little awareness of the approach to leadership that I present in this study.

The way we educate and train people for leadership is linked to this state of confusion. Any meaningful, lasting, and realistic approach to education for leadership begins with a shared conviction and understanding of leadership. I do not propose that everyone think alike but that together we seriously explore the nature and purpose of leadership. The approach to leadership that I espouse in this study may serve as a focal point for this discussion in the church, particularly among religious educators and pastoral ministers. The difficult work and challenging adventure of education for authentic leadership must face the attitudes presented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER EIGHT

PERSPECTIVES OF PARTICIPANTS TOWARD EDUCATION FOR LEADERSHIP

Introduction

The perspectives in this final section of interviews respond to the connection between education and leadership. The areas of discussion include: Religious education, skill development, social development, leadership training, modelling and education, as well the use of base communities for education. Discussion of these concerns is followed by a summary of the perspectives. A final summary of the last three chapters offers a holistic presentation, as well as a concluding analysis, of the interviews and all three perspectives.

The Relationship between Religious Education and Leadership

Mary Norton: Religious educators ought to foster leadership. However most of them would probably not understand leadership nor want to increase their task.

Penny Miller: I think that the responsibility for leadership education is all our responsibility. I can remember hearing remarks of parents saying that their children had come home and talked about desegregation or justice, and they were not up there [in religious education classes] to learn about those things. The parents don't

have any concept of what is trying to be done. I think a good percentage of religious educators are really trying to share new insights.

Angela Fuller: I think that probably leadership education should be a responsibility of religious education and we should assure that it is happening.

Rochelle Prince: I think it is a great idea for religious educators to be involved in leadership education. I am questioning whether we could influence society. We have a lot of ways to influence society. Sometimes I think that we as a small group cannot tell society how to be leaders. That is really not true. I think of Betty who has a large School of Religion class. She also has a lot of teachers under her responsibility and she trains them. I think of all the people she could influence. I mean she could influence teachers and they can influence young students to realize what leadership is all about. Of course, catholic schools are a good place for doing the same thing. Influencing young people about leadership is important so that they grow up with the idea of leadership instead of having to change it after they become adults.

Education and the Development of Skills/Gifts

Kevin Murphy: Harvard Business School and other people have come up with all sorts of things to train leaders. I think what they have determined about different styles is the fact that leadership really starts with the individual and the ability to work with gifts and abilities. In other words, you and I may take over a project and you would handle it entirely different than me. Another example is

the use of the Myers Briggs and learning how each person operates. In my own diocese, I am a very strong F [feeler] and there is someone else who is a strong T [thinker]. The way for me to get a job done is through relationships and I manage to get the job done quite well and have a high level of performance from my staff. The T person is equally successful and does not spend half the time with people that I spend.

Stephen Baber: I think it is very unlikely that a high level of quality leadership would be exercised by somebody who does not have natural gifts and charisms. Leadership requires the ability to know how to do certain things. Skills and the organizational techniques oil the gears and make the exercise of charisms more effortless than the simple use of charisms. In the priesthood, most of the charismatic guys have left. To some extent, it is because no one ever taught them some of the mechanics of leadership.

Gretchen Wilson: I think there is an awful lot of education that has to go on right now. People in the parishes need help on how to bring forth leadership from their group.

Edgar Lewis: I think the only way you can have effective leaders is to give them opportunities to lead. Give them an opportunity to succeed. Give them positive feedback on how effective they were in particular situations. Give them opportunity to bounce off their reactions, their own perceptions.

Joseph Plummer: I would develop a program that would clarify needs--leadership needs--and out of these set some specific goals. Then we need to look at resources and personnel. Then target the budget and build a curriculum to do the training of the people for

specific areas that you have targeted. It is important to have ongoing assessment, evaluation, and readjustment. People must be enabled to go out there and meet those needs. I am beginning to look at the practical side of leadership. I would be less idealistic and more geared toward goal oriented-leadership training.

Rochelle Prine: When I think of developing leaders, I think of how it happened to me. You look for people in your parishes that are willing to come forth and take on leadership roles. You suggest classes for them to learn some skills needed for leadership. I was willing to try to learn something new. It really bothers me that so many young people think they are not leaders. If they would be willing to learn the skills and gain confidence, they could be leaders.

Developmental Issues and Education for Leadership

Mary Norton: As part of the parenting process, we need to develop leadership. For example, children should be allowed to think something is stupid and express it. They should not be punished for expressing their ideas or feelings.

Lee Ann Reynolds: I don't think leadership training is happening enough. I think it happens first when families and schools have something built into them to enable students to go inside themselves and begin to develop a sense of self-esteem, self-image and confidence. I don't think it is necessary to set up some formal training. It begins with the individual person and others helping them to see where they have excelled, helping them realize they have a lot to offer.

I am really interested in helping folks take what they learn and integrate it and in helping them cater not just to the mind but also to the heart. I would want that even in the corporate world. We are trying in our program to develop communication skills, skills for the actual job. I see it as formation, holistic formation. Our big thing is providing support, ongoing support. We train people in small groups so they can experience some support. We provide mentorship all along the way and I think that long term mentorship is real important.

Leadership training

Kevin Murphy: Actually today, many lay people have more training in theology than priests. I think that for adults the best form of education is not a lecture format. I like the idea of practica instead of such a cerebral approach to education. Such a model is found in medicine. Physicians do not perform operations without a great deal of time practicing and working side by side with other doctors in operating rooms. There are, however, very few disciplines that provide practicums. I think of educating with practicums or formative processes of education where you really have mentors. I think a lot of modelling needs to be part of any leadership education process. Such a process would be beyond the classroom. It is on the job, supervised efforts where you are affirmed. It is certainly something which would include skills training. There are many leadership styles. It is important to recognize that there are many ways to do leadership. What we have to avoid, for example, is taking a very good teacher and making that

person the assistant principal without any background or experience. instead we ought to have that person work with the principal discovering what the job is like. Often times, we don't even ask a person if he/she wants to move into a leadership position. The bottom line is formation, working beside a supervisor.

Stephen Baber: I think my potential as a leader and my eagerness to lead have been enhanced by having seen others lead effectively. By the experience of observing and by the experience of have led effectively, I have a much clearer idea of not only how I might exercise leadership but also the kind of leadership that is most effective for me. I think we could put different lay folks into offices that in other times and places were held only by priests. People need to recognize that we can have in the church different kinds of folks in traditional leadership positions at a diocesan level. When these folks are effective, people at the parish and local level see that they can do the same thing.

A lot of attitudes toward leadership spring from our perception of the family. We are moving from a period where family roles were very clear to all the members to a time when those roles are not so clear. That is causing people to reconsider their roles and possibilities. So I think people are experiencing new things in the ways families are configured and responsibilities are shared. Leadership in families is changing in terms of articulating a vision and motivating people. It is now more common that roles are not always falling to one person or the other. It changes with time, and I think that is helpful. In a family, people are experiencing that at times the father may take the lead in something; at other times, the

mother; or at other times, the children. It does not have to be a permanent lifetime "here is your job description." It is changing. Leaders can change depending on the circumstances and people.

We need to first identify the kinds of talents and charisms that the people need. Then we recruit the more talented and charismatic student for the seminary or leadership position. Many seminary students today have no idea how to work meetings and have no training on how to discover their talents or what natural gifts other possess. Without those things, they cannot be effective.

The ideal situation for leadership education to occur is when there is a congruence between office and leadership. In such a situation the one who holds an office also is a leader. When that happens, there is a mentor. So it happens more informally. I can imagine a network of people who recognize each other as leaders and take it upon themselves to scout people for potential leadership.

Elizabeth Brusch: In our national program we don't deal with leadership directly. People don't come here and study leadership. Basically everything that is going on is leadership. We have a sense of being transformed. What happens is they get in touch with their issues, and they go back and see that they can make a difference. They want to get their peers involved. They just can't work in their departments anymore. They come up against the hard issues in terms of the structural church. They also discover there are limits to power. We see a lot of change and ownership and growth. That is pretty exciting. I think that happens because of our emphasis on collaboration and some skills and knowledge. Everything is focused

on their goals. What they are learning does change things, their bishops say this is true.

John Rice: In terms of developing leadership, I stick around the word *emotional*. We have to somehow expand people's awareness of who they are inside, getting in touch with their emotions. I still run into leaders in the church who are so afraid of expressing any emotion. I hate that. That is one piece. We also need to educate people to understand that it is all right to risk and to fail and to try new things that are not going to be automatic winners.

It seems like you have got people who want to change or want to move toward a more collaborative style, and they will find the energy and the way to do just that. I am trying to think how you change people who don't want to change and how you begin a process to alter that reality. I see the problem being with that element in the church who wants things to remain the same forever.

We live in an era of the information glut. We have to educate ourselves on how to manage all the new information without being overwhelmed by it.

Joseph Plummer: My interest is in developing leaders for evangelization. My responsibility will be to train other leaders who have some training already and give them certain techniques. Then they will go into parishes and train evangelization teams. Some persons are being trained not for ministry itself but for things like advisors in pastoral affairs or in financial leadership. Our deacon training program is geared toward specific ministries.

Angela Fuller: Well, in our diocese, the only way people will find a way to learn about leadership is to go away to school. I don't

know if that is going to work well or not. We need to train in whatever ways we can discover. A lay ministry formation program will give people basics but the people who would take these classes have other occupations. They will be volunteers. I don't think their education makes them elite. I just dream that our catholic laity be more educated.

Rochelle Prince: I definitely think leadership training is a matter of formation. Formation is being around people that are leaders. That is just as important as getting an education. I think they go together. The only way I see leadership happening is through education. We need to educate people into new ways to lead. People need to come to know they have gifts and something to give to others. I think that in base communities those gifts can be affirmed.

Leadership Education through Modelling

Kevin Murphy: What we are determining today is that one of the most formative pieces of our life is our family. We talk about leadership beginning with our first child. A tremendous amount of leadership is required of the first child. In some studies, it is the first child that ends up in executive leadership positions. You can see the importance of modelling through the issue of welfare. Once a family is on welfare, it is modelled to subsequent generations.

John Rice: Maybe we need to take priests who have moved successfully from the old model of church into whatever phase of the new church we are in and use them as mentors in establishing training programs. Ask them questions, watch them in how they manage, supervise or work with people. Then try to glean from those

experiences something that is objective and tangible about the change that they have experienced.

I also think that we need to look to organizations outside ourselves. I do not know exactly where to look but roles are changing all over. So I think we would have to select service industries or organizations that are somehow comparable to us. We need to look at a successful businesses and pick out industries to study how they move from the past to the present.

Marian Rice: The church should be in the forefront in pointing out what leadership is and how an organization becomes a moral, ethical influence. It should say something to the world about leadership. The church should be an example.

Thomas Miller: Leadership is something that can be learned. You have to learn your limitations, your gifts. You need to learn how to deal with people, to express yourself and how to communicate effectively with others. Good communication skills are necessary. You need someone else to instill those qualities. Then you can take it from that point. Young people need some leaders in their environment so they can see someone else leading.

Lee Ann Reynolds: I think the model is real important. As we develop leaders, I think I am a real advocate of first of all modeling leadership for them. I am a real advocate of feedback leadership. When we are moving somebody or helping people move into leadership and they do not have the skills, they need to piggyback. I think support is very important and that is modelled too. Accountability is also important. In our own training, we had to

keep goal sheets and ask ourselves questions like, "Did you meet your goal?"

We provide mentorship in our programs. I think mentoring is significant throughout our lives. I mean significant people that have helped us learn a skill or move to a new place in terms of attitudes or whatever. Those folks are real important and in our leadership development, I think people who have good experiences in particular areas can share a lot of that experience. They can seek companions for the journey among those who are trying to develop themselves.

Rochelle Prince: When I think of leadership education, I don't mean formal education. Base communities are a form of education between people. I guess I am trying to get people into positions in the church or in a group or company that possess leadership skills. That is the best way to educate people because you are dealing with people who possess those skills. Those skills can be modelled in the group.

Base Communities and Leadership Education

James Adams: I have an apartment complex, and the largest group that lives there does not have a history of responsibility. So these people need leadership. They need a lot of guidance. One of the things I have been thinking about is how could I put together the people that we have living there. This would mean putting the management of the whole apartment complex in the hands of the residents so that they become responsible for where they live and how they live together.

I also have a small business. I would like to try operating it from a consensus basis or circles method so that the employees would not try to shine my shoes but would learn to be honest with me.

Marian Rice: We need programs like the one I just completed that allow people of diverse backgrounds to come together. Then you have a challenging possibility wherein people might see themselves as leaders. We need grass root parish level community experiences that foster leadership.

Lee Ann Reynolds: I really like the model of developing leadership in small base communities, and that is one reason why we decided to develop our own lay ministry program and leadership training. We could not find anything like it. We are making our own tapes and writing our own manuals. People are in fixed groups of six to eight persons. I like the constant group support that occurs in a small group. I think leadership training is part formation. I also like the formal training and education. If you are going to be in ministry you need to know the important kinds of documents, books and actual intellectual knowledge. We can also learn from our secular experience of management and organizations. We need to know negotiation and communication skills communication. Sometimes in the church we are too nice and so we don't deal with a lot of things.

I really see us moving into small faith communities and leadership in those groups is going to be different. We will need small group leaders. I think you need different skills if you are leading 4 people or 1,000 persons.

Summary: Perspectives of Participants on Education and Leadership

None of the participants associated on their own initiative issues of education for leadership and religious education. However, no one objected to the association if the interviewer raised the possible connection. Participants suggested religious educators need to work to influence society. Yet the emphasis on religious education was still child centered. The work of leadership education is a shared reality, they said. Responsibility for leadership education is not the religious educator alone but the responsibility of the religious educator in union with the whole community.

Some participants suggested that we learn about leadership by not dealing directly with the issue but by practicing acquired skills. Leadership education is something one acquires while doing something else, like ministry or education. Several participants thought that since leadership skills vary according to person and context, education for leadership is a highly individualized effort. The respondents most readily identified education for leadership with acquiring effective skills.

I noted that the smaller and less resourced a diocese, the increased concern over educational opportunities for nonordained persons. The participants suggested that large, mainstream educational institutions such as universities and seminaries, the only realistic resource for leadership education for these dioceses, are the only possibility for education.

The resources of family and parenting are helpful places to foster leadership. The family and school develop leadership by fostering self-esteem and self-confidence. The participants raised

the issue of leadership serving the therapeutic need and healing the dysfunction of organizations as an important concern. In this sense, the concept of leadership education among the participants had a therapeutic and personal frame to it.

The example of others is influential in shaping their own leadership thinking and practice. Attentiveness to those who practice leadership is the best way to discover the meaning of leadership and to educate for leadership. Both persons and organizations are able to model leadership.

The participants raised the concept of mentoring a number of times. Often they connected mentoring with enabling persons to develop skills and techniques which will help them reach specific organizational and ministerial goals. The church needs to look beyond itself for mentors in leadership. At the same time, the church should serve as an example of authentic leadership to a gamut of persons and organizations in society.

Leadership education, many suggested, is fostered by small groups. The creation of these base communities, which do not overtly train persons in leadership, are very valuable because they offer opportunities to practice authentic leadership and gain peer support. Even when the participants discuss mentoring as a form of leadership education, the emphasis returns to selecting models that have strong skills.

Synthesis and Critique of the Participants' Commentary

Having given the comments of the participants on perspectives on the church and leadership, perspectives on the nature and purpose

of leadership, and perspectives on education and leadership, I want to summarize and synthesize their remarks into a holistic perspective. Such a synthesis provides an integrated picture of the participant's thoughts on leadership and religious education, and it prepares the way for a futuristic view and the prescriptive suggestions that are presented in Chapters Nine and Ten. I also analyze the participants' perspectives using the framework of transforming leadership presented in Chapter Four. This is done in an integrative manner.

No participant offered any definition for leadership. What I found is that as a collective body of data, all the parts necessary for leadership as I define it are present. Many of the participants found it very difficult to talk about leadership and preferred to talk about leaders. How can persons recognize leadership if it is not clear what people mean by leadership? I do not propose that one is not able to practice transforming leadership unless they can articulate the nature and purpose of leadership. Some of these participants may be practicing transforming leadership. There are women and men who in religious education and in pastoral ministry practice transforming leadership without naming their activity as transforming leadership. The ability to practice leadership does not depend upon the ability to articulate the nature and purpose of leadership. However, education for leadership is furthered when people understand and recognize leadership when it occurs. When persons are able to articulate and evaluate leadership according to some shared appreciation of the nature and purpose of leadership, leaders and participants can be supported and encouraged in the

practice of leadership. The issue is complex, messy, and unclear. The participants in the study yearned to know more about leadership, about its purpose and nature, about the role of leadership in the church and society. When I offered a definition, it was welcomed. Most objections to my definition were based on the meaning and background that the participants attached to a phrase or word. After some clarification, they found the concepts acceptable with a few exceptions. This does not mean that the participants readily adopted my view.

I found these participants well grounded in the value and practice of communication skills. They viewed these skills as crucial to their understanding of leadership. Many of the participants, equated skills with leadership. I suggest that the participants' attention to proficiency in interpersonal skills, decision making, and, in a few instances, conflict resolution give a therapeutic character to their understanding of leadership. This therapeutic approach to leadership generated by the participants emphasizes resolution, communication, agreement, protection, and conviction. The same participants often felt that those in authority were afraid to take risks, unable to think critically, and eager to uphold the status quo. The participants valued developing critical thinking, challenging the status quo, presenting alternatives ideas, as well as transforming culture and institutions but they did not view these conditions as basic to leadership. It was more important for leaders to realize goals than change them. Participants determined that skills and styles of leadership help leaders become effective, excellent managers. Adroit skills and appropriate styles combined

with innate traits assist leaders to work therapeutically with persons and organizations. Participants strongly believed that leaders are persons who enable people to cope with reality, accept differences, adapt to change, comfort the confused, and move everyone to realize the vision and goals of the leader. Leaders have a vision and practice leadership rather than leaders and followers who share mutual purposes and vision practice leadership.

Sixty-five percent of the participants are in their forties and another twelve percent are in their thirties. Fifteen out of seventeen have already had substantial leadership training of some nature. Twelve out of seventeen have had some graduate education. My point is that these are the men and women who will have a dramatic effect upon our understanding and practice of leadership in the church and society throughout this decade and the next. Their understanding of the nature and purpose of leadership and their efforts to practice leadership will be influential and formative. Their views will contribute to developing leadership trends in the church into the next millennium. The interviews reveal that the respondents held an industrial view of leadership, a view that is goal dominated, cost benefit driven, pragmatic, scientific, product oriented, rational, and personalistic. For example, persons holding office or authority are recognized as leaders simply because of their hierarchical position in the church. A participant indicated that a leader needs to realize goals as well as having a perception of where he or she is going. Another participant said that leaders have to realize goals and see a product; that is the measurement. At the same time, other participants would like to see a more horizontal

model of leadership, as one participant described it. However, the top down, leader over follower model was still viewed as leadership. A new understanding of leadership is something that should be shared by those who are practicing leadership and educating others for leadership. Chapter Ten looks at a new understanding of leadership and sets forth possible processes for leadership education.

The participants tended to equate leadership and leaders. While they asserted in the interviews a personal belief in empowerment and collaboration, they still recognized product-oriented, hierarchical, role and office bound positions as leadership. However, the respondents approve of a concept of leadership that is practiced by leaders rather than by leaders and followers. We need to think about leadership apart from leaders in order to understand the process of transforming leadership. Leaders and followers need to understand the nature and purpose of transforming leadership. When we collapse the two, we tend to focus on the individual person or context. The participants collapsed the two concepts and confusion over leadership exists. I suggest that persons who collapse leadership with leaders drift toward the specific goals or vision of an individual who is able to exercise the greater influence. Energy and resources are spent not in the influence relationship but on the goal of an individual. What is lost is the big picture, the broad vision, the sense of process and relationship, interconnection and interdependence, and ultimately the future.

The participants often understood ethics as the moral behavior of leaders. It was difficult for the participants to separate the

ethics of leadership from the ethics of leaders. They noted that leaders ought to possess integrity and treat followers with respect. Many participants suggested that the leader was to be a better moral person than the followers, free from any contamination or misdeeds.

I think it would be helpful to recapture the distinction between the ethics of the process of leadership and the ethics of the content of leadership. This helps us to understand the problem of ethics and leadership faced by the participants. Rost (1989) offered that, "If leadership is an influence relationship, then the process whereby leaders and followers interact--the process whereby leaders and followers influence one another and others outside the relationship--becomes crucial to the ethics of leadership" (p. 4). Rost (1989) distinguished the ethics of the leadership process from the ethics of leadership content, "Leaders and followers have numerous options in supporting various change proposals, and not all the options are necessarily good from an ethical perspective. Changes are not value free; they have ethical ramifications for leaders and followers. The content of leadership has to do with the issues that leaders and followers tackle and more specifically with the changes that leaders and followers propose concerning those issues" (p. 12).

The confusion of the ethics of leadership content with the ethics of the leadership process (relationship between leaders, participants and others) amplified the dilemma of clear thinking in the interviews about ethics and leadership. The participants are persons who appear open to new ideas. I suggest that they would be open to a more in depth discussion of the relationship of ethics and

leadership. The point is that the participants found it difficult to talk about the ethics of leadership. They were more comfortable talking about the behavior of individual persons.

Participants spoke about the need for change in the future church and the lack of leadership that exists both in society and in the church. "Bad leadership" was something that was viewed as leadership but was seen as undesirable and in need of transformation. For all their desire for change, the participants did not view change of any significant nature as essential to their understanding of leadership. For example, a participant said that change should be an important issue for an effective leader but the core of leadership is being in charge. Six out of ten respondents who commented on change were women who viewed change as very important when discussing leadership. These female respondents also valued the attitude of openness to change as significant for leaders. The male participants spoke of change as motivation. A male respondent said that motivation means to move people toward the goals and intentions of the leader. Female participants were more critical of present leaders and attitudes toward leadership than their male counterparts. Several female participants criticized the clergy who hold position of power and authority as lacking compassion. They said that the church has a hierarchy that makes the rules and tells the rest of the people what should be done, they have lost the human element. A women respondent called for a shift of responsibility from the pastor to the people. Women were more eager for significant change than the men and were more vocal about the paucity and depth of the change taking place in the church.

These participants were genuinely and generally concerned with the practical. The motto, "it is by the real that we exist," governed their personal and professional philosophy. My understanding of transforming leadership is about real, substantive change but that change is fostered by a fascination with the ideal. Victor Hugo's adage--that it is by the real that we exist and by the ideal that we live--should serve as a vehicle for understanding leadership. We cannot fear nor shrink from transformation and the pursuit of the ideal. Such is the crucible, cradle, and crusade of leadership. An understanding of leadership that avoids intended, substantive change may swiftly result in the collapse of leadership with management or therapy. Leadership is much more than developing coping mechanisms or organizational mechanics. Leadership is transformational and substantive change is necessary for such transformation.

Leadership is political. The participants reluctantly acknowledged this reality but frequently spoke of moving people, motivating followers, and getting others to accept the goals of the leader. The political aspects of leadership were understood more as manipulation than influence. The participants viewed power as essential to leadership. The majority of participants understood that power ought to be transformed into empowerment.

Leaders who practice transforming leadership concern themselves with the mutual purposes of leaders and followers. However in the interview data, the respondents gave little attention to the mutual nature of leadership. Instead, the vision of the leader takes priority. Participants value the skill of listening, but the

mutual discernment that engages a mutual purpose was almost ignored. American individualism reared its head, and the comments of the participants show how much it has influenced everyone in the United States. The goals suggested by the participants in the interview were issues that satisfied immediate, short term needs. A respondent used the example of a relative who, she said, is a leader. This relative got other people involved by inviting them to help with liturgical music or participate in soccer. Another respondent said that good leaders make one feel successful. She noted how important it is for leaders to help direct people in the successful accomplishment of their tasks or to develop satisfactory performance in their work.

The metarelations of those needs and goals offered by the participants in the study, the relationships between one group of leaders and followers and another group were ignored. Therefore the substantive changes that are required in our society were also left unexplored. No wonder the participants view leadership in terms of communication skills or dynamics for planning a good meeting.

The relationship of the leader with the followers as articulated by the participants may be characterized as dependent. The relationship of leaders to participants in transformational leadership is interdependent. The process of transforming leadership is a prophetic passage from existence to the critical reconstruction of life lived in uncommon community.

At this point, I want to bring my definition of leadership forward and place it in dialogue with the holistic analysis as I have presented it. *Leadership is a dialectical process which involves an*

influence relationship among leaders and participants who intend and move toward real changes that reflect their mutual discernment.

I believe that transforming *leaders and participants* ought to be ethical, educative, critical and transformative. They engage in a dialectical process which involves an influence relationship between leaders and participants who intend and move toward real changes that reflect their mutual purposes. Transforming leaders and participants who practice the process of leadership should value human emancipation, social change, and the pursuit of an achievable common good.

Excellent management and successful communication skills are not leadership. What I claim here is that all the elements in my definition must be present for leadership to exist. Some participants spoke convincingly of the need for enablement and empowerment, some spoke of the leader follower relationship, some spoke of change, some of mutual purposes and discernment. Collectively, they were talking about leadership. Individually they were speaking of realities and skills that are necessary in our organizations but are really not leadership. They were speaking about administration, manipulation, power wielding, communications, management, authority, office, goals and productivity, tasks and styles, organizational therapy or the like. The fact that together they were talking about leadership is refreshing and hopeful. It is hopeful because I believe it means that authentic, transforming leadership can be recognized, understood and practiced by almost anyone. Leadership is not an elite activity

but a shared possibility that is grasped when there is dialogue nurtured by critical thinking.

The fact that individually they were unable to articulate a concept of leadership is a problem. There were no sources for their reflection upon the nature and purpose of leadership. As one participant stated, "In our program we don't deal with leadership directly. People don't come here and study leadership. Basically everything that is going on is leadership." Where is reflection on leadership happening? The crisis of leadership is that we are not thinking about leadership. Instead, we are reacting to situations, systems, and structures.

There are many positive developments about leadership that arise from the interviews. The concepts of enablement of persons, the recognition and affirmation of potential leaders are welcome signs in this period of transition in leadership studies. Some of the participants encouraged a movement away from identifying leadership with position or office. Others supported a positive relationship between leaders and followers that fosters mutual discernment.

The participants supported issues such as collaboration, enablement, empowerment. Listening skills, affirmation, relationship building, nurturing, mutuality and the like often flowed through their dreams for leadership. I view this as a positive development because it courts the feminine perspective of leadership. The traditional male perspective of leadership urgently needs the female frame of reference. Leadership is an art, not a science.

Much of the emphasis on education stemmed from the interest participants gave to skills necessary for good communication and excellent management. Other attention was given to discernment of charisms, gifts, and their affirmation. As long as people understand leadership in terms of product, short term goals, and skill or personal style development, education will take the form of management training and instruction.

When leadership is concerned with real, substantive change and the transformation of persons and cultures, basic assumptions and structures, people will require an alternative to traditional methods of instruction. Some of the participants favored the use of mentors in leadership. Others have experienced the personal change in their lives due to participation in small communities that foster trust, honesty, dialogue and virtue. It was not uncommon for these communities to also have altruistic motives for their groups that meant attention and commitment to causes beyond the needs of the group.

No person possesses the *truth* about leadership. Experts in the study of leadership, the women and men in this study, and my own work on leadership join together to discover the meaning, nature, and purpose of leadership. Through this study, I hope to offer fellow sojourners a guide in leadership travels. The study exposes the disarray of theory, perspectives, and experiences of leadership in the church. My definition attempts to influence people and expose fresh ideas in an effort to reconstruct and rediscover leadership for the next century. I do not hold that the participants' view of leadership, especially their collective view, is wholly incorrect or

untenable. Nor do I hold that my understanding of leadership is the only worthwhile perspective on leadership. A purpose of this study was to explore the perspectives of nonordained women and men on leadership. I am indebted to their insights on leadership, inspired by their openness to new ideas, and hopeful because of their insistence on making leadership in the future a more human endeavor. I also intended to place the participants' perspectives into a conversation with my own understanding of leadership. While the study did allow me to accomplish this purpose, it did not allow me an opportunity to enter with the participants into a sustained dialectic on leadership. That is a tempting possibility for future study and research. Indeed such a dialogue is essential if people are to educate for leadership in the christian community.

A gap exists between the concepts of leadership that are held by the participants and the concept of transforming leadership as I have articulated it. In Chapter Four, I suggested that transformational processes are resocializational processes that create a deep change in the way we understand and construct our reality; create and educate our worldview; reconstruct our approach to life as a community of children, women and men; and develop a clear understanding of those international economic and cultural forces that form our environment and our future. The concept of change discussed by the participants dealt more with adaptive and planned change. The morphogenetic theme of transformation valued by the participants, was not essential to leadership. Change was not a priority for them as they reflected upon the nature of leadership.

I propose that the crisis of leadership is intellectual, not manual. Leadership needs to be understood as transforming. All else is something other than leadership. I intend to make leadership accessible to the widest spectrum of people and not an elitist process. At the same time, I intend to distinguish leadership from other practices. The intellectual gap that exists between the concepts of leadership held by the participants and the theory of transforming leadership should narrow through a liberating dialogue among people interested in leadership. We cannot speak about educating for leadership until that dialogue begins among the people of God and their fellow citizens of the world.

We are engaged in a transition period from an industrial era to a postindustrial period. Attention must be given to the issues, needs and dreams of a new decade and new century. These are some of the concerns of transforming leaders who practice transforming leadership. The next two chapters will examine the context of future leadership and the environment that shall influence education for christian leadership.

The data in these interviews are descriptive of the present understanding of leadership and approach to training and development among those nonordained men and women who aspire to practice leadership in christian communities. They do not see transformation as crucial to religious education or leadership. The breach between the approach to education for leadership in the interview and the approach to education for transforming leadership requires a bridge. My final effort in this study is to offer some prescriptive ideas and insights to further our understanding of

transforming leadership, our efforts toward leadership education, and provide an outline for building a bridge to a postindustrial era in the church. These insights about leadership and education are linked to a context that is in transition. The future needs of persons and organizations are shaping leadership and education. The next chapter faces a future context for leadership and education. Chapter Ten helps to create a design for leadership education.

CHAPTER NINE

THE FUTURE CONTEXT OF LEADERSHIP

Introduction

Transforming leadership is leadership for the future. Transforming leaders and participants who practice transforming leadership will enable our generation to make a transition into the next century. There will be other approaches to leadership that establish authentic leadership. It is my opinion that for the present, transformational leadership best captures the nature and purpose of leadership. Much of what is termed leadership is skill development or management. Such important skills and techniques are necessary for us to cope with our complex world. Coping is one thing and leadership is another reality. Our complex world demands that we go beyond coping. Only authentic leadership will assist us to move through this maze and make the transition from an industrial era to a postindustrial period. A paradigm shift of global dimensions is occurring in our world.

I outline in this chapter some present and future concerns that people engaged in transforming leadership must address as they participate in this passage. There is no need to go kicking and screaming into a new millennium, but rather we need to form a partnership with the issues of a new age. I briefly examine the ecclesial and secular realities that leadership must herald and

challenge. These realities ought to be faced collectively by theology and science, educative processes and information banks, and the communal effort of women, men and children.

The eclectic pattern that emerges from a discussion of our future influences how we educate for leadership in church and society. Formed by present and future needs, the approach to leadership that exists among potential nonordained leaders, and the concept of transforming leadership, prescriptive directions will be offered in the final chapter. My intention, in this chapter, is to raise only some of the more striking factors which shape our horizon and our efforts to educate for leadership.

Future Issues Affecting Transforming Leadership

Transforming leaders and participants practice leadership in the context of culture. Future leaders and participants also face specific elements in Western culture. These elements include the influences of a management mindset, therapy idioms which enable persons to be well-adjusted, and an economic prism for judging success. Management, therapy, and economics are not evil. They are necessary and good. However, they are not descriptors for leadership. Transforming leaders and participants may practice excellent management, therapy or economics. The excellent practice of these important activities does not imply that those who so engaged are practicing leadership.

Transforming leadership shapes culture. Schein (1984) claimed that leaders form, transmit and shape culture in organizations. Changing culture is a very difficult task. The

transforming leader who practices transforming leadership faces a question. Is it a process, a partnership between leaders and followers? The problem becomes even more complex in our diverse American culture. What is American culture? How do people communicate vision to a diverse culture? Can leadership occur in a capitalistic system? The problems of consumerism, a materialistic society, privatization of democracy, an overemphasis on therapy, the loss of community, an economy based ethic, anthropocentric attitudes, adultism, and the superiority of a male perspective threaten human well being, lessen dialectical possibilities and confound significant change processes in a capitalistic culture.

Bennis (1989) suggested that we use a management model in the Western culture. American institutions are overmanaged and underled. We are drowning in information. It seems appropriate that we are also immersed in physical, emotional, and spiritual therapy. However, change also characterizes this new age. American culture requires more than therapy, it requires transformation. The sole pursuit of self-interest, self-knowledge, and individualism is cancerous. Liberty appears to be reduced to self-interest. Roberts (1988) suggested in *The Leadership Secrets of Attila the Hun* that skill and trait development make leadership. The leader controls, takes charge, produces, acts. This popular book makes leadership easy, simple, accessible, affirms the individual, and produces immediate results. It is also not about leadership, and it does not help us to make the necessary paradigm shift.

We need to break out of an economic base for leadership and break into values as the base for leadership. The problem of a

capitalistic culture is the overemphasis on the bottom line. Changes in the political direction of Eastern block countries in Europe should not serve to sanctify capitalism but open our eyes to the dangers of any closed philosophy. The people in the Western culture must be open to reconstructing capitalism and the culture they shape and transfer to subsequent generations. This is important if people in the Western culture wish to transcend economics as a base for ethical decisions, the privatization of social and religious institutions, the pursuit of self-interest, and a management mode than does not encourage critical thinking. Transforming leadership is needed so that people do not simply recycle crises every twenty years and move the intellectual furniture within an old paradigm. Transforming leadership is needed to challenge our values, culture, basic assumptions, and those governing principles which frame our deep personal, religious, and organizational structures.

Community, trust, and civic republicanism are important for transforming leadership to flourish and enable people in the Western culture to shake the stranglehold of abrupt individualism. Individuals do not have to be transformed before society is transformed. Many of the participants in this study believe that there must be inner transformation in the leader before a difference is possible in leadership. Transformation is mutual when leaders and followers share the process of leadership. The impetus for change occurs from the relationship among leaders and followers. This relationship between leaders and followers is encouraged by the creation and experience of community and a society blessed by civic republicanism.

Smith (1982) viewed organizational change more from a relationship than structure. Organizations are systems of relationships. Change occurs when we alter the relationships between relationships, the metacommunication between systems of communication. Substantial change in organizations begins with reflection upon the initial conditions which fashion organizations. People also begin to change organizations by the way they talk about them, the way they use metaphors and other symbols. When people change the metonymy or context, they begin to change the system. Leadership is a relationship that fosters morphogenesis. How we understand and communicate leadership determines whether leadership happens in an organization, whether there is an authentic change in the relationships between relationships.

Leadership is not about the management of change. As organizations become more flexible and organizational systems allow for more adaptability, change becomes more difficult in large organizations. Weick (1976) reminded us that large scale change is more difficult in loosely coupled systems even if local change becomes more facile.

The scholars who wrote the various chapters in Adams' book (1986) have made an attempt to reshape leadership in organizations. These organizational theorists and change agents are attempting to humanize organizations. They wrote about vision, the value of intuition, openness and trust. These authors called for a second look at intimacy, curiosity, and adventure in organizational behavior. They also reminded us that people need to be heard, they need security, personal growth and fulfillment, safety and emotional

support. This sounds like participatory management, not leadership. Perhaps what is taking place in contemporary organizational theory is a transitional philosophy that will enable us to move to the organizations of the future. Leaders are more than custodians. Excellence in management may be needed to prepare the way for leaders who practice transforming leadership in future organizations. We need to move beyond hierarchic, linear, dualistic, logical positivistic, Newtonian mechanics.

People need to change the way they view reality. It is no longer adequate in our shrinking world to singularly view reality from a Western perspective. Masculine and management are two metaphors for coping with our present condition. Practitioners and educators of leadership need to critically appropriate our collective memory as a culture and people, critically name our present condition, and creatively imagine our future. Changing the way people grasp and interpret their reality is necessary for reimagining the way persons construct reality. People socially construct their reality and they can reconstruct it.

Organizations and Future Leadership

Beres and Musser (1988) demonstrated that significant, systemwide change can take place in organizations. A bottom-up approach to change enabled an international organization for women to move from a centralized, hierarchical approach to organization to collegial networking. Another contemporary discussion on organizational theory and change is presented by Sibbet and Brown (1986). They examined an organization which restructured itself to

both meet economic success and respond to larger community issues. The organization viewed itself as a learning community, proactive rather than reactive, interdependent and contributive to the development of leadership in a large system of private, governmental, and community sectors. Such examples already exist. It is time to imagine and create organizations for the future.

I suggest that future organizations will allow people to act in ways that explore alternatives even though these alternatives challenge the organization itself. What this means is that we should create organizations that agree to disagree. These organizations deal with a broad, diverse culture that does not settle for total immersion in capitalism. Instead, organizations can build organizations that welcome anthropological, sociological, religious and organizational diversity. The organization does not have to have shared cultural values. Tolerance for diversity keeps change possible and a corporate vision does not become static. Movement from hierarchy to heterarchy supports a less competitive and more participative organization. Organizations that are participative explore multiple rightness and a sense that truth is found in the partnership of community and the individual.

Future organizations should experience a breakdown into smaller, circular networks. These circular organizations are disassociated from the banking approach to organizations where information is deposited from the top. Circular organizations are more holographic in that the part reflects the whole. They are participative rather than hierarchical and manipulative. Finally, they are distributive in that power sharing and policymaking occur

at multilevels. Organizations are educative organisms. The parts affect the whole. Organizations ought to be more oriented toward their responsibility in the world as agents of social consciousness. Organizations can no longer be credible, or financially successful, if they simply attempt to do their own thing, make money and ignore their social responsibility. The way people view organizations ought to change. Organizations that are educative and examples of leadership will be more collaborative; have broad purpose; share decision making; meet wants and needs beyond their own self-interest; and seek to uncover and combat prejudice that is based in culture, race, gender, sexual orientation, or religion. Organizations cannot afford ethically or economically to develop an organizational culture in which there is only one way to do things or one way to view reality. Isolation is deadly. All reality is interdependent.

Ritscher (1986) and Joiner (1989) established the spiritual character necessary for meaningful and relevant organizations. This spiritual dimension explores the ideas that we are all linked and share a common reality in our search for a common good.

Transformation is necessary for life and we have as human beings a free will enabling us to choose our own destiny as individuals and collectively. There are consequences to human actions and people are responsible for those actions. Our spirituality enables men and women to transcend the ego and to focus on interdependence in ways that embody caring and compassion. The human mind-body-spirit are interwoven like a tapestry. Any attempt to segregate them in organizations leads to dysfunction and failure. The spiritual dimension faces issues of human suffering. It allows us to focus on

that energy which gives our lives purpose and meaning. The spiritual dimension of organizations allows persons to discover vision and organizations to be inspired. The spiritual dimension breathes new life in organizational settings, nurtures integrity, insight into human nature, commitment, and openness. When there is an openness to mystery, symbol and imagination which are at the heart of the spiritual, there is hope, insight, adventure, curiosity, and possibility for a more meaningful future.

Problems facing Leadership in Transition

Harman (1979) wrote about four dilemmas facing our society: Growth, work, control, and distribution. These problems are rooted in the industrial paradigm that dominates the Western culture. These problems arise from this basic paradigm which emphasizes individualism, free enterprise, material progress, social responsibility as the concern of government, and few restraints on capital accumulation. The goals of organizations and societies encourage efficiency, productivity, growth in production and consumption, the primacy of technology, and power wielding. The result has been the alienation of persons from community and nature, the exploitation of resources, a division between the haves and the have nots, the consumption of vast resources by a small percentage of the world's population to preserve these same goals, and the condoning of these actions through a self-realization ethic. "The result is a cultural crisis of major proportions--a growing and massive challenge to the legitimacy of the present industrial system" (p. 115).

Bellah et al. (1985) suggested that politics should foster a public dialogue but too often it requires an infighting that promotes the give-get model so prominent in American culture. This effort at conflict resolution is typical of a therapeutic model. "The ideal therapeutic world is one in which impersonal bureaucratic rules guarantee free access to market choices and the opportunity for empathic communication in open and intense interpersonal relations. It is a world without politics and it would seem, without community (p. 133)."

The family in America is undergoing radical change. Gilligan (1982) raised the consciousness of men and women and how they view reality. The female view uses relationship as a life lens. Women today cannot solely carry the responsibility for altruism. It must be a shared responsibility birthed in processes of partnership. Russell (1981), a black female theologian, presented the altruistic character of the theological term *covenant*. Families are losing both the sense of social and ecclesial covenant as well as the feminine perspective of partnership and a true altruistic imagination and practice, she opined. The family is turning in on itself. Bellah et al (1985) wrote that "the family is no longer an integral part of the larger moral ecology tying the individual to community, church, and nation. The family is the core of the private sphere, whose aim is not to link individuals to the public world but to avoid it. Americans are seldom as selfish as the therapeutic culture urges them to be. But often the limit of their serious altruism is the family circle" (p. 112). Altruism and a genuine concern for others are often confused

with the give-get syndrome that is embedded in a resistance to critical reflection.

Baum (1979) explored the implications of the sociological concepts of *Gesellschaft* and *Gemeinschaft*. He made a distinction between family and institution. A family has an inherited relationship, a bond that is thick, one in which common values and human emotions are shared and people do what love demands. A family believes that the sense of "we" is greater than the sense of "I." There is a real awareness of care and mutuality. Whereas an institution is more like a club. There is a deliberate choice to include or expel, there is only a legal bonding, the "I" is greater than the "we," uniformity and rule reign and responses are mass produced. Rationality is primary over the person. The institution promotes and protects its own advancement. I hold that our society and church ought to recapture this sense of family and act more like a family than an institution.

The advancement of a technological society rooted in the industrial paradigm leads to increased unemployment and the loss of imagination. Philosophy and the free exchange of ideas have been traded for the free exchange market system. The benefits of human play and imagination are exchanged for the benefits of work. Reason and imagination should not be pitted against each other. Fischer (1983) called for a rediscovery of imagination. She asserted the importance of imagination and play in education, philosophy, and linguistics. People are capable of creative and critical thinking when they tap the resource of their imagination.

We live in an age of awe and wonder, where mystery is a dimension of all knowing. In such a world, the imaginative language of symbol and metaphor is again recognized as an appropriate tool of thought. Another front of renewal is research in the area of human physiology. The right brain is responsible for the metaphorical, synthetic, and concrete; the left brain for the linear, analytic and rational. The right hemisphere of the brain seems to be more dominantly the source of those functions which we describe as imaginative, the aesthetic, mythic, and symbolic. Therapists realized the healing power of the right brain and began to employ image, fantasy, and metaphor as catalysts of healing and wholeness. Developments such as the theology of story, recovery of the imaginative roots of science, and right brain research are evidence that a quiet revolution is building. (pp. 2, 3)

Levinson (1978) and Sheehy (1976) are reflective of the dominance of a therapeutic-human relations model in American culture. These models are appropriate and healthful but need to be balanced within a culture. The stage theories of human development have made many positive contributions. They serve as valuable models for life coping and self-revelation. Yet, stage theory is also rooted in individualism. The dominance of this model inhibits civic republicanism, a public philosophy, authentic community, and real change. It also tends to diminish the search for a governing social ethic. Utilitarian individualism serves as the fulcrum of our cultural ethic and supports a spirit of competition that works against the building of authentic community. An expressive

utilitarianism ethic promotes the idea that the good is what feels good. Autonomy is valued over interdependence. The individual learns to adapt to existing structures and conform to her or his environment rather than confront and challenge existing beliefs and systems.

An overemphasis on individualism may actually work against democracy by creating apathy. The lack of interest in the last several national elections serves as an indicator. Human relations models in organizations and culture are translated to empathic models wherein false community and lifestyle enclaves are established. For example, individuals may dwell in condominium communities with neighbors who share common economic and social backgrounds but wherein no real dialogue occurs. Churches absorb and embody the American culture and abandon alternate solutions in favor of authority over dialogue. The establishment of closed communities such as Heritage USA by Jim and Tammy Baker or the authoritative pronouncements of Catholic bishops prohibiting the use of condoms in the midst of an AIDS ravaged national plague serve as examples of an absence of any public ethic. Another example is found in alcoholic persons and drug addicted individuals who seek refuge from our culture in the more authentic community of Alcoholic Anonymous or ALANON in order to rescue themselves from destructive isolation.

The therapeutic aspect of our society encourages excessive autonomy and the give-get syndrome. The adages "I'll scratch your back and you scratch mine," and "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" typify our moral stance. These viewpoints are operative in

the popularity of the death penalty in this culture. That is why what Burns (1978) called transactional leadership (people exchange valued things to achieve goals) is really not leadership and remains bankrupt. It does not challenge, change, or present an alternative consciousness as does transformational leadership.

Bennis (1989) summarized some of these problems facing contemporary and future leaders. He said that most people only see parts of reality. Greed is primary. People don't want direction. They distance themselves from reality. They view their isolated actions and behaviors as amoral.

The problem is also political. Parochial priorities are primary and the public good is secondary or, at worst, irrelevant. Special interest groups are powerful due to rampant individualism. A "take care of me" attitude proliferates instead of a participative attitude that encourages a dialogue among leaders and followers. Apathy in the democratic process is growing. The positivistic-rationalistic perspective is sanctified. The dominant model for policymaking is transactional. It is an exchange theory, a bargaining stance instead of a search for the common good, significant change, and public solutions to private concerns. A take charge mentality and approach to leadership in a period of crisis or transition is counterproductive to transformational leadership. I have no doubt that change is difficult in a society that is so pluralistic and privatized. The conflict resolution-management-skill-trait approach to leadership is inept. Transformational leadership is essential.

Change also occurs at the international level. The citizens of every nation are world citizens. Global, long range planning for real

change is necessary to protect and responsibly respond to an international physical-social environment. Harman (1979) suggested that microdecisions lead to macrodecisions. Good microdecisions do not mean good macrodecisions. Leaders and followers need to think globally. Successful implementation of a macrodecision calls for a reeducation of whole societies. This implies a cultural and institutional transformation in which people understand the implications of a macrodecision, and they make individual microdecisions in accord with overall policy. Such a stance is necessary in moving from an industrialized society to a transindustrial society.

The industrial paradigm is marked by industrialization, the scientific method, material progress, and the domination of practical values. It fails, according to Harman (1979), to (a) allow the individual to contribute to society, (b) foster distribution of power, (c) foster responsibility for the management of technology, (d) promote goals that enlist the deepest loyalties of citizens, and (e) develop the habitability of the planet. Industrial age approaches to leadership suggest that leaders and followers react to these ills in the short term and seek solutions to immediate problems or, at most, discuss alterations in institutions. Transformational leadership suggests changes that signal deep, cultural implications and the redefinition of basic assumptions, attitudes, values and social roles. There needs to be a shift in the accepted vision of reality. The values of the industrial paradigm (rational, male, management oriented, quantitative, goals dominated, technocratic, cost benefit driven, personalistic, hierarchical, short term,

pragmatic, and materialistic) are inadequate. Transforming leaders and followers need to recognize that science and a logical positivistic approach to reality and problems has been shaped by the values of the industrial paradigm. Shifts are necessary in the way they think: A move towards a more spiritual order, toward a world philosophy that transcends cultures and religions and enables us to reflect together on our human existence; A collective spirituality and social order that places emphasis on what it means *to be* rather than what it means *to have*; An ecological ethic and a teleological view of life that uproots our preoccupation with practicality and productivity. Shifts in the way we think, value and perceive reality will bring some necessary chaos. We will change and this change will occur with irregular celerity. The answer to whether this move to a postindustrial paradigm via a quantum leap or by incremental steps is uncertain. What is certain is that transformational leadership is necessary for global morphogenesis.

The existence of utilitarianism and expressive individualism as the dominant ethics in our society disables us. We do not have a moral basis to establish a common moral standard that will guide us toward the future and enable us to shape life within a postindustrial paradigm.

As individualism continues to define the political, economic, cultural and religious face of the United States, our nation has plunged deeper into global interdependence. A rapidly changing geopolitical scene will surely jolt us to evaluate our culture. Long term peace is not secured by negotiation alone but by a fresh appreciation for mutual purposes that initiate critical

conversations, acknowledge cultural traditions, explore alternatives, and employ the trustful deconstruction of assumptions.

The deforestation of Brazilian rain forests is a global concern, acid rain in the Eastern block countries, the violation of human rights in China, the disproportionate use of world resources by Americans, the hunting of rhinoceros' in central Africa are no longer private issues of one country but common concerns that demand a radical appreciation for a new philosophical frame that includes a notion of global ecology.

Leadership has to do with empowering people to get them involved. It has to do with reconstructing our lives as to its intrinsic meaning. When we grasp the importance of restructuring the way we make meaning out of our joined lives, we enter the spiritual, we begin to collapse the barriers between the sacred and secular, the private and public. Our sense of the common good is discovered when diverse groups meet in dialogue. Leadership is not therapeutic or didactic but dialectic.

Present research methods do not enable scholars to respond to a global community. Research is still rooted in a social science priority, the desire to quantify and link the world's problems with a technological solutions. Scholars need to deconstruct their scientific methodological assumptions as they have grown in various disciplines and set an axe to those roots before rebuilding our culture. Transformational leaders and followers are called to work hand-in-hand with these problems in a period of transition. Leaders and followers in this era of transition to a postindustrial period do

leadership together and bear the promise of global redemption through a collaborative partnership.

I believe we have not yet entered a postindustrial paradigm but anomalies exist which challenge the present paradigm. There is dissatisfaction with existing systems and solutions to current dilemmas. There are attempts at transformation. For example, efforts to save the environment, restore the ozone layer are becoming more popular. Yet, recycling is initiated as a response to the advent of a crisis, not by the free choice of the populace. Overpopulation, the growth of a hungry third world, violence, extensive drug and alcohol abuse, unemployment, the gap between the haves and the have nots, and the destruction of the environment all signal the conclusion that we are in a plateau period. People will move forward by exercising leadership to change the paradigm. Manning (1989) wrote that people desire to put the accent on living instead of working for a living. Personal fulfillment and time for family and friends assume new significance. People are looking for cleaner cities. "Relating will be critical in the 90's. We will look deeper in our lives, moving inward rather than upward" (p. 2D). Instead of desiring things, people will want new and meaningful experiences. There is an increased interest in ethics in business and personal life. "Fewer students are going after bachelor's degrees in computer science and engineering, while the number majoring in English, history, math and foreign languages has been creeping steadily upward" (p. 2D).

Naisbitt (1990) wrote that, "for the last two decades U. S. women have taken two thirds of the millions of new jobs created in

the information era and will continue to do so well into the millennium" (p. 217). It is no longer an advantage to have been socialized as a male in American business. Emphasis is on being entrepreneurial, self-managing, and oriented toward life long learning. Women are heading their own businesses at twice the rate of men. "Male or female, the effective leader wins commitment by setting an example of excellence: being ethical, open, empowering, and inspiring" (p. 217). These feminine, relationship oriented, right brain activities and qualities are favored over the logical positivistic and male qualities dominant in the industrial paradigm. These realities also signal a plateau period.

Transformational leadership is inspired by the feminine dimension and is well suited not only to a period of paradigm transition but to the new paradigm. Naisbitt (1990) suggested that in addition to women assuming power and influence in the next decade the people of the world will witness a global economic boom, a renaissance in the arts, the emergence of a free-market socialism, global lifestyles, the economic rise of the Pacific rim, the age of biology, a religious revival, and the primacy of the individual. This summary suggests that there will be a mixture of industrial and postindustrial values and supports the idea that we are at the point of immersion in new, transcendent values and orientation.

Ferguson (1980) examined old and new paradigms that people have encountered in this period of transition. She opined that the aquarians ought to give more attention to the human brain and how it relates to learning. Change occurs best when there is a partnership between the mind and the heart. "The human brain has boundless

capabilities for paradigm shifts. It can order and reorder itself, transcend old conflicts. Anything that disrupts the old order of our lives has the potential for triggering a transformation, a movement toward greater maturity, openness, strength" (p. 73). Renewal is better than stress. Pathology is an opportunity. Personal transition holds the possibility for the evaluation of life's dimensions and societal reclamation. Conspiracy is part of our transition. It is a word that means to breathe together, to look again at fresh alternatives from a callow and unconventional perspective. Conspiracy in this sense violates isolation. We no longer have to compromise. We can live our values in open dialogue respectful of different opinions and sail toward uncharted possibilities.

Leadership in the 1990s must respond to the caveats of anthropocentrism. Leadership recognizes that there is a sacred interdependence of the earth's history and human development history. When we alter the earth we change, for better or worse, human values, organizations, ethics, purpose, existence, and a shared telos.

Advances in health herald the paradigm shift as people realize the mind-body bond. Generous persons are more healthy while isolation and excessive individualism inspires depression. The human body is not a machine but a dynamic organism which requires a holistic mindset to function with full potential.

There are changes as well in education. Ferguson (1980) built on the insights of Freire. He made every effort to understand the authentic needs of people, discover the themes of life most important to them, and employ a humanizing pedagogy. Freire (1983)

stated that leadership must practice co-intentional education. "Teachers and students (leadership and people), co-intent reality, are both Subjects, not only in the task of unveiling that reality, and thereby coming to know it critically, but in the task of re-creating that knowledge. As they attain this knowledge of reality through common reflection and action, they discover themselves as its permanent re-creators" (p. 56). Ferguson (1990) insisted that when people care, they learn. The feelings centers of the brain are key to memory and cognition. Therefore, the power of imagination and intuition ought to be employed more often as people engage ourselves in education. The human body is a replica of the earth. We act as if there is a dualism but in reality there is none. Educators in the future must take that important insight seriously.

Summary: A Future Context

The following remarks on human development, organizations, ethics, and leadership offer a vision for the future. These comments form a cradle for discussing prescriptive guides for christian leadership education examined in the final chapter.

Human Development.

Erickson (1963) established eight stages of psychological development. Erickson's theories were illuminated by Gould (1980), Levinson (1978), and Sheehy (1976). Piaget (1967) studied cognitive development in children. Moral development was outlined in six stages by Kohlberg (1973). Most recently, Fowler (1981) contributed to developmental theories by a pioneering work on faith development

that includes six stages. Gilligan (1982) challenged the male perspective and the inadequacies inherent in the developmental theories. Stage theory is still child centered and only recently has adult development been taken seriously.

Stage theory is strongly affected by the individualism, therapeutic stance, and goal orientation of an industrial paradigm. Fowler does advance a notion of community and authentic altruism in his stage six. According to his opinion, only a few people actually attain this stage of development. Of course, who is the judge of whether someone attains moral or faith perfection? Whose faith or stage of moral development is universally acceptable? People tend to move through these stages, according to the theorists. I suggest that stage theory must be understood as only one lens for understanding human development, not as a prescriptive notion. Any truly valuable stage theory needs to be far more inclusive and respective of cultural, sociological, gender and age differences. Stage theorists may actually encourage the already existing gap between adults and children. Adultism needs to be challenged, not championed. People have universal and diverse life style choices which need to be respected and in the process of respect brought into dialogue with each other.

Developmental theory should be more integrative. There is danger in compartmentalizing the human person. Conversation between theorists is necessary to prevent further dualism. The future is leaning toward an appreciation for a holistic and holographic perception of the human person in the midst of creation. What are the spiritual ties that bind all humanity? Stage theory

ought to help people discover less about self-realization and more about valuing the interplay of all stages and a pursuit of the common good. In the future, human development needs to enable people to grasp their common teleological purpose. A common teleology does not exclude diverse opinions, methods, or expressions which foster and embody a shared purpose.

Adults must be able to use the lens of a child to be fully human, to let go of the rational as a constant interpretive tool, and the rigid frame of adultism. Human development in the future ought to sustain intergenerational learning as a priority.

Intergenerational contexts for education help people look at the community as a learning resource that is a font for human wisdom and regeneration as well as a wellspring to birth generativity for public life. Stage theory tends to ignore anthropocentric attitudes. Transforming leadership ought to help move human development to be more creationcentric. The real possibility of prolonged life also provides additional challenges for transforming leaders and followers as biologists breaks new barriers.

Ethics.

MacIntyre (1981) presented an alternative view of ethics. In American society, the emotivist self has lost its connection to a larger purpose or grand telos. "Thus the society in which we live is one in which bureaucracy and individualism are partners as well as antagonists. And it is in the cultural climate of this bureaucratic individualism that the emotivist self is naturally at home" (p. 35). Part of the cure is to recapture a sense of civic virtue and a shared

narrative. Virtue needs a context and that context is a common narrative. Our shared human narrative serves as a womb for civic virtue. We are never more than co-authors of this human narrative. This narrative focuses our common quest for *the* good which shapes the other goods in our life. We form traditions which socially embody the goods which constitute a tradition. The exercise of virtue sustains these traditions. "Lack of justice, lack of truthfulness, lack of courage, lack of the relevant intellectual virtues, these corrupt traditions, just as they do those institutions and practices which derive their life from the traditions of which they are the contemporary embodiments" (p. 223).

I have already spoken of the need to take seriously what Sullivan (1986) calls civic republicanism--the call to a public philosophy and democratic economy. "For civic republicans, moral authority has been embodied in a common understanding of justice as a proportionate sharing in the common good" (175). Such a philosophy is akin to the christian sense of distributive justice. In this sense, political justice is identified with the wise distribution of the necessities of life and rough equality of wealth. "A public philosophy develops out of the insight that the quality of personal life is grounded in social relationships, an insight that is embodied in the political art of integrating the various kinds of self-concern into an awareness of mutual interdependency" (p. 208). This public ethic insists upon the primacy of interdependency over self-interest. "Tocqueville knew that maintenance of private liberty depends on active citizenship and that in turn upon public virtue, a shared moral order (p. 214)." That is a lesson Americans are in

danger of forgetting as our society is mired in an individualistic and competitive culture. Civic virtue, the common good, a shared narrative, and a universal teleology are at the heart of a new ethical paradigm. Ethics is more of an art than a skill because it fosters continuous processes that parent dialogue between the private and public and forge a new pattern for human existence and the meaning citizens place on that existence.

Organizations.

Transformational leaders strive to create organizations that are socially responsible. Need should determine the structure of an organization. Our understanding of organizations is developing. We are appreciating the fact that organizations are more than rational structures. They are evolutionary. Organizations are relationship-bound organisms that carry meanings and are shaped by and shape meanings and culture. They are more complex than we first imagined. There is no one organizational theory that is able to capture that complexity. The old industrial paradigm is unable to deal with this complexity and a new one is required. New paradigm organizations will be more heterarchical than hierarchical, will move from power as control to empowerment and shared responsibility. A new approach to organizations will be from a simplistic modality to a complex understanding and mindset, from a deterministic view to an interdependent approach in which there are multiple interactions and consequences, from a mechanistic design to a more holographic one. A subjective view of organizations will surpass an objective view. There will be a move from a scientific

approach to a naturalistic one, and from linear causality to multiple source causality. These are dramatic shifts in the way we understand organizational theory and change.

This moves beyond popular organizational development which is only a shift within a paradigm. Organizational development is a set of strategies that aim at self-renewal, self-development, and group and interpersonal skill development. The emphasis in organizational development is on improvement rather than transformation. Organizational development does not deal critically with issues like capitalistic, economic, and political structures, technological development, social class, and community therapy. It is not concerned with changing the forces that shape society and culture.

Organizations need the kind of change that occurs in its genes. New forms of learning are needed that incorporate double loop learning, that enable persons and organizations to uncover their own way of thinking and behaving, and to critically apprehend their way of knowing and perceiving reality. Often these ways of knowing are rooted in economic, political and cultural systems. Change needs to occur at those deep levels for transformation to take place and alternative organizations for the future made possible. Transformational leadership is needed for transformational change.

Critical thinking and inquiry is vital to new paradigm organizations. Critical thinking inculcates processes that are both dialectic and public. Ideas, persons and organizations mutually construct a milieu that fosters respect, openness, trust and a common desire for truth. A "best solution" to organizational

dilemmas is located in a framework based on mutuality, community, and justice. Critical thinking is risky, messy and requires a shift in the way people look at their human interactions and their ways of being together (our political activity). It requires a shift in how people live with one another and how they appreciate and use common resources.

Loosely coupled systems in organizations tend to promote multiple levels of leadership and should be encouraged. Organizations should embolden multiple viewpoints. Organizations of the future will foster true community that witness and model the virtues of a republic. They should be learning communities and mentoring resources that model participation, citizenship, and the incorporation of a telos that supports the common good. In those efforts, organizations will be educative in the full sense of the word and will be creatively causative for continued transformation.

Leadership.

Leadership in the future will help us make meaning out of our lives. Transforming leadership is born out of community and creates authentic community. The female perspective is more adaptive to the new leadership model than the past emphasis on authority, control and manipulation by power wielding. Leadership occurs at multilevels, including grass roots levels. The leaders-participants relationship is symbiotic and holographic. Leadership is a participatory relationship that evolves from a search for the common good. Leaders who practice leadership in the new paradigm will be faithful to the generative themes emergent from mutual

purpose of leaders and followers. Leaders and followers do leadership that brings forth a better world, through critical thinking and global sensitivity. Failed leadership lies in a failed relationship that has not sustained critical thought, a voluntary stance, and an informal and mutual perspective. Failed leadership is a nonissue if the relationship is engaged and transformation is intended.

Leadership is a dialectical process which involves an influence relationship among leaders and participants who intend and move toward real changes that reflect their mutual discernment. I offer that transforming leaders in a new paradigm and in future organizations ought to be ethical, educative, critical and transformative. They must engage in a dialectical process which involves an influence relationship between leaders and participants that intends and moves toward real changes which reflect their mutual purposes and value human emancipation, social change, and the pursuit of an achievable common good. Transformational leadership is the midwife of our new paradigm and the organizations of the future. Transformational leaders who practice transforming leadership are the co-creators of the future. The advent of a postindustrial era cannot be heralded by management or excellent communication skills. The era will become a reality because of leadership.

Conclusion

Education does not happen in a vacuum. Education has a context. I believe that the perspectives on human development, organizations, ethics, and leadership offered in Chapter Four and in

this chapter are important considerations that shape leadership education. Transformational leaders and followers will deal with the perspectives outlined in this chapter and will notice the effects of these perspectives upon their practice of leadership. The deconstruction of industrial approaches to human development, organizations, ethics, and leadership implies that we cannot exempt the way we educate from that same process of deconstruction. Education for leadership faces reconstruction. A new approach to leadership education is necessary to meet the demands, changes, and needs of a global community experiencing transition in the 1990s.

CHAPTER TEN

EDUCATION FOR LEADERSHIP

Introduction

My efforts in previous chapters have been to uncover the approach to leadership prevalent among nonordained persons who intend to practice leadership in a christian context. I have also offered an alternative approach to leadership. This alternative considers transformation as the core of leadership. The alternative of transforming leadership and the creation of transforming leaders and followers, who practice the process of transforming leadership, required a deconstruction of existent approaches to leadership. This deconstruction led to the construction of a new approach to leadership that corresponds to the paradigm shift occurring in our society and church.

I believe we can educate for leadership. However the direction, content, and process of that education needs a radical reformation. I hold that the definition I have proposed for leadership and for transformational leaders carries strong spiritual dimensions and implications. It supports the value-virtue base of a postindustrial paradigm. The definition and approach to leadership that is set forth in this study are appropriate for religious communities and religious educators of all denominations including Roman Catholic christianity.

In considering education for christian leadership, I mean that the leadership definition and approach that are promulgated here are not only appropriate for christian communities but are also broader than those communities. A theology of the Reign of God is crucial to catholic theology, ministry, and religious education.

Transformational leaders and followers further this theology which is the heart of christian faith and religion. Transforming leadership involves education for christian leadership. But transforming leadership is also broader than the christian perspective. The process of transforming leadership in no way proposes specific beliefs and content of a particular religion. Transforming leaders may discover a similarity between the content of leadership and the content of their unique religious practice. Transformation of the world into the Reign of God and its values of justice, freedom, social change, human emancipation, and the value of the common good is basic to the purpose of religious education.

This final chapter will explore models of education appropriate to transforming leadership, the development of transforming leaders, the educative character of transforming leadership, and the responsibility of religious education to transforming leadership. I also include some specific recommendations for leadership education in nonordained ministry formation programs and end with a concluding section.

Resources for Christian Leadership Education

Leadership is embedded in community and involves an influence relationship between leaders and followers. The significance of

community, a public philosophy, a shared narrative, a public paideia, civic virtue, and social transformation resounds throughout this work. These community and public dimensions of leadership are also at the core of education for christian leadership. Education is a community responsibility and methodology. Dewey (1938), Freire (1983), Moran (1979), and Westerhoff (1976) certainly support the connection of community to religious education. Westerhoff (1976) is deeply committed to a faith enculturation process to religious education. It is the community that educates in a socialization process. There is value in considering that transformational leadership needs to be understood, practiced and enculturated in communities of faith. Transforming leadership will also enable a community to confront the caveats of a faith enculturation model. It can rescue a community from over indulgence in its own pursuits and keep the community connected to a larger context and the deeper issues which shape the community.

I agree with Westerhoff that people often act their way into new ways of thinking rather than think our way into new ways of acting. Moran (1987) claimed that teaching means to show how. "Teaching is a bodily activity in a human group. Teaching is embodied in the community's life" (p. 149). Transforming leaders educate for christian leadership by practicing the process of leadership. The arena for this practice is small communities or base communities which comprise a larger parish or organization. The practice of leadership should also happen at many levels within the church. The diminutive framework of these base communities enables leadership to be discussed, defined, practiced, recognized,

and affirmed. The base community nurtures leadership and grafts it into the lifeline of the church. Ponce (1979) described base communities.

What are the hallmarks of these basic Christian communities? There are many, but I would list these as being essential: The hallmark for commitment to community is, first of all, a vision of a communal society; that is, a society that is trusting, where I know that I must depend on others-- that is, a society where I am poor. Second, a commitment where there is a deep faith that reveals the transcendent dimensions and also the meaning of our activity, all of which impel us to justice. Third, where there is a comfortable acknowledgement of our culture, language, and traditions. Fourth, where there is a sense of commitment and fidelity to this group. Fifth, where there is preparedness for personal as well as communal sacrifice. Finally, where there is an ability to celebrate the beliefs and values (culture) that give meaning to an enterprise, all of which ultimately expressed itself in the Eucharist. (p. 24)

Boff (1985) suggested that the base community is one that moves back and forth from its two poles of spirituality and social reconstruction. "Faced with the organization and imperialism of the established social system, people tend to feel unimportant, that there is no way out. To fight this feeling there must be the hope and deep faith that justice and participation have more of a future than does exploitation" (p. 136). A base community reflects upon its social and structural problems such as justice,

participation, marginalization, freedom of speech and of action. These thrusts of life in a base community deal with transformation and are open to the nature and purpose of leadership. They form a hearth for leadership education and a companion for potential transformational leaders. A number of the participants in the interview process expressed interest and confidence in the use of base communities. Education for leadership should take the opportunity for leadership that resides in these communities seriously.

Training programs for leadership, including those used by the respondents in the study, focus on leadership sessions. These scattered and brief sessions address communications and skill development. The respondents in the study were shaped in their approach to leadership by these sessions. However, the building of community is a long term process. Education for transforming leadership and the education of transforming leaders are arduous processes that requires commitment. They are not short term fixes learned in a series of weekend workshops. Authentic community, realized in the concepts of base community and family and previously explained through the sociological term *gemeinschaft*, is a primary resource for leadership education. *Education for leadership happens when transforming leadership is practiced in community.*

Moving from the industrial age paradigm to a postindustrial paradigm requires transforming leadership. It is a transition from what Ramos (1981) called a marketcentric to a multicentric paradigm. The use of critical theory in leadership and education is necessary both in the period of transition and later when people have

fully embraced the new, multicentric paradigm values. Once leadership is understood as a process, critical theory has a permanent place in the nature of leadership. Transformational leaders who practice the process of leadership practice critical thinking. Foster (1986) summarized critical theory and said that in the final analyses, it prods us to, "raise legitimate questions about social structure: the questions of class, power, and culture. Critical theory raises the questions of the appropriation and distribution of resources to society" (p. 90). Grob (1984) reflected on the nature of critical thinking and education. "Truth is now seen to reside not in a given doctrine or set of behaviors but rather in the give and take of the critical process in which ever new perspectives on the issue in question are progressively disclosed" (p. 41). For Freire (1983) education is a dialectic process of action and reflection that becomes transformative. He called this critical reflection approach to education "conscientization." Leadership is about conscientization.

Brookfield (1987) concluded that "becoming critically aware of the ways in which we behave possessively and manipulatively within relationships is important if we wish to be involved in genuinely democratic, reciprocal relationships" (p. 227). The critical thinking dimension of influence relationships form an important partnership that feeds transforming leadership. Questioning assumptions is a risky and dangerous activity. It also provides an opportunity to challenge basic assumptions, explore alternatives, and practice the skill of imagination. Critical thinking puts our economic, political, religious, and intellectual framework at risk. When this occurs, the

leader who initiates critical thinking also initiates responsibility. The responsibility for critical thinking rests on the voluntary and free participation of leaders and followers who practice the process of transforming leadership. Transformational leaders are educators who bear the responsibility and adventure of learning. They are responsible not only for those they tame but also for those they liberate. Education for transforming leadership is a liberating partnership in which responsibility is shared. Leaders and participants do leadership. Leaders and participants also educate for leadership. *Education for leadership happens when leaders and participants employ critical thinking.*

The combination of community and critical thinking converges in Groome's (1980) transformative methodology, shared praxis. Groome names five movements in his methodology. The movements are prepared by focusing, this means establishing an emotional and physical environment that makes a statement about participative education. He suggests that generative themes (Freire) are explored wants and needs. A focus activity helps persons find a way into the selected theme. The activity carries the seed that should be presented in movement three.

The first movement names present action, the participants' present way of knowing. What is important is to have a clear expression of one's own praxis. Movement two begins a process of critical reflection that promotes community, values, imagination, freedom, and education. It is an attempt to understand the why of our present thinking. Basic assumptions are probed. How are we shaped by others, society, or education? What are the social

realities that shape our tradition, narrative and present way of knowing? Movement three examines the community story and vision. What has the community (organization) come to know and do over time and what has that meant for our lives now and toward the future. Story implies our identity as a community, including our traditions, symbols, values, etc. Vision means living into the mission and purpose of the community and our personal, interpersonal and socio-political contexts. It is exposure to new thought, a broader purpose, and a richness of resource or an opportunity to explore more deeply existing ideas from a new perspective. For the christian, the vision is the Reign of God. Movement four places the praxis of the participant in a dialectic with the story and vision of the community to image for themselves that story and vision, to rediscover it, to reshape intellect and action, head and heart. Movement five provides the participant in this critical dialectic an opportunity for decision and response to the whole process.

Methodology for leadership education is most effectively enabled by shared praxis. Shared praxis is experiential, uses critical thinking, requires a dialectical process, respects the mutual learning relationship between educator and participants. Shared praxis has transformational possibility.

The application of shared praxis to educating for leadership is logical and appropriate. A community may realize it needs leadership and intentionally focus on that discussion. Present praxis is identified, critical thinking employed, the concept of transforming leadership and transformational leaders and followers

introduced. Leaders (educators) and participants engage in a dialectic among themselves and between the concept of transforming leadership and their present way of approaching and defining leadership. Finally, concrete responses and future directions regarding the process and leadership are shared and implications are established. *Education for transforming leadership is appropriated by a shared praxis methodology.*

Morgan and Ramirez (1983) spoke about learning communities in which no one is irrelevant to the learning process and wherein every attempt is made to embrace as much diversity as possible. Learning is about "new consciousness and new capacities for action" (p. 13). Learning is holographically embodied. Harman (1988) referred to the Greek concept of *paideia* which proposed these learning societies. In fact, they were the primary function of society. "Paideia was education looked upon as lifelong transformation of the human personality, in which every aspect of life plays a part (p. 147)." Rampant consumption, the depletion of resources, material acquisition, endless economic growth without ecological and global responsibility were all antithetical to such a learning society.

Educators must rediscover this life long learning, the interdependence of all persons, institutions, and creation, and the primacy of education that transforms. "'Learning society' implies reversal of a number of aspects of the long term industrialization trend" (p. 147). Developing a public *paideia* is also part of the transformative character of religious education (Seymour, O'Gorman & Foster, 1984). The participants in the study experienced

leadership training that was short term, goal-oriented, and avoided reflection on the relationship of leadership to transformation.

The inculcation of public paideia, the appropriateness and value of developing a learning society, the reemergence of spiritual ideals and democratic virtue create a climate conducive to the process and dynamics of transforming leadership. Transforming leadership is about education for the future. Transforming leaders educate for justice, invite participants to journey with them toward a common good, and foster learning communities. *When people encourage learning communities and a public paideia, they create an environment that focuses the elements necessary for transforming leadership and education for leadership.*

Caveats Facing Education for Leadership

The concept of therapy as I use it in this study refers not to specific treatments nor to particular psychological theories. Rather, I imply that there is a mindset operative in our society and in our way of thinking about self. Bellah et al (1985) examined therapy as "a cultural form, a language for thinking about self and society, that was interested more in achieving practical results than to theoretical consistency" (p. 317). MacIntyre (1984) claimed that in our time "emotivism is a theory embodied in characters who all share the emotivist view" (p. 30). MacIntyre defines characters as social roles which provide a culture with its moral definitions. He described three of these characters in our society, the rich aesthete, the manager, and the therapist.

The manager represents in his character the obliteration of the distinction between manipulative and nonmanipulative social relations; the therapist represents the same obliteration in the sphere of personal life. The therapist also treats ends as given, as outside his scope; his concern also is with technique, with effectiveness in transforming neurotic symptom into directed energy, maladjusted individuals into well-adjusted ones. The idioms of therapy have invaded all too successfully such spheres as those of education and of religion (pp. 30-31)

It is easy to transfer the therapist mindset to the contemporary approaches to theology and leadership. Leadership in nontherapeutic. *Education for leadership transcends the management/therapeutic mindset and intends substantive changes that are transformative. Education for leadership is education for transformation.*

The participants in the study demonstrated a skill-trait theory of leadership that furthers an emotivist ethic. A skill-trait oriented theory of leadership inhibits the discussion of ethical issues of global significance, such as economic and social justice, crosscultural and interpolitical concerns, a search for the common good and civic virtue, the interdependence of diverse peoples and institutions, and the collaboration of humanity and nature. When ethics is connected to productivity, individualism, and personal development, it tends to revolve around personal behavior and explicit personal morals and sexual issues. Ethical models which flow from emotivism and moral relativism take precedence over the

ethic of civic virtue. Discussions on the morality of abortion and the morality of proponents and dissenters, for example, take precedence over considerations about the ethics of the relationships between leaders and followers on both sides of the abortion issue and the changes that this issue will have on our society. The first issue is really about personal morals and behavior, and the second is about leadership ethics.

Attention to the development of skills as a means of furthering leadership sets leadership apart from ethics. It is reasonable to see why the participants in the interviews found it difficult to talk about ethics and leadership. This difficulty is rooted in the confusion surrounding the ethics of the leadership process and the ethics of leadership content as well as confusion about the nature and purpose of leadership. What is required is an understanding of transforming leadership that assists leaders and followers in their efforts to create a community narrative rooted in civic virtue. *Education for leadership is serious about understanding the relationship of ethics to leadership. Education for leadership regenerates an ethic of civic virtue that transcends emotivism and moral relativism.*

Most training programs for leadership advertise that they will develop leadership skills. They will increase competence in planning, organizing, the management of conflict, and shared decision-making skills. A purpose of these efforts is to create a better fit among goals, the organization, and the people involved in the organization. Training, instruction, personal and organizational developmental concerns are addressed. Leadership is about

transformation. Leadership is about influence relationships, mutual purposes and discernment. The participants in the study did not seriously discuss the meaning of influence. The respondents did not approve of power wielding, although they could imagine such activity as leadership. They understood leadership as something done to followers. For the respondents, the vision of the leader, apart from the vision of the followers, is primary. This attitude of the respondents indicates that there needs to be more discussion on the meaning of influence and the role that it plays in the leadership process. Leadership is something that leaders and participants do together. It is not something that leaders do to followers. When leaders and followers are engaged in the process of leadership, it is political because influence is exerted to reconstruct the way that leaders and followers shape their community and their larger society. Influence requires the use of persuasion and wisdom, the employment of culture and religion, the application of symbol and imagination. Influence excludes manipulation, power wielding, intimidation, passive violence, tricks and games, or domination. The needs of the participants and the needs of the leaders are considered.

The mutual, dialectical, participative character of leadership requires education, not instruction or schooling in skills. Both education and leadership are dialectical processes. Leadership education is not "born again," one does not have a "leadership experience" in which he/she is changed in the twinkling of an eye. Expertise in planning, organizing, management of conflict in a series of workshops do not make pastoral leadership. Education for

pastoral leadership requires a new way of thinking and acting about leadership, not new skills. Skills training is appropriate to improving one's efforts to influence and persuade. It stops there.

The interviews show the need for those interested in leadership studies to examine the relationship of power and influence among leaders and participants. The confusion of the participants in the interviews about influence is linked to a confusion about the meaning of leadership. What needs to be resisted is the quick fix for leadership, the weekend training program, the substitution of communications and group facilitation for leadership. Persons ought to have the opportunity to reflect upon their past and present leadership training and examine their own and other approaches to the nature and purpose of leadership. *Education for leadership happens in the long term and is ongoing. Education for leadership is a transformation of the mind and the heart and the why of how we think and act.*

Leadership is often associated with office, role, and position. The participants in the study reflect this association in their understanding of leadership. They also object to the control of people by organizations. Instead, they favor collaboration. Yet, their perspectives on leadership do not foster significant change nor do they reveal a shared ethic of leadership that respects the influence relationship of leaders and followers. Leadership that is associated with office, role, and position is frequently associated with authority, manipulation or control. Dysfunctional families, institutions and organizations have dysfunctional behavior marked by manipulation and control. We ought to educate for leadership in

such a way that discredits dysfunctional behavior and disassociates itself from leadership as authority, manipulation, coercion, domination, and power wielding. Dysfunctional organizations do not encourage the discovery of mutual wants and needs. Real change may be ignored or bluntly prevented. Dysfunctional organizations need transforming leadership to regenerate their structures and establish organizational health, to favor a liberating openness.

Dysfunctional organizations work against the emergence of transforming leadership and their structures impede education for leadership.

The church needs to draw on more than theology to fashion a framework for understanding institutions and leadership. This is especially true if the church is about the transformation innate in a Reign of God theology. Transformation is the distinguishing character in ecclesial teleology. The church is present in the world to transform it by actions which respect human history and culture and engage that history and culture in authentic dialogue. Lernoux (1989) suggested that there are tragic results to a lack of dialogue.

Some religious scholars and political scientists believe that the prime cause of such immorality (merger mania, crooked bankers, bribery etc.) is the compartmentalization of political, economic, and moral-cultural systems. Each system follows its own logic with only the most tenuous connection among religion, economics and politics. Civil religion holds society together by providing a minimum standard for behavior: People may not kill one another, or covet their neighbors wife, but they may deprive a neighbor of his economic due--

and be called a "smart operator" by a society that has made money its chief idol. (p. 192)

The church cannot be catholic nor assume its global responsibility by excluding people from the dialectic necessary for leadership. A sad but forceful example are catholic gay men and lesbian women who are casually ignored and clearly discarded even after attempts by organized groups to break into the dialogue. The gay catholic organization, Dignity, is an example. McNeil (1988) stated that these groups have an educational thrust by virtue of their very existence. He referred to the gay virtues of hospitality and compassion. Moran (1984) suggested the same thing and reports a gay person who wrote: "Usually for most gay women and men, coming out in the church meant coming out of the church. For those who don't, the church has meant more than just a closet The church has become for them a giant tomb At their best, they, like feminist groups, bring a new meaning of power to political life and church life. Such groups need the larger church, but in turn the larger church is in desperate need of their invigoration" (p. 172).

An ethic of detachment and manipulation and a purely objective, logical positivistic philosophy and theology must give way to a search for the truth. Foster (1986) suggested that we are rooted in the industrial paradigm in a functionalist framework. This framework has influenced our notion of truth in society and in the church. It is marked by the ideas that, "(a) Society is real and guided by a consistent, core value structure, (b) knowledge is objective and amenable to discovery by positivistic methodology;

and, (c) trained scientists stand above and beyond the data they observe" (p. 8). In contrast, Palmer (1983) stated that the English word *truth* comes from a Germanic root that also gives rise to the word *troth*, as in, I pledge thee my troth (p. 31). It is by this troth that we enter sacred covenants. Troth is at the heart of relationships that are mutual and transforming.

With this word *troth* one person enters a covenant with another, a pledge to engage in a mutually accountable and transforming relationship, a relationship forged of trust and faith in the face of unknowable risksSo truth has nothing to do with manufacturing a world, keeping it at a distance, manipulating it to suit our needs, or owning it as property. Truth involves entering a relationship with someone or something genuinely other than us, but with whom we are intimately bound. Truth contains the image we are seeking--the image of community in which we were first created, the image of relatedness between knower and known that certain philosophies of science now affirm. (p. 31)

Truth is known in community and in open dialogue. Truth is central to transformational leaders and educators who seek human emancipation, social change and the search for an achievable common good. Palmer (1984) welcomed diversity as essential for discovering truth. Truth cannot be aligned with one action or thought.

If my truth cannot be challenged or enlarged by the perceptions of another, I have merely found one more way to objectify and hold the other at arm's length, to avoid again the

challenge of personal transformation. This view isolates the self, creates as many worlds as there are knowers, destroys the possibility of community, and finally makes the other an object of no real account. . . . To search for truth is to reach out with our whole persons for relationships which can reform us and the world in the original image of love. To know the truth is to enter with our whole persons into relationships of mutuality with the entire creation.
(pp. 54-55)

Diversity and a desire to know truth are foundational to education for leadership. *Education for leadership welcomes diversity, intellectual conflict, and the influence of transforming relationships.*

Suggestions on Education for Leadership

Foster (1989) has written that leadership is educative, transformative, critical, and ethical. These too are at the purpose of religious education. Religious education is transforming and so is leadership. *I call for a new partnership in the church among those who understand religious education as transformational to assume a serious responsibility to educate for transformational leadership. I invite religious educators to be transformational leaders who practice the process of transforming leadership.* They are able to rally the power resources necessary to practice leadership, to enable others in community to reflect upon and evaluate leadership (since one of their responsibilities is to create authentic base communities), and to generate a new way of thinking and acting for

those who will serve the church as transforming leaders. Religious education is predominantly a nonordained, feminine activity and thus the potential transforming leaders in the church are nonordained persons. As transforming leaders they have the potential to transform clergy, the institution of the church, and our larger society through the practice of the process of leadership.

One of the insights I gleaned from the data analysis was that it was not the "leadership program" that brought participants to a new appreciation of leadership and enabled them to think critically about the nature and purpose of leadership. Rather it was the attitude or mindset and the behavior of leaders that initiated the critical process. The concept of mentoring is an important educational resource. We need to identify transformational leaders who practice the process of leadership and who have been able to articulate the nature and purpose of transforming leadership. This implies that we are able to recognize transforming leadership *when it occurs*. This is why leadership cannot be attached to product or goal. Otherwise, one has to wait until the goal is attained before evaluation. My definition of leadership states that the leaders and participants intend real changes. *Religious educators need to name leadership*. Naming includes insight into what leadership both is and what it is not. *Following this effort, religious educators ought to abandon programs which confuse the process of naming leadership and collapse leadership with skill development.*

Smith (1985) suggested that all transitions need sponsoring. The transition to a new way of thinking and practicing leadership in this period of change to a postindustrial era could benefit greatly

from the concept of mentoring. Mentoring can help take the desperation out of living with today's changes and difficulties (p. 25). The mentor, then, is one who synthesizes the story of the participant, one who holds life as it is experienced in such a way that it can be seen through the prism of a different light. The mentor asks difficult questions as teacher, guide, listener and witness. Above all mentoring is a relationship in which feelings, values, and intellectual pursuits are shared. This sharing enables a new wisdom, a new spiritual consciousness to emerge. Mentoring is an immersion into the wisdom pool of the community. Mentoring acknowledges that the journey of education is never done in isolation. I believe that the mentoring experience may originate from an individual or a group. Qualities of confidentiality, nonjudgement, tolerance, openness to ambiguity, commitment, and mutual respect of persons and ideas are essential.

I suggest that we identify and affirm transformational leaders. These women and men are educating for transforming leadership. Base communities who are serious about leadership would do well to be mentored by a transforming leader. A purpose of mentoring leaders is to enable persons and communities to, in turn, mentor other leaders themselves. Transforming leadership is contagious and mentoring groups as well as transforming leaders who are mentors ripen the contagion. *Education for transforming leadership and transformational leaders happens through the practice of mentoring.*

Many programs designed to enable ministry consider the importance of leadership. Unfortunately, the nature and purpose of

leadership is not seriously explored. Those responsible for education for leadership need to separate issues that address the periphery of leadership: persuasion skills, content issues (the what do I have to know to realize a goal or objective), communication techniques, and management savoir-faire from the leadership process. The respondents demonstrated that their understanding of leadership is unsettled and confused. This state of confusion is not their fault since it results, in part, from an immersion in industrial age concerns and culture. Training programs for religious educators and persons in ministry formation that encourage an understanding of transforming leadership are practically nonexistent. The responses of the participants showed that people need to mutually reconstruct their understanding of leadership. Persons serious about developing leadership need to foster a clear understanding of the nature and purpose of leadership that transcends the values of an industrial era.

There does not need to be an agreement on the methodology of leadership education. Indeed, how leadership education occurs may have to be constructed locally to meet specific needs and resources. The interviews revealed respondents who desire a healthy intimacy with others that generates a shared understanding of local needs and wants. There does need to be an ongoing dialogue on the nature and purpose of leadership that enables potential leaders and followers to question, deconstruct and reshape their understanding of leadership based on new values and a reclaimed sense of virtue that will lead us into the next century. The transformation of persons, culture, institutions, and values in this crucial period of transition

requires more than skills and styles that keep us secure through therapeutic management. It requires a new way of thinking about leadership and leaders.

An emphasis on skill development and leadership styles inhibits educating for leadership. Leadership training as it is presently experienced by the participants in this study reduces leadership to specialized situations and contexts. Therefore, no real way exists to think about leadership because leadership is whatever the facilitator or individual needs at a particular time. This is very clear from the remarks shared by the interview participants. Using this approach, leadership is very difficult to talk about because it has no common denominator, no common values, no shared telos. Present leadership training cannot lead us into the future because it has already been shaped by the past. It is short term, solely practical, individualized, and chained by productivity.

The crisis of leadership is not in issues that relate to the periphery of leadership. Nor is the crisis of leadership in the placement of personnel. The responses of the participants in the study reveal that the crisis of leadership is in the lack of attention to the nature and purpose of leadership, particularly the process that is leadership. *Ministry and religious education endeavors need to separate programs which instruct persons in the periphery of leadership from educational opportunities that address the core of the leadership process, transformation.* The periphery of leadership issues ought to be named as communications for ministry, church management and administration or something similar so as not to confuse these issues with leadership.

Summary

Education for christian leadership should respect and incorporate the following recommendations:

1. Education for leadership happens when transforming leadership is practiced in community.
2. Education for leadership happens when leaders and participants employ critical thinking.
3. Education for transforming leadership is appropriated by a shared praxis methodology.
4. When people encourage learning communities and a public paideia, they create an environment that focuses on the elements necessary for transforming leadership and education for leadership.
5. Education for leadership transcends the management/ therapeutic mindset and intends substantive changes that are transformative. Education for leadership is education for transformation.
6. Education for leadership is serious about understanding the relationship of ethics to leadership. Education for leadership generates an ethic of civic virtue that transcends emotivism and moral relativism.
7. Education for leadership happens in the long term and is ongoing. Education for leadership is a transformation of the mind and the heart, the why of how we think and act.
8. Dysfunctional organizations work against the emergence of transforming leadership and their structures impede education for leadership.

9. Education for leadership welcomes diversity, intellectual conflict, and the influence of transforming relationships.

10. Education for leadership involves a new partnership in the church among those who understand religious education as transformational to assume a serious responsibility to educate for transformational leadership. Religious educators must be transformational leaders who practice the process of transforming leadership.

11. Religious educators need to name leadership. Following this effort, religious educators ought to abandon programs which confuse the process of naming leadership and collapse leadership with skill development.

12. Education for transforming leadership and transformational leaders happens through the practice of mentoring.

13. Ministry and religious education endeavors need to separate programs which instruct persons in the periphery of leadership from educational opportunities that address the core of the leadership process, transformation.

Limitations of the Study and Future Directions

The participants in the study are a select group. The majority of the respondents (88%) have experienced some form of leadership training, 53% of the respondents are currently hired in full time positions by an organization operated by the Catholic Church. Another 24% of the respondents do volunteer work in an organization operated by the Catholic Church. In addition, 65% of the respondents are from the midwest in the United States. The rest of the

participants in the study live in the western, southern, and northern sections of the United States. No participant lives in the eastern United States. Generally, these participants reflect the perspectives of those nonordained persons in the Catholic Church who are committed to ministry and leadership. I suspect that their perspectives also reflect the perspectives toward leadership of the average nonordained parishioner. However, the study does not suggest that generalization. The purpose of the study was to examine the perspectives on leadership among nonordained persons who have received some significant leadership training and are likely to exercise leadership in the Catholic Church.

The approach to leadership that I presented in Chapter Four is not the common understanding shared by educators and other people who have an interest in leadership. The approach to religious education that I briefly set forth is also not a widely shared perspective. These perspectives, especially those I presented in Chapter Four on the nature and purpose of leadership, need to be more broadly discussed, practiced and evaluated so that new light may be shed upon these concepts. One participant commented that "there are many leadership theories existing in the field, the theory you [the researcher] presented is only one among many." This is true and demonstrates the confusion over leadership that exists--and is obvious in Chapters Six, Seven, and Eight--among professionals and volunteers in ministry, religious education and many secular professions. I believe that the approach set forth in Chapter Four is a step in dispelling some of the darkness surrounding

leadership and its relationship to pastoral ministry and religious education.

The study is not a theological work as much as a study in leadership as it relates to nonordained persons in ministry and religious education. Perhaps, another study should examine in more detail and with greater theological expertise the theological underpinnings of transforming leadership.

Another study will need to research the average nonordained person and their perspectives on leadership. A comparison of the results of such a study could be compared to the responses gathered in this work. Further research needs to occur among those participants in this study to measure the success they experience practicing their understanding of leadership. Additional qualitative research could be done among those practitioners of transformational leadership in the Catholic Church to examine their perspectives on leadership once it is experienced in the field.

Evaluation of transformational leadership is necessary. It is difficult because the nature and purpose of transformational leadership are not widely studied nor practiced. A key to evaluation is inherent in transforming leadership. Since transforming leadership is about intended change and not linked to goals or products, evaluation may occur simultaneously and with immediacy. This approach to evaluation helps identify transforming leadership when it happens and furthers its understanding and practice. Guidelines for evaluation of transforming leadership and transforming leaders and participants ought to be set forth in some future study.

Conclusion

Most leadership theories abreast in the literature today deal only with the periphery of leadership. Popular leadership concepts address skills, traits, personalities, excellence, position, office, qualities, management, and situations. There is a lot of attention given to leaders but little substantive work is given to the nature and purpose of leadership. Business and management continue to dominate and influence writing and thinking about leadership. The approach and definition given to transforming leadership strikes out in a new direction. Leaders and followers must address the issues set forth in Chapter Nine, issues which are already shaping our future. The transforming leader holds a vision and end values which inspire participants to embrace the challenge which a postindustrial future offers them.

One of our tasks on this journey toward leadership, in this conspiracy of hope, is to learn again the meaning of respect. Respect is a word with Latin roots. It means to look again. As women and men who cherish religious values, as men and women who seriously practice religious education, we need to look again at ourselves and the meaning we place upon leadership. We need to affirm human goodness, dispel fears not community, and affirm that people are gifted, graced, whole and holy. We need to see and act in ways that proclaim that we are called to leadership. We need to live public lives consecrated to the transformation of ourselves in a lifelong process and to nurturing real, substantive change in our church and the transformation of the the world around us. Such transformation would confront run away self-interest and move us

all toward cherished human tolerance and develop an appreciation for the gift of diversity.

Dead Poets Society is a powerful movie with actor Robin Williams. He assumes the role of a professor of English literature in a strict boys school whose hallmark is conformity and legalism. The classroom was surrounded with patriarchal and stoic pictures of Shakespeare, Thoreau, Whitman and other literary giants. At one point, he had each student stand on the teachers desk and look at each other and their classroom. In doing so they began to literally see things in a new way, to gain a sense of respect for themselves, for the world around them, their educational pursuit, teachers, and each other.

Leadership holds a mirror up to those in the church and society. This mirror is held up so that all of us may begin to understand and remove the blindness, fear, and ignorance that keeps us from seeing in a new way and enables us to value transforming change, not as a threat but as a needed and precious gift.

Participants in the interviews are dedicated women and men who take ministry, education, and leadership seriously. They are the potential leaders who will shape the church of the future. Collectively they are searching for an understanding of leadership. In their dialogue as a community, they may discover the nature and purpose of leadership. When we fail to directly address the nature and purpose of leadership among these nonordained leaders, we fail the church and the society that the church is called to inspire. Ministry training programs and religious education must directly attend to the nature and purpose of leadership. The periphery of

leadership cannot be discarded. Those skills are necessary. However, those interests and skills do not address the nature and purpose of leadership. Education for transforming leadership should attract primary attention.

Educators for christian leadership would do well to instill a thirst for transforming leadership at every level of parish and diocesan life. I am concerned that the hierarchical and authoritative mindset of some clergy and ecclesial structures are dysfunctional and actually work against education for leadership. Leadership that is transforming and the creation of transforming leaders and participants are threatening. It does challenge basic structures and assumptions, the governing variables of an organizations, our understanding of power and virtue, authority and office, management and leadership. As a religious educator, I believe the Reign of God and leadership calls us to nothing less than transformation.

This is not the last word on leadership nor on education for christian leadership. I view these ideas and approaches as a movement, an evolutionary direction. When the process of leadership is practiced, the nature and purpose will also be transformed, responding to the mutual wants and needs of leaders and participants. Transforming leadership appears ideal. However, it is by the ideal that we live.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, W. M., (Ed.). (1966). *The documents of Vatican II*. New York: America Press.
- Adams, J. A. (Ed.). (1986). *Transforming leadership*. Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press.
- Agar, M. H. (1980). *The professional stranger*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Anderson, J. D., Jones, E. E. (1978). *The management of ministry*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Anderson, R. S. (1986, November). Christian catchers. *Minding God's business*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Bailey, F. G. (1988). *Humbuggery and manipulation: The art of leadership*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Baum, G. (1979). *The social imperative*. New York: Paulist.
- Bass, B. M. (1981). *Stodgill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.
- Bausch, W. J. (1982). *Ministry: Traditions, tensions, transitions*. Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications.
- Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Bennis, W. (1989). *Why leaders can't lead*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Beres, J. E., & Musser, S. J. (1988). Avenues and impediments to transformation: Lessons from a case of bottom-up change. In R. H. Kilmann & T. J. Covin (Eds.), *Corporate transformation* (pp.152-180). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bilken, S. K., & Bogdon, R. C. (1982). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Boff, L. (1985). *Church: Charism & power, liberation theology and the institutional church*. New York: Crossroad.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1984). *Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolton, R. (1979). *People skills*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Boyle, V. J. (1985, May). The pastor: Foremost leader of the parish. *The Priest*, pp. 5-7.
- Brenner, M., Brown, J., & Canter, D. (Eds.). (1985). *The research interview*. New York: Academic Press.
- Brookfield, S. D. (1987). *Developing Critical Thinkers: Challenging adults to explore alternative ways of thinking and acting*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brueggemann, W. (1978). *The prophetic imagination*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Byron, W. J. (1980, September-October). The purpose and nature of leadership. *New Catholic World*, pp. 205-208.
- Cohen, W. A. (1990). *The art of the leader*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J. : Prentice Hall.

- Coleman, J. A. (1982). *An American strategic theology*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Cooke, B. (1976). *Ministry to word and sacraments*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Curran, C. E. (1987, Spring). Being American and being Catholic. *Horizons*, 49-63.
- Curran, C. E. (1985). *Directions in Catholic social ethics*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Deming, W. E. (1989). *Out of the crisis*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Collier Macmillan.
- Denzin, N. K. (1970). *The research act*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Dorr, D. (1983). *Option for the poor*. New York: Orbis.
- Dunn, W. (1989, December 11). Kicking off 'transitional decade.' *USA Today*, p. 1A.
- Dyer, W. G. (1987). *Team building issues and alternatives* (2nd. ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Eppley, G. (1983, Winter). Developing leaders for the church. *Human Development*, pp. 6-8.
- Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and society*. New York: Norton.
- Fenhagen, J. C. (1977). *Mutual ministry*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Ferguson, M. (1980). *The aquarian conspiracy: Personal and social transformation in our time*. Los Angeles: Tarcher.
- Fieldler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fischer, K. R. (1983). *The inner rainbow*. Ramsey, NJ: Paulist.

- Fitzpatrick, J. P. (1981). Faith and culture. In Jesuit Conference (Ed.), *The context of our ministries: Working papers* (pp. 10-13). Washington, DC: James L. Conner, Jesuit Conference.
- Fiorenza, E. S. (1985). *In memory of her: A feminist theological reconstruction of christian origins*. New York: Crossroad.
- Firestone, W. A. (1987, October). Meaning in method: The rhetoric of quantitative and qualitative research. *Educational Researcher*, pp.16-20.
- Foster, W. (1986). *Paradigms and promises*. Buffalo: Prometheus Books.
- Foster, W. (1986). *The reconstruction of leadership*. Victoria: Deakin University.
- Foster, W. (1989). Toward a critical practice of leadership. In J. Smythe (Ed.), *Critical Perspectives on educational leadership*. (pp. 39-62). London, UK: Falmer.
- Fox, M. (1988). *The coming of the cosmic Christ*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Fox, M. (1983). *Original blessings: A primer in creation spirituality*. Santa Fe, NM: Bear & Co.
- Fowler, J. W. (1981). *Stages of faith*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Fowler, J., Keen, S. (1978). *Life Maps: Conversations on the journey of faith*. Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press.
- Freire, P. (1983). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Futrell, J. C. (1982, Winter). Learning leadership from watership down. *Human Development*, pp. 28-35.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilmour, P. (1986). *The emerging pastor*. Kansas City, MO: Sheed and Ward.

- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. New York: Aldine.
- Goodman, P. S. & Associates (Eds.). (1982). *Change in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gould, R. L. (1980). Transformations during early and middle adult years. In N. J. Smelser & E. H. Erikson (Eds.), *Themes of work and love in adulthood*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership*. New York: Paulist.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1982). *The servant as religious leader*. (Report No. HEO 15984). PA: Center for Applied Studies, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 226686)
- Greeley, A. M. (1978). *The American catholic: A social portrait*. New York: Basic Books.
- Grob, L. (1984) Leadership: The socratic model. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), *Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 263-280). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Groome, T. H. (1980). *Christian religious education*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Gutierrez, G. (1973). *A theology of liberation*. New York: Orbis.
- Hakim, C. (1987). Qualitative research. In C. Hakim (Ed.) *Research Design* (pp. 26-35). Boston: Allen and Bacon.
- Harman, W. W. (1979). *An incomplete guide to the future*. New York: Norton.
- Harmon, W. W. (1988). *Global mind change*. Indianapolis: Knowledge Systems.
- Hycner, R. H. (1982). Some guidelines for the phenomenological analysis of interview data. Unpublished manuscript.

- Hoge, D. (1987). *Future of Catholic leadership*. Kansas City, MO: Sheed and Ward.
- Holland, J., & Henroit, P., S. J. (1980). *Social analysis linking faith and justice*. Washington, DC: Orbis.
- Hollenbach, D., S. J. (1989, March). The common good revisited. *Theological Studies*, pp.70-94.
- Horn, C. (Ed.). (1985). World views and public policy. In C. Horn (Ed.), *Whose values* (pp. 167-186). Ann Arbor, MI: Servant.
- House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16(3), pp. 321-38.
- Hunt, J. G. (1984). Leadership and managerial behavior. *Modules in management*. Chicago: Science Research Associates.
- Joiner, C. W. (1989, July). *Saints, counselors, philosophers, and capitalists*. Paper presented at the meeting of the World Future Society, Wahington, DC.
- Kavanaugh, J. F. (1983). *Following Christ in a consumer society*. New York: Orbis.
- Keating, C. J. (1978). *The leadership book*. New York: Paulist.
- Kellerman, B. (Ed.). (1984). *Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kilmann, R. H., Covin, T. J., & Associates (Eds.). (1988). *Corporate Transformation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Keirseey, D., & Bates, M. (1984). *Please understand me: character & temperment types*. Del Mar, CA.: Prometheus Nemesis.
- Kohlberg, L. (1973). Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive-developmental approach. In T. Lickone, (Ed.), *Collected papers on moral development and moral education*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- Kondrath, W. M. (1985, Fall). Styles of ministerial leadership. *Human Development*, pp. 30-33.

- Kotter, J. P. (1988). *The leadership factor*. New York: Free Press.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structures of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lahey, S. (1989, September). Hallmark's court jester. *Corporate Report*, pp.18-22.
- Lernoux, P. (1989). *People of god: The struggle for world catholicism*. New York: Viking.
- Levinson, D., Darrow, C. N., Klein, E. B., Levinson, J. H., & McKee, B. (1978). *Seasons of a man's life*. New York: Knopf
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lawler, E. E., Mohrman, A. M. Jr., Mohrman, S. A., Ledford, G. E. Jr., & Cummings T. G. (1985). *Doing research that is useful for theory and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Leege, D. C. (1986). *Parish organizations: People's needs, parish services, and leadership* (Rep. No. 8). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame Study of Catholic Parish Life.
- Lindbloom, C. E. (1980). *The policy-making process* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Manchester, W. (1988, Oct.-Nov.). Manchester on leadership. *Modern Maturity*, pp. 40-46, 109-111.
- Manning, A. (1989, December 13). Boomers are ready to loll into decade. *USA Today*, pp.1D, 2D.
- MacIntyre, A. (1984). *After virtue* (2nd. ed.). Nortre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- McBrien, R. P. (1980). *Catholicism*. Minneapolis: Winston Press.

- McFague, S. (1982). *Metaphorical theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- McNeil, J. J. (1988). *Taking a chance on god*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- McNeil, J. J. (Ed.). (1984). *A challenge to love: Gay and lesbian catholics in the church*. New York: Crossroad.
- Mishler, E. G. (1986). *Research interviewing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Moore, A. J. (Ed.). (1989). *Religious education as social transformation*. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.
- Moore, M. E. (1983). *Education for continuity and change*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Moore, M. E. (1989, Summer). The unity of the sacred and the public possibilities from feminist theology. *Religious Education*, pp. 384-401.
- Moran, G. (1979). *Education toward adulthood*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Moran, G. (1987) *No ladder to the sky, education and morality*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Moran, G. (1984, June). The religious element in education. *Living Light*, p. 315.
- Moran, G. (1981). *Interplay: A theory of religion and education*. Winona, MN.: St. Mary's Press.
- Morgan, G., & Ramirez, R. (1983). Action learning: A holographic metaphor for guiding social change. *Human Relations*, 37, 1-28.
- Mostyn, B. (1985). The content analysis of qualitative research data: A dynamic approach. In M. Brenner, J. Brown, & D. Canter (Eds), *The research interview*. New York: Academic Press.
- Muccigrosso, R. (1984, Fall). Leadership: What can and should we teach? *Human Development*, pp. 20-23.

- Myers, I. B. (1980). *Gifts Differing*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Naisbitt, J., & Aburdene, P. (1990). *Megatrends 2000: Ten new directions for the 1990's*. New York: William Morrow & Co.
- Nanus, B. (1989). *The Leader's Edge*. Chicago: Contemporary Books.
- Niebuhr, H. R. (1951). *Christ and culture*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- O'Collins, G. (1978). *The second journey*. New York: Paulist.
- O'Meara, T. F. (1983). *Theology of ministry*. New York: Paulist.
- Palmer, P. J. (1983). *The company of strangers*. New York: Crossroad.
- Palmer, P. J. (1983). *To know as we are known/A spirituality of education*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Parenti, M. (1978). *Power and the powerless*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Peters, J. J., & Waterman, R. H., (1982). *In search of excellence*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Peters, T. (1987). *Thriving on chaos*. New York: Knopf
- Perkins, P. (1980). Paul, Peter and the shape of early christian leadership. *New Catholic World*, pp. 213-216.
- Piaget, J. (1967). *Six Psychological studies*. New York: Random House.
- Philibert, P. J. (1986, June). New leadership for tomorrow's church. *Living Light*, pp. 304-312.
- Ponce, F. (1979). Building basic christian communities comunidades eclesiales de base in the U. S. experience. *In Developing basic christian communities-A handbook*. Washington, DC: National Federation of Priests' Councils.

- Power, D. N., (1980). *Gifts that differ: Lay ministries established and unestablished*. New York: Pueblo.
- Prior, A., O.F. M. (1989). Enabling leadership: Church in South Africa. In P. Gilmour & P. Killen (Eds), *Journeys in ministry: Nine memoirs from around the world* (pp. 27-35). Chicago: Loyola University Press.
- Rachels, J. (1986). *The elements of moral philosophy*. New York: Random.
- Ramos, A. G. (1981). *The new science of organizations: A reconceptualization of the wealth of nations*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Rausch, T. (1989). *Authority and leadership in the church*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier.
- Ritt, T. C., Jr. (1984, July-Aug.). Leadership in shared ministry. *Catechist*, pp. 23-24.
- Ritscher, J. A. (1986). Spiritual leadership. In J. D. Adams (Ed.), *Transforming leadership* (pp. 61-80). Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press.
- Roberts, W. (1988). *The leadership secrets of Attila the Hun*. New York: Warner.
- Rossing, B. (1985, October). *Qualitative methodology in the study of experiential learning: A study of community leadership development*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Midwest Research to Practice Conference in Adult and Continuing Education, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Rost, J. C. (1988, July). *The nature of leadership in the postindustrial era*. Paper presented at a meeting of Educational Leadership Researchers at the Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, NC
- Rost, J. C. (1989, July). *Leadership and ethics in the 1990s*. Paper presented at the meeting of the World Future Society, Washington, D.C.

- Russell, L. M. (1982). *Becoming human*. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Russell, L. M. (1981). *Growth in partnership*. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Sauers, F. (1985, Fall). Institutional leaders' values. *Human Development*, pp. 28-29.
- Schattsschneider, E. E. (1960). *The semisovereign people: A realist's view of demoncracy in America*. Hinsdale, IL: Dryden Press.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schillebeeckx, E. (1981). *Ministry*. New York: Crossroad.
- Schneider, S., I. H. M. (1981, January). The foot washing (John 13:1-20): An experiment in hermeneutics. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 43(2), 76-98.
- Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in administration: A sociological interpretation*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Seymour, J. L., O'Gorman, R. T., & Foster, C. R. (1984). *The church in the education of the public*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Sheehy, G. (1976). *Passages*. New York: Bantam.
- Sibbet, D., & Brown, J. (1986). Leading as learning: Developing a community's foundation. In J. D. Adams (Ed.), *Transforming leadership* (pp. 287-304). Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press.
- Smith, G. M. (1985). The adult as mentor. In *Christian Adulthood: A catechetical resource*. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference.
- Smith, K. K. (1982). Philosophical problems in thinking about organizational change. In P. S. Goodman & Associates (Eds.). *Change in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Smith, P. B., & Peterson, M. F. (1988). *Leadership, organizations and culture*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Spradley, J. E. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Staw, B. M. (1977). The experimenting organization. *Organizational Dynamics*, pp. 3-18.
- Stott, J. R. W. (1985, August). What makes leadership christian? *Christianity Today*, pp.24-27.
- Sullivan, W. M. (1986). *Reconstructing public philosophy*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Taylor, S. J., & Bogdan, R. (1984). In depth interviewing. In S. J. Taylor & R. Bogdan (Eds), *Introduction to qualitative research methods* (pp. 76-105). New York: Wiley.
- Tavard, G. H. (1983). *A theology for ministry*. Wilmington: Michael Glazier.
- Tesch, R. (1984, April). *Phenomenological studies: A critical analysis of their nature and procedures*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1986). *The transforming leader*. New York: Wiley.
- United States Bishops Conference (1984). Catholic social teaching and the United States economy. *Origins*. Washington, DC: National Catholic News Service.
- Unsworth, T. (1989, April 11). Management by mote moot. *National Catholic Reporter*, pp. 1, 11.
- Vroom, V., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and decision-making*. New York: Wiley.
- Waterman, R. H., Jr. (1987). *The renewal factor*. New York: Bantam.

- Weakland, R. G. (1989, October 13). Taking up a global church agenda. *The National Catholic Reporter*, pp. 1, 14, 15.
- Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21 pp. 1-19.
- Westerhoff, J. H. (1984). *A pilgrim people*. Minneapolis, MN: Seabury Press.
- Westerhoff, J. H. (1976). *Will our children have faith?*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Whitehead, J. D., & Whitehead, E. E., (1986). *The emerging laity*. New York: Doubleday.
- Wilson, L. (1989, November 12). Women need to know they can lead, says counselor. *The Catholic Key*, p. 13.
- Wingeier, D. E. (1989, November). *Leadership patterns in Korea*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of Association of Researchers and Professors of Religious Education, New York: NY
- Wrapp, E. (1986, February). Growing the next generation of pastors. *The Priest*, pp. 39-43.
- Yin, R. K. (1984). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage
- Zaleznik, A. (1989). *The managerial mystique: Restoring leadership in business*. New York: Harper and Row.

APPENDIX 1

First Interview Guide

1. Please give me some information about yourself, some insight into your personal and professional background and formation.

Follow up question:

Please expand. Tell me about your family, faith community, religious development (events/persons), work, and activity in the church.

2. Tell me about your experience of being a nonordained catholic.

Follow up question:

What do you see as the problems facing the church and non ordained persons wishing to practice leadership in the catholic church?

3. What is leadership?

Follow up question:

What five key words or concepts would you use to describe leadership?

Follow up question:

Why are these important to you?

4. What do you think about future leadership in the church?

Follow up question:

What are some issues which leaders in church or society must face in the next few decades?

5. Can you tell me more about the use of nonordained persons for leadership in the church?

Follow up question:

Can you give me an example of leadership?

Follow up question:

What makes this leadership?

6. What perimeters would you place, if any, on nonordained leadership?

7. How do we educate for leadership?

8. What is religious education?

9. Is there a connection between religious education and leadership education?

Follow up question:

Should religious educators be responsible for initiating and sustaining education for leadership in the church? Explain.

APPENDIX 2

Second Interview Guide

1. Please comment on the first interview transcripts which you have read this past week. I would be interested in any clarifications, insights, agreement, criticism, or questions.

2. Is there a crisis in leadership?

Follow up question:

Describe this crisis.

Follow up question:

What should be our response to such a crisis?

2. Is there a connection between ethics and leadership?

Follow up question:

Is ethics tied to the leader or to leadership?

Follow up question:

Whose ethics ought to be employed? What is the core of the ethic in question?

3. Is there a connection between politics and leadership?

4. What is the role of change in your understanding of leadership?

Follow up question:

Should change be part of the purpose of leadership?

Follow up question:

What do you mean by change?

5. Design a program for leadership education. This program is intended for ministry formation or religious education purposes at the parish or diocesan level. What would be included as essentials in the purpose, design, evaluation, and content of your program?

6. I am going to offer you a definition of leadership. Please react to it. *Leadership is a dialectical process which involves an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend and move toward real changes that reflect their mutual discernment.*

7. Do you have any further comments, questions, observations?

APPENDIX 3

Demographic Record of Interview Participants/1989

1. Name:
2. Address:
3. Area Code and Telephone Number:
4. Age:
5. Male: Female:
6. Married: Single: Divorced:
7. Ethnic Background:

White:	Black:	Hispanic:	Other:
--------	--------	-----------	--------
8. Education:

	School	Location
Elementary:		
High School:		
College:		
Graduate:		
Technical/ Specialist:		

9. Were you always Roman Catholic?

If not, what religion did you previously practice?

10. Work Background:

Present Employer:

Last Previous Employer:

11. Leadership Education:

Have you had any specific education/training in leadership?

If so, briefly describe this education/training and what institution or organization did this take place?

Dated:

Signed:

Thank you again for your participation!

Appendix 4

CONSENT FORM

This consent form is designed as an agreement for the protection of the rights and welfare of any individual who participates as a subject in research. The following basic concerns are presented for examination by the participants in the proposed study.

1. The main purpose of this study is to examine the attitudes of American, nonordained Catholics toward leadership.
2. The researcher expects no risks for the subjects.
3. It is hoped that participants will gain from the completed study a deeper understanding of the nature of leadership and how the church will educate for leadership.
4. Participation by subjects is voluntary and any participant may withdraw at any time.
5. Potential participants will be given the opportunity to ask questions about the procedure, and that these questions will be answered before the subject's agreement to participate.
6. There is no agreement, written or verbal, beyond that expressed on this consent form.
7. Each participant will be interviewed twice. Each time the interview will last approximately two hours. The researcher will summarize the content of the first interview and share the results with the participant. General themes of the entire research will also be shared with individual participants.

8. All interviews will be audiotaped. These tapes will be destroyed upon completion of analysis of the transcriptions.

9. All interview data is confidential.

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

Signature of Subject

Date

Signature of Researcher

Date

Signature of a Witness

Date

Done at:

City

State