University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

1994-12-16

Leadership: Personal Narratives of Practitioners

R. Daniel Israel 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

Israel, R. Daniel EdD, "Leadership: Personal Narratives of Practitioners" (1994). *Dissertations*. 604.
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/604>

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.

**LEADERSHIP:
PERSONAL NARRATIVES OF PRACTITIONERS**

**by
R. Daniel Israel**

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

**Doctor of Education
School of Education
University of San Diego**

December 16, 1994

**Dissertation Committee
Joseph Rost, Ph.D., Director
Robert Infantino, Ed.D.
Helen deLaurentis, Ph.D.**

ABSTRACT

LEADERSHIP: PERSONAL NARRATIVES OF PRACTITIONERS
R. Daniel Israel, Ed. D., University of San Diego, 1995, 329 pp.
Director: Joseph C. Rost, Ph. D.

Leadership scholars and researchers have still not come to an agreement as to what the nature of leadership is. Most research within leadership studies has been grounded in preconceived or stated definitions of leadership. However, very little information exists about people's experiences of leadership. This project addresses the lack of experiential clarification of the leadership relationship. It utilizes a new leadership research method grounded in the experience of people. Leadership narrative research uses the stories people tell about their leadership experiences as a form of data collection. This study is designed to discover if Rost's (1991) definition: "Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes," reflects the lived experience of people or if his definition prescribes what leadership *should* be (p. 102).

This study into the nature of the phenomenon of leadership adds to the understanding of the leadership dynamic by investigating leadership as experienced by a variety of individuals within different *milieus*. The researcher interviewed five people in five different private and public organizations. The interviews were then transcribed and analyzed. The research population included participants from Walt Disney Institute; Intel

Corporation; and San Diego State University; the El Cajon Police Department and Woodbridge High School, Irvine, California. The data demonstrate a general identification by the participants of leadership with management. However postindustrial leadership values do arise within some stories indicating a shift in consciousness and transition from the industrial to postindustrial paradigm. The study uses the metaphors of journey and conversation, along with 22 personal narratives to help differentiate the nature of leadership from management theory.

Of the 22 narratives the researcher analyzed 5 stories describing the participants' lived experiences fit Rost's definition. Six stories partially reflected the definition. Eleven stories did not reflect it. Therefore, the definition for those eleven is prescriptive.

Copyright © 1995 by R. Daniel Israel

DEDICATION

To my mother, Patricia Halagan and to John Halagan, Sr., who has been a father and more to me, I dedicate this dissertation. By their lives they have taught me how to have the vision to love and the strength to persevere. It is because of their love, perseverance and support that this life-step was possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing a dissertation is not only a difficult task but also a humbling one. Unlike doctoral course work, which was somewhat familiar in that I had taken many courses during my life, writing a dissertation was like hiking into the wilderness. At times I felt so lost that the only thing I could do was to simply continue hiking. But as in living, it was the unknown that seemed to draw me through the wilderness to the oasis of completion.

As in life, the dissertation process insists on the recognition of our weaknesses and strengths. For me the process insisted that I recognize that this step in life could not be taken in isolation. It only could occur because of the people who are now or have been in my life.

With that in mind I want to thank and acknowledge some who earlier in my life gave freely of their lives. I want to thank Sheila Vaughan, Ph.D., who turned me on to the joy of learning and the exhilaration of helping others see that every instance in life is a learning possibility. I want to thank William Shipley, Ph.D., for exposing me to philosophical thought and teaching a dynamic and livable form of Thomistic Philosophy. And I want to thank William Thompson, Ph.D., who expanded my theological consciousness.

As in any sojourn the trip through the leadership doctoral program has been made easier and more enjoyable because of others. Jim and Eileen Ramsey, thank you for good wine, good movies and lots of laughs. Doug Schwanke, Kathy B and the boys are also some of those others. Kathy's joy in motherhood and loving presence brought much needed solace, and without Doug's absolute generosity in

maintaining my computer (and my sanity) this project would probably never have been completed. Thank you Dougie!

For the conversations ranging from leadership to theology and spirituality on the beach in Del Mar or over good wine and fine food at the *beach chalet* or in the *jungle*, I want to thank my friend and colleague Br. Peter Bray, Ed.D. Having a compatriot to *suss* out thoughts and ideas was invaluable (and sorely missed).

For the enthusiastic support and understanding of what I was trying to do in this dissertation and for her keen insights which helped me to simplify my thought, I thank Helen deLaurentis, Ph.D.

For his gentle, kind direction in writing and for his solid presence in the school of education I thank Bob Infantino, Ph.D.

And finally as this sojourn ends a special acknowledgment and heartfelt thank you goes to Joseph Rost, Ph.D. When I was looking for a doctoral program to enter a friend suggested that I speak with someone at the school of education concerning the doctoral program in leadership, I did. As fate would have it, Joe was the person with whom I spoke. It was because of the questions Joe asked me during that conversation that I decided to apply to this program. Over the past four years or so the questions continue to amaze me. For the questions I want to thank Joe. I also want to thank him for his seemingly unending patience during the dissertation process. However, it is encountering Joe Rost the person and the opportunity to have been able to study under and come to know this pioneer in leadership studies that I am most thankful. Thank you Joe for your patience, for the questions and for a different way of looking at the world.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE	1
Introduction	1
Purpose for the Study	2
Research Questions	3
Significance	3
CHAPTER TWO. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	5
Introduction	5
Functionalist Views: Confusion About What Leadership Is	6
The Industrial Paradigm Recapitulated	15
Process, Content and Leadership: A Clarification	35
Clarifying Questions	35
Leadership: A Postindustrial Value	36
Hodgson's Confusion	38
Hodgson the Pragmatist	42
Conclusion and Clarification of the Issue	43
Language, Metaphors, Paradigms and Leadership	44
Introduction	44
Barker's Attempt	45
Barker and the Idea of Paradigm	47
Clancy's Powerful Journey	47
The Journey Metaphor in Industry	50
Purpose for Industrialists	52

Lakoff and Johnson: The Effect of Metaphor	53
Industrial Age Metaphors Revisited	56
Paradigm: Its Meaning and Effect	63
Critical Theory: A Seque to a New Paradigm	65
Reality: Alternative Views	69
Leadership as Transdisciplinary	71
Conclusion	75
CHAPTER THREE. REASEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	77
Overview	77
Design	80
Usefulness of This Study	83
Narrative Form as Data Collection	85
Methodology	89
Data Analysis	90
Protection of Human Subjects	92
Limitations and Implications	93
CHAPTER FOUR. LEADERSHIP NARRATIVES	95
Introduction	95
Leadership Narratives	98
Story One: Helen Pratt's Story of Leadership	102
Story Two: Alan Bailey's Leadership Story	108
Story Three: Deborah Furness and Finding Katmandu	116

Story Four: Stan Palm	125
Story Five: Bob Moreau	128
Story Six: Bill Kalaf and Reengineering at Intel	134
Story Seven: Mike Nakoue and Becoming A Department Chairperson	138
Story Eight: Craig Dunn	143
Story Nine: Fred Morrison's Story of Leadership.	147
Story Ten: Colleen Cross	153
Story Eleven: William Shannon's Story of Leadership	159
Story Twelve: Traci Sypolt's Story of Sydney Pollack	175
Story Thirteen: Jack Smith's Leadership Story of Chief Davis	179
Story Fourteen: John Halagan's Story of Leadership	188
Story Fifteen: Jeff Glazer and Developing a Mentoring Program	197
Story Sixteen: Christi Valestro's Leadership Story	202
Story Seventeen: Greg Copps' Story of Leadership	211
Story Eighteen: Katherine Russell's Leadership Narrative	225
Story Nineteen: John Dohse's Leadership Story	236
Story Twenty: Bill Mullen's Leadership Story	247
Story Twenty-One: Debbie Setzer's Leadership Narrative	255
Story Twenty-Two: Chris Corr's Leadership Story	270
Summary Analysis of Leadership Narratives	280
Domains of Meaning Reflecting the Definitional Elements of Management	281
Domains of Meaning Reflecting the Definitional Elements of Leadership	281

Some Reflections	282
Conclusion	284
CHAPTER FIVE. LEADERSHIP: THE EMBRACE OF EXCHANGE	286
Introduction	286
Rost's Definition: Descriptive or Prescriptive	289
Experiences of Leadership	292
Storytellers' Descriptions and Rost's Definition	297
The Significance of What Was Found.	298
Limitations of the Narrative Approach to Leadership Research	302
Advantages of the Narrative Form	303
Suggestions for Methodology	304
Suggestions for Further Research	305
Some Concluding Remarks: Consciousness and Exchange	306
REFERENCES	313
APPENDICES	324

CHAPTER ONE

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

Introduction

In his seminal work, *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*, Joseph Rost (1991) provided a definition for leadership. In contradistinction to authors who believe that leadership is not definable because of its complexity (Vaughan & Associates, 1992); or to those who define it specifically within a certain field, such as educational leadership (Duignan & MacPherson, 1992); or to those who say they define it but actually don't (Conger, 1992); Rost's definition is clear, concise and describes the leadership dynamic as an interactive process that is not limited by behavioral, psychological, trait or disciplinary categories. *"Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes"* (Rost, 1991, p. 102).

Rost's rationale for defining leadership is very practical in that, "as of 1990, scholars and practitioners do not know, with certainty, what leadership is" (p. 6). As a result, "scholars and practitioners cannot articulate what it is they are studying and practicing" (p. 6). In other words, without a clear acceptable definition, one will not know leadership when one sees it.

Rost's definition suggests that the characteristic processes of leadership occur in recognizable forms. His definition further implies that

the leadership process is *commonly* recognizable, otherwise how could one know it, identify it and talk about it when one sees it?

For leadership scholars the critical question thus becomes: Does creating a definition about a phenomenon as complex and dynamic as leadership in fact create the phenomenon? Or is Rost's definition of leadership a description of elements within the phenomenon that individuals commonly recognize and identify, semantically and experientially, as leadership?

Is Rost's definition prescriptive or descriptive? That is, does defining leadership in the logical and linear manner put forth by Rost *prescribe* what leadership *should* be on a theoretical and logical level, or does Rost's definition describe characteristic elements within the leadership process that are commonly experienced, recognized and described by individuals as leadership?

Purpose for the Study

The main purpose for this study is to gain information about and clarify people's experiences of leadership. Previous research within leadership studies has been grounded in preconceived or stated definitions of leadership. This project differs in that it addresses the lack of experiential clarification of the leadership relationship by utilizing a method of research grounded in the experience of people and not on a preconceived or stated definition of leadership. In short, this study is designed to discover if Rost's definition of leadership reflects the lived experience of people or if his definition prescribes what leadership *should* be.

Research Questions

1. Is Rost's definition of leadership descriptive or prescriptive? That is, does Rost's definition of leadership reflect the lived experience of people? Does his definition solely prescribe what leadership *should* be in the future?
2. What are the processes people experience within the leadership dynamic that are manifest as external phenomenon?
3. How closely do the descriptions that informants provide agree or disagree with Rost's definition of leadership?

Significance

The need for this study is significant, namely, to clarify whether leadership scholars and practitioners can use Rost's definition as a foundation on which to evaluate and describe action and certain "general structures of experience" (Salomon, 1991, p. 10) as leadership. Leadership scholars have not yet studied whether leadership is idiosyncratic or whether it has recognizable elements found within certain experienced patterns of interaction (Salomon, 1991, p. 10) which reflect the experience of individuals and which are commonly identified as leadership. Furthermore, up until this project no research has specifically been done to elucidate the relationship Rost's leadership definition has to the experience of individuals. This study into the nature of the phenomenon of leadership adds to the understanding of the leadership dynamic by investigating leadership as experienced by a variety of individuals within different *milieus*.

In chapter two my investigation into the nature of leadership continues with a review and critique of the current leadership literature. The critique and review of literature is aimed at disclosing whether the

selected contemporary leadership scholars have provided us with an insight into the nature of leadership as distinct from management theory.

Chapter three describes a new form of data collection I have developed for leadership research. The reader will note the simplicity of this research methodology. I have simply asked participants to tell me a story about an experience they have had that they would consider to be leadership. Other researchers have used the narrative form but usually to report the data gathered through their research. This method uses the narrative form as a means of collecting data. Some of the stories told to me were more engaging than others, simply because some people are better storytellers than others. However, because this methodology is designed not to interfere with the participants recounting of their experience, whether or not the story was engaging to the listener was not of import because the data were provided to me whether or not the participant was a dynamic story teller. One of the exciting consequences of this new methodology is in the coding and analyzing of the data. Because the data are not biased by leading questions posed to the participants by the researcher, the raw data that was gathered reflect individuals' personal experience.

The findings of this project are provided in chapter four. The reader will notice the influence which metaphors and organizational structures have on the stories told by the participants. I think the reader will be surprised with the results of the findings with regard to theories in use and espoused theories as conveyed by the participants.

In the final chapter I provide the reader with my summary, conclusions and observations of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Leadership continues to be a much debated topic in the 1990s.

Judging from the current literature there is still no agreement on what the nature of leadership is. In seeking to find an acceptable definition of leadership that describes certain patterns of actions and certain “general structures of experience” and not simply “single variables” (Salomon, 1991, p. 10), one discovers within a review of the current leadership literature that, except for Astin & Leland (1991), Ramey (1991), Rost (1991), and an attempt by Nanus (1992), scholars have described and attempted to define leadership within the context of their own particular academic discipline such as education (Barnett, McQuarrie, and Norris, 1991; Birnbaum, 1992; Foster, 1986a; Thomson, 1992) or business (Dilenschneider, 1990; Hosmer, 1994; Kanter, Stein & Jick, 1992; Koestenbaum, 1991; Morrison, 1992).

Limiting one’s reference to particular disciplines influences and limits the construction of one’s definition: the result of the limited and functional approach most scholars have taken is that the reader is provided only with insights into how to make a particular organization more effective or successful.

Because of the functionalist and narrow approaches taken by most scholars, the current leadership literature has demonstrated much confusion in the understanding of a leader, what a leader does (what I call leadership behavior), and the nature of leadership as a phenomenon.

This review of the leadership literature is a critical analysis intended to shed light on why many of the current offerings demonstrate confusion rather than clarification of the nature of leadership. To that end, I have chosen to highlight eleven authors whom I see as being important contributors to the study of leadership. Within the critique of each author, I include references to other literature that supports the author's findings, ideas or points of view.

Functionalist Views: Confusion About What Leadership Is

A few examples demonstrate the confusion that exists about what leadership is. In *The Visionary Leader*, Wall, Solum and Sobol, (1992) conveyed a story about a bank president who began to delegate more authority to his front line employees. He eliminated first-line supervisors replacing them with self-managed work teams while embracing the idea that "his role [was to ensure] that everyone in his bank shared his vision of the organization and the culture in which people did their work" (p. 26). To his great astonishment he discovered that the confusion created by these changes called for "more leadership" from him. According to Wall, et al., the

leadership demanded of him took the form of having to “define [the] broad limits [of his employees] as well as to unite his staff behind a common vision” (p. 27).

Wall et al. did not provide a definition of leadership. Rather, in the analysis of the story a confusion between the individual behavior of a positional leader and the idea of leadership emerged. According to these authors the bank president had to do nothing more than put contingency management theory into operation (Hunt, 1984). That is to say, he needed to provide a good environment viz., interaction and tweaking of the structure to ensure successful completion of the task at hand. This approach has been characterized as bureaucratic and hierarchical, and remains management as it has been cast in the industrial paradigm (Morgan, 1986).

The Visionary Leader provides the reader with an excellent how-to approach to building a vision and a mission statement and provides some insights into change and the change process. The skills and behaviors Wall et al. encourage are admirable, and one would hope that positional leaders would possess them. Even though *The Visionary Leader* provides a formula for reframing one’s approach to leadership, it has, along with much of the current literature, confused what a positional leader does with the nature of the leadership phenomenon (Koestenbaum, 1987, 1991; Peters, 1987; Peters and Austin, 1985; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Zaleznik, 1993). As a result,

The Visionary Leader does not provide any new insights into the *nature* of leadership

In *Learning to Lead: The Art of Transforming Managers into Leaders* Conger (1992) perpetuated the confusion between what a leader does and the nature of leadership. Conger attempted to address the effectiveness of leadership training for managers by studying, as a participant observer, five of the “best known” and “more innovative leadership training programs offered outside universities” (p. xiii). These consisted of the Pecos River Learning Center; ARC’s VisionQuest; the Leadership Challenge Program developed by James Kouzes and Barry Posner; the Leadership Development Program at the Center for Creative Leadership in Greensboro, North Carolina; and the Forum Corporation’s leadership course.

As an overview of these five leadership training programs, *Learning to Lead* was a very good guide, albeit problematic. It is problematic in that Conger’s stated objective was to “learn whether training really makes a difference in leadership development” (p. xii). However, Conger never attained this goal for two essential reasons: (1) he never provided a clear definition of the *nature* of leadership, and as a result (2) the readers don’t know what *effective* leadership is. Without a clear definition of leadership *per se*, it is very difficult to determine what *effective* leadership is and what an *effective* leadership training program would be. Conger, along with the

five leadership training programs he reviewed, failed to advance the understanding of the *nature* of leadership.

Both Conger and the people who designed the five leadership training programs have confused the nature of the dynamic *process* of leadership with the skill/traits of being a leader. Both Conger and the five programs reviewed in his study never provided us with an insight into the dynamic of the leadership process, the nature of leadership.

This confusion is compounded by Conger's unsuccessful attempt at defining leadership. Instead of clarifying the nature of leadership, he focused on the behaviors of a leader. Conger wrote:

I have chosen to use a single definition that is broad enough to capture many of the important manifestations of leadership in organizations and that also outlines the general behaviors that we would seek to develop: Leaders are individuals who establish direction for a working group of individuals, who gain commitment from these group members to this direction, and who then motivate these members to achieve the direction's outcomes. (p. 18)

For Conger, leadership is something that an individual leader does to followers in order to achieve the leader's goals. This unilateral, goal orientation is a good description of the content of what a leader does. It does not, however, provide an insight into the nature of leadership. Conger's description of leadership is management pure and simple and belies

leadership in order to provide business managers with observable skills and behaviors that are judged to be successful by the accomplishment of goals set by the leader/manager. This definition of leadership is only repackaged 20th century management theory accompanied by rope climbs that are all the fad within many of these leadership training programs.

It is this lack of clarity and discipline in maintaining the distinction between what a leader wants to accomplish (content) and the dynamic leadership *process* that is evident within the current leadership literature. The lack of distinction between content and process becomes problematic when attempting to determine what the nature of leadership is.

The inability of current authors to distinguish between the content of a phenomenon and its nature is mind boggling. Senge (1990) compounds the confusion, only in a slightly more covert and thus insidious way. *The Fifth Discipline* has been extremely popular with both academics and business executives. In an attempt at providing the reader with an approach to constructing social reality, Senge presented a new age approach to business replete with creating new mental models, building shared vision, team learning and personal mastery. All of these qualities and tools are given, according to Senge, in the service of building a *learning organization* (p. 12). It is well to note that Senge does bring the reader to the awareness that a more systems and less isolated approach to business is imperative if business and other organizations are to be successful in the 1990s.

The traits and qualities Senge puts forth are admirable. One would hope leaders and followers within organizations are using these approaches and incorporating them into their lives as leadership behaviors. However, Senge also confused the meaning of leadership with traits and qualities. For Senge these traits and qualities are in service, not to create empowered persons who are honored and valued for their contribution to the learning organization, but rather, these espoused qualities are covertly aimed at motivating them for the bottom line, thus perpetuating false consciousness (Denhardt, 1981, p. 108). "How has this substantial investment in developing skills and appreciation of mental models returned benefits for Hanover's management? O'Brien and others simply point to Hanover's steadily improving performance over the years in profitability" (Senge, 1990, p. 185). This quote is but one example of the confusion of values Senge perpetuates throughout this book. But his confusion is most apparent in his description of leadership:

The new view of leadership in learning organizations centers on subtler and more important tasks. In a learning organization, leaders are designers, stewards, and teachers. They are responsible for *building organizations* where people continually expand their capabilities to understand complexity, clarify vision, and improve shared mental models--that is, they are responsible for learning. (p. 340)

Senge confused leadership with tasks. He never spoke to the nature of the phenomenon of leadership.

The list of those who confuse leadership with what a leader does is certainly not limited to the above examples (Bittel, 1984; Donnelly, 1992; Hitt, 1993; Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 1993; Jocques & Clement, 1991). Even though many authors put a slightly different twist on their approach to describing and discovering what leadership is (Bolman & Deal, 1992; Bryman, 1993; DePree, 1989; Greenleaf, 1991; Lynch, 1993; Phillips, 1992; Phillips & Hunt, 1992), some authors, such as Bennis and Nanus (1985) and Sergiovanni (1992) don't even try to define leadership. Bennis and Nanus don't define leadership because of its complexity (p. 4). Rather they prefer to focus on the "new leader" who "is one who commits people to action, who converts followers into leaders, and who may convert leaders into agents of change" (p. 3). Bennis and Nanus provide the reader with many noteworthy qualities and traits, not the least of which is the acknowledgment of and focusing on the importance of vision within leaders. In fact for Bennis and Nanus vision is the clearest distinction there is between a leader and manager. "By focusing attention on a vision, the leader operates on the *emotional and spiritual resources* of the organization, on its values, commitment, and aspirations. The manager, by contrast, operates on the *physical resources* of the organization" (p. 92). But when push comes to

shove, they too reduce the nature of leadership to what the leader does to others.

Avoiding a definition of leadership is not limited to the business sector (and their academic consultants). In *Dilemmas of Leadership: Decision Making and Ethics in the Community College*, a fine work on the necessity of ethical practice within the community college system, Vaughan & Associates (1992) did not agree upon a definition of leadership. In fact Vaughan et al. only generally agree with the idea that ethics is “that set of principles, beliefs, and rules of moral conduct that guides the actions of the members of the college community. This definition fits well with the prevailing philosophy of most community college leaders” (p. 5). Even though Vaughan et al. did not provide a firm philosophical foundation for the moral/ethic being presented, eventually the reader does come to see that these pundits tend toward civic republicanism (p. 64).

Leadership scholars may appreciate the variety of authors gathered in Vaughan’s volume. In addition, the practical examples, viz., case studies, personal reflection and discussion, provide the reader with a view of the college president as leader and the president’s role as an influential leader in ethical issues. It is this role as influential leader in ethical matters that Moriarty (1992) provides a unitary view of leadership as residing in the president. He placed the “primary responsibility for moral discourse . . . with the president” (p. 69). This view of leader and leadership reflects the great

man and trait theory of leadership coupled with an emphasis on positional authority. Unfortunately, again, we are left with no new insight into what the *nature* of leadership is.

English, Frase and Arhar (1992) are also locked into the industrial paradigm and see schools as reflections of bureaucratic hierarchies. It is no wonder the parameters of their definition reflect an 18th century bias toward individualistic success and power over followers. How else would the bureaucracy continue and those within authority positions remain in control unless scientific management theory and bureaucratic structure are reinforced by the ritualistic repetition (in print) of the need for order, control and positional authority? (See Blackmore, 1989; Duignan & MacPherson, 1992; Foster, 1986a, 1986b; Freire, 1990; Morgan, 1986 for this and other critiques of scientific management and theory X.)

The disappointment here is that English et al. are well known educators who, by disregarding developments in our understanding of socially constructed reality and in paradigms, are perpetuating a social construction which, in its objectivated state (Berger, 1967), has become counterproductive in providing society with people who are able to work in teams, think in a divergent and creative manner and respond imaginatively to new situations. English et al. reinforce an approach to educational leadership that does not empower educators. In short this work plunges us head on into the 18th century.

English et al. do provide us with a glimmer of hope. Even within their own limited purview, they do make the daring statement that leadership can occur outside of recognized structures and bureaucracy: "Leadership involves the act or influence of others to induce them to adopt the posture and position of or to act in a way advocated by the leader (see Bennis and Nanus, 1985). Leadership can and does occur outside organizations" (p. 4).

It is not that the above cited works are terribly bad books. On the contrary, most of them are quite good, albeit less than beneficial in providing the populace with alternative ideas, metaphors (Jones, 1982; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), and a language (Foster, 1986a; Foster, 1986b; Gronbeck, Farrell, and Soukup, 1991; Lincoln, 1985a; Wittgenstein, 1974) that will enable a shift in consciousness to occur from the individualistic utilitarianism of the 18th century to a postindustrial paradigm.

The Industrial Paradigm Recapitulated

There are three works worth mentioning that have attempted to break free of the industrial paradigm. Starratt's (1993) attempt tacitly focuses upon a shift in language and, thus, metaphor when speaking about leadership. He provided the reader with a summary of the development of leadership theory from Max Weber (1963) who, along with Karl Manheim (1940) "had developed a useful distinction between functional rationality and substantive rationality in their studies of organizations" (p. 4), to Vail's (1984) "description of leadership as purposing" (p. 5) and Burns' (1978)

transformational leadership. It is Starratt's contention that the new generation of leadership theorists and researchers, starting with Deal and Kennedy (1982) as his touchstone, and proceeding through Bass (1985), Bennis and Nanus (1985), Clark (1970), Gardner (1990), and Tichy and Devanna (1986), made "breakthroughs in the [leadership] literature" (p. 5).

The breakthrough for Starratt was that the new generation of leadership authors "move[d] away from the positivist, reductionist behaviorism of the previous generation toward a more descriptive, naturalistic phenomenology of leaders in action" (p. 5). This was a step perhaps, but a breakthrough is questionable. It is questionable because a breakthrough implies a qualitatively important development. Their attempt, however, was a breakthrough only in the sense that these researchers began, as did many social scientists during this period (Lincoln, 1985a, 1985b; Lincoln and Guba, 1989; Patton, 1980; Spradley, 1979), to utilize qualitative research. This attempt was simply a step. However, Starratt's new generation of leadership scholars failed in the sense that these authors had not broken through to a qualitatively different purview. Even with their utilization of qualitative methodology for research, the paradigm and values espoused by this new generation of leadership scholars remains grounded in the industrial values that so influenced the previous generation of leadership researchers and practitioners. To wit, the examples and the metaphors Starratt has employed to critique (both positively and negatively) leadership

authors and researchers such as Deal and Kennedy (1982), implant within the reader the value system from which Starratt and the new generation of leadership theorists view leadership. His examples gave evidence of how heavily influenced these authors have been by a paradigm steeped in positivism, functional rationality and reductionism.

Two examples will suffice to show the value-laden, industrial purview Starratt has embraced. In speaking of the epistemology and methodology of the new generation of theorists and how the new generation has “tended to move away from the positivist, reductionist behaviorism of the previous generation toward a more descriptive, naturalistic phenomenology of leaders in action,” Starratt confused a method of research with the phenomenon being studied. He suggested that because these researchers had employed a more dynamic method of research that provides a look at life in a more real format than quantitative “snap-shots” (p. 5), these authors would necessarily see the phenomenon of leadership and gain a new insight into its nature. But in Starratt’s own words, this method and the subsequent generalizations gleaned by these authors “summarize the dynamic and longitudinal patterns of leaders’ activities [and] illustrated . . . captivating stories of how various leaders masterminded a turnaround of their individual organizations” (p. 5).

In short, the images and metaphors Starratt used in attempting to demonstrate the qualitative breakthrough these authors had presumably made only reconfirmed that Starratt, along with those he has critiqued, have

remained within a paradigm that speaks to and supports the values inherent within good management. Starratt focused on the actions of a leader, what a leader does to others, in this instance, how certain individual leaders have *masterminded* a turnaround. This example, along with the metaphor of masterminding, suggests the action of one individual upon others. It also suggests an individualistic approach to accomplishing a preconceived goal, namely that of turning around an organization to higher productivity and profitability. Starratt, along with the authors he has critiqued, focused upon leadership as the accomplishment of certain unilateral, predetermined goals, which belies any breakthrough in the understanding of leadership by the authors that Starratt uses for the basis of his argument.

Starratt's examples simply reinforce the values of an industrial paradigm that emphasizes values that are "(1) structural-functionalist, (2) management-oriented, (3) personalistic in focusing only on the leader, (4) goal-achievement-dominated, (5) self-interested and individualistic in outlook, (6) male-oriented, (7) utilitarian and materialistic in ethical perspective, and (8) rationalistic" (Rost, 1991, p. 27). Furthermore, the idea of masterminding a turnaround suggests that the leaders manipulated those involved within the project. Manipulation and control over others are staple values in good management theory.

Another example Starratt used to demonstrate a breakthrough in the leadership literature and research was Deal and Kennedy (1982). Starratt's

interpretation of Deal and Kennedy's work on culture reinforces the idea that leadership is known by its content and what a leader does to (or, in this case, for) others. In the name of culture, one individual is asked to determine and to "guard [the] essential values of the culture." The leader must "remind" people "in the organization of the essential meanings of the culture, by promoting rituals and celebrations that sustain those essential meanings and values of the organization" (Starratt, p. 5).

Starratt and Deal and Kennedy (1982) are seeking and describing a hero. They are seeking someone to save us from our woes--a single, individual who by manipulating our culture, guarding our values and teaching us essential necessary meanings would enable us to continue to survive within an organization and become successful. In short, Starratt reinforced the idea that unless we are special and possess certain traits and skills, we will continue to be unable to experience leadership. For these and other members of the new generation of leadership authors, leadership resides in individuals who could be characterized because of their traits and accomplishments as heroes (Caroselli, 1990; Khare and Little, 1984; Robert, 1991). Starratt reinforced a paradigm that by its very nature undermines personal responsibility. These scholars supported a paradigm that is based upon a hierarchical, power-over-others model of organization (Fisher, 1993; Hughes, Ginnett & Curphy, 1993; Hunt, 1991; McLean & Weitzel, 1991; Sadler, 1988; Sayles, 1993). This paradigm reinforces the status quo, the

keeping of those in positions of power within powerful positions (English, 1993; Israel, 1993).

Starratt revealed most clearly his inability to shed the industrial paradigm when he attempted to “form a more unified metaphorical framework out of which [he] could describe a new understanding of leadership.” He asked himself “whether leadership had to be a prisoner of such a limited number of conceptual and metaphorical frameworks? Would leadership take on fresher tones and meanings with different frameworks? Why must leadership be confined to the present language employed in the literature?” (Starratt, p. 17). The questions Starratt posed are important and could lead to some exciting conclusions. This type of questioning certainly does provide an opportunity to explore different frameworks from which to view the leadership phenomenon.

For Starratt, drama is the metaphor he chose to come to a new understanding of leadership. Drama is also the apparent answer to his questions. However, almost immediately Starratt inhibited a breakthrough in a new understanding of leadership that is void of a value system based on power over others, rather than a value system based on the notion of power as influence and noncoercive. Starratt stated uncategorically that in the “new understanding of leadership” which he put into a framework of drama, “leadership means being a playwright, a lead actor, a stage director, a drama critic and a director all in one” (p. 17). For Starratt, even the attempt to

change the metaphor from managerial terms to metaphors grounded in drama has failed. He again insisted that leadership is what someone does to others. Leadership, for Starratt, is power over others, even though he has couched it in a metaphor depicting the drama of life (Burke, 1969; Geertz, 1971; Perinbanayagam, 1985; Turner, 1974).

In a later chapter Starratt introduced the idea of “leadership in the postmodern context” (p. 88). Starratt reverted again to leadership being what someone does to others. Even though he espoused values grounded in critical theory (which he identified as postmodern), his insistence that these values are accomplished and instilled by a certain leader upon and for others disenfranchises (Fay, 1987) the populace and is contradictory to the very nature of the critical dynamic within postmodern thought. “Leaders in the postmodern world are called to engage the challenge with humility. . . . The leader needs to teach compassion . . . the leader will need to communicate the fragility of the enterprise” (pp. 108-109). But this purview is contradictory to his call for a leadership that is

able to critique the shortcomings, and the myths that support, the *status quo*. It has to be a leadership grounded in a new anthropology, an understanding of the human condition as both feminine and masculine, as multicultural, as both crazy and heroic, violent and saintly, and as embedded in and therefore responsible to nature. We

are talking of a leadership broadly based throughout society, rather than a leadership exercised by a select few. (p. 136)

But Starratt's most glaring contradiction and the statement that reveals the paradigm in which he is grounded is in his answer to the question: "Where will these teachers of the new leadership be found? At present there are but a few centers, such as . . . the Center for Creative Leadership in Greensboro, North Carolina" that are teaching leadership. As demonstrated above, the Center for Creative Leadership teaches contingency management theory, pure and simple.

Starratt's attempt at providing a different frame from which to view leadership has failed. Even though he provided us with many fine insights and he espoused values that I fully support--values grounded in critical theory that could enable persons to become liberated from oppressive regimes and organizational models, values that could enable people to take responsibility for their lives and the world around them--his project failed because of his inability to make the distinction between what a leader does and the phenomenon of leadership. It failed in that his purview tacitly supports the industrial paradigm with its insistence on values that are contrary to the emerging 21st century's postindustrial paradigm with its emphasis on relationships that are noncoercive, influential and collaborative in nature. The underlying presence of the values endemic in the industrial

paradigm thwart the successful liberation of the populace from regimes and organizational models that are oppressive in nature.

Another work that has attempted to break free from the industrial paradigm while trying to depict the phenomenon of leadership as not being limited to a single discipline is *Empowering Leaders* by David Ramey (1990). This work attempts to provide a frame out of which to help individuals attain spiritual insight into the effect their behaviors might have on others and the intrinsic connection spirituality has, according to Ramey, with the phenomenon of leadership. For Ramey, leadership is a task. Even though this task may call for development of personal traits, qualities or spiritual awareness and growth, they are tasks nonetheless: "Those who assume the task and responsibilities for leadership quickly realize . . . [that] finding new meanings, new awareness and satisfaction in the dilemma of leadership challenges is a spiritual process" (p. 213). For Ramey leadership is a *something* that is done by a *someone* (or ones) who is spiritually mature (p. 14).

Ramey suggested that leadership has an objective, out-there and static quality that one can simply choose to do at will. However, the unique twist for Ramey is that in order for the action to be leadership, one must "achieve the essential state of mind and inner detachment necessary to function effectively, live comfortably with ourselves, and create meaningful work and organizations with others. This inner detachment or spirituality of

leadership is represented in the relationship between Zen Buddhism and Japanese management" (p. 214). Leadership, then, is grounded in management, but it can only be achieved within a spiritual framework.

Having leaders and collaborators strive to become higher conscious beings who live a spiritual mission is admirable. One would hope that more of our local and world leaders would strive for the values Ramey has presented. However, Ramey does not speak to the nature of leadership. Furthermore the metaphors used by him reinforce an hierarchical value system, which, as I have already demonstrated, is part and parcel of management theory. An example of one of the metaphors used by Ramey demonstrates my point. In the latter part of his book Ramey wrote: "This inner mastery enables us to assume the tasks of leadership by responsibly inspiring hope and confidence among others that the right path will emerge and we finally shall succeed" (p. 217) Ramey's use of the metaphor *the right path emerging* implies that there is only one way of succeeding and that it is predetermined by, one would suspect, God. This image of one right path emerging evokes engrams reminiscent of following. It elicits images of succeeding only if we follow or are led to success. The image of the right path emerging is status quo in nature. It suggests that because there is only one right path to follow, and that there is someone who determines that right path, we must not deviate from that path. It reinforces an hierarchical, linear and functional model. Furthermore it reinforces a theological model in

which there is an Absolute on high manipulating reality so the right path will emerge. Ramey's metaphor reinforces a hierarchical organizational model where there is a spiritually mature person who will "inspire . . . confidence" among those who might otherwise lose their way, who would not succeed and certainly would not experience leadership because they were not spiritually mature and were unable to follow the right path because of their spiritual immaturity.

I agree with some of what Ramey has to say. We need more individuals who are spiritually mature. However, the continued use of hierarchically based metaphors within spirituality (and religion) only reinforces a consciousness of dependence upon authority. It inhibits personal responsibility, creativity and liberation. In short Ramey has called for spiritual management of those who are unable to find the right path. It is all rather patronizing I think. This theological model might be characterized as confessional (deLaurentis, 1990).

Rost (1993) put it very succinctly when he said: "If we are going to make an impact on the quality, effectiveness, and results of leadership development in the 21st century, we have to confront head on these two problems: (1) the problem of equating leadership with the leader, and (2) the confusion caused by understanding leadership as good management" (p. 7). Even if it is good spiritual management!

For Ramey there are certain things to do in order for leadership to occur; this is evidenced in chapters five through ten. Leadership is done and is only known by successful outcomes. For Ramey, leadership is good (spiritual) management.

Development of an integrated consciousness of leadership, however, requires a level of inner reflection and detachment resembling the spiritual disciplines. . . . [The] adage of mindful presence in both work and family describes the fundamental task of leaders in achieving a personal sense of integrity within themselves and creating humanizing organizations and public systems which create this kind of harmony between the individual and society, among organizations, and within institutions. (p. 215)

For Ramey leadership is equated with faith and has become a vital component for the survival of humanity.

There is a universal faith of leadership which if real will be recognized by those who live their lives with an intentional dedication to a cohesive personal, public and organizational quest. . . . Leadership may be seen by some as a vital component not only of our specific confessional beliefs or religious orientation, but as a response to a universal call to enrich humanity. In either case leadership is essentially and intrinsically a spiritual process. It is entirely

consumed with tapping, motivating, developing, inspiring or correcting the human spirit in addressing a goal or challenge. (p. 5)

It may be true that a spiritual part of us may be affected when leadership is engaged; however, Ramey's attempt at creating a spirituality or theology of leadership is problematic. This approach to leadership is elitist as it views leadership in such a way as to admit only a very few into the inner sanctums of an idea that again reinforces hierarchy. Whether it be in organizations or in spirituality, only a very few chosen people would be able to experience leadership. Leadership could only occur for those who had entered into their sort of spiritual process. Furthermore, this approach suggests that leadership is dependent upon results. Results are a staple of management theory, and thus, as criteria, do not provide deeper insights into the nature of leadership. This approach reinforces a bottom line, industrial mentality, even though it is couched in high spirituality.

Finally, for Ramey, leadership is leaders doing great things. But because Ramey insisted that leadership is a spiritual task, these great things reflect a spiritual dimension. In short Ramey has reverted to the great man, great woman theory of leadership:

This inner mastery enables us to assume the tasks of leadership

The spiritual task of leaders is to develop the consciousness of eagles within themselves and others. It is to enable and empower themselves and others to achieve the personal mastery, the relational mastery,

and the organizational mastery to create systems which serve to strengthen the human spirit, allowing us to soar beyond our current perceptions and awareness. (p. 217)

In conclusion, *Empowering Leaders* is more a treatise on confessional and traditional spirituality than it is a well developed exploration of the nature of leadership. This work would be of greater service to the academic, theological and business community if Ramey had focused on management rather than attempting to speak to leadership. His reinforcement of hierarchical metaphors and industrial images will only continue to perplex the already clouded understanding people have of the difference between management and leadership.

In their attempt at not being limited by the industrial paradigm, Kouzes and Posner (1993) delved further into the trait theory of leadership. Along with Ramey, Kouzes and Posner equated leadership with ethical and moral content as exemplified in the traits of leaders. But instead of infusing leadership with a spirituality, Kouzes and Posner equated leadership with good relationships and equated good relationships with credibility (p. 11). For scholars serious about determining the nature of leadership and determining if a difference exists between leaders and leadership, the question must arise as to why many leadership pundits equate leadership with traits and infuse a moral or ethical content into this phenomenon as Kouzes and Posner have.

In a partial answer to that question, Kouzes and Posner responded that we need more credible and ethical leaders because many people now lack confidence in the present leadership structures (p. 5). Intertwined with the lack of confidence in leaders and leadership, Kouzes and Posner developed the theme that “the dominant organizational metaphor we have carried forward in history, myth, legend, and management textbook will not serve us well for much longer.” The dominant metaphor will not serve us much longer because it reinforces this lack of confidence in leaders. “It is virtually impossible to conceptualize a different connection between people at work if our language forces us into top-down, boss-subordinate images, if we must accept the status of being superior or inferior” (p. 5).

I agree with Kouzes and Posner that the need to change our metaphor is imperative if we are to move into the 21st century and embrace the impending paradigm. However, Kouzes and Posner failed in their attempt to change the metaphor. The examples they used are inconsistent in that the metaphors employed by those they interviewed often reinforce hierarchical values. Even though the examples are myriad, I will use one to demonstrate this point.

In an attempt to show why there are compelling reasons for corporations to change, Kouzes and Posner used a quote out of Xerox’s quality handbook: “The objective is to build long-term relationships with the best vendors to involve them in the earliest phases Xerox treats the

vendors as part of the extended family” (p. 5). Viewing these actions by Xerox from contingency management theory and from the psychological model of leadership, the idea of an extended family is very appealing. However, in using the family metaphor we are still reinforcing the idea of having the head of the family, the one (or two) individual(s) who by reason of their age, position or authority still have power over other members of the family. The metaphor of family may make the work situation seem to be a bit more soft and comfortable while drawing people into the false consciousness of filial proprietorship. The family metaphor reinforces the industrial values of power that are top-down, hierarchical and modeled to perpetuate power over others in order to accomplish certain predetermined tasks. The family metaphor reinforces a parent-child relationship and thus a dependent mentality upon those who are subordinate (Israel, 1992). Kouzes and Posner’s use of this metaphor within this example belies their stated desire to leave the “dominate organizational metaphor” (p. 5).

Kouzes and Posner must be recognized for their insight into the need for change. They have attempted to convey some steps being taken within business corporations toward a new metaphor and paradigm. Their problem, remains, however, that they are still grounded in an industrial metaphor that does not allow them to break free from images, ideas and language that reinforce the industrial paradigm with its concomitant values and ethic.

More will be said later about the effects metaphors have on the way we see and act within our life world.

The attempt to move from a dominant organizational metaphor to a metaphor not based in hierarchical images becomes more confused and ineffective when Kouzes and Posner identify leadership with a relationship. In this identification they framed the relationship within industrial terms that reflects bottom line or production values:

Production and consumption of many services are *inseparable*.

Quality in services often occurs during service delivery, usually in an interaction between the customer and the provider, rather than being engineered at the manufacturing plant and delivered intact to the customer. . . . Leadership, too, is intangible, It is a performing art. It is an encounter. Leadership is something we experience in an interaction with another human being. . . . Leadership is high in labor content; in fact, that is all that it is. . . . Performance varies from leader to leader, from constituent to constituent Leadership acts (producing the behaviors) and the reception of those acts are inseparable. Constituents most often experience their needs being met or not met at the moment of the encounter. (p. 11)

Even though “leadership is something we experience in an interaction with another human being” (p. 11) that is, leadership is a relationship, it is clear that for Kouzes and Posner leadership is something that fulfills needs

and is accomplished by the leader doing something to the constituents and the constituents fulfilling the needs of the leader (Burns, 1978, p. 64).

Although Kouzes and Posner attempted to demonstrate that leadership is a relationship, the *reason* for having a relationship primarily is to accomplish the desires of the leader. A leader fulfills the needs of the constituents because by fulfilling those needs successful leadership will occur.

What defines success for Kouzes and Posner? "When it comes to leadership, perhaps the most appropriate response we can give is . . . [that] success is leaving the area a better place than when you found it" (p. 261). Leadership then is result dependent. For Kouzes and Posner it is consequential in nature. Furthermore because leadership is deemed successful only if the area is left better than before, leadership also necessarily must have an ethical or moral content. But for Kouzes and Posner the ethical or moral good does not arise out of the phenomenon of leadership but rather out of the actions (and consequences of the actions) of the leader. "Genuine leadership is definitely associated with something more than handling and controlling. There is supposed to be some moral force behind it. To lead, not mislead, you must have the knowledge, skills, and abilities to consistently exemplify the values you profess" (p. 70).

By having identified leadership with the actions of one person and by having identified leadership with consequence and content, Kouzes and Posner have simply repackaged 18th century utilitarianism and contingency

management theory in the popular façade known as successful leadership. By simply seeking to exhaust the needs of leaders and constituents and not to speak to and fulfill their deeper primordial wants, Kouzes and Posner reinforced the utilitarian value of seeking to provide happiness rather than fulfillment (MacIntyre, 1984, p. 64).

Thus, for Kouzes and Posner, leadership is known by its content and by its result; it is consequential, it seeks to fulfill utilitarian ends. As such the nature of leadership must always change because the “polymorphous character of pleasure and happiness . . . is a notion without any clear content at all. It is indeed a pseudo-concept available for a variety of ideological uses, but no more than that. Hence when we encounter its use in practical life, it is always necessary to ask what actual project or purpose is being concealed by its use” (p. 64). Could simply seeking to exhaust the needs of leaders and constituents perhaps account for the dissatisfaction present within constituents? Could the quest for leaders who demonstrate certain traits espoused by Kouzes and Posner be a hopeful attempt to satisfy the discontent among constituents? “There is a growing sense among employees that management is not competent to handle these tough challenges, that they are not quite telling us the truth, and that they are motivated more by greed than by concern for the customer, the employees, or the country” (p. 33).

I would hope that constituents are seeking something deeper than mere traits or scripted behavioral responses from individuals who are positional leaders. Perhaps the indication that constituents are seeking more credibility in positional leaders is one reason why many leadership authors equate leadership with traits and infuse a moral or ethical content into this phenomenon. Perhaps it truly is the hope of many leadership scholars that positional leaders will themselves act and become more authentic. However, as long as the underlying motivation for becoming more credible, ethical or authentic is to manipulate others to fulfill the needs of the leader or the organization, the discontent among the constituents will remain and the “sense among employees that management is not competent to handle these tough challenges, that they are not quite telling us the truth, and that they are motivated more by greed than by concern for the customer, the employees, or the country” will be a recurrent theme within organizations.

Although Kouzes and Posner stated “leadership is a process and a set of practices [that] as such . . . is amoral”(p. 66), they continually use the word *leadership* to mean only what a leader does and rarely use the word to mean what the leader and constituent do together. If what a leader does to others is leadership and if leadership is known by its successful outcome, then leadership must have a moral and ethical component. Their argument that “process and practices admit no right or wrong . . . [and] process can be used for good or evil . . . [and] processes themselves are neither positive or

negative” does not make for a credible leader, which is the dominant message of the book (pp. 66ff). Kouzes and Posner argued throughout the book that credibility is necessary for leadership to occur. It would appear, then, that the reason for being a credible leader is for utility rather than as an expression of a more fundamental virtue or from the realization that constituents inherently know the inauthenticity of many trait-induced actions (Quinton, 1983).

Process, Content and Leadership: A Clarification

Clarifying Questions

In a recent paper, Rost (1993a) has succinctly brought clarity to the problems, misrepresentations and confusion that Kouzes and Posner and others have run into regarding (1) the issue of leadership being a process, and (2) the infusion of content, moral and ethics into the phenomenon of leadership. Having provided a definition for leadership in 1991, Rost has doggedly maintained the distinction between leader and leadership, between what a leader does and the leadership phenomenon. He clearly distinguished “two general issues and analyses that . . . can [be made] about leadership understood as a relationship” (1993a, p. 7). Rost began by providing a clarifying question with regard the process of leadership: “The process question is: Is the way that leadership is being done in the organization at this moment in time ethical?” The next clarifying question concerned the content of leadership (content refers to the “substance of the

proposed changes the leaders and collaborators want to make” [p. 7]). The content question is: “Are the proposed changes (decisions, policies, positions) that the leaders and collaborators intend for the organization morally acceptable or, in a word, ethical?” (p. 7).

Leadership: A Postindustrial Value

By defining leadership within the value system of the postindustrial paradigm, Rost clearly depicted leadership as a process. By defining leadership within the postindustrial paradigm, the static, linear and unilateral task values present within the industrial paradigm (and the utilitarian ethic) no longer hold sway on or necessarily color the metaphors used to describe the difference between process and content. No longer need process be confused with content, as Kouzes and Posner (1993) and others have done (Kotter, 1990; Senge, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1992). Rather, because Rost has insisted that “content . . . [refers to] the substance of the proposed changes (decisions, policies, positions) that the leaders and collaborator intend” (p. 7), he reinforced the relational quality necessary for the dynamic. “The process of leadership becomes a point of concern since there are certain criteria in the definition that must be adhered to when leadership kicks into the life of an organization. The two criteria of concern are (1) influence and (2) mutuality” (p. 7).

For Rost, leadership is not ethical because of what one person does or does not do to others, as Sergiovanni (1992), would suggest. Rather,

leadership is ethical because the phenomenon is a relational process. (By relational process I mean that as in any good and healthy relationship, such as in a good friendship, the consanguinity perdures because there exists mutual desire to maintain and develop its presence.)ⁱ It is “ethical because the process adheres to the basic inherent ethical benchmarks that define the nature of leadership” (Rost, 1993a, p. 7), namely, that leadership is an influential relationship rather than coercive, and the intended purposes of the relationship are mutual rather than hierarchical.

Contrary to Kouzes and Posner and other leadership authors, Rost does not believe that leadership is known or experienced as some thing someone does to others. Whether or not the phenomenon is ethical is not dependent upon one individual or the consequence. Rather *how* the process is employed determines whether or not leadership is ethical. The content is not tied to what a leader does to someone else. Rather the content of leadership is dependent upon the “substance of the proposed changes the leaders and collaborators want to make” (p. 7).

Confusing leadership with content, when content is seen and understood as the consequences of the actions of the leader (or follower) on others, is viewing leadership through the lens of the industrial paradigm. The value system of the industrial paradigm is expressed in organizational models that are intended to maintain power over others for the explicit purpose of attaining unilaterally predetermined goals.

Kouzes and Posner confused the process and content of leadership. For them, the reason for any form of process is its outcome, its consequence, that is, its utility. They do not see the virtue in the process itself. Kouzes and Posner do not understand process as the *way* leadership exists. They do not understand that leadership arises only from within and because of the dynamic interaction between leaders and constituents. The approach professed by Kouzes and Posner and others, even though seeking to provide a *segue* to process, only reinforced an hierarchical and static world view while enforcing a utilitarianism that is isolationist in nature (Israel, 1993).

Hodgson's Confusion

Another example of a leadership scholar attempting to move out of the industrial paradigm came from Hodgson (1994) when he attempted to move toward the idea of leadership as a process rather than seeing leadership as known by its content. In the journal article "Understanding Leadership's Moral Dimension" Hodgson provided the reader with a brief literature review in which he discussed leadership as a moral activity by attempting to define morality in the context of leadership (p. 68).

The metaphors and values Hodgson concerned himself with in this piece are operative values for leadership if it is to be seen and understood as a postindustrial phenomenon. These values most certainly complement the idea of leadership being conceived as a dynamic process. The values and metaphors that Hodgson dealt with are (1) democracy, (2) emancipation, (3)

awareness of culture, (4) use of power, (5) regard for agency. Hodgson's analysis and development of these themes as being necessary if a new conception of leadership is to emerge moves the reader toward gaining a clearer understanding of leadership as a process rather than being known only by content. However, Hodgson's identification of a leader's traits with leadership muddies his argument. This was demonstrated at the outset when he wrote "leadership and the action of leaders are occasionally defined now with such words as **instinct, intuition, will, values, beliefs, intentions and empathic insight**" (p. 67, emphasis in original).

Even his reliance upon the professed values of critical theorists such as Blackmore (1989), Brookfield (1990), Codd (1989), Foster, (1986c, 1989), Greene (1990, 1991) and Mezirow (1990), was annulled when he wrote "this paper presents a way for leaders to envision the moral dimension of leadership" (p. 74). Hodgson placed the onus for leadership in the traits and actions of the leader.

Hodgson's article is a very good example of the difficulty many scholars have with distinguishing the idea of leadership from the actions and traits of a leader and distinguishing leadership from consequence. In my estimation Hodgson blurs the very important aspects of the content and process issue Rost has clarified.

The blurring of these ideas comes not only from confusing leadership with leaders, but with the language and metaphors Hodgson used. For

instance in the section entitled "Understanding Leadership's Moral Dimension" (p. 67) Hodgson stated that "leadership is as complex as any aspect of human interaction" and that "an approach to the moral education of leaders is suggested--grounded in experience and values and placed within the context of human relationships--where leadership exists" (p. 68).

Hodgson suggested that interaction is essential within the leadership dynamic and that leadership is a process because it exists "within the context of human relationships." However, Hodgson's confusion became clear when he relied on Maxcy (1991) and Mitchell (1990) to demonstrate the "consensus with the current academic study of leadership" (p. 69) namely, that leadership is a moral activity. Both Maxcy and Mitchell identify leadership with the actions of a leader.

For Hodgson "a concern with values ultimately makes leadership a moral activity" (p. 69). In confusing the idea of leadership with leader, Hodgson placed the concern for values on the actions of the leader when he used Mitchell's argument that "leadership is intrinsically and fundamentally valuational" (Mitchell, 1991, p. 66), "through its regard for affect, motives, attitudes, beliefs, values, ethics, will, commitment, norms, and responsibilities" (Hodgson, 1994, p. 69). All of these are traits found within a leader or a follower. They do not speak to the interactive dynamic between leaders and collaborators out of which the leadership process emanates. The traits may be present within the leader and collaborators, they may help

facilitate the relational dynamic, but the traits are not the dynamic nor are they leadership.

According to Rost, leadership is a dynamic that arises out of noncoercive interaction between leaders and collaborators. Leadership is the process: it is *how* that process is done that determines its virtue, not the content of the changes nor is it the traits that may be demonstrated by leaders and collaborators. To say that “Leadership is intrinsically and fundamentally ‘valuational’ through its regard for affect, motives, attitudes, beliefs, values, ethics, will, commitment, norms, and responsibilities” (Mitchell, 1991, p. 66) suggests that leadership is objectified, is a tool, a skill or a trait by which someone can affect others. When the above conclusion is coupled with Hodgson’s statement that “one of the few points of consensus within the current academic study of leadership is the identification of leadership as a moral activity”(p. 69), the content orientation to his fundamental understanding of leadership comes more clearly to light.

As demonstrated in the last section, the results and consequences of the leadership dynamic may be moral but the activity of leadership does not depend upon content or consequence. For Rost “The process defines both the nature of leadership and its ethical integrity” (Rost, p. 155). Leadership’s ethical integrity is concerned with the process by which mutual purposes evolve not with whether or not they are accomplished. Nor is leadership known by the use of good, ethical or moral traits employed by the actors

within the process. Thus, there cannot be moral leadership, or good or bad leadership, there can only be leadership which arises out of the “multi-directional influence and mutuality” of the leaders and collaborators. “The ethics of the leadership process requires that the leaders and followers use influence in their interactions to achieve this mutuality. All other behaviors are unethical in a leadership relationship (Rost, 1991. p. 161). It is the process that determines leadership, not the ethical or moral value of the consequence or the trait.

Hodgson the Pragmatist

Hodgson’s pragmatic approach to moral theory and leadership and his confusion of leadership with leader have prevented his embrace of non-consequential process in defining leadership. In fact Hogdson never provided the reader with a definition of leadership.

Until leadership scholars are able to disengage the idea of leadership from trait theory and dependence on content, they will continue to be wedded to the industrial paradigm. Clearly stated: leadership is the process, it is ethical only if there is adherence to noncoercive process. As long as scholars and practitioners view leadership as being dependent upon accomplishment or consequence for its recognition, they will be unable to fully embrace the values inherent in the postindustrial paradigm. Leadership will be mired in the values, images and metaphors of management.

Hodgson demonstrated this point very clearly when he ended his article by stating that it was the “leader [who has] a particular responsibility to protect the rights and dignity of individuals, to regard their agency, and to understand the cultural context in which human beings chose their actions. Such is the essence of leadership’s moral dimension” (p. 75). For Hodgson and many other leadership scholars, the metaphors, images and values representative of hierarchy, control over and displacement of personal responsibility still reign within their language and consciousness. For the serious leadership scholar, the question that arises is: Are these authors aware of the inconsistencies they are propounding?

Conclusion and Clarification of the Issue

Why are scholars like Kouzes and Posner and Hodgson returning to (and in some cases remaining with) the great man/great woman and trait theories of leadership (Blanchard, Zigarmi & Nelson, 1993; Lewis & Jobs, 1993; Perkins, 1994; Potter & Fiedler, 1993; Wills, 1994)? I would suggest that these authors are in a quandary as to how to fulfill the deeper wants of those involved within organizations. These scholars equate the process of leadership with the content of what a leader does to others. Many follow Kouzes and Posner in their thinking that by calling for more credible leaders (traits), good leadership will occur and the constituents’ complaints will be silenced. However, as I have demonstrated, the industrial model and

paradigm does not allow for, and in fact thwarts, the possibility of fulfilling the deeper humanizing values for which the constituents have been clamoring. This is so because the value system, language, and organizational models (with their underlying metaphors) reflect a unilateral, bottom line and power over value system--a model that reigns in the consciousness of our culture. The industrial paradigm with its concomitant values, metaphors, language and images is not designed for the soundness of the human being, but for the utility of the organization and its rulers.

Language, Metaphors, Paradigms and Leadership

Introduction

The concepts that govern our thought are not just matters of the intellect. They also govern our everyday functioning, down to the most mundane details. Our concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people. (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p. 3)

This review of the leadership literature has demonstrated the influence of the industrial paradigm upon consciousness, language, attitudes and behaviors. If we are to clear up the confusion about the nature of leadership, one thing that must be done is to discard the remnant images embedded in the metaphors of the industrial paradigm. Expanding the vocabulary (language) used by scholars and practitioners alike will enhance

the conscious, unconscious and metaphorical models through which we view the world. Broadening our language and speech patterns to reflect values that are more inclusive, collaborative and influential is an essential step toward objectivication of the postindustrial paradigm (Berger, 1967).

Presence of mind in choosing the vocabulary we use will help us to cohere with the values many future-oriented scholars and practitioners see as imminent within the coming millennium. Our language must be ameliorated to include and reflect values that enable cohesion (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980) with our culture, language and actions. But more importantly inclusion of postindustrial values into our conscious thought patterns, as conveyed by our everyday conversations, will help to bridge the transition from the industrial paradigm to the imminent arrival of the new millennium and a paradigm grounded in influential and noncoercive relationships. To that end it is now appropriate to have a more complete discussion of metaphors and paradigms; two linguistic constructions that are at once descriptive of our lives and prescriptive of our thinking.

Barker's Attempt

The leadership literature is woefully deficient in the discussion of metaphors. Except for Barker's (1992) *Future Edge: Discovering the New Paradigms for Success*, and Clancy's (1989) *The Invisible Powers*, I was unable to uncover any current substantive works that explore the effects of language, metaphor and paradigms on leadership. Johnson's (1990) *Business*

Buzzwords is simply a compilation of business buzzwords and certainly is not a serious academic endeavor.

Barker's work is concerned mostly with reinforcing the industrial paradigm. He provided the reader with an overview of Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Kuhn (1970) but was unable to break through to a new paradigm for business. He never defined leadership. Instead, within the section entitled "And Now About Leadership" he defined leader: "A leader is a person you will follow to a place you wouldn't go by yourself" (p. 163). In relying heavily on Bennis (1990) Barker is yet another author who has identified leadership with a leader.

Barker attempted to supply the reader with a future orientation when he provided a cookbook approach with "three keys to the future" (p. 7). These consist of (1) anticipation, (2) innovation, and (3) excellence. Each one of these keys is geared toward maintaining control over one's business environment. He focused on innovation and anticipation by conveying anecdotal stories supporting his insistence that change is happening and people need to be aware of it because "you can and should shape your own future. Because, if you don't someone else surely will" (p. 20). Barker has reinforced the elemental qualities in the industrial paradigm: fear, power over others and control. Interestingly enough the values of self preservation, security, safety and survival reinforced by Barker are inherent within the most basic phase of the development in consciousness (Hall, 1986, p. 58).

Kohlberg characterizes this stage as the pre-conventional level of development (Kohlberg, 1981).

Barker and the Idea of Paradigm

Barker provided an inadequate and simplistic overview of the idea of paradigm. This was evidenced when he suggested that an individual can create and shift a paradigm: "You don't have to be a paradigm shifter to get all the advantages. Just being a paradigm pioneer is sufficient" (p. 78). Here the great man, unitary leader vision creeps out in Barker's thought. Suggesting that a reality as complex as a paradigm can be changed by one individual elicits images of the strong, independent leader who will save all of us by his or her actions. For Barker even if one does not shift the paradigm, just being a "pioneer" will be enough to reinforce another value of the industrial purview, namely, individualistic advantage.

For Barker the import of shifting metaphors and paradigms lies only in consequence and having more control. Barker's attempted clarification of the importance of image, metaphor and language in leadership studies is dismal. The serious scholar would do better to read Kuhn (1970) and Lakoff and Johnson (1980) in their original works.

Clancy's Powerful Journey

Even though Clancy's (1989) offering is fundamentally concerned with business rather than leadership, he provided the reader with a very thorough

exploration of the effect metaphor has on consciousness, behavior and organizational structure. Clancy provided an historical approach seeking to uncover the dominate metaphors used within business. He used four arbitrary time divisions: (1) the Industrial Revolution, 1770-1905; depicted as "the period that remade our world into an industrial civilization." (2) World War I and the Great Depression, 1905-1941, a period in which "very large organizations such as Ford and General Motors were created"; (3) post World War II, 1941 up to the oil crisis of the 1970s which stood as a period that "was marked by the dominance of U. S. industry, which stood largely without competitors after the war"; and (4) 1975-present in which "U. S. industry lost its preeminence and was forced to compete strenuously with foreign competitors" (pp. 29-32). Clancy used these four divisions to demonstrate the "shift in metaphorical use over time" (p. 29).

By demonstrating the shift in metaphorical use Clancy provided the reader with six prime metaphors used by business leaders within the above four time periods. These six prime metaphors fall into two classes according to Clancy, "descriptions of processes (journey, game, war) and descriptions of systems (machine, organism, society)" (p. 33).

The interest in Clancy's work for the leadership scholar lies in both the effect metaphor has upon thought, actions and structures within society, and in the development of the idea of entailment of leadership as it is found in the metaphor of a journey. Relying heavily upon Lakoff and Johnson (1980),

Clancy described entailment as “the relationships and concepts that the metaphor brings to mind--that determine its power and richness” (p. 27).

The lover thought of as a red, red rose conjures up the images of youth, beauty, fragility, and freshness. . . . The idea of entailments explains a puzzle: How can we use quite different metaphors--sensibly--to describe the same thing? We would all be comfortable with describing an argument as a journey (the argument is *proceeding*), a container (points *in* the argument), or a building (*constructing* an argument). We can do this because these quite different metaphors share a key entailment--in this case, the entailment of a surface. (A journey describes a surface along its path, and a container has surfaces, as does a building.) In this way, we find the complete consistency across metaphors is quite rare, but coherence, in the sense of shared entailments, is typical. Our minds appear comfortable with this coherence and ignore the substantial inconsistencies. (P. 28)

In his research Clancy selected the business speech of forty-three businessmen over the past 200 years to determine the most widely used metaphors. Clancy discovered that “just six metaphors [were] by far the most commonly used (in order): journey, machine, organism, war, game and society” (p. 29).

The entailment of leadership is tied to the metaphors of all three process metaphors; journey, game and war and to only one systems

metaphor, i. e., society (p. 31). The importance of this for leadership scholars becomes clear in that the use of the process metaphor of journey by the actors surveyed by Clancy was the highest in the time period from 1905-1941 (64%). This was the time period of great industrialization within this country, the time of the development of huge industrial organizations such as Ford, General Motors, and General Foods. This was the time of Taylorism and assembly-line production when the human being was expected to fit the machine and produce like a machine in as predictable manner as possible. This was an era in which what was good for General Motors was good for America. The presence and influence of large corporations on the American culture and psyche were immense. It is during this time that the entailment of leadership became identified with the prominent values of the industrial era.

The Journey Metaphor in Industry

One of the great industrialists of this period, Henry Ford, saw his life as "not a location, but a journey" (Ford, 1923, p. 43). Alfred Sloan used the metaphor of a journey when speaking about General Motors as the Depression approached: "Before it was realized what was happening, this great ship of ours was in the midst of a terrific storm" (Sloan, 1965, p. 437). And, according to Clancy, C. M. Chester of General Foods, in a speech entitled "The Great Highway" in October of 1936, "pictures American business as journeying on the Great Highway, always making progress (this,

recall, in the midst of the Great Depression)" (Clancy, 1989, p. 38). In Chester's view: "the road rapidly has been getting wider, straighter, smoother and brighter than ever" (Chester, 1936-37).

The entailments of the journey metaphor are myriad. A journey has a goal, a purpose. A journey suggests a vehicle of some sort, for instance, a ship. There is a course which one must travel if on a journey. One may follow a path. The path will take the traveller where he or she wants to go. Clancy made the point that a very important entailment of the journey metaphor is that of the sea voyage.

We think of treasure ship or commercial cargo voyages--activities whose purpose is to produce wealth. Linked to this idea is the entailment of difficulty, even the peril of an undertaking. There is always the possibility of catastrophic failure: breakdown, shipwreck, and destruction. The "crash" of 1929 embodies this idea--a great journey come a cropper (Clancy, p. 39).

Images of strong captains who pilot their vessel to safe shores are elicited from the entailment of a sea voyage. These are men (and I use this word decidedly) in whom we can place our trust because of their expertise, strength, wisdom and confidence. We see them as strong men of character, leaders who are able to keep the crew in shape, in line, fit, and disciplined and their vessels seaworthy. The leadership entailment emerging from and reflecting the metaphor of a journey makes perfect sense for the industrialist.

We immediately conjure up the idea of a strong, knowledgeable leader in whom we must put our trust, the related idea of a close-knit team, and the necessity for harmony and cooperation. These are all important features of a successful modern business and are a constant challenge to those less successful. The modern business concepts of teamwork and management leadership fit very comfortably with this entailment of the voyage metaphor. (Clancy, 1989, p. 40)

Clancy's description of leadership demonstrates his view of leadership as an entailment of the industrial paradigm, complete with the metaphors, images and values of a singular leader who has power over and commands others. Clancy's description of the leadership entailment of the journey metaphor demonstrates to the leadership scholar and practitioner how important it is to be aware of the language used if we wish to cohere with the postindustrial paradigm. By using metaphors and entailments that cohere with industrial values and purposes, the leadership scholar or practitioner will reinforce the images of the industrial paradigm in the minds of people. The use of industrial metaphors when describing leadership confuses the purposes and values of leadership with the purposes and values of the industrial era.

Purpose for Industrialists

For the industrialists of the post World War I era, the "purpose of business *was* to produce wealth. It was taken as a matter of immutable law,

akin to a revelation of science or theology" (Clancy, 1989, p. 213). Alfred Sloan stated that "It is the strategic aim of a business to earn a return on capital" (Sloan, 1985, p. 49). The values, images, metaphors and language of the positional leaders at that time cohered with their purposes; namely, to fulfill personal happiness by being wealthy.

Just as the values, metaphors and language of the industrial paradigm were present within the consciousness of the industrialists during the wealth gathering era, so too, the values, metaphors and language reflective of the postindustrial era must be present within leaders of the rapidly approaching millennium. Leadership scholars and practitioners must use the images, metaphors and language that cohere with the impending paradigmatic shift. The discouraging thing, however, is that even insightful authors such as Clancy unwittingly reinforce the metaphors and entailments of the industrial paradigm.

Clancy's historical approach provided the reader with a very good developmental perspective and the sense of dynamism that is present within the language, images and metaphors we use. However, his inability to shuck off the images of the industrial paradigm has frustrated the effectiveness of this work for leadership scholars.

Lakoff and Johnson: The Effect of Metaphor

In describing the concept of a metaphor, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) stated that: "*The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one*

kind of thing in terms of another" (p. 5). And in describing the effect metaphor has on a culture, Lakoff and Johnson put it concisely: "The most fundamental values in a culture will be coherent with the metaphorical structure of the most fundamental concepts in the culture" (p. 22). In other words, "our values are not independent but must form a coherent system with the metaphorical concepts we live by" (p. 22). Metaphors frame not only the way we perceive and act in the world, but they affect the meanings connected with our perceptions and actions. Metaphors are like rose colored eye glasses in that when one wears them one sees the world with a rose tint. When one takes them off, the world may have the same outlines, but the color, tint and hue are different. The solid objects may look the same but their color and nuance are quite different.

If metaphors color our world view, then a paradigm sculpts and models the world in which we are engaged. A paradigm can be characterized as a model, that is to say, that when we talk about a paradigm we are talking about a model. For instance, when we talk about the industrial paradigm we are describing our society in terms that reflect the values and structures of the scientific and industrial revolutions of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The epistemologies of the scientific and industrial revolutions insist that knowledge, truth and value could only be known if they are objectively (read empirically) verified. Furthermore the strict organizational

structures of the time have been designed to fulfill the production needs of the developing neophyte industrial complex.

The scientific and industrial revolutions changed the way people view what it means to live in the human community. This revolution in thought shifted what was of central importance in life. The rise and embrace of bureaucratically structured organizations changed whose hands the scepter of authority would reside. No longer would the authority reside in a monarch enthroned by the right of God. Nor would the human community exclusively turn toward the most powerful institution on the face of the earth, the Roman Church for validation in ethical and moral affairs.

From now on the human community would be informed by the rise of the liberal thought of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The empirical revolution, with its insistence on the scientific method, where "on one side the observer; on the other, reality--and separating them, a mediating method which serves as a neutral filter between the two" (Roszak, 1973, p. 147), was developed in order that humankind would no longer be dependent upon outside intervention, viz., faith or God. Rather, the empiricist's and industrialist's vision was that humankind would have "that discipline in which taste, inspiration, and intuition do not *prove* anything and are, in themselves, insufficient to constitute knowledge" (p. 142) value or worth. The empirical method would determine truth, value and worth and "in this way we achieve *objectivity*" (p. 150). Empirical objectivity insures the mode

of consciousness in which, as Bacon said: “the mind itself be from the very outset not left to take its own course, but be guided at every step, and the business be done as if by machinery”(Bacon, 1870, p. 40).

The scientific and industrial revolutions sought to have control over nature itself by objectifying how knowledge is attained. Objectifying attainment of knowledge was embraced in such a dramatic fashion that the empirical method became “*the* means of knowing, or *only* means of knowing. And those who speak from any other stance are to be dismissed as offering us what Bacon called ‘but so many stage-plays, representing worlds of their own creation after an unreal and scenic fashion’ (Bacon, 1870, p. 757)” (Roszak, 1973, p. 150).

The organizations that developed during the industrial and scientific revolutions were quite similar in structure to the Roman Church, and the existing monarchies, as these were the preeminent organizations of the time. And curiously enough, these models fit very well into the mindset of the empiricist and industrialist because the hierarchical form allowed and, in a sense, demanded decisions from those on top on what was to be done, how it was done and how valuable what was being done would be. The few methodologists set the values of an age.

Industrial Age Metaphors Revisited

The metaphors which emerged from the industrial paradigm describe organizations as hierarchical, linear and authoritarian. These values are

easily exemplified as a pyramid. The use of the image of a pyramid as a metaphor specifies a certain place for each member in the pyramid, with supreme authority ensconced on the top, whether it be deity, pontiff, governor or CEO. Supporting the institutional organization, whether it be ecclesiastical or industrial, was mandated by not only the figurative metaphor but by the everyday language of people. As mentioned above, the language used within a metaphor is an entailment. For example there were overseers such as the holy see, who had fathers superior, pastors and rectors who watched over their flock of people. The monarchy borrowed from the church and had lord high chancellors or the lords of the estates. The language was patriarchal, which reinforced authority and dependence of the common person upon authority. There were entailments of authority such as father, son, child, master, laborer, manager and apprentice, who, as a dependent person asked for permission from "father" or one's superior. The subordinate was then either granted or denied permission from on high.

In industry the main purpose of the pyramidal, authoritarian organization has been to support a linear assembly line production in service of profit for those who are in the upper positions of the company and the stakeholders. The goal and *raison d'être* for industry have been concerned with only the production of a product and the accumulation of profit, to obtain an external and objective worth. The commonly accepted idea of believing that a human's purposes, goals and meanings can only be known

and realized objectively is a direct outgrowth of the rise of seventeenth and eighteenth century science. Where knowledge and meaning are reduced to objective quantities that exist apart from the human being (Roszak, 1973, p. 146).

Scientific management parallels hard science in that its concerns are also objective in nature. Scientific management is concerned with power over others with an eye to controlling nature and its results. Science's

supreme virtue . . . is that it allow an objective knowledge to be distilled and so accumulated over time. . . . Once we agree there is a form of knowledge that can be distilled without loss, we should be aware of the crucial step we are taking. We are agreeing that it is no loss to the scientist personally or to the culture generally to strip human thought of its most intimately personal qualities--its ethical vision, its metaphysical resonance, its existential meaning. . . . We are [thus] legitimizing an act of depersonalization, a censorship of those very qualities of mind and spirit which have always been regarded as indispensable to the health of culture. (Roszak, 1973, p. 146)

With the rise of the empirical and industrial paradigm has come an "objective knowing [that] gives a new assemblyline system of knowledge, one which relieves us of the necessity to integrate what we study into a moral or metaphysical context which will contribute existential value" (p. 157).

Assembly line knowledge is divisive, nonrelational and isolate in nature. Its

dominant metaphor is that of a machine, predictable and tyrannical in that humans lose their “capacity to act and speak together” (Arendt, 1993, p. 23). A characteristic of assembly lines (and assembly line thinking) is that they rest on “isolation--on the isolation of the tyrant from his subjects and the isolation of the subjects from each other through mutual fear and suspicion [which] contradicted the essential human condition of plurality, the acting and speaking together (p. 22). Tyranny Arendt concluded “generates, in other words, impotence” (p.22). Besides impotence, tyrannical behavior brought the control and isolation of knowledge for the sake of production. In a recent exposé in the *Los Angeles Times Magazine* on the industrial war complex, D’Antonio (1994) related that:

The uranium miners at the Chapter House in Red Valley remember spending long days in the excavations breathing cool air that was filled with invisible, odorless radon gases. They recall eating their lunches in deep tunnels that branched in every direction and ended in large caverns where the “working face” was broken with tools and explosives. They drank the water that trickled out of exposed underground springs, and some went home to houses built from the radioactive rocks discarded from the mines. “We didn’t know what we were mining was for the military or the atomic bombs,” says former miner Kelewood Yazzie, who is now almost 70. “We knew that production counted. That was it.” (p. 17)

The symbols exemplified in the metaphors of the industrial paradigm structure our thought, actions and possibilities. D'Antonio provided an example of this in his description of a town near the Hanford atomic weapons plant in Washington state, which

became the world's largest nuclear complex after World War II, with nine reactors that turned the fuel from Ohio into plutonium, which was then refined and set along the atomic trail to be fashioned into bombs. The community surrounding Hanford, known as the Tri-Cities, takes pride in its Cold War role. One of the cities, Richland, was built by the government and *embraced its image as an atomic city*. People there still bowl at Atomic Lanes and shop at Atomic Foods. The Richland high school teams--the Bombers--still use the mushroom cloud as an insignia and, until recently, the symbol of the atom adorned the granite pillars at the entrance to the Richland cemetery. (p. 20, emphasis added)

These metaphors and images limit personal insight because their representations continually reduce knowing, value and worth to empirically and objectively provable facts, facts that are provable only by the methodologist. The metaphors of this model reinforce dependence upon the experts in the empirical method to provide the facts. They reinforce the myth that empirical science and its methodologists will use the knowledge they discover for "bright hopes and humanitarian intentions" (Roszak, 1973, p.

134). But in a most tyrannical manner, these metaphors reinforce dependence upon outside authority as determining what is good and valuable.

Though the Atomic Energy Commission assured the public that all was right at Hanford in the late '40s and early '50s, roughly 1 million curies of radiation were being released into the environment. Scientists have already determined that the Bailies and their neighbors, who lived directly across the Columbia River from Hanford, probably received the largest dose of radiation that left the site. It came in the air they breathed, the water they used to irrigate their farms, the local food they ate. Throughout its 40-plus years, Hanford technicians tested all of the "pathways," which carried the contamination to the human body, and found radiation in every one. No warnings were ever issued. (p. 20)

Said Bailie:

"We were like guinea pigs I was given thyroid exams in school. And thousands of kids were put through whole body counters so they could check for radiation. Where are they now that people are sick?"

In the early 1980s, Bailie began to collect stories about deformed animals, stillbirths and cancers, and he began asking questions about Hanford. Activists from as far away as Spokane and Seattle joined the debate, *met by intense opposition from Tri-Cities residents who'd*

drawn their identity from the atom and placed their faith in government assurances about the reactors' safety. (p. 20, emphasis added)

Obtaining and controlling an external objective became the central value reinforced by the industrial world view. The determination of the value of the external objective resided in methodologists whose value system itself is only known in relation to the method by which it is achieved, that is through an external method of verification. For the industrialist or the empiricist, what is more factual than high production and the "bottom line"?

In concluding my thoughts on metaphors and the industrial paradigm I would like to point out that it is interesting that Ignatius of Loyola used the words *companions* and *company* synonymously when referring to the members of the Society of Jesus (the Jesuits), who were dedicated to working with the poor and enhancing people's lives through caring for the sick, education and the love of God. Perhaps this gives one some insight into why organizations spawned by the industrial revolution and modeled after the church and monarchies also became known as companies. The organizational structure used by the Society of Jesus was very effective in accomplishing its mission of helping the poor, educating and civilizing society. Perhaps what we have then is a true mixing of metaphors. When we consider that the *raison d'être* of most companies (and industry, in general) has not been to civilize but to obtain personal (read corporate) happiness and

fiscal success, by controlling others to obtain a personally desired object or goal it is an ironic twist of fate that the hierarchical structure used by the church and the monarchies--the same structure the liberal philosophers of the seventeenth and eighteenth century were rebelling against--fit their own purposes so well that they reinstituted that very same structure within the new industrial paradigm they were constructing.

Paradigm: Its Meaning and Effect

As stated earlier, a paradigm is a model in that it allows people to see and gain insight into something as amorphous as, for instance, the structure of a society. A paradigm provides an easily graspable description. A model is the skeletal structure, the bare bones, as it were, of how, in this instance, a society is structured and how people should act in it.

A paradigm is similar to a model in that, it represents the complexity of, for instance, an airplane, in a simple form that can be picked up, looked at and studied, although perhaps not in particular detail. But a model gives enough detail to gain an insight into its important elements. Paradigm and model, however, differ in that a paradigm stands for the "entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques . . . shared by a . . . community" (Kuhn, 1970, p. 175). A paradigm includes not only the skeletal structure but the emotional and societal elements present within the entity it conveys. Thus, to say that our society is based on the industrial paradigm not only describes the skeletal organization of our society, i. e., the model, but a paradigm speaks to

our emotional, affective, value and belief systems that are shared within society (Kuhn, 1970). In this instance the industrial paradigm reinforces the values of security, status quo, power as power over others, leadership as great men/women doing great things, leadership as doing the leader's wishes and leadership as achieving goals (Rost, 1993b, pp. 6-7)

A paradigm includes not only the skeleton, but the inner marrow of the bone out of which the skeleton emerges and is formed. A paradigm includes not only the sinews, blood vessels, muscle and flesh of society, but also its heart, soul and emotion.

As with people, paradigms do not change easily. Because they are social constructions of reality, the consciousness, images, metaphors and language of society must begin to change before a paradigmatic shift may occur.

The above critique of the industrial paradigm is intended to raise our awareness and consciousness of how impactful this model has been upon our lives and our culture. It is not intended to imply that the empirical and industrial models are inherently evil.ⁱⁱ We could not survive today without the industrial and scientific paradigms. However, these paradigms are limited and will not provide all the solutions to problems and dilemmas that are already present and that are still to come. People must begin to embrace other models and paradigms in conjunction with the industrial model that is now dominate.

Critical Theory: A Seque to a New Paradigm

Within leadership studies it is perhaps the critical theorists who have provided a pair of lenses that clarify and make more coherent the values and metaphors people use. The critical theorists have provided an acceptable alternative purview and language within the leadership literature.

The critical theorists clearly embrace values suggestive of the postindustrial paradigm. They embrace values of self-understanding, rational and emotive self-clarity, where the self is not isolate but “recognizes the interdependence of people” (Blackmore, 1989, p.120). The values embraced by the critical theorists are communal and inclusive in nature. The fundamental values of inclusion cohere with the metaphorical structure of the fundamental concepts within the postindustrial paradigm. The coherence of language with the metaphors people live by brings clarity to the lives of both leaders and constituents. Coherence of language and metaphor is the first step in bringing a richer meaning to life and making work worth doing so that work is not simply a means by which constituents earn their livelihood (Fay, 1987, p. 70). Work rather becomes more fulfilling of those habits that humanize us, that make us more human.

Humanizing habits are like any other habit. They must be practiced before they are of use. To be more human we must regularly exercise our capacity to know. A coherent metaphor with this capacity in postindustrial

leadership is collaboration, in that collaboration suggests active engagement with another to give and gain knowledge. An important way we know is in context with others, by interacting and investigating, collaborating and accomplishing (Dewey, 1963).

The use of our will in choosing to love another or in treating each person as valuable by respect for his or her humanizing abilities is another capability we must practice habitually. The metaphor of influence suggests give and take in a freedom that necessitates viewing each other as valuable and worth engagement. By valuing each other's thoughts and ideas, even in disagreement, with no sense of fear, reprisal or rejection if disagreement does indeed arise, the operative elements necessary for an influential relationship exist. There is a sense of respect here that is very akin, though not equal to, love. Love by its very nature is freeing of the persons involved. It is noncoercive, and people in love realize disagreements are not separating phenomena but rather are opportunities to promote growth and change, two more humanizing values and habits that are part and parcel of the postindustrial paradigm.

Leadership metaphors that are expressive of an era that is postindustrial by nature and whose values broaden the narrative of human engagement do so by *valuing* the human person. Leadership metaphors of the postindustrial paradigm no longer perpetuate isolation, alienation or

divisiveness; all resultants of only recognizing value as residing in what Roszak called objective knowledge.

Objective knowing gives a new assemblyline system of knowledge, one which relieves us of the necessity to integrate what we study into a moral or metaphysical context which will contribute existential value. We need no longer waste valuable research time and energy seeking for wisdom or depth, since these are qualities of the person. We are free to become specialists, and then, as impersonal researchers, we need only worry about being well informed (in our field), well bibliographed (in our field), and correct (in our field). (Roszak, p. 157, 1970)

The metaphors explicit in the understanding of leadership that is grounded in the postindustrial paradigm, broaden the narrative of human engagement. By reflecting the values eminent in the postindustrial paradigm, leadership (devoid of the limitations inherent within the management paradigm, a paradigm that enforces isolation, exploitation and manipulation of the worker) imbues free interaction, cooperation, collaboration and liberates "humans from forms of life which are inherently misguided and oppressive (Fay, 1987, p. 71). The continual confusing of the metaphors of management with leadership misguides and oppresses people by perpetuating false consciousness among both leaders and constituents.

Along with other scholars, the critical theorists have been unidisciplinary in their investigation into the nature of leadership. They write about educational leadership and administration rather than leadership as a transdisciplinary phenomenon (Foster, 1986; Maxcy, 1992). Even though he limited his investigation to his specific discipline, Maxcy (1992), for example, saw a need to change the language used within leadership studies in order that there be more coherence in metaphor and experience.

What is required is a new 'map' of language, in particular what Deleuze calls 'order-words,' operating from deep-seated human speech. The relationship between linguistic statements and the act of leadership would then be seen as internal and immanent (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 79). Every statement is related to implicit presuppositions. (p. 134)

Although Maxcy's emphasis on educational leadership and administration limited his ability to speak to the nature of leadership within a transdisciplinary frame, many of the values Maxcy and other critical theorists enlist are congruent with gaining a deeper insight into the nature of leadership (Fay, 1987; Foster, 1989). Furthermore, the values the critical theorists embrace speak not only to superficial behaviors which could be characterized as traits, but rather they speak to deeper structural changes in organizations and the metaphors that help form our consciousness.

Reality: Alternative Views

In order to begin to write within a different frame using alternative metaphors, scholars must recognize dissimilar frames for viewing reality (Castaneda, 1968, 1971; Gilligan, 1982; Harman, 1988; Jones, 1982; Lincoln, 1985b). Scholars first need to recognize that a purview grounded solely upon a narrow view of functional rationality will only reinforce the product of a narrow rationality: namely, a narrow functional enactment of life. Relying simply upon a narrowly conceived and linear form of rationality that is part and parcel of the industrial paradigm reinforces tautological thinking and, by definition, an inability for divergent thinking and creativity (Walters, 1990, p. 455). In short, a form of rationality that is solely analytic and not synthetic limits our ability to reframe the current problems within our society (p. 455). The same solutions to reoccurring problems most likely will result in reoccurring problems (p. 457).

A good example of an author who provided leadership scholars with a fundamentally different model, frame and metaphor when approaching organizational reality is Margaret Wheatley (1992). Wheatley's concisely written, practically grounded and theoretically enticing book demonstrates the effects the new science of quantum physics has had on people's view of the world. She gave her readers a glimpse into a view of reality not hindered by the need for power, control and order. It is one of the few works in the

field of leadership that provides both practitioner and scholar a segue into the imminent postindustrial paradigm by providing new metaphors.

Wheatley supplied many practical examples in support of her insights. Her example of participative management is salient in its clarity and meaningfulness to both business leader and academic alike. Her grasp of contingency management theory (Hunt, 1985; Morgan, 1986) and beyond (Weick, 1985) became clear when she questioned the motives underlying participative management. Besides reflecting "a current business trend," Wheatley asks if participative management "is merely a more sophisticated way to manipulate workers?" (p. 143). Or does this movement somehow, because of the unified field theory in quantum physics, reflect or express a more basic heuristic--the heuristic of the fundamental relational quality that exists throughout nature and is thus demonstrated in some manner by our organizational behavior (p. 143)? In short, Wheatley gives leadership scholars and practitioners a new and viable frame on which to begin to enact and objectivate (Berger, 1967) the values expressed in the postindustrial paradigm (Kuhn, 1970; Rost, 1991).

Wheatley enables us to see the efficaciousness of Lincoln and Guba's view that, "Constructions held by people are born out of their experience with and interaction with their contexts. Indeed, the tie is so close that one can easily argue . . . that constructions 'create' the context" (1989, p. 60).

As individuals and as a society, are we perpetuating our ineffective context by not releasing our previous constructions? By not releasing our current social constructions of reality, are we perpetuating our ineffective context? I believe we are. The perpetuation of our ineffective context necessitates holding on to our current social constructs. One of the ways we can escape this tautology is to look into the *nature* of the phenomenon of leadership. Most scholars acknowledge that leadership exists. Yet, because most scholars are limited by not only their disciplinary context, but by the fundamental paradigm out of which they view reality, they have not yet been able systematically to explore and discuss the *nature* of leadership. They are caught in a tautology.

Leadership as Transdisciplinary

The concepts that govern [and limit] our thought are not just matters of the intellect. They also govern our everyday functioning, down to the most mundane details. Our concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people.
(Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p.3)

Rost's (1991) exploration into the nature of leadership is the most thorough attempt to date at investigating the *nature* of leadership. This work goes beyond the limitation of 18th century liberal philosophy which enforced the ethic of the industrial revolution and the industrial paradigm.

Furthermore, Rost's definition is clear, and concise, and has described the leadership dynamic as an interactive process that is not limited by behavioral, psychological, trait or disciplinary categories. "*Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and their collaborators who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes*" (Rost, 1993, p. 99). Rost has dared to go where no one else has gone. He has dared to describe the heuristic of a very complex phenomenon: the *nature* of leadership. Because Rost's definition is not limited by behavioral, psychological or disciplinary categories, his definition of leadership can be characterized as describing leadership as transdisciplinary.

In order to gain a clearer understanding of the term transdisciplinary, I must turn to a metaphor I have been using for about three years. I have used this metaphor when I attempt to describe leadership as a process to people. The metaphor I use is that of *leadership as a good conversation*. In using the metaphor of a good conversation I have always been surprised at the ease with which most people assimilate the intellectual constructs and feel a sense of what leadership is as a dynamic. In what follows I am relying heavily on Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) description of the metaphor of a conversation for my explanation of leadership as transdisciplinary.

Leadership is like a good conversation. And like a good conversation, it is not dependent upon a certain discipline to exist. Yet like a good conversation, leadership can be recognized and occur within any discipline.

Lakoff and Johnson showed that within a good conversation “several dimensions of structure can be seen” (p. 77). The dimensions of structure present within a conversation include, but are not limited to, (1) participants, (2) parts, (3) stages, (4) linear sequence, (5) causation, and (6) purpose (p. 78).

Much as Lakoff and Johnson have done with the structural dimensions of a good conversation, Rost has pinpointed a coherence of structure within the leadership dynamic consisting of four essential elements or dimensions. The four structural dimensions of leadership, according to Rost, are that: (1) leadership is an influence relationship, (2) between leaders and collaborators, (3) who intend real change (4) that reflect their mutual purposes.

As with leadership, one could characterize a good conversation as being solely influential in nature. Within a good conversation, each participant is engaged in the conversation by his or her own free will with no fear of reprisal.

As with a good conversation, leadership as a dynamic has interactional properties. The change the leaders and collaborators intend must reflect their mutual purposes. That process cannot happen without some interactional process occurring which allows the leaders and collaborators to develop a mutual purpose. The noncoercive influential process helps the people in the leadership relationship to persuade each other regarding the mutuality of the

intended changes. Thus, leadership as a dynamic process is recognizable because of a coherence of structure characterized by four essential process values that are interactional and relational in nature.

As with a good conversation, defining the dynamic of leadership may well leave out some dimensions (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p. 77). A definition is the least we know about something (Israel, 1992). It is the structure out of which we are able to frame, understand and speak about the experience. A definition does not necessarily provide us with all the aspects that may emerge from certain interactive events. "There are many details that could be added that characterize conversation more precisely, but these six dimensions of structure give the main outlines of what is common to typical conversations" (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p. 78). The same may be said of the four dimensions of structure within the dynamic of leadership.

In speaking of an essential element of leadership as a dynamic relational process, Rost (1993) stated: "Leadership is a relationship that takes place during a specific change process. As a result, any time people do leadership, they are involved in a process that is bounded by time, subject matter, specific leaders and collaborators engaged in the process, place, and context" (p. 103). A good metaphor to describe this event is interaction. Even though we are bound by time, the coherent structure of the phenomenon is not *dependent* upon a certain discipline, i. e., context or language, but rather is dependent upon the dynamic of interaction. The coherent structure of

leadership is recognized across disciplines because it surpasses the limitations imposed by certain disciplines or certain individual traits or consequences even though for leadership to become a dimension of experience the background of the discipline “will typically serve as a background for understanding” the leadership dynamic (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p. 176).

As with a conversation, leadership occurs within a certain context; but as with a conversation a specific context is not necessary. For instance, leadership may occur sometimes within a group of sociologists or sometimes within a group of historians, but it is not necessary that in order for leadership to emerge and be recognized it only emerges or is recognized within one of these two disciplines. Leadership may emerge and be recognized within almost any activity, no matter what discipline is the background for the interaction, as long as the four interactional properties that comprise its coherence emerge within the gestalt.

Conclusion

Leadership as transdisciplinary perceives leadership as a dynamic process which transcends the limitations of any certain discipline. Leadership as transdisciplinary surpasses the limitations of language, metaphor and values within a specific discipline and creates a new framework and referent. The referent for leadership as transdisciplinary is

not the status quo. The referents for leadership are influence, collaborative interaction, pursuit of mutual purpose and intention for real, lasting and effective changes. In short the referent for leadership is a dynamic process, not static content or consequence. Leadership is a phenomenon that transcends the limitations of certain particular disciplines and yet it is recognized by and within each discipline. Leadership is transdisciplinary.

Metaphor, language, conversation and the transdisciplinary actuality of leadership are operative elements if one is to gain an insight into leadership as a phenomenon. This brief discussion of these elements in conjunction with the discussion of the limitations present within the current leadership literature will be of help to the reader in interpreting the narratives of the participants in this study.

ⁱ It is important to note that the idea of a good relationship may be applied to politics, business, education or virtually any other community. Healthy and good relationships exist not only in small groups but also within other large socially constructed realities.

ⁱⁱ How people use these models may not be for the good.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Overview

If it is true that “how you study the world determines what you learn about the world” (Patton, 1990, p 67), then the design of a study is paramount to the insights one will gain from that study.

In this study I am seeking to find if Rost’s definition of leadership reflects the lived experience of people, or if it prescribes what leadership should be. I am not seeking to discover a definition of leadership that has been “generated by logical deduction from *a priori* assumptions” (Patton, 1990, p. 66). Rather I am seeking to discover what the nature of leadership is as it is expressed in the lives and stories of people.

This inquiry into the nature of leadership is naturalistic and grounded in qualitative design. Naturalistic and qualitative inquiry maintains an “emphasis on inductive strategies of theory development” (p. 66). Contrary to theory development that is deductive, the inductive narrative gains insight into the experience of leadership by the stories the participants tell. These stories are reflections of an experience each has had and that each would consider to be leadership. The participants’ narration is not necessarily logical or linear, nor need it induce any certain end point, moral or definition.

The design and theory of this study is intended to take the researcher into the real world as the participants' recall it to be within their stories of leadership experiences. The researcher has been able to gain insight as a result of "a hermeneutic relation between experience and story, in which experience elicits the story, and the story articulates . . . experience" (Widdershoven, 1993, p. 9). It is through the articulation of the participants' experiences in the form of a story that the results and findings of this study are "grounded" in the experiences of the informants (Patton, 1990, p. 67).

Because I have sought to research what people's experience is within the leadership dynamic, this inquiry is phenomenologically based. This is to say that I have sought to discover the essence of the participants' experience of leadership. In this investigation I have sought to "probe into the richness of the human experience and to illuminate the complexity of individual perception and action" (Tesch, 1984).

To more fully illuminate the complexity of individual perception and action, the design for data collection took the form of stories told to the researcher by the informants. The narrative approach is intended to modify and enhance both the phenomenological focus and design of the project. In using the narrative approach for researching the phenomenon of leadership, the participant (by telling his or her story) led the researcher instead of the researcher leading the participant with interrupting research questions that may be extraneous to the experience the participant is recalling.

By eliciting their own feelings, emotions thoughts and reflections through the telling of their story, the storytellers place their story into context. To contextualize an experience is to bring the past into the present as the present moves into the future. Contextualizing an experience allows us to recall our lives as interconnected phenomenal events--events that are not isolated instances but rather meaningfully connected as if by an heuristic thread.

When a story is told about something that happened in the past, the event is revived, together with the thoughts and feelings that surrounded it. A story makes my past actions understandable by a re-enactment of the deliberations by which they were motivated. A story is a *reconstruction* of life, by which past experiences survive in a more pure way because the inessential is removed, so that only the essential remains. (Widdershoven, 1993, pp. 11 ff).

The use of stories told by informants has not only more fully contextualized the experiences of the informants, but it also serves to contextualize the purpose and usefulness of this project for both leadership scholars and practitioners. This is so because the meaning of the actions articulated within the participants' stories bring the actions experienced by the participants into relationship with a specific plot, which is, in this instance, leadership. It is well to note that a plot suggests a history and an outcome. Because history and outcome are referents, the meanings of the

actions become more explicit; they frame, as it were, the actions. The actions gain an identity, and as with personal identity, actions are “dependent on a mutual relation between lived experience on the one hand, and stories in which this experience is articulated on the other” to be meaningful. And as with personal identity, meaningful action “presupposes a felt unity of experience. This unity serves as a foundation for stories, which express experience and thus make its unity manifest” (Widdershoven, 1993, p. 8).

The narrative form provides the researcher and the practitioner the referents necessary to gain insight into the nature of leadership because stories bring meaning to the events of our lives and to our lives themselves. “According to Ricoeur (1990), the meaning of action is articulated in stories, which bring the action in relation to a specific plot, and thus make its meaning more explicit” (p. 8). The actions within the leadership phenomenon become more explicit and gain clearer meaning because of the context the story provides.

Design

To obtain people’s experiences of leadership in this project, I developed a research design that entails the following items. First, the study is qualitative in nature. The participants were interviewed and the data were analyzed by phenomenological and qualitative methods as set forth by Hycner (1982) and elaborated below.

Second, I selected five organizations that are varied in nature. One was Disney Development, the project development arm of Walt Disney Corporation, a multinational organization in the entertainment and recreation industry; another was the El Cajon Police Department, a small police force in San Diego county; a third was Intel Corporation, the largest computer chip developer and manufacturer in the world; the fourth was Woodbridge High School in Irvine, California, a suburban high school with a student population of about 2500; and the fifth was the San Diego State University College of Business.

I chose these organizations to gain insight into the variety of human experiences that are contextualized by diverse organizational settings. Furthermore, the researcher purposefully sampled these firms to provide “a wide range of variation on dimensions of interest” (Patton, 1990, p. 182). Specifically, I chose the Disney Development Corporation and Intel Corporation to provide an insight into the business community and the tacit effect the business context may have had on the participants’ experiences and narration of leadership. I chose the El Cajon Police Department to provide an insight into the public service sector and the tacit effect working within the public service sector may have had on the participants’ experiences and narration of leadership. And finally I chose San Diego State University and Woodbridge High School to provide an insight into the educational community and the tacit effect working within the educational

community may have had on the participants' experiences and narration of their experience of leadership.

Third, once permission was granted from each organization to do the research, I selected five people from each organization to interview. I interviewed the highest positional leader I was able to interview, two middle managers and three staff employees. If the CEO was unavailable, I interviewed the next highest ranking executive within the organization. This sampling was chosen to gain a wide variation in people's experiences of leadership, because I wanted to sample the experiences of people at the upper, middle and lower levels of each organization.

Population size within phenomenological research is varied. "The usual number of participants in a phenomenological study is between 10 and 15 persons, depending on the phenomenon to be researched; sometimes researchers work with only 6, or as many as 25 people" (Tesch, 1984). I interviewed a total of 25 people for this project. I selected an equal number of males and females who are as ethnically diverse as the available research population allowed. I traveled to the organizations to do these interviews on site. The interviews lasted for an hour to an hour and half. The data were transcribed, summarized, analyzed and compared to Rost's model of leadership.

The strategy in using the variation of sampling described above is aimed at "capturing and describing the central themes or principal

[similarities] that cut across” diverse organizational boundaries (Patton, 1990, p. 172). In this research I sought to find any common patterns that emerged from the variation in sampling of individuals within heterogeneous organizations.

Usefulness of This Study

This study is useful to both scholars and practitioners alike in that most studies on leadership focus upon a person: that is, leadership is often described as what one leader does to followers (Birnbaum, 1992; Conger, 1992; English, Frase, and Arhar, 1992; Kanter, Stein, and Jick, 1992). Furthermore, these studies essentially translate into the great man or trait theory of leadership and thus are, according to Burns (1978), fraught with problems in that “we must supplement our data on the ‘greats’ (national or local) with aggregative, cumulative data on the personal, social, and political influences operating on large numbers of sub leaders and followers” (p. 53).

In short, some previous studies about leadership ended up being idiosyncratic and thus limited. Burns believed that we can compensate for this limitation if we are able to “make inferences from data gathered at one level about phenomena at another level.” This would enable us to

partially at least, compensate for the noncomparability, unreliability, and narrow focus of the information we have on individual great leaders. Even more, we can hope to build the foundations of a more

general theory of the role of leadership in the processes of historical causation. (Burns, 1978, p. 53)

In order to build a more general theory and understanding of leadership, this study was

inductively derived from the study of the phenomenon it represents.

That is it is discovered, developed, and provisionally verified through systematic data collection and analysis of data pertaining to the phenomenon If the data upon which it is based are comprehensive and the interpretations conceptual and broad, then the theory should be abstract enough and include sufficient variation to make it applicable to a variety of contexts related to that phenomenon.

One does not begin with a theory, then prove it. Rather, one begins with an area of study and what is relevant to that area is allowed to emerge. (Strauss and Corbin, 1991, p. 23)

Because this is a phenomenologically based study, I was able to broaden the focus of the investigation from what an individual leader does to a follower to the experience of those involved within the phenomenon that is commonly called leadership. This study, in short, focuses on the dynamic process and not the actions of one person.

This investigation holds further significance because, in contrast to previous studies within the discipline of leadership theory and praxis, I did not attempt to define leadership (Burns, 1978; Morrison, 1992; Rost, 1991).

Nor did I ask individuals to provide their own definitions of leadership (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 1). Rather, I asked individuals to reflect upon and narrate, within the form of a story, a personal experience that each recognized and perceived to be an inner process that expressed the “critical behavior [which] enables us to establish and explain the references of mentalistic terms” (Koethe, 1976, p. 620), which in this case is leadership. To paraphrase Tesch (1984), this study sought to unpack the inner, subjective experience of the participants in order to gain an interpretive understanding of the event being investigated (p. 26).

Narrative Form as Data Collection

The recognition of the importance of narrative within the social sciences has become widespread. From the critical social scientists (Fay, 1987) to ethicists (MacIntyre, 1984); and from research methodologists (Lincoln & Guba, 1989, Josselson & Lieblich, 1993) to leadership scholars, (Burns 1978; Rost 1991), and theologians (Shea, 1980), researchers and academics alike have acknowledged the importance of placing one’s life in context in order to give identity, meaning and value to it. “Without my story, I have no identity. I do not know who I am, or what I am about. If you have no story, how do you know where you’re going: and if you’re going somewhere, how will you know when you get there?” (Downs, 1977, p. 66).

The development of fourth generation evaluation (Lincoln & Guba, 1989) has helped to cement an interactive and pseudo-narrative approach

within research. In using Lincoln and Guba's fourth generation methodology, the researcher must include all of the stakeholders and their concerns within the evaluative/research process. By including the stakeholders and their concerns, the researcher is able to place events within not only a temporal context, but also within cultural and situational contexts that have been given meaning by those involved. These reconstructions are derived directly from the accounts of the stakeholders and quite often are reported in a narrative form.

Strauss and Corbin (1991) developed a method of coding and interpreting data within the format of a story. However, they too, only use the narrative form as a method of analyzing the data and not as a method of data collection. They defined a story as "a descriptive narrative about the central phenomenon of the study" (p. 116). They further elaborated on clarifying the meaning and use of a story line as "the conceptualization of the story. This is the core category [or] the central phenomenon around which all other categories [such as the story line and coding of information] are integrated" (p. 116). Again, these methodologists utilized the story form for coding and interpretation of the data, not for data collection. The approach used by Strauss and Corbin is one of reporting by the researcher *about* an event within the past. It does not have the quality of relating an event that is brought to the present by the informant placing the event within a story form.

It is perhaps Jesselson and Lieblich (1993) who have come closest to using narrative as a method of data collection. In *The Narrative Study of Lives* Volume I, Jesselson and Lieblich have provided researchers with a method of gathering and analyzing data which is based on the narrative form. Their emphasis is on the life stories of individuals. They sought to place the individual's entire life within context to provide an interpretation of each one's life. They have been more concerned with an entire life's story than with a specific experience that is contextualized by preceeding and proceeding events and that is concerned with leadership in particular.

Most phenomenologically based studies have informants respond to questions generated by the researcher. But having an informant answer an interview question (or series of questions) is not telling a story (Ong, 1982). The purpose of answering a question is limited and framed by the question. The purpose of answering a question is to provide information within the context (frame) of the question. However, *telling* a story is not limited by the confines of a specific question. Rather telling a story brings forth the experience into the present so that it is conveyed as being dynamic and not as a static remembrance (Beane & Doty, 1976; Dunne, 1973; Eliade, 1963). In this study each participant was requested to simply tell the researcher, in the form of a story, an experience each one has had in her/his life that each would consider to be leadership. Other than requesting the story to be about

what the participant considered to be leadership, the researcher did not direct the narrative of the participant through leading questions.

The value of storytelling has long been acknowledged within theology (Breech, 1989) and in psychology and children's spirituality (Coles, 1989, 1990), but the dynamic use of this as a research method has not been advanced within leadership research. Rather the narrative structure and form have been applied to situations or theories and have been used to emphasize a truth, make a point, demonstrate a theory, or provide an interpretation.

Within leadership studies, the active use of the narrative or story form has not been used to gain phenomenological insight. This is to say that the respondent has not been asked to become the storyteller by orally conveying the story of the particular incident being investigated. "Stories swarm around us, seeking our attention. In a sense, everyone of us is a storyteller, for each of us is a medium for those swarming stories that demand to be told to our friends or family" (Ross, p. 57, 1972).

Previously researchers in leadership have not asked the respondent to view and describe their experience of a specific incident within the context and confines of a story. A story consists of a beginning, a middle and an end; the identification of a main character(s); identification and explication of a main theme or plot; and the narration of it as a lived and *remembered* event

which includes logical, emotional and conscious reflection of the outside criterion being experienced.

This approach brings the experience of the storyteller to the present. It allows the researcher not only to record the events but also to come in touch with the emotive and descriptive elements that are revealed by the story, "since [the] story is the only means by which the interpersonal reality of humankind can be expressed in its cognitive and affective fullness" (Bausch, 1984, p. 19).

In approaching leadership research by this method, the event being investigated--the outside criterion--is no longer *reported* but becomes a lived experience, a story that unveils existential meaning and insight into the phenomenon: "It is [the] story . . . that touch[es] us at our deepest levels and convince[s] us of truth" (Bausch, 1984, p. 11).

Methodology

The procedure for obtaining the participants' stories consisted of providing each of the participants with a written request to reflect upon an experience of leadership that is prominent in their memory and had been very influential in their lives. This written request was presented to the participants at least seven days prior to my interview with the participant. The purpose for providing the request prior to the actual interview was to allow the participant time to reflect upon and organize their story within the

framework provided in the request. A copy of the request is contained in Appendix A.

Because this is a phenomenologically based investigation, the need for bracketing the researcher's bias is essential. Upon meeting with the participant for the *telling* of the his/her story, the researcher was as supportive as possible. This support simply took the form of facilitating the participant in the telling of his or her story. This facilitation took the form of active listening, follow-up questions and questions of clarification when it appeared the *participant* was in need of such support. The support questions were not intended to be clarification for the researcher. The researcher remained as distanced as possible from the formation and relating of the story by the participant. This approach was used in an attempt to not influence or direct the story toward any bias the researcher may have had. The personal interviews were taped. Some written notes were taken by the researcher to highlight any nonverbal clues or cues the participant may have given.

Data Analysis

Within phenomenological inquiry it is essential to the success of the data analysis that the researcher make "an effort to become aware of [his or] her own presuppositions" (Tesch, 1984). This is known as bracketing. Bracketing was one of the foremost attitudes this researcher employed while

gathering and analyzing the data. The data analysis process followed the guidelines put forth by Hycner (1982)

1. Transcription of data.
2. Bracketing of researcher's biases and presuppositions.
3. Listening to interview for the sense of the whole.
4. Delineating units of general meaning.
5. Delineating units of meaning relevant to the research question(s).
6. Clustering units of relevant meaning.
7. Determining themes from clusters of meaning.
8. Writing a summary for each individual interview.
9. Identifying general and unique themes for all interviews.
10. Contextualization of themes.
11. Composite summary and conclusions.

The participants were given the transcription of their own individual interview to verify that the transcription reflected what they were attempting to communicate to the researcher. This served to verify that the data the researcher used for the analysis of the individual interview were reliable.

After the data were collected, summarized and coded and the researcher had gained a perspective on the themes, the data were interpreted in light of the research questions:

1. Is Rost's definition of leadership descriptive or prescriptive? That is, does Rost's definition of leadership reflect the lived experience of people?

Does his definition solely prescribe what leadership *should* be in the future?

2. What are the processes people experience within the leadership dynamic that are manifest as external phenomenon?

3. How closely do the descriptions that informants provide agree or disagree with Rost's definition of leadership?

More specifically the data were interpreted and compared to the definition of leadership put forth by Rost to determine whether his definition is descriptive or prescriptive.

Protection of Human Subjects

Prior to being interviewed the participants were given, had read and signed the informed consent form as *per* the guidelines in the Doctoral Handbook (1988) for students and faculty of the School of Education, University of San Diego. A copy of this form is contained in Appendix B.

The participants or the organizations involved were not at risk because it was not necessary for the participants to relate a story regarding the organization in which they worked. Furthermore, anonymity for the characters within the narrative was preserved if the participant felt this was necessary for whatever reason. This option was made clear to the participant in the cover letter that was sent to the participant before the storytelling

session. Along with the cover letter the participants were also sent an instructive memorandum on the form their story should take. Copies of these two documents are contained in Appendix A.

Each participant was fully advised that the story being told would be on the record and that the person's name and organizational affiliation would be used within the dissertation. The rationale for this approach is that the dissertation findings would be enhanced and made more true to life by having the names and organizational affiliation of the participants on the record. Since this research is not of a sensitive nature or designed to delve into sensitive personal or organizational issues that are problematic, and because this is a phenomenological study, the data collection, analysis and reporting were as open and honest as possible to insure effective and meaningful interpretation and application by scholars within the leadership field.

Limitations and Implications

Because this research is phenomenological, it is necessarily research into an individual's subjective experience (Tesch, 1984). Furthermore, the aim of phenomenological inquiry is to gain an "interpretive understanding" (Tesch, 1984). Therefore phenomenological research is not intended to be generalizable, as quantitative research methods purport to be. Rather I am concerned with "inductively building theory, through the qualitative analysis

of data” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 7). The purpose of interviewing various people in the diversity of organizations mentioned above was to illustrate any significant common patterns that emerged from the participants within the variation (Patton, 1990, p. 172). This research may, in the future, provide other leadership scholars with valuable insights into leadership as a phenomenon.

CHAPTER FOUR

LEADERSHIP NARRATIVES

Introduction

Because I am researching the phenomenon of leadership as is experienced and narrated by individuals, and because I am seeking to compare these experiences with the four essential elements within the leadership dynamic as put forth by Rost (1991), I have had to devise a method to make the comparison of the storyteller's experience to Rost's definition. The method I have devised is simple. I took the four elements necessary for leadership presented by Rost, namely that leadership is (1) an influence relationship; (2) it consists of leaders and followers; (3) leaders and followers intend real changes; and (4) the intended real changes reflect the mutual purposes of the leaders and followers. I also took the four contrary elements to leadership found within a management relationship, as put forth by Rost. Namely, that management is an (1) authority relationship; (2) it consists of managers and subordinates; (3) who produce and sell goods and/or services; and (4) goods/services result from coordinated activities (Rost, 1991, p. 149). I then categorized the general domains of meanings from the narratives into relevant domains of meaning.

In other words, the researcher addresses the research question to the units of general meaning to determine whether what the participant has said responds to and illuminates the research question. If it appears to do so, then it is noted as a unit of relevant meaning.

(Hycner, 1982, p. 8)

I then placed each relevant domain of meaning under the appropriate element of leadership or management.

In order to compare the domains of relevant meaning with Rost's definition and to gain an insight into the heuristic patterns present within the narratives, I chose representative stories for each one of the four elements. In this project I was dealing with the narrative form which gives "meaningful patterns and [provides] a context in which thoughts and actions can be understood" (Widdershoven, 1993, p. 16). As a result the values, images, metaphors and behaviors of the players were essential elements that formed the meanings refined from the stories. The evaluation and interpretation of the domains of meaning in each narrative depict the operative images, values and metaphors being used by the players. The images, values and metaphors were used as the basis of comparison regarding each element of leadership or management as presented by Rost. The domains of meaning were not viewed as isolated statements but rather as representative distillations of the participants' thoughts and actions (p. 17).

It is well to note that quite often the storytellers were frustrated in their attempt to convey what they meant. This became evident within both the stories and subsequent conversations with the storytellers. The frustration experienced by the storytellers will be dealt with later in this chapter. Let it suffice to say that the vocabulary the storytellers used was not adequate for answering the request to convey a story about a time in their lives they experienced leadership.

To gain insight into the data, the reader should keep in mind the question I asked the participants and the purpose of the research. The purpose of the research is to gain insight into the nature of leadership by comparing people's stories of their experience of leadership with Rost's definition. The question I asked the participants was to tell me a story about a time in their lives when they experienced what they would consider to be leadership. These two elements are the two frames in which the stories were told and by which the data have been interpreted.

Furthermore, maintaining the two frames of vision--the purpose of the study and the question I asked the participants--is necessary if the blanket of common language and metaphor is to be penetrated and one is to uncover the heuristic patterns present within the narratives. Without the context of the story, the data become isolated--idiosyncratic bits of information that are not cohesive--and thus become meaningless to my purpose.

To say that any one of the stories is typical is perhaps not a totally accurate approach, considering the uniqueness of the person and his or her personal experience. However, one of the advantages of the phenomenological and narrative approaches to research is the use of domains of meaning and domains of relevant meaning. By this method the researcher is able to discern the similarities present within each story and is also able to bring forth the common heuristic present within each narrative. In order to compare the elements found in each story to the four elements in Rost's definition, I compared the relevant domains of meaning to the four elements of leadership and to the four elements of management as put forth by Rost. The stories are divided into the four general categories of management and the four general categories of leadership as put forth by Rost.

I conclude this chapter with a summary of the analyses of the stories.

Leadership Narratives

In seeking to gain an understanding of influence and authority within the leadership dynamic, I begin with Helen Pratt's story about her experience as an officer in the Marine Corps during the Desert Storm conflict of 1990. Pratt is currently a project manager for the Disney Institute. It is interesting to note that the structure within which she works at the Disney Institute is very loose and relatively flat. Even though she works for a very large and bureaucratic organization, Disney Institute is somewhat

autonomous because of its mission as the creative arm of Walt Disney Company. Disney Institute develops and implements new projects for the Walt Disney Company. In Pratt's words she is working on a project "which is going to be a resort, a kind of educational vacation. They don't like us to use the word *education*. They want it to be an enrichment vacation. So I have to remind myself of that."

The story told by Helen Pratt typifies the influence the industrial paradigm has had on people and on the leadership narratives told to me. Because Pratt's story is military in nature and about the Gulf War, one would expect it to be heavily influenced by the industrial and bureaucratic model. Pratt's choice of stories was most definitely influenced by the fact that she was within an hierarchical and positionally authoritative organization. But the fact that she was able to tell me *any* leadership story she wanted, whether it be military or not, indicated the import of this particular experience of leadership in her life. The fact that she was not within the military structure when she was asked to tell the story or when she relayed it to me further suggests that it was the leadership event that spurred her to recount this experience and to recount it in the way she did. It was not merely the military structure she was in that brought forth the images, metaphors and values she used to describe this event.

Pratt is 29 years old and has been employed with Disney for about two years. In her everyday activities at the time of our interview, Pratt was

involved in developing health and fitness programs for the new vacation project at Disney. Her positional title was research assistant to William Shannon, but as he said:

When I was looking for a research assistant, it made no sense to me to look for someone who knew a lot about what I already know. It also made no sense to me to look for someone who had been a researcher. Because in two years I'm not going to have a researcher anymore. I'm going to have a hands-on, active, supervisor type person; a leader. So when we looked at the job description, we looked at creativity because we are creating something new. We looked at writing ability and the ability to get along with others, and all those other things. I also didn't find it necessary to massage my own ego, having someone come in who knew a lot about sports. It didn't make any sense. So I brought in someone who I knew could handle and have expertise in areas I did not. But I also brought in someone who I knew could work with other people in a leadership capacity. So I ended up with someone with the academic expertise, a master's in exercise physiology. I ended up with someone who knew a lot about programming areas that I did not know as much about as she does: Aerobics, stretching, alternative fitness practices, tai-chi, yoga and self-defense. These are programming areas we are going to include [in the new resort].

Finally I got someone who is a Marine, who as a short-of-stature, feminine, petite female clearly exhibited enough leadership quality to handle 120 Marines in Desert Storm. I'm very confident that she can handle some fitness instructors and guests at the Disney Institute. I really think I found the person who met all those issues for me.

I tried to look at what it would be like to work for Bill Shannon . . .

because I think her working style compliments mine.

If you look at the description of the programs we're left to do, some say "Bill" because I've already worked on them or I have real solid expertise in them. Others say "Helen" because that's what she's strong in. They will all come through me; I mean I'll look over them, but most of them say "H" and "B."

I think our idea is to work on some things simultaneously yet separately, and other things simultaneously. I don't need to be called "sir." But I'm more comfortable with someone who understands the hierarchy because the Disney Development Company is not the military, but there is a clear hierarchy that one needs to manage up and answer to. Someone who has been a fitness instructor or a full-time academician might not understand that. But someone who has been a lieutenant in the Marine Corps does understand that.

Story One: Helen Pratt's Story of Leadership

When I was in the military, I was sent to Saudi Arabia, in September of 1990. I had just turned 28. I'm going to be 30 this month. When I was sent over there initially, I was supposed to be the camp commandant, which meant that I was in charge of a camp for 350 Marines to make sure there was enough food brought in on a daily basis. I was in charge of being certain that the trucks were taken care of within the mechanic side of the house. I was also in charge of record keeping and administration. I also made sure the troops had recreation facilities to work with to keep their minds off the situation in which we were involved. That camp was set up at the Port of Al Jabaul. Three months after being at that port, we were scheduled to move up to Al Mishab, which was three miles from the coast and twenty miles from the border of Kuwait.

The way I saw the situation was that we were kind of like sitting ducks. The officers pushed us up to the front and they had the infantry behind us. What I gathered from that was that they were trying to let the enemy know that, yes, we have people here. However, the Iraqis didn't know what type of forces they were. So when the war started, we got rid of one of their AWACS planes which, I think, was their only source of intelligence. The night the war started we knocked that out. Therefore, they knew that we had forces there on the east coast. As soon as that AWACS plane was

knocked out the push for everybody to go west came about. So I kind of felt that the Iraqis knew we were there.

One type of situation that I was involved in, and it occurred on several occasions, was that we were told to go 100% alert within our compound. The compound was in the shape of a triangle. The apex of that triangle was facing toward Kuwait, and the bottom of it was down toward Saudi and the east. We were told that we had to man the berm 100% which meant that everybody had to be awake the whole night. As a lieutenant in charge of Marines, I was told to make sure my Marines were on the perimeter, making sure that they were awake all night, and that they had their guns in the right position. For me that was a hard thing to do because it was like: "Here you go, Marine! Here is your weapon, go out there and stand on the berm. Whether somebody comes at you or not, I want you to fire if you see the enemy or when told to do so." That was one of the things that [pause] throughout my whole military experience was difficult: People were not people, they were numbers. And I had to make decisions as to whom the people were going to be on that apex with the 50 caliber machine gun, and whether or not they were going to get hurt, I didn't know if they would or not.

One particular night that we were at 100%, we were told that there was going to be an imminent attack, and it was coming from the coast. My first inclination was: "Are they going to attack us in canoes?" I couldn't imagine the Iraqis coming at us in any other way because I knew they didn't

have any kind of ships or boats or whatever. But we manned the berm at 100%, and I was told to go in and get pyro from the armory to give to my Marines. Part of that pyro ended up to be grenades (there were ten of them I had to get for my side of the triangle). There were also more items that I needed to pick up rather than just a few grenades.

This kind of brought everything into perspective for us as to where we were and what type of situation we were in. I picked up not only grenades, but I got a LAW, which is like a bazooka. When you fire it there's a back blast. I had to get other types of weapons that I was familiar with, but I wasn't sure my Marines had ever touched them or fired them or anything like that. I was to give these weapons to certain people within my platoon or within the company, and insure that they used them properly. This was difficult in the sense that in the back of my mind I asked myself: "Do they know how to use them or will they hurt one another?" I gave them to my staff sergeants who had been in the military for fifteen, eighteen years, and who were familiar with them, and I just left them with them to use as needed.

I was in that location for three months and on several occasions, as I mentioned before, we had to man the berm at 50% or 100%. I had to make sure that the Marines were out there. There were other times when we had been attacked, when we had missiles come in on our location that we had to go into our bunkers and don our gas masks and make sure that there was no

poison air. I remember one particular night, the first night it occurred, I wasn't sure that my Marines had gotten in the bunkers and that they were wearing their gas masks. So I actually went out to different locations to find out where they were, and if they were following the instructions of wearing their equipment. Most of them were. I found the ones that were not following directions were my staff NCOs. They were over there smoking cigarettes.

You know, when you instructed me that the story should have a beginning, a middle and an end, I think my beginning was getting into Saudi Arabia and being in a war situation, and realizing that this is what being in the military was all about. Going up to the new location, setting up a camp and making sure my Marines knew what they were doing, because if any of them made a mistake, it could have killed them. There were incidences of people who shot themselves or shot one another, but we had no incidents where that occurred. We came back with everybody we went over there with. There weren't any deaths. There were no major injuries where there was a loss of life.

As I said before, that whole situation kind of made me take a step back and say: "This is what being in the military is all about, being an officer, especially: To lead whether I wanted to or not, whether I liked the decision that had to be made or not." I had to tell people to do things that were difficult. I had to tell people to go out and put their lives on the line. I know

that being a leader is not always telling, but it is in the way you present yourself and in being an example to others.

I think sometimes being a leader is making a decision, a lot of times some people might not like the decision that has to be made, but making a decision and sticking with it is sometimes necessary. I've read that people are born leaders and that leaders are not made. I guess being a leader to me is being somebody that others want to emulate. Someone is a good leader because they make the right choices for the good of all, not just the selfish choice.

I also see leadership as interactive, because a lot of times the decisions that are made have to be accomplished by not just one person but by others. Sometimes suggestions will be made by others and that will alter how things are done.

Everybody has a different type of leadership. Some people are very authoritative: it is this way or no way. The way I lead is by interaction with the people with whom I have to accomplish the goal or mission. If somebody has a suggestion that is going to make it easier or safer or more appropriate then I'll take that suggestion and it might change the course of events.

I think a good leader is somebody who can take a suggestion from somebody else, and use it and not feel like they have to stay embedded in their first decision. They don't have to feel that their decision is right, and that they wouldn't alter it [end of Pratt's story].

Contrary to Rost's definition of leadership (Rost, p. 150), Pratt views leadership as a directional attempt to impact other people. For instance Pratt saw leadership as:

- Making sure the Marines knew what to do.
- Being an officer (positional leader).
- Having to lead whether she wanted to or not.
- Being a leader is making decisions.
- Making the right choices for the good of all.
- Telling people to do things that were difficult.
- Making decisions.

The domains of meaning that emerged that reflected leadership as a manager-subordinate relationship were:

- The officers pushed us up to the front.
- I had to make sure the Marines were out there.
- I went out to find out if they were following instructions.
- I had to make sure that my Marines knew what they were doing.
- I had to tell people to do things.
- Someone is a good leader because they make the right choices for the good of all.

The domains of meaning that reflect producing goods and services resulting from coordinated activities were:

- Decisions that are made have to be accomplished by not just one person but by others.
- I lead by interaction to accomplish the goal or mission.

There were no domains of meaning reflecting the production of goods and services in Pratt's story.

Pratt's story reflects a view of leadership as authoritative, coercive and directional in nature. Even though Pratt stated that she would take suggestions and that the suggestions "might change the course of events" the use of the suggestions were still solely determined by the authority figure. There was only minimal influential behavior present.

Furthermore, when I attempted to find relevant domains of meaning that could be categorized under the headings of influence, leaders and followers, intended real changes and intended real changes that reflect mutual purposes (as Rost described), Pratt had none.

Pratt's story and understanding of leadership is a prime example of the influence the hierarchical authoritative model has on how many people view leadership. For Pratt leadership is authority. It is directing others and accomplishing predetermined and externally set goals. Leadership is the direct management of others.

Story Two: Alan Bailey's Leadership Story

Alan Bailey is dean of the college of business at San Diego State University. In his words: This is my twenty-sixth year at SDSU. It is my

sixteenth year as dean of the college of business. I came here as a faculty member, became department chair and then became dean in 1978.

I'll relate one story that is fairly recent. It took place about this time last year. As you know the California State University system has been going through a fair amount of down sizing and budget difficulties over the past three years. Last year about this time, it became clear to me that there were two forces pushing on the college. One was the fact that we were significantly downsized from an overall faculty stand point: about 30%. We hadn't made any adjustments to the administrative structure of the college at all. Secondly, there was an increasing expectation on the part of the system that an increased level of involvement in development or fund raising was going to be the name of the game for the next five years. This expectation came through the chancellor, to the president and finally to the campuses. Those two forces came together and raised some questions about if we should reorganize the way we go about our work. Should we try to reflect the change in size of the faculty? And should we try to find some way to devote some resources to fund raising and development?

For a number of months I thought about how to approach that process, given the sort of culture in universities. Universities don't like change. The *status quo* is well protected by the faculty governance process. We like to spend eighteen months discussing whether we ought to discuss something. Then, maybe, we will discuss it.

I decided that I needed to initiate a change in the administrative structure of the college. At that point I faced the decision about whether or not one would proceed through the normal consultative processes. Or, was the imperative for change so powerful at that point that this was one of those situations where the dean needed to make a decision, commit to a course of action, and take all of the heat and the flack associated with that because time was of the essence.

There was a window of opportunity associated with some staff positions and so for a number of weeks I thought about what to do. I then came to the decision that leadership requires of one when he is faced with those situations to act. To pursue this change under the normal paths would have meant that we would have probably still been discussing it today. We would have lost some windows of opportunity that were present. So I made the decision to reorganize the administrative resources in the college, and then effectively announced it to the staff and the faculty. I then went about the process of doing it, with the expected types of consequences.

Lots of faculty members wanted to argue about the process and the lack of consultation. Not many people wanted to argue about the underlying reasons for the decision, or whether or not it was a good idea. They were concerned that we really needed to follow policies and so forth. After the decision we had a number of discussions about what are the administrative

responsibilities versus the academic responsibilities and a few things like that.

The result was that we reconfigured the support groups in the academic departments. We took about a third of the resources that had been in the academic departments and created a development function for the college. We physically relocated administrative offices as part of the reorganization. There was a physical aspect to the personnel process which was accomplished in a period of three to four months. Since July 1, I put it all in place and have been operating that way ever since.

So that would be my description of an experience where that [leadership] was necessary. . . .What made it even more difficult was that I had to make that decision at a time when I was promoting more team like behavior. I was trying to get the people on this staff to think more broadly about their work and so forth. One of the real downsides of having to make the decision in that mode was that it tended to give people an opportunity to say that it was contrary to other initiatives that were going on simultaneously. It made it even more difficult because I have, before that and after that, [emphasized verbally] continued to try to promote a change in the way we go about our work and to be more team based and be less functional. I am trying to get people to think more broadly about the nature of their work, to be more customer focused.

One of the real downsides of having to make that decision was I knew that it was going to be contrary to other things I was doing. But I still felt that that was just an opportunity. I felt that it was just a situation that would not present itself again. It was essential to our future success. And its long-run benefits would outweigh the short-run costs of maybe taking a step back in some other initiatives. It was worth just taking a lot of heat generally and so forth [end of Bailey's story].

The domains of relevant meaning that emerged from Bailey's story about leadership fall into the four general elements present within the definition of management used by Rost. They include relevant domains of meaning that reflect top down or positional authority where Bailey:

- Decided to initiate change in the administrative structure of the college.
- Came to the decision that leadership requires one to act when faced with a critical situation.
- Felt that at times leaders have to make hard decisions.
- Violated normal procedures.
- Was promoting teamwork at the time of the decision.
- Announced the decision and went about initiating the change.

The domains of relevant meaning also reflected that Bailey viewed relationships within a manager-subordinate structure. Bailey:

- Decided not to proceed through normal consultative processes with the faculty.
- Announced it to the staff and the faculty.
- Had a number of discussions about what were administrative responsibilities vs. academic responsibilities.
- Continued to promote change among the faculty.
- Tried to get the people on this staff to think more broadly about their work.
- Put it all in place and has been operating in that way ever since.

Domains of relevant meaning reflecting the production of goods or services are also present in Bailey's story:

- The change was essential to our future success.
- We created a development function for the college.
- The long-run benefits would outweigh the short-run costs of maybe taking a step back in some other initiatives.

For Bailey providing the customers (students) with goods and services from coordinated activities meant having to:

- Reconfigure the support groups in the academic departments.
- Relocate administrative offices as part of the reorganization.
- Try to get the people on his staff to think more broadly about their work.

As with Pratt's leadership story, each of these relevant domains of meaning is authoritative, coercive and hierarchical in nature. Relevant domains of meaning that could be categorized under the headings of influence, leaders and followers, intended real changes and intended real changes that reflect mutual purposes as Rost described them did not emerge in Bailey's story. For Bailey, leadership is management.

Bailey's story is representative of the view that leadership is the attainment of goals as dictated by authority. Bailey's desire to accomplish the reorganization of the college of business was so strong that he even ignored the normal procedures that had already been set up within his organization. It is interesting that the postindustrial values of cooperation and collaboration arise within Bailey's story and are discarded for the industrial value of authoritative goal attainment: "Lots of faculty members wanted to argue about the process and the lack of consultation. Not many people wanted to argue about the underlying reasons for the decision." Bailey did not recognize postindustrial values to be of significant importance to affect his behavior even though he considered his actions to be leadership.

Bailey's actions are not even good contingency management and demonstrate vividly the conflict between espoused theories and theories-in-use (Argyris, 1982). This is demonstrated in his statement that:

What made it even more difficult was that I had to make that decision at a time when I was promoting more team like behavior. I was trying

to get the people on this staff to think more broadly about their work and so forth. One of the real downsides of having to make the decision in that mode was that it tended to give people an opportunity to say that it was contrary to other initiatives that were going on simultaneously. It made it even more difficult because I have, before that and after that, [emphasized verbally] continued to try to promote a change in the way we go about our work and to be more team based and be less functional. I am trying to get people to think more broadly about the nature of their work, to be more customer focused.

One of the real downsides of having to make that decision was I knew that it was going to be contrary to other things I was doing. But I still felt that that was just an opportunity. I felt that it was just a situation that would not present itself again. It was essential to our future success. And its long-run benefits would out weigh the short-run costs of maybe taking a step back in some other initiatives. It was worth just taking a lot of heat generally and so forth.

Bailey's use of the imperative in describing the events of the reorganization demonstrates the effect one's purview has on people's thoughts and actions. After weeks of all but solitary thought, Bailey "then came to the decision that leadership requires of one when he is faced with those situations to act." Framing leadership as authority and emanating from a single person reinforces leadership as being coercive. Framing

leadership in this way not only controlled the lives and behaviors of others but mandated the subsequent actions of Bailey himself: “I then came to the decision that leadership requires of one who is faced with those situations to act.” Bailey’s values are grounded in a structure that reinforces power over others, and ultimately it controls him. One could argue that Bailey’s actions were not free because he didn’t seem to think that he had an alternative mode of action in this event. A system based on coercion eliminates freedom and Bailey’s story is illustrative of this insight.

Story Three: Deborah Furness and Finding Katmandu

Furness is from northern Illinois and has traveled extensively prior to coming to work for the Disney Institute. She is a research assistant for the Humanities Programming Track. She develops curriculum. Her story involves hiking in the Katmandu Valley:

Before coming to the Disney Institute, I taught in Singapore for the ten years. While I was in Singapore I was director of applied and fine arts for a school of 2,800 students from 48 countries. It was a wonderful opportunity. But after ten years outside America, I decided it was time for me to reestablish my roots, because America was rapidly becoming a foreign country to me. I came back to the States last fall. I have been back for almost a year. Before coming back to the States I had been advised by friends that returning to American education was perhaps not what I should do. People who had been involved said that things had changed greatly. I

thought it might be a good time to try my hand at another field, so I looked into corporate work.

I decided to go to Vail, Colorado where I became a director of convention sales for a resort, after that I became the director of a psychiatric outpatient program. I then looked into the corporate world. I did some studying and decided that the corporation I wanted to work for was Disney. I came to Orlando and knocked on Disney's door; magically with very great fortune, it opened.

I am currently a research assistant for the Disney Institute Humanities Programming Track. We are developing curriculum and course content for the new vacation concept Disney is developing. We don't like to use the word course, but rather programs to be offered for participants within the humanities. This consists of everything at the Institute except for sports, fitness and the performing arts.

When I first got your letter and started to think about an experience of leadership, I thought that being a teacher is a leadership role every single day. Teaching is different from being in an office environment; everything you do is leadership, and that's why there is all of those smiling faces in your room staring at you and saying: "lead me, lead me." While I was in education in Singapore, I was director of instrumental music which entailed what some would call leadership roles of taking the students on concert tours across the United States. Leadership somewhat came with the territory. But instead of

using that as an example, I tried to think of more specific or unique leadership situation.

The story of leadership that surfaced in my thoughts was a time in Nepal. It was a leadership situation that I found myself in without choosing to be a leader. There were three couples and myself who were loosely traveling together. We were meeting in Katmandu. We were going to mix and match our forces during the three week time-frame we were going to be in Nepal.

In preparing for the trip several of us read a book that described the best way to see the Katmandu Valley. The book said not to enter the valley from Katmandu and then explore outward the way most tourists do but rather, to start from the valley and explore your way back into Katmandu. This is the way a native villager would approach the city. By using this approach the traveler gets a different perspective of the valley and Katmandu.

All seven of us thought of ourselves as experienced travelers. We like to do things a little differently than normal tourists would; so naturally this appealed to us. One of the couples did not arrive when they were expected. While we were waiting for them to arrive, the rest of us decided to take the half day trek in the valley that the book we had read suggested. The directions in the book said to go out to the reclining Vishnu.

We started asking around town for directions and were instructed that the reclining Vishnu was not, as we thought, on the edge of town. It was actually in another small town outside of Katmandu, about six miles from the edge of Katmandu. We hired a taxi to take us out to the starting point for our trek. I don't know if you have ever been to Nepal, but there is not a lot of vehicular transportation out there apart from ox carts. Foot power is very popular. Our intent was to visit the reclining Vishnu and then follow the directions back to Katmandu that were given in the book. The instructions directed us to take paths through villages that would bring us up into Katmandu. We started out on our trek assuming that we would be back in Katmandu by 1:00 p. m.

From the Vishnu we walked into the first little village on our route. We were delighted. The locals were carting wool and drying wool on the roofs of their houses. We wandered around this village, just enjoying the sights and the sounds and watching what was going on there. We were feeling wonderfully remote from the downtown area of Katmandu and of civilization. We suddenly realized that we had wandered to a point that we were not sure where the path was that we were supposed to take.

We started looking around the perimeters of the village and we mutually agreed that this certain path must be our path. We took off down the path assuming that this must be THE path. We were happily walking along and meeting villagers along the trail occasionally, passing through

incredible scenery. We were at the base of the Himalayan Mountains. It was a lovely path and we walked, and walked, and talked, and chatted. It was all fun and adventuresome and everything was great. Then we realized that we had been walking for close to two hours and in theory we should be winding our way down toward Katmandu. We should be seeing some signs of the city. We left the Vishnu at 10:00 a. m. and it was now about noon. It was the time of day when the sun was positioned overhead so we couldn't tell which way was north, south, east or west. [Nervous laugh.] We were in the type of terrain where we didn't have many options as to different paths to take. We are taking a path along the river valley that was on the edge of rice terraces that were built on the sides of the hills. We were walking along a narrow one foot wide path with several hundred feet drop off on the opposite side. We didn't have a lot of options, like: "Oh! I think I'll go to the left."

All of a sudden within our group of five, there was trepidation: "We're lost and not only are we lost, but nobody is ever going to find us again," because we are not where normal tourists would go. You know as much as all of us wanted to be beyond the realm of normal tourism, we also realized that there were no roads, there were no towns. Once in a while we would come across a hut, but the Napolese in that area didn't speak English, so they were not a lot of help.

At that point somebody had to take a leadership role. The five of us were good friends and prior to this we had worked well together. It was

interesting to see this element of fear and confusion that started to rise within the group. There was a part of me that had a real vested interest in this outing. As far as I was concerned it was going to be a GOOD afternoon and we were going to have fun. We were going to enjoy ourselves.

[Secretively whispering.] And we weren't going to get lost. [Nervous laugh.]

So I somewhat took over and said to myself and the others that we could remember from our readings that there was a town that we should pass through called Tupak. We were on a ravine with a river at the base of it. Every time we would pass anybody on the trail or across the valley, we would holler over asking: "Tupak? Tupak?" It got to be a joke with us because we realized we were lost and that we should have been in Tupak by that time. We got a lot of strange looks for hollering like that. I don't think we ever really found Tupak. We finally found a little crossroads and decided it was Tupak. We still don't know to this day if that's what it was.

There were other considerations that began to arise. We had headed out for a three hour walk and did not come with provisions. We had a couple of little bags of trail mix and some candy bars and that was all. This was December, and we were in the foothills of the Himalayas; the sun would be going down soon and it would be getting cold.

At that point, members of our group started saying: "What are we going to do? Where are we going to stay? What will happen? How will we get back?" I guess I had just decided that I had to be the leader and I had to

say, "This is the way." I said this with the utmost confidence to convince everyone that we were headed in the right direction. I said: "This is south, we know it's south and we know Katmandu is down there." In my heart I'm saying: "Oh my God, are we on the right track?" I couldn't express that doubt to them at all. I had to just lead them with total confidence and say this is the way we go and this is the right trail. At the same time I had to maintain a jovial banter with them. I pointed out all of the exciting things we were seeing along the way. I tried to keep people's minds off the innate fear of the unknown and the realization that we were in a completely foreign land with no links to our civilization. We had none of our traditional Western security blankets to get us back. [Secretively whispering] So we walked and we walked and we walked [small laugh].

This was one of those times that I wished I had incredible eyesight, because I can remember straining at the horizons hoping to see anything that could give me some sort of direction. I knew that as we came into Katmandu there had to be smaller villages around the edge of the city. We knew we had strayed radically because we were not seeing more than one little hut on the edge of a field every now and then. We were not seeing any towns or any villages. So we walked and walked, and finally in the far, far distance I could see a flag. In Nepal, very large stupas always have flags. I remember when I first glanced over the rolling terrain--you must remember that we are at the base of the Himalayan Mountains where you could glance

over and see something and then with the next step it wouldn't be there any longer--that in my heart I knew the flag I saw had to be Bonna. Bonna is the largest stupa in Nepal, and it is only a few miles outside of Katmandu.

As I was leading onward I was hoping and praying that this was Bonna. Everybody else thought I knew what I was doing. We have talked about this since and everybody was sure that I knew where I was headed. It was a feeling of total leadership. To have helped everybody else maintain their emotional and psychological equilibrium was a total feeling of leadership. We found our way back down to Bonna and from Bonna we were able to get public transportation back to Katmandu. There was an afternoon bus on which two people rode. The rest of us commandeered the back of a truck to ride down to Katmandu.

I see this as a leadership experience even though I did not willingly choose the leadership role. I had a strong desire to make a positive outcome out of our experience. I also wanted to alleviate the recognizable fear and panic as it began to develop within the group. These two things drove me to assume the leadership role [end of Furness' story].

The domains of meaning that emerged in Furness' story that reflected leadership as an authority relationship were:

- I took over and instructed the others.
- I decided that I had to be the leader.
- We were going to enjoy the hike as far as I was concerned.

The domains of meaning that emerged in Furness' story reflected leadership as a manager-subordinate relationship were:

- Somebody had to take the leadership role.
- I gave instructions with confidence.
- I tried to keep their minds off fears they had.
- I had a total feeling of leadership in helping everybody.

The domain of meaning that reflected producing goods and services emerged as:

- Part of me had a vested interest in the success of hike.

Domains of meaning reflecting the management elements of goods-services resulting from coordinated activities were not present within Furness' leadership story. Furness' story did not clearly reflect the leadership elements of influence, leaders and followers or intended real changes or intended real changes that reflect mutual purposes.

In this story Furness indicated that leadership, besides being management, is being a savior who is in total control and who is completely knowledgeable. Furness' image of leadership is an image of a unitary figure responding to an immediate need and fulfilling that need.

It is interesting that, even though this was a group of friends who had worked well together in the past, Furness took this tack. Probably even more interesting is the fact that a more interactive dynamic didn't arise among these sojourners. The question could arise as to whether Furness' assertive

behavior and managerial actions closed the possibility for alternative behaviors to arise among the group? And one could also ask if perhaps, even though this is somewhat of an educated and experienced group, their acquiescence to this form of control occurred because of their dependence and comfort with the model of leadership that is identified with some one telling others what to do?

Story Four: Stan Palm

Palm is a senior management analyst for the El Cajon Police Department. He has been with the department for twenty years. His story concerns a leadership experience he had when he was in the military:

I have been thinking about the question you asked me. I will relate a story of an earlier time in my life. It was one of those things where I didn't have a large bit of confidence in my leadership ability. But through my military experience, it hit me that quite often leadership is something that you develop. This was a profound experience for me because I didn't have a lot of confidence, even after I had gone through something as arduous as Officer Candidate School. My first assignment was as platoon leader at Ft. Carson, Colorado. It was a combat engineer outfit. I got into this outfit hearing all kinds of stories about the battalion commander, Lt. Col. Robert W. Lockridge. He was a very formidable figure. In fact, he would walk around the battalion area with a little ax handle, it was his swagger stick of sorts. There were all these tales of careers he had ruined. His whole

demeanor was something that really frightened me. But as time went on, I became aware of the fact that he really wasn't quite as evil as he appeared. He would offer little steps of encouragement. I was amazed many times because he would seek me out and complement me on things that I had done.

I remember one particular episode when he was leaving his assignment as battalion commander. We were having a major motor pool inspection, which many times would make or break careers for command type officers. I was in charge of my company's motor pool because I was an incoming lieutenant. We got a surprise announcement that an inspection was coming. As result, I was scrambling about trying to get some important data. My motor pool sergeant was off and we were missing a key maintenance file, and I didn't know where it was. We surmised that it had to be in a desk. So here I was, a second lieutenant freaking out and forcibly breaking and entering into a desk. All of a sudden, out of the corner of my eye, I saw Lockridge's profile going past the door. I didn't know what to do. He had to have been witness to what was transpiring. I immediately composed myself, as well as I could. He stepped in and I gave him the greeting. He said to me as calm as could be: "Stanley: yours and everybody else's performance reports have all been completed. Don't worry about a thing. Everything's going to be just fine." He then walked out.

Now from my past experience if I were to flub this inspection, I was dead meat. But as it turned out, we went through the inspection and passed it with flying colors.

I guess the real measure of leadership was there. He had built this aura of sorts. But he had these moments when he injected compassion and understanding for a person like me who may have really needed it. That is my story of leadership.

He had a lot of integrity. I always knew where I stood with him. And I think that was probably the real thing that made me really respect him. If he was a bull-shit artist, I would not have had the degree of respect I had for him [end of Palm's story].

For Palm the domains of meaning that emerged reflected leadership as authority were:

- Lockridge had built this aura about him.
- He said: "Don't worry about a thing."
- He said: "Everything's going to be just fine."

The domains of meaning that reflected leadership as a manager-subordinate relationship were:

- Lockridge would offer little steps of encouragement.
- He injected compassion and understanding for a person like me.

Relevant domains of meaning that could be categorized under the management heading of goods and services, and goods and services resulting

from coordination of activities did not emerge in Palm's story. Relevant domains of meaning that could be categorized under the leadership headings of influence, leaders and followers, intended real changes and intended real changes that reflect mutual purposes as Rost described them did not emerge in Palm's story.

Even though Palm recognized that the human element was a very important aspect in the manner Lockridge managed, Palm's view of leadership is grounded in positional authority.

I would like to suggest that the presence of the humanizing actions of Lockridge in Palm's story of leadership is important because the narrative form allows for tacit values to emerge. People responded to the request to tell a story about leadership. They were not asked to tell a story about management. Nor did they relay stories that they would consider to be management. The tacit values that arise within the stories constitute the differences between leadership and management. For Palm the difference appears to have something to do with the values that transcend attaining an immediate goal or positional authority.

Story Five: Bob Moreau

This is Moreau's 28th year in law enforcement. He's been with the El Cajon Police Department for 25 years and is the assistant chief of police for the El Cajon Police Department.

The story I will tell you concerns one of the first leaders that I really became exposed to. He is somebody that I described here as a motivational kind of leader. That is one of the descriptors that I came up with. My first exposure to him was when he was a captain in the San Diego Police Department. He later rose and became the chief. His name is Ray Hoobler. In terms of law enforcement, when I say motivational, I see his leadership style as that of a traditionalist. He was experienced and inspiring. He had the "been there, done that, follow me" kind of leadership. And he motivated by recognition.

The instance I want to tell you about concerns arrest procedures, Before we could make an arrest we had to call in. One day I called in and he said: "Bob, what color is the badge on your chest?"

I said, "It's gold."

He asked, "Is it the same size as mine?"

I said: "Yeah."

He said: "What does it say on it?"

I said: "Officer."

He said: "What's mine say?"

I said: "Captain."

He says: "Well we both have the same authority, we're both police officers. You've never run a bad arrest by me before. Don't bother calling me in the future, just send them down."

That did two things: As a leader it showed me that he had tremendous confidence in the kinds of arrests that I'd been making. And it was a very small thing in terms of leadership, but by placing that kind of trust in me I would have followed him anywhere.

I had tremendous confidence in his ability. In the 1960s we had a lot of riots and different situations going on so if you were going to follow somebody and do the kinds of things he wanted you to do, then inspiring and motivational leadership is a strong quality. I've always remembered that in my career.

When I came to El Cajon I met an entirely different kind of leader, that was Wally Dart. He had been the chief of police for eighteen years. Here's a man who had tremendous integrity, honesty. He was extremely caring about people. He knew everybody on a first name basis.

Wally Dart had the ability to establish loyalty. He held his organization based on trust and confidence and loyalty and respect. And he did this during economic hard times. We were never the highest paid. We were never the lowest paid. We didn't always have the best equipment. We got what the city could afford. The officers and people who followed him were able to do so knowing that they worked for a very good person. They knew that he wasn't going to do anything that was not in their best interest.

In that example I'm talking about an inspirational leader.

When I'm talking about leadership, certainly there's leadership at a lower level than at the chief. As a captain my working relationship is very close with the chief and I'm using chiefs within the county to describe what I've seen.

We have a chief now who is progressive, innovative and conceptual--a different type of leadership altogether. Both of them are very good leaders, but they each have different leadership qualities.

One thing these chiefs all had in common was experience, but Dart is also caring, open and nonthreatening.

The task for leadership is to get to where the followers have a feeling that they had a part of the solution.

Trying to describe leadership to you is very difficult. You don't isolate leadership on any one thing. There's a lot of different types of leadership. No single type of leadership. I think it was Eisenhower who described leadership in a real interesting way. He put a piece of string on a table one time in a meeting he was having, and he pushed at different positions on this piece of string. He said: "If it's pushed in this direction, the string moves in a disfigured position in this direction. If you push it this way, it moves in a disfigured position in this direction. But if somebody stands up and takes the front of the string and pulls it in this direction, what happens? Everything falls into line. And it moves and that's the leadership." That's the person that has taken that entire organization with that string and

moved it in one direction. And that can be very effective if that's what you are trying to accomplish with that organization. There are some organizations that don't require the entire thing to be moving in one direction. We are trying to attack things on a lot of different fronts. And I'm not convinced that there is any one perfect leadership style. It depends on the individual and his or her personality. It depends on that individual and that person's capability. And once a person starts working outside his or her capabilities, it could adversely affect the person's ability to lead. You have to stay within yourself.

But in all of the leaders I've worked with personally, I've seen experience and caring about people and honesty. These are three things that are consistent in all of them [end of Moreau's story].

The domains of meaning that emerged in Moreau's story that reflected leadership as an authority relationship were:

- Hoobler had the "been there, done that, follow me" kind of leadership.
- He motivated by recognition.
- He said: "Don't bother calling me in the future, just send them down."
- Moreau felt that leadership depends on the individual.

Relevant domains of meaning that reflected leadership as a manager-subordinate relationship were:

- The task for leadership is to make you (the subordinate) feel you are part of solution.
- Dart motivated by recognition.
- The leader pulls string and everything falls in line.
- The leader has taken the organization and moved it in one direction.

Domains of meaning reflecting production of goods or services and goods or services resulting from coordinated activities were not present within Moreau's story. There were no domains of meaning in Moreau's story that reflected any of the four essential elements necessary for leadership as put forth by Rost.

Leadership for Moreau is framed by positional authority and the qualities and traits of the leader. For Moreau leadership is management with an aim toward getting followers to feel as if they were a part of the solution of a problem. Leaders lead by directing others.

Contingency theory seeks to bring people into the decision-making process and it promotes integrity (Kouzes and Posner, 1993). However, the important thing to notice with this story is that the values of inclusion and integrity arise within the experience of the storyteller and are known as a value in themselves. They don't necessarily arise simply for the completion of goal or task within the eyes of the storyteller. The difference between leadership and management for Moreau was the presence of these values

within the actions of those he considered to be leaders. This suggests the emergence of postindustrial values as conveyed in the storyteller's experience of leadership and as told by the storyteller.

Story Six: Bill Kalaf and Reengineering at Intel

Bill Kalaf reports to the Information Technology Group at Intel's Folsom, California, plant. He is in charge of business reengineering and is responsible for developing the methodology and for supporting the execution of the program for task level and milestone deliverables.

My name is Bill Kalaf, I am 44 years of age. I came to Intel because I saw a challenge here. The move helped me get with a progressive company; a firm that hasn't been established for a hundred years, but one that is growing; a firm that wants to change its ways and adopt to the business environment, especially in international competition. So I came to Intel.

I am involved in the reengineering effort. This project is run by the business itself. It is not a division. I am responsible for developing the methodology and supporting the execution of the program for task level and milestone deliverables I read an article once, from United Technologies that explained the difference between leadership and management in very simple terms. It compared leadership to Babe Ruth. The article talked about how Babe Ruth used leadership regarding to how to hit a baseball and how to win in baseball. Because Babe Ruth showed by example, people followed. In the article, management was a scenario of taking the baseball players and

trying to coach them on how to hit a baseball. In both leadership and management, you could talk about the same concept, but you'll never get the same result.

Leadership is basically a follow me approach, a roll up your hands and follow me approach, versus, do what I say. In other words do what I do and don't necessarily do what I say, but do what I do. And management is just the opposite. Do what I say. Don't necessarily do what I do. Two different approaches. Most businesses follow the management approach, which is real different.

I see the instance of leadership accepting possibly two different directions. Acceptance of leadership can be a recognition of doing and getting people to follow the trend. The acceptance of leadership can be from a perspective of seniority: tying leadership to seniority. Acceptance of leadership may not be from a skill set, but from an overall understanding of the business. Leadership can come from many different [places]; not necessarily seniority. But in a lot of companies (inaudible), leadership is actually tied to how long you've been with the company. If the guy has been there thirty years, then the guy must be an excellent leader. It may not be true. In some smaller companies I've seen, people say that a leader is one that people want to follow, because of example. I've also seen that a leader has been appointed from outside with the skill set necessary to accomplish that leadership, more like in a management role. The guy has been a

financial officer and has done excellent in financial leadership, so he must have the skills to be able to be a leader-manager in an information systems (IS) organization. But he might not have the skills to do that. I have seen all three of these take place.

The reason is that people respect leadership more than they do management. A good example of that is in many IS businesses, most of the managers come from a specific business like finance. A man may come into IS from a firm where he was a financial officer. He may then take over an IS organization. However, they really don't understand what it takes to structure an IS organization. Most of the managers ask for your opinion but don't really understand what it takes to drive it. They don't understand the concepts and what the long-term gains from it might be.

I've only seen one case where that was wrong and he was an IS person from ground up. He managed the organization, probably made that organization twice as successful than any others I've ever seen in a small amount of time. [end of Kalaf's story.]

The domains of relevant meaning in Kalaf's story that fit into the category of leadership as an authority relationship were:

- Babe Ruth leadership was showing by example.
- Leadership is a follow-me approach.
- Leadership is from perspective of seniority.

- Leadership is not from a skill but from an overall understanding of business.

Other significant domains of meaning that emerged reflected leadership as a manager-subordinate relationship. They were:

- Management is do what I say.
- Leadership is getting people to follow the trend.

There was only one significant domain of relevant meaning that emerged which could be categorized under production of goods and services resulting from coordinated activity and that was:

- He managed the organization and made it successful in a very short time.

There were no domains of meaning in Kalaf's story that reflected any of the four essential elements necessary for leadership as put forth by Rost.

As the man in charge of re-engineering Intel, Kalaf's message is masked with images and metaphors of leadership as authority based on a manager-subordinate relationship. His underlying theme appears to be control and power as wielded by one person (or a small group of persons) over others. For Kalaf leadership is management, and not even good management. This story is a prime example of the reinforcing false consciousness within people by using contingency management models and identifying them with leadership. The distinction Kalaff makes between

leadership and management is no distinction at all. Upon reflection both turn out to be management.

Story Seven: Mike Nakoue and Becoming A Department Chairperson

Mike Nakoue the science department chair at Woodbridge High School in Irvine, California, told a leadership story about his becoming department chair.

I'm Mike Nakoue. I am 41 years old. I've been at Woodbridge High school for twelve years. I've been department chair for nine years and I've been teaching in the neighborhood of twenty years now. So I've been around.

What immediately comes to my mind in my career--I've been pretty much a leader type since I was a young kid--is October 10, 1985, I remember the day vividly. Our present department chair at the time, Roland Rudder felt that he had too many other commitments and he was tired. He had asked me the year before if I was interested in being department chair and I said no. I didn't want to deal with all the headaches that go with the position. The following year he just said that it was time for him to do something else. So the entire department, there were eight of us, went into a conference room--no one really wanted to do be department chair--and we ended up having nominations. It was unanimous. (Laugh) Everyone voted for me to be department chair.

Knowing that I had full support from everyone in the department--and knowing that it was unanimous--I reluctantly took on the position. I thought

I would just continue with the program Roland built and do the best I could. I thought I would add to that foundation a little. I thought that maybe I'd do it for three or four years. Nine years later, I'm still continuing to build and grow and expand the program here at Woodbridge.

My initial feeling was that its not always wise to follow a star. Roland was a star. It would be like Gene Bartow of UCLA following John Wooden as head coach. I mean, he was destined to fail. How are you going to wing nine or ten national championships out of eleven? How are you going to top that? With that in mind I said to myself: "Oh, just do the best you can and keep the ball rolling."

That initial year I was trying to develop my position and have people have confidence in me as a leader. I think that immediately everyone saw that I could do the job, and that I added a lot to the department. My confidence level grew as each semester went by. My responsibility level increased and I've been very high profile and have developed an excellent program here at Woodbridge.

Now, I'm really seasoned at this position. It makes you callused after a while. After always questioning if your decisions are right or wrong, now you just base them upon what your gut tells you and you go with it. Things don't phase me anymore.

In the initial years you have concerns, you don't want to inconvenience or hurt anybody. But sometimes you can't keep everyone happy and that's just something you learn.

So that's how I felt at that time and now I see that you can never keep everyone happy. There's always people who say: "Why do we have so many meetings? Why can't you just make the decision on it?" And then you have other people, especially in a population of twelve, who say: "Gee's I don't get enough say in this decision making. We need to meet more" (said in a whiny, mimicking manner). So you have the whole spectrum here. What I generally try to do as a leader is present the issues and open up the discussion. I try and follow our superintendent, our initial superintendent, Stan Cories', four rules in decision making. I keep them right on my desk as a reference. The four laws are the following:

1. If others have the highest interest, the greatest expertise, and the greatest responsibility, I delegate and let them decide.
2. If others have some interest, some expertise, but I have the greatest responsibility, I take input and then decide. It is more of a participative decision making.
3. If I have the highest interest, the best information, the greatest responsibility, I better decide and announce it, beaus it will come back to haunt me if I don't.

4. If I have high interest and good information but others have the ultimate responsibility, I seek direction from higher authority and let that person decide.

I try to keep these as a guide when I make decisions so everyone in the department has input. Sometimes I wish more people would get involved. If they don't it ends up being my job to get things done. I've learned over nine years that it just doesn't always happen that way: I sometimes have to take control of the situation and just do it. For myself, I think I've got broad shoulders and I just do what I think is best.

Being the department chair has been an opportunity for professional growth in my life. I look back and say it was the best thing for me at the time. Being department chair has continued to be a good experience for me, even though at the time I really didn't want to do it. It has been good for me [end of Nakoue's story].

The prominent domains of relevant meaning that emerged in Nakoue's story suggesting that his view of leadership is one of authority were that he:

- Bases decisions on his gut feelings.
- Presents the issues.
- Delegates when others have the greatest expertise and responsibility.
- Takes input and then decides when others have some interest and expertise but he has the greatest responsibility.

The domains of meaning that emerged indicating Nakoue's view of leadership is a management-subordinate relationship were that he:

- Keeps the ball rolling.
- Can't always keep everyone happy.
- Presents the issues.
- Is open for discussion.
- Delegates when others have the greatest expertise and responsibility.
- Takes input and then decides when others have some interest and expertise but he has the greatest responsibility.
- Decides and announces the decision when he has the highest interest, the best information and the greatest responsibility.

There was one domain of meaning that emerged that reflected production of goods and services:

- He developed an excellent science program at Woodbridge.

There were no domains of meaning that emerged in Nakoue's story that support any of the four elements necessary for leadership to be present according to Rost. In addition, no domains of meaning emerged to support the management element of production of goods or services resulting from coordinated activities.

Nakoue's early realization of not being able to please everybody and his use of Stan Cories' rules demonstrates Nakoue's view of leadership as

being hierarchical, i. e., the manager/leader decides what is to be done, except when the first of Cories' rules operates. Furthermore, the directives are given to the people in the relationship from the top down and the responses are bottom-up. Nakoue's story indicates that besides being hierarchical, leadership is a perfunctory necessity that must be done within his science department. For Nakoue leadership seems to be a burden even though he feels that it has been an opportunity for professional growth. Since leadership is hierarchical and is a manager-subordinate relationship, it is understandable why leadership would be a burden for him.

Story Eight: Craig Dunn

Craig Dunn is a professor of business ethics at San Diego State University. His story concerns a time when he taught at a private school.

An example of leadership that comes to mind is when I taught on the grammar school level. I hate to use myself as an example, but I guess it is an experience of leadership that has influenced the way that I manage people.

While I was teaching grammar school kids, I was determined that I would never ask the kids to do something that I wasn't willing to do myself. On the other hand, I wasn't going to do things with them that they could do themselves. It reminds me of my mother teaching me to tie my shoes. She would get so frustrated. She was a very patient woman, but I remember her taking my shoe and throwing it across the room, because this was a difficult skill for me to master. You know, I learned with kids that it is much easier

to sit down and tie their shoes yourself than it is to teach them how to tie their shoes.

At the school where I was teaching we had all kinds of chores we had to do. It was a small private school and my idea of leading the kids was that I would do the work with them. I would never ask them, for example, to clean the toilets if I wasn't willing to clean the toilets myself. I think that is good leadership. It's leading by example. It's leading by showing them what to do.

For example, I can actually think of a particular day when, at the very beginning of the school year, we had moved into a new building. We used to meet in a church and then we rented a roller rink. There was a lot of work to do around it. We took truck loads of trash out of there. We had to set up a system for keeping the school clean. We didn't have the money to hire people to come in. I can remember taking this kid, Timmy, into the bathroom and saying: "You know this is how you clean."

My first approach was, let them do it. Well, there was about an inch of Comet (cleanser) in the corners of the bathroom. And I realized you can't just tell people: "this is what to do," especially if they don't understand how to do it. So I took him back in and showed him, this is how you clean the toilet. You put the Comet here. You let it sit. You scrub. You flush. You don't leave an inch of Comet. There was literally an inch of Comet in the corners of the bathroom when he was through the first time. It was an experience

where I went into the bathroom with him and showed him how to do it. I was leading him into it. I think, to me, that is part of what leadership is. Part of leadership is showing people how to do something, not just telling them.

I remember the job I had in the homeowners' association. My philosophy was that I would hire people who I thought were very qualified for the position and then let them do their job. I would be willing to do anything to help them with any part of their job. But, it's like with the glass artisan that I've hired to work at my house. If I hire an artist to do a job for me, to put new windows in my bathroom, I let him do it. I tell them that this is what I want you to do. We then come to some agreement about the job. I think hiring competent people is part of the key to leadership, being willing to work alongside of them, showing them what to do.

I can think of an example with a woman I hired for the homeowners' association. We had rules about kids and about behaviors in the recreation center. She wasn't a very patient person, but this is another kind of leadership experience. She kicked a kid out of the center. We had a Jacuzzi in the center. In her opinion, the kid had been abusing the privileges of using the Jacuzzi, by splashing or whatever. She had given him a pretty severe penalty. I think she had kicked him out for two weeks or something like that. I disagreed with the penalty. I was her boss. But I didn't reverse her decision. What I did was I talked to her afterwards, after she had

mandated this decision. I said, "You know I don't agree with this decision, but I'm going to support you in it." I think that is another aspect of leadership: it is supporting what your employees do, even when you might disagree with them. But at the same time educating them in the process to understand how they might better do their job. That is part of the example of being hands off. I would never, as a leader, chastise an employee in public for example. I would lead by example. I would lead by showing her the way I treated the kids and the penalties I imposed for their misbehavior. I would demonstrate and tell her how I thought it ought to be done. I might talk to her privately afterwards, as I did in that instance. But there is no place in my mind for publicly chastising an employee [end of Dunn's story].

As with Nakoue, Dunn also viewed leadership as authoritative and residing in a manager-subordinate relationship. Dunn's idea of leadership is:

- An experience that has influenced the way that I manage people.
- Leading by showing them what to do.
- Telling them that this is what I want done.
- Hiring competent people which is part of the key to leadership.
- Being willing to work alongside of them, showing them what to do.
- Talking to the subordinate afterwards, after she had mandated this decision.
- Supporting what your employees do.

- Educating the subordinates in the process to understand how they might better do their job.

The domain of meaning in Dunn's story that reflected the management category of goods and services resulting from coordinated activities was:

- Setting up a system for keeping the school clean.

There were no relevant domains of meaning that emerged which reflected the four leadership elements present within Rost's definition.

As an educator Dunn's story reflects the influence the industrial paradigm has had on education (English, 1994). For Dunn leadership within the educational experience is showing and leading people to learn things and not just tell them. Within a milieu different from education, Dunn viewed leadership as telling people what he wants and then letting them do it. For Dunn, hiring competent people is part of the key to leadership. Dunn viewed leadership as management.

Story Nine: Fred Morrison's Story of Leadership.

Fred Morrison is a police officer in El Cajon, California, and supervises a leadership institute for law enforcement officers. He has taught a course on issues in leadership that discusses the values and perspectives that result in leadership in law enforcement organizations. His narrative follows.

The story I'll tell is the first sergeant I had in the police department, Jerry Smith. It is not a finite story. The story doesn't have a particular

incident. It is a story about an approach, a method of how Jerry worked with people.

When I first came on the police department in 1975, there were seven of us who joined the department together. We went through the academy and were trained in the field, prior to the academy. When we got out of the academy, we went to work in different areas. I worked for Jerry off and on for probably the first three years of my career. I ended up being able to work with him as a peer because I became a sergeant as well. I have emulated him. I actually wanted to emulate his style of doing things because when I worked with Jerry I felt like he valued me as an individual.

Three of us, Paul, John and I came on the police department and were assigned to a section of the city. We worked as a team covering that area, pretty much on the same shift. Even though we were new people, Jerry acted like he wanted to hear what we were doing, not just a "listen kid, I'll tell you what to do" kind of approach. He was an old timer, definitely an old timer. He was not a highly educated person as far as academics, but a very common sense, worldly type of person. We felt very comfortable with his opinions and his calm recommendations.

We had several officers on that squad that were senior and easily could have developed an environment in which they assigned us to all the rotten details and we were just cleaning up after them. Of course this profession has a certain amount of rites of passage. You know, you have to

earn your salt so to speak. You have to prove your way into the camaraderie, I guess.

Jerry really didn't allow that stuff to go on. Certainly there was a bit of the teasing and things like that that would go on with the rookies, but when it came down to doing work and making decisions, he made sure there was equality in assignment. He protected rookies from being unfairly treated by senior officers. He made it clear that everyone in the squad had an equal responsibility and made sure that work was done well. He never had different standards for people. He established criteria for doing work. He made it very clear what his levels of quality were, and he held everybody accountable for those levels of quality, whether you were a fifteen year veteran or a one year officer.

Jerry was very effective in taking people's talents, no matter what their tenure was, and bringing them into the program. He allowed you to share what you had or knew in a way that didn't become belittling to anyone else. It made you very comfortable if he asked you, at a shift meeting for instance, to give your opinion or thoughts or share some information. In contrast, some sergeants at that time would promote the idea that because you were a rookie, you would sit there and you'd only speak when you were spoken to. That was never Jerry's way. He demonstrated his work ethic. He worked very hard. He never slacked off. It was a personal offense to him if you didn't earn your fair day's wage.

He would give you guidance as opposed to a lecture. And he would let you go ahead with something. And if you were heading in the wrong direction, he'd allow you to stray for a certain distance and then bring you back. But he gave you the parameters to experience things and to make a little bit of a mistake so that you could straighten it out.

It was a method he had of doing things. You wanted to do things right because you didn't want to let him down. In real life, leadership is the people who bring you along and give you the stuff that you carry with you for a long time. Those are the leaders that affect you. They take care of you. They give you room to work and then they bring you back and instruct you when you need it or they let you run and point at you when you do well.

Another thing that we worked on when I was with him was that we started a parking control program in the east county. A manual had to be put together on how this new function was operating. So he said: "I need this manual to be put together. Fred, I want you to work with the clerk and in the next month try to put something together." He let us run with the task. When we were done with it, the manual was a really nice document. He took out road blocks when we needed it, but when it was done he made it very clear that it had our name on it. His fulfillment came from the fact that his people did a good job. He made you feel good that you had done that. And he let others know that you're good, he didn't hold the prize. He shared

the prize. He gave it away to the people who made him look good, and he made sure that people knew that.

In a bureaucracy when it's something good, there's a boss that makes sure his name is attached to it. When there is something bad, you stand alone. And I never felt that loneliness when I was in trouble. Jerry was there with you. At the same time I could feel the warmth of the spotlight I guess. When things were good, he made you stand up and take a bow. He had a way of making groups of workers care about each other and care about what they were doing because they cared about Jerry [end of Morrison's story].

For Morrison, emulating Jerry translates into seeing leadership as a manager/subordinate relationship where the images of the relationship are "inherently unequal, with the manager having the dominant part and the subordinate--as the name indicates--having the subordinate part. Management is a two-way relationship that is primarily top-down as to the directives given and bottom-up as to the responses given" (Rost, 1991, p. 147).

Morrison's story conveys leadership as authority as is demonstrated by the following domains of relevant meaning.

- Smith made it clear that everyone had equal responsibility.
- He established the criteria for quality.

- He gave parameters for experience by allowing subordinates to make little mistakes and then straighten them out.
- He took it as a personal offense if you didn't work hard.
- He would point at you when you did well.

The domains of meaning that emerged in Morrison's story that reflected leadership as a manager-subordinate relationship were:

- Smith gave guidance, he didn't lecture.
- If you strayed too far, he would bring you back.
- He allowed you to make little mistakes so you could straighten them out.
- He would bring you back and instruct you when you needed it.
- He let us run with the task.
- He took out road blocks.
- He made it clear that everyone had equal responsibility.
- He made sure that there was equality in work.
- He let us run with the task.
- He made everyone accountable.
- He took out road blocks.
- He made groups care about each other and what they were doing.

There were no relevant domains of meaning that emerged that reflected the management elements of producing goods and services and producing goods and services resulting from coordinated activities. There

were no domains of meaning reflecting the four leadership elements present within Rost's definition.

Morrison's story evokes images of leadership as residing in a great man who elicited loyalty from his subordinates in order to complete tasks. Morrison's great man had the talents/traits to incorporate people into the force and to encourage people to be responsible while helping them along the way, at the same time he maintained a definite positional authority and controlling presence. Morrison's vision of leadership has been greatly influenced by his incorporation into the police structure by a caring but exacting manager.

Story Ten: Colleen Cross

Colleen Cross is 38 and has been at Woodbridge High School for fourteen years. It was her first-full time teaching job. She started teaching physical education for six years and has been in administration for the last eight years. She is now an administrator in charge of student activities. Her story concerns her involvement with student government and administration.

My story about leadership concerns a recent event that took place here at Woodbridge. If you've been reading the papers at all, then you probably have read about this whole sexual harassment thing that has developed in connection with an annual pep rally we have. This rally had male football players dress as female cheerleaders and do a routine. There has been an

interesting dynamic in the student council that I had to deal with that concerns leadership.

Basically the problem has to do with the school board policy of sexual harassment. It also concerns a faculty contingent who were very much against the rally and who were offended by it. It also concerns the administration saying that we had probably better not do the rally.

I was directed by the administration to caress the Associated Student Body into making the decision to not have the rally. The object was to make them feel that they had decided to cancel the rally.

It was a real delicate process of trying to move the ASB toward thinking that they made that decision themselves. I didn't want it to be the kind of thing where the administration just said: No! No! No! We have to say no enough, and this was a very touchy issue. I knew that if we just crammed it down their throats, there might be a real negative student response. Whereas, if the student body felt that ASB had made the decision, it would be a little easier for them to swallow. So I had that interesting dynamic of having my administrative people over me telling me one thing, and at the same time, knowing how the kids feel. And yet I had to bring them around, so it was a real challenge for me personally.

I felt very much caught in the middle--sort of damned if you do and damned if you don't. I didn't necessarily agree with the strong contingent in the faculty who thought the whole thing was horrible. I agreed that some of

the things that were done last year at the rally were inappropriate. But I am not a throw-the-baby-out-with-the-bath water type of person. I felt that with some controls, the skit could be kept in the assembly. I sort of sided with the kids in that respect. It created a lot of conflict in me personally to have to be taking a strong stand with the kids in telling them not to have it, when inside I'm thinking: "Hey, just clean it up and give the kids another chance." You take risks with teenagers, that's just what you do. It was difficult for me to have to do something that I didn't agree with because of what I was directed to do by the administration. I didn't feel it was the right decision, necessarily. I actually feel, in hindsight, that it was the right thing to do. But at the time, I was experiencing a lot of internal conflict because I was having to do something I didn't agree with.

At the ASB meeting where we were having the discussion, the ASB president, a young man, was sitting next to me. I was impressed with how he was reading me. Even though I really didn't sense that he agreed, he was taking a leadership role with the ASB cabinet and making statements like, "We would be foolish to do this in the current climate. It doesn't really matter how we feel about it, we have to look at the bigger picture. Right now with the current climate and with all of this media attention we would be under microscopic scrutiny."

I was very proud of his leadership ability coming through there. To be quite honest, I was sitting next to him and kind of under my breath, feeding

him some of these comments. He then was parroting them out. But he didn't seem to resent that. He seemed to appreciate me feeding him the words he needed in order to provide leadership for the ASB cabinet. That was interesting for me. I would sit there and whisper to him, under my breath things like, "Did you realize they'd be looking at every move we made?" This would be when there was other members talking at the table. Then he would say out loud, "Do you guys have any idea at how closely they would be looking at every move we make?"

Doing that made him feel good about his leadership ability in bringing people around to the decision he could tell he had to make. I was happy with the fact that I was able to do that without having to tell the ASB these things myself. It was a good experience of a transfer of leadership. Empowering him to do what I needed to have done, so that it came from a peer rather than from an adult.

It was the first time that I had to do something as delicate as feed information to a student leader and have it hopefully appear that it was his comments and his ideas. I haven't really had to do that before. I was always able to just say it myself and the ASB would pretty much agree--as long as I said it gently. This is the first time I used a tactic of feeding an ASB officer the words and having him say it like it was his idea. For me, leadershipwise, it was an interesting way to have to do it, to take care of a delicate situation [end of Cross' story].

Domains of relevant meaning that emerged in Cross's story that reflected leadership as an authority relationship were:

- I used a tactic of feeding an ASB officer words.
- I was happy I was able to do that [accomplish my goal] without having to tell the ASB myself.
- I felt with some controls the skit could be done.
- There was an interesting dynamic in the student council I had to deal with.
- The administration said not to do the rally.

Domains of meaning reflecting a manager/subordinate relationship in Cross' story were:

- It was a real delicate process of trying to move the ASB toward thinking that they made that decision themselves.
- I had to bring them around.
- I was sitting next to him and kind of under my breath, feeding him some of these comments.
- I was able to make him feel good about his leadership ability in bringing people around to the decision he could tell he had to make.
- It was a good experience of a transfer of leadership.
- I empowered him to do what I needed to have done.

Domains of relevant meaning emerged in Cross' story that reflected the management element of producing goods and services and producing goods and services from coordinated activities. They were:

- The object was to make the ASB members feel that they had decided to cancel the rally.
- If we crammed decision down students' throats, we would have negative reaction.
- He seemed to appreciate me feeding him the words he needed in order to provide leadership for the ASB cabinet.
- Leadershipwise, it was an interesting way to have to implement a decision.

There were no relevant domains of meaning that emerged in Cross' story that reflected the four leadership elements present within Rost's definition of leadership.

For Cross leadership is related to solving problems within an organizational structure that is greatly influenced by outside political pressure and inside pressure from faculty members. Cross identified leadership with a personal challenge in that she had outside pressure from the school board and inside pressure from the administration to keep things calm while knowing how the students felt about the situation. Cross is immersed in a classical organizational struggle to enforce externally determined decisions and maintain control over subordinates. In order to

keep everyone happy Cross engaged in a manipulative tactic with the ASB. For Cross leadership is bringing others to do the wishes of authority through means that reinforce a false consciousness of feigned free choice.

Story Eleven: William Shannon's Story of Leadership

William Shannon is 38 and a native of southern California. He is currently an executive for the Disney Institute. His story is about being head basketball coach at Woodbridge High School in Irvine, California.

My leadership story concerns what went into the building of a state championship basketball team.

I got many phone calls and wonderful accolades, as you would expect, when the championship happened. But one of the things that hit me pretty hard was when an old friend, who is a coach called and said: "You realize that ninety-nine percent of the people in the business will never experience what you have done--to win the top prize in your sport?" What he said is very true. That really hit me as a significant statement to make. As a coach, I think you could draw a lot of comparisons: there are a lot of authors out there but very few of them win a Pulitzer or Nobel Prize.

In 1987, while I was head basketball coach at Woodbridge, my team and I won the California State Basketball Championship. It was my fifth varsity team. Our being in the playoffs itself was an accomplishment. The statistical fact that is amazing is that in order to do that, we had to win eight postseason games in a row, five of which were in hostile environments. Prior

to that, in order to get seeded as the fourth seed in the playoffs we needed to be a league champion. That probably meant having to be an undefeated league champion. In reality, what we did was win eighteen games in a row. That is pretty hard to do. [Said sarcastically punctuated with a crisp chuckle.]

I really think there were three really important decisions, maybe four, depending on how you want to frame it, that have affected me as a leader. First of all, as a young coach, I made a conscious decision to surround myself with a circle of friends that were not my own age. These men were not typical coaches who attended clinics and wrote down everything that was said. I chose to work in basketball camps where I had the opportunity to spend a week with these atypical coaches.

My coaching friends, the ones with whom I can pick up the phone and talk, are those that are my age. But the majority of those who had a tremendous amount of influence on me are all in their sixties and seventies. Relating to older, more experienced coaches taught me a lot about viewing a program from an experienced person's point of view.

The second thing I decided to do as a young coach was probably even more significant. Many people are caught up in emulating what other people have done and invented. In basketball you translate that into offense. There are coaches who have been in the business ten years, twenty years, forty years. They are consistently teaching their players the same exact offense. I

found that approach to be boring. It made practice mundane. That approach would make practice mundane for both me and the players. I decided to change the whole philosophy of the way I approached the game. I decided to put players in spots, in the offenses, where they had the best chance to succeed, instead of creating a robotics type atmosphere where we just ran the offense. What happened as a result of that was I got a great effort on the part of the players. Even though at times I might want to question their commitment and question how hard they would play, I still knew that their egos were involved. I said: "You're going to be able to play this position. We're going to run these numbers of options for you, because you can better score with them than you could if I tried to make you do something you can't do."

The third thing that was a major contributor to my being a leader was that I worked harder than the other guy. Probably the best illustration is this: I had the kids convinced that it was extremely difficult for opponents to prepare for us. The reason was that we weren't running an offense out of a book. Second, I had the kids convinced that when I had an opponent scouted, we were going to win. They were going to have the best opportunity they could to win, to succeed.

I think those three factors were significant. One of my older coaching mentors had told me once: "When you get your shot, you need to find guys that are like you. You must bring good young people into the profession and

give them responsibility." So when I was looking for people to be assistant coaches and the Joe Rafels and the John Halagans and the Rus Davis and the John Parps came along, I grabbed them. I found guys that were workaholics. I found guys that were very much interested in the kids. But I also treated them a lot like the players. I gave them responsibility. I gave them a road map to follow. But I didn't give them step-by-step footprints. I let them learn. As they learned, they were given more and more responsibility.

After Woodbridge had been opened for five years and I had those young kids in place, and those young coaches in place, the program really became a monster that fed itself. That's why we have had three former assistants who have now gone on to become head coaches, and others who have had the opportunity. If you count John Halagan, we have had four assistant coaches who became head coaches.

We did something right philosophically by bringing in those young, eager-beaver coaches and giving them a lot of responsibility, much as I gave the players. I gave them a footprint for success just like I gave the players. So as the leader, you take a step back. I think those are the four significant thoughts and points that we tried to get across. And it worked.

There are a lot of issues that dovetail. For instance, I did a lot of public relations in the community. I reached out and was very much involved with the media. I wanted a close relationship with the media

because I saw my relationship with them as a chance to expose my program and motivate my players and my coaches. I think that once you have that success, you become an ambassador for your program. I mean, I've spoken at basketball clinics and basketball camps throughout the country: from California to Duke; from North Carolina to the University of Nevada, Las Vegas; from the University of Alabama to Santa Clara University. I've worked with and have relationships with the people in all of the very top programs.

Another thing that affected me as a leader is that even though we never really had a lot of phenomenal athletes, we've had a lot of overachievers who've been able to go on. I think the only other issue of leadership that was a really key decision was my friendship with Bud Presley. Bud is in his seventies and is considered the foremost defensive coach in the history of the game. I'm one out of perhaps only twenty who can pick up the phone and talk with him, or who corresponds regularly with him. I think a lot of other people really didn't befriend him because of the nature of his personality. This won't mean anything to anyone who is not a basketball person.

Bud said to me once: "Kid, life is too short to coach assholes." Coming from a man who has coached on every level and been very successful, it was something that I really took to heart.

When I look back upon the people I've coached, and when I've had one or two kids who were resource kids and who were in special education, I would have my A+ kids developed relationships with them and help them. I also had players who were scholar athletes. And because I was doing intellectually stimulating things on the court, these athletes were challenged. When I look at where some of my players have gone on to play in college, or where my players have gone on to be students, I'm pleased.

There are often times as a coach where you can compromise intellect for athleticism if you think someone may win a game for you one day. But what I took from Bud's comment, and the conversations we've had, is that it is better in the long haul to have dealt with really quality people. And he's absolutely right. So as a leader of those kids, and as hard on them as I had been and as demanding as I was, I think that they would probably all say that I was pretty good for them. I have had players who have either played, are playing or who are students at places like, Brown, Princeton, Columbia, Yale, Stanford. I've had just tons of players at the University of California campuses and at real quality universities. You know that's really important to me.

Some of my former players run their own computer firms. One of my former players, who went to DePaul, is my stock broker. They are policemen and orthopedic surgeons and they are working for major corporations. I think a lot of that certainly has to do with their parents and their own intelligence. However, I think the basketball program at Woodbridge also

had a lot to do with it. That's one of the things that makes me most proud. That and the fact that when it is all said and done, starting from scratch, with eleven varsity teams we won 69 or 70 percent of our games. When you talk about being around that kind of quality people, coaches and assistants and really running a really intellectually stimulating environment, and you still win seven out of ten games, that's pretty good.

A step-by-step process in each season really began about 1985 and just continues right now. I mean right to now. They have that environment, even though I'm not there. That's about it, I would think.

I'm going to start with the summer of 1985. As I mentioned to you, that was right at the time where I decided I was going to be my own coach and design my own stuff. That was when I decided to make an effort to hang around the professors emeritus, if you will, of the game, as opposed to people who were my age or a little older. One of the interesting places I visited was Pete Nuell's Big Man Camp at Loyola Marymount University. It began as a camp where Coach Nuell, who is a legend, took the big players in the NBA, 6' 8" or 6' 9" and up, and taught them things about the game that they never had learned. Because they were the best players in their colleges, they had spent the majority of their time down underneath the basket and really didn't learn how to play basketball. What was sort of a gestalt for me was that I was doing the same thing. What I realized from him was that I needed to teach my high school athletes exactly what he was teaching the great

athletes who were playing the sport. When I began using his approach, we made a quantum leap in wins. The more fundamentally sound the kids became, the more sophisticated things we could do. I also had instant credibility with the players, whether they were freshmen or seniors, because I could say things like: "When I watched Buck Williams of Portland go against Kiki Vandewegh of the Knicks, this is what they did." They were running those basics in practice, which seem mundane at times and don't seem as fun as playing a game or running a competitive drill--but the basics became a very valuable tool. The more our kids became comfortable with what I learned from Coach Nuell, namely, things that had to do with footwork, and getting yourself open, things like having your body in the best possible position to create possibilities for yourself, with or without the basketball, the more things we could naturally employ in the offensive schemes we were running.

A second benefit that happened as a result of going to Nuell's basketball camps was that we became better defensively. I'm not certain that when I made the decision to do follow his approach that I recognized that there were going be a lot of ancillary benefits. I knew it would motivate the kids. And I knew we would be better offensively. I hoped that we would be better defensively. But I had no idea how it would allow us to be more sophisticated both offensively and defensively, because of what we were learning to do that really had to do with footwork. I continued to go back and

visit his camp every year, even though it was really repeated, just to pick up more things.

In 1985, I had an interesting combination of kids. I had some very, very bright perimeter players, only one of whom was a great athlete. The rest were just very hard-working good kids. All of them also had at least a 3.5 G. P. A. and a couple of them were 4.0 students. My front line players were very young. Two juniors and a sophomore. The sophomore, Adam Keefe, turned out to be the best player I have ever coached. I think, looking back on it, the reason he's now in the NBA, playing for Atlanta, is because when he was a ninth and tenth grader we worked very hard on the footwork. So when he was a junior and senior, I could really design options for him. He was so much more capable of doing great things because I didn't anchor him down underneath the basket. I didn't force him to do so many more things on the move

I think that 98% of the coaches who would've had Adam Keefe in their program would have made him a very good back to the basket post player. I did that. But in addition, I think he's quoted in a newspaper article as saying that I gave him knowledge and taught him about the roles of the other people around him, so that when he went from one level to the next, or from one team to the next, he understood his jobs and responsibilities and those of the people around him. He is more versatile as a result.

Being more versatile means that if you took basketball positions one through five, five is your big post player. Position four is supposedly your power forward, your-more-close-to-the-basket sort of guy. As a high school player, I played Adam at the three position. People in the NBA refer to this as the small forward, even though Adam was 6' 9" and by far the biggest player we'd ever had.

When you talk in terms of how he became a leader as a result, he did. All of our captains have become leaders as a result. Because one thing they are all able to show is versatility, no matter what position they play. We asked our biggest players to go out and play man-to-man defense and put pressure on the basketball, and work hard and move their feet in different ways. Most coaches would've said: "Put him in the middle, have him clog everything up, let him block shots and keep him out of foul trouble." Well, I didn't believe that that was going to win championships, or that that was going to make players be the best players they could be.

When players are being recruited, if they're questionable because they're white, or they're not as big as the next guy, or you're not sure what they can do, if the recruiter understands that the program they're from is strong and that they are versatile, then those kids have a better chance of moving along to the next level.

This approach which engenders versatility makes players constantly challenge one another. They are all going to improve. This includes me as

the head coach, I mean, I constantly wanted to challenge myself to come up with new and better ways to scramble the egg. And the players have the same--they had to have the same attitude. We ran offenses at times where, if you drew circles on the court, there might be ten different spots where people might catch the ball. Some of those spots were far out from the basket and other spots were right underneath the basket. I didn't care if a player was 6' 9" or 5' 9" he learned to react and defend and play with the basketball and without the basketball at those particular spots. The same idea applied when I watched Coach Nuel and when I watched some of the other old coaches that I've observed and worked with. They were not afraid to put their own ego aside and let the kids make decisions and let their coaches make decisions.

This approach engendered freedom in the players. If you have freedom to make decisions, you have the freedom to develop. And I think that's true in an academic world. I think it's true in the business sense. I know it was true on the court, and I know it was true in the basketball program. There were times when we were clearly not as athletically talented as many of the teams we played. But the majority of the times we came out on the victorious end because we had kids that would feed off each other, emotionally and intellectually. They would also feed off of the coaching staff.

I wouldn't tolerate a poor effort. I wouldn't tolerate misbehavior. I insisted that they carry themselves with class. But I gave them every

opportunity to be creative. I designed specifically for them, and I put them in places where they could be creative and where they could be leaders. If you review a basketball season, the chances are very good that your best player is going to have the most points and the most rebounds. But when you look back at a particular situation or when you go game by game and you play these little mini narratives back in your head, there is not a guy on the team that you couldn't go back and say: "That guy won this game for us. That guy's contribution led everyone else to victory" And I don't think you do that if you create robots or people that you stifle what they can do. For the first time in the history of the city of Irvine, we had a twenty game winning season. It was the first of several that we had. That's why when I gave you my introductory stuff, when I talked about scholar athletes and I talked about how the program had an impact on them, I was giving you what I think is leadership. Because you are talking about the leaders on campus. You are talking about the leaders in athletics. You're talking about the leaders in the community and you're talking about that link that they all have in common: That 84' x 50' piece of wood in the Woodbridge gym, a place where they played basketball and spent more hours than they did with any of their other high school endeavors.

Beginning in 1982, a tradition began to develop. I never named the team captain until the season was over. So even though the rules state that you have to send your captain out to meet with the officials so they know who

can speak on the floor, I would send a different guy out very often. I would use that as a reward system. On our best teams it would be a different guy each time. If I thought someone needed a little kick in the butt, if someone needed a little positive reinforcement or if I found out something had gone wrong in their life that week, or if they had an exceptionally good practice, or they had an exceptionally bad practice, or I wasn't sure how good they were going to play that night, I would send them out there to give them that leadership opportunity. So in our hall of fame in our gym that lists all our "All League" and "All CIF" players, year by year, are the names of the captain or captains. They're not necessarily ever up on the top of the list. I never said at practice: "You're the captain." The leadership position changed and rotated. And very much like contributing to the success of the team, game by game as we look back at the narrative, a different person would step forward in that role.

As for leadership, I think a leader, probably above all else, has to recognize the responsibility he has. But also a leader has to be able to look, as best he can, through the eyes of the people he's leading. That's why when I talk about putting players in the best chance and best place they have to succeed. And when I talk about seeking the old long time leaders and letting them advise me on where I should go, that's really what I mean. In the performing arts they say that you must know your audience. In advertising they say: What's the hook? Well in my frame of reference, the hook is being

able to get at each individual in your group and find out really what makes that person tick, to not only look at the group collectively but look at individuals. I would define leadership as a person who is really able to do that, to look from the eyes of the people they are in charge of. If you don't do that I think you are really making a mistake

There are roles that you have to have. You have to understand that people answer to people. I mean that is just the way it is. But I don't want people afraid to approach me. I don't want to have people that I'm afraid to approach. I don't want it to be a dictatorial environment, even though there are people that succeed in that style. There are people that get their staff to work incredible hours and do incredible things. But that's not me. You probably don't realize it and maybe John Halagan [a former assistant coach for Shannon and now head coach at Woodbridge High School] doesn't talk about it much with you guys in the family. But I mean, as years went by, I really gave John a lot of responsibility. And by doing that it allowed me to be more creative. That allowed me to be a better leader, because there were things he was working on and thinking about during games and practice and before that if I didn't have to deal with, I was free to focus on other things. And that is the same type of relationship that I see in this framework. I don't want to be the person, I don't want someone to call me every five minutes to make a decision. I want people to make good solid decisions on their own. And you know its funny, here we're talking about basketball. When you

have the ball or you're without the ball and you're on offense or when you're on defense you are making decisions all the time. A leader makes good decisions for the benefit of the group [end of Shannon's story].

The relevant domains of meaning that emerged in Shannon's story reflected elements of both management and leadership.

The relevant domains of meaning that emerged which demonstrated leadership as an authority relationship were:

- I decided to change the whole philosophy.
- I decided to put players in spots.
- There are roles you have to have.
- A leader must recognize the responsibility they have.
- You're going to be able to play this position.
- I put them in places where they could perform.

The relevant domains of meaning that emerged which reflected leadership as a leader-follower relationship were:

- Kids would feed off each other.
- They became versatile on the court. (They could play different positions and configurations.)
- I continued to visit his camp every year.

The domains of meaning that emerged that reflected leadership as a manager-subordinate relationship were:

- You have to understand that people answer to people.

- I treated the coaches like players.
- I gave John a lot of responsibility.
- I got great effort from the players.
- I had the kids convinced that we were going to win.
- I gave them a road map to follow.

The domains of meaning that reflected production of goods and services and goods and services resulting from coordinated activities were:

- I changed accepted philosophy and placed players in spots that gave them their best chance of success.
- Success happened because I let my kids have freedom to express themselves on the court.
- We won 7 out of 10 games with high quality people.
- We won the state high school basketball championship.
- We had a twenty game winning streak.

There were no relevant domains of meaning that emerged that could be categorized under the leadership elements of influence, intended real changes or intended real changes that reflect mutual purposes.

Shannon's story of leadership was not an episodic story but rather a story over a period of time told to illustrate a view of leadership which has grown out of the metaphor of playing and coaching a game. For Shannon the idea of leadership is framed by coaching kids to win the game. To that end Shannon's view of leadership is content driven. He utilizes interaction,

cooperation and collaboration in coaching to attain the end goal of winning. One of the interesting aspects of this story is that there is an apparent *sense* of attainment of goods and services (i. e., winning the game) as resulting from coordinated activities. But because this is a team situation, there is also a strong *sense* of mutuality being present within the dynamic. However, even though players and coaches have apparent mutual purposes, that is, to win games and a championship, these are relatively short term and are very specific goals. They are not purposes. Leadership is a way to attain a specific goal for Shannon.

Story Twelve: Traci Sypolt's Story of Sydney Pollack

Traci Sypolt is originally from Sacramento where she attended high school and college.. She is 32 years old and is currently working in sales and marketing at Intel, in a systems capacity. Her job consists of a full spectrum of driving product out the door and support. Her story is about an experience she had with Sydney Pollack.

I have given some thought to the story I want to tell. I will be honest. I'm not a very good storyteller. I tend to talk in objectives, bullets and the like. The example that came to mind when I was reading the instructions you sent was an experience I had in San Francisco when I went to see Sydney Pollack, the film producer. Not only was seeing him a moving experience but I think it was a stellar example of leadership, in that he got

two standing ovations. He got one ovation for the quality of his work and the latter for the quality of his person. That was very respectful.

Story telling--oh God--guide me a little bit.

Q. You know you were at the a lecture and Pollack began to talk.

A: He was at the Palace of Fine Arts in San Francisco. He was seated on the stage during his introduction which consisted of running through film clips arranged as a medley of his accomplishments. It looked somewhat like a mini film-festival for Robert Redford, who was in many of Pollack's films. It was great. The works were recognizable and everyone there enjoyed his work.

When the medley was completed, he got a standing ovation. At that point he moved into a question and answer session with the audience. He just sat there with about 500 or 600 people and answered questions as if he were sitting in his own living room. It was very natural. He dialogued with the people as if they were friends. It was very comfortable. He had command of the audience as he answered the questions. I don't know what word best describes what happened. It is not that he empowered. It is also not that he was condescending. The people didn't know the movie lingo and the ins and outs of the industry, but he was still able to maintain a dialogue.

When he finished the presentation he got a standing ovation. I thought that was a great example of leadership. He was confident, he was articulate, he was knowledgeable, he was successful in the quality of his

work and in the way that he carried himself. He controlled the situation, for lack of a better word. It wasn't a manipulative control. It was control through giving control away. He shared control. It was definitely his show and he ran it, even though there were 600 or so other people sitting there wanting to be a part of it.

There was a lot of interaction. People would ask very specific questions. In his answers he would extrapolate on what he was trying to accomplish in a certain work. He would give some highlights and some of the problems that he encountered in making films. It was as if the entire audience was participating in this journey. It was fun. He was able to communicate frustration, achievement, and humor. We all were part of it. From an audience standpoint, everyone was very comfortable. As I told a friend of mine while we walked out: "It was kind of like we were talking with uncle Sydney." I mean he just had that quality [end of Sypolt's story].

Sypolt saw leadership in her encounter with Sydney Pollack to include influence: The relevant domains of meaning were:

- He dialogued as if they were friends.
- He answered questions.
- He was not manipulative.
- He was willing to share control.

There were also elements of authority present within Sypolt's story.

They were:

- He controlled the situation.
- It was his show.
- He had command of the audience.

The leadership elements that reflect leaders and followers that emerged in Sypolt's story were:

- He sat there and answered questions.
- He maintained a dialogue.
- He shared control.
- There was a lot of interaction.
- It was as if the entire audience was participating in this journey.
- We were all part of it.

Domains of meaning reflecting the management elements of manager and subordinate relationship, production of goods and services and the production of goods and service resulting from coordinated activities did not emerge in Sypolt's story. The leadership elements of intended real changes or intended real changes that reflect mutual purposes also were not present within Sypolt's narrative.

Sypolt's vision of leadership as characterized in her encounter with Pollack suggests that she saw leadership as residing in one person who has accomplished great things. For Sypolt there is much respect due to those who are accomplished. She saw leadership as emerging in the traits and accomplishments of an individual.

The interesting thing about her description, however, is that even though one could characterize her understanding of leadership as that of traits or the great man/woman theory, the leadership element of influence was fairly strong in her story. The presence of influence coupled with the accented presence of the elements of leaders and followers suggests that Sypolt's life-world is one that sees the necessity of interaction and noncoerciveness to be present within leadership. The presence of these two postindustrial values within Sypolt's story and her consciousness signify an experiential and cognitive understanding of leadership that is more than hierarchical, great man/woman and trait laden.

Story Thirteen: Jack Smith's Leadership Story of Chief Davis

Jack Smith is the chief of the El Cajon Police Department. He was born and raised in the Los Angeles area. His father was the fire chief in the city of Inglewood for about 20 years. When Smith was 20 he applied to the fire department and the police department in Los Angeles. He thought he was going to be a fireman, but the police department job came up first, so he took it. He worked with the Los Angeles Police Department for twenty-seven years under Chief Ed Davis. His story concerns chief Davis of the Los Angeles Police Department.

I was recruited for the chief's position here in El Cajon because they had personnel problems. The chief that was here before me didn't necessarily have a vote of no confidence, but there was much turmoil and

acrimony in the department. There had been grievances filed against the city manager, the personnel director, and the chief of police. Basically I was brought in here to improve relationships within the department and with city hall. I've been here for five years. My degrees are in the social sciences from California State University at Long Beach. I have a bachelor's degree in criminology. However, much of my undergraduate work was in sociology. I obtained a master's degree in social psychology.

The leadership story I want to tell takes place while I was with the LAPD in about 1971. I was number five on the promotion list and about ready to make lieutenant. I was called into Chief Ed Davis' office. He sat down with me and discussed his vision of how he felt law enforcement should work and how it could be more effective. I would say that Davis was a nontraditionalist in policing. He felt that many of the methods for doing police work in the traditional criminal justice system weren't effective. He felt that simply arresting people wasn't effective. He thought that reacting to situations wasn't effective. He felt that the problems in the country would increase if police didn't change the way they did policing. He thought that we would have total anarchy in our country. Davis had a vision for the police to provide better service to the community by going out into the community and developing prevention strategies. He had created the neighborhood watch in which lines of communication between the police and the community were established. He was very much for interaction between the

police and the citizen. Davis talked about the territorial imperative. He thought we needed government employees and people to regain a sense of responsibility for their community by living and working in it. He felt that by having the territorial imperative people would care more for their community. The community is theirs. It belongs to them. Therefore, they have more of an interest in it. He felt that there was a lack of interest in a community being developed because people were so mobile and transient and many of the civil servants didn't live within it. He thought this lack of interest in community included the people who worked within the police department. He wanted to change that.

At the meeting in his office he gave me sixty police officers and about \$300,000 and said: "I want you to go out and I want you to develop prevention strategies in the neighborhoods. I want to see what will happen. I want you to work with your police officers in a different way. I don't want it to be as para-military as it has been in the past. I want you to start dealing in a participative way. I want you to go down and mobilize the community and get them to work more effectively with the police and I want you to develop prevention strategies in the neighborhoods and see how they work."

So I did. I went and started a pilot program that lasted for about eighteen months. We developed a lot of crime prevention strategies in the block captain program. We encouraged strategies that included locks on doors and those kinds of things you commonly see today. We developed these strategies among the sixty people Davis gave me for this pilot. It was very

interesting in that it was one of the first experiments with participative management in policing. We actually took the team away for a three day retreat which was unheard of in law enforcement at that time. Nobody ever did those things. We went away for a three day strategic planning session, as we call it today, back then it was just a meeting. And it developed many things that are commonplace in law enforcement today: just by talking to police officers, getting their ideas and talking about how we could really go into the community and prevent crime from happening vs. always reacting to it.

As the pilot progressed, the traditionalists had a great deal of difficulty with it. They thought that dividing the neighborhood would make it easier for the communists. Remember, this is 1970 and many felt that the communists would be able to come in and take us over because we would destroy the strength we had in large government organizations by breaking down the power base. To many of the traditionalists we were communists by doing this. To them we were doing things that social workers do. We were not doing what police officers were meant to do. We were ruining law enforcement and it would never be the same.

People would come into my office and would sit around bouncing off the walls in anger. They would ask: "What are you doing? You're destroying the police force." Different people who had stakes in specialties, like detectives, were affected by this approach because we eliminated all of those

specialized functions, or at least we generalized what they did. For instance, a homicide detective would work the field and do a lot of different things. People who were in specialized assignments were very upset about the change. People said things like: "You're infringing upon my territory."

After 18 months we did a final report. We had some successes. I'll never forget what happened next. On a Friday afternoon after Davis had reviewed the report he called me on the phone and said: "I want you to develop an organizational chart because I want to change the whole Los Angeles Police Department to this mode of doing things. I want it on my desk on Monday." [Laughter.]

I remember thinking: "Oh my God, how are we going to do this?" We sat down and created an organizational chart for the Los Angeles Police Department. Davis then called his deputy chiefs in and said: "All right, this is how I feel about things. This is the way we're going to do it. Within four months I want this department devoted to doing policing, team policing this way."

All kinds of hell broke loose in the department. Davis was criticized as making social workers out of everybody. People felt that this would never work and so on and so forth. I guess the lesson on leadership was that this man was intelligent and committed to his way of doing things. I remember being in a meeting with the deputy chiefs (because I was involved in the initial project), he sat there and through intelligence and through conveying

his vision he was able to bring ten very strong personalities around to say: “You know he’s right. This man is a genius. Why didn’t I see these things before?” He was able to motivate them sufficiently to allow them to go down to their captains and motivate them to change. The whole department really went that way.

I guess when you talk about MBO many times people participate but don’t make decisions. Well Ed Davis did make decisions. Here was a mission. This is what we’re going to do. And now we’re going to participate in how we’re going to implement these ideas. I want your ideas, I want your suggestions, but there was no question about where it was going to go. In other words it was an organizational democracy, as he used to say. That is, you have a say, but I make the final decision. And that’s really the way he operated. But I felt that during that time it was really almost a quantum leap in terms of how we thought about doing police work. And now in the 1990s, I mean this is twenty years ago, we’re seeing his vision really come to be accepted almost worldwide.

Ed Davis had a vision of what would make things better and he was able to make it happen. This was leadership [end of Smith’s story].

The domains of meaning that reflected influence in Smith’s story were:

- Through Davis’ intelligence and conveying his vision he brought them around to saying he was right.

- He was able to motivate them so they could motivate their captains to change.

The domains of relevant meaning that reflected authority in Smith's story were:

- I was called into Davis' office.
- He discussed his vision of law enforcement and how it should work.
- He gave me sixty police officers and \$300,000.
- Davis said: "This is the way we're going to do it."
- Davis made decisions.
- This is what we are going to do.

The domains of relevant meaning that reflected managers and subordinates were:

- I want you to go out and develop prevention strategies.
- I want you to work with your police officers in a different way.
- We're going to participate in how to implement these ideas.
- You have a say but I make the final decision.

Smith's story about Davis demonstrated management elements of producing goods and services. They were:

- He wanted to develop prevention strategies.
- He felt that with the territorial imperative people would care more about their community.
- I want team-policing to happen.

The domains of meaning that reflected the management elements of producing goods and services from coordinated activities were:

- He had a vision to provide better service by going out into community.
- We developed crime prevention strategies among the sixty people Davis gave me.
- We're going to participate in how to implement these ideas.
- He created neighborhood watch involving communication between police and community.

Domains of meaning that reflected the leadership relations of leaders and followers are:

- We took the team for a three day strategic planning session.
- We developed participative management.
- It developed by just talking to police officers and getting their ideas.

Domains of meaning that reflected the leadership elements of intended real changes were:

- He encouraged development of different strategies.
- He felt problems would increase unless police changed the way they did policing.
- He initiated new methods of policing (e. g., participative management and community-based policing).

The domains of meaning that reflected leadership elements of leaders and followers who intended real changes that reflect their mutual purposes were:

- We developed the new policing practices by talking to police officers, getting their ideas and going into the community (to implement them).
- We developed these strategies among the sixty officers.
- We sat down and created an organizational chart based on team policing (to change the organization of the LAPD).
- We are seeing Davis' vision accepted worldwide.

For Smith leadership is identified with one man's vision and his ability to make that vision happen. All the elements of management are present within Smith's story about Davis. According to Smith, Davis was authoritative in his command style. Davis gave clear direction and used positional authority to attain his vision. He saw the need to provide the community with a new method of policing, and he proceeded to use the organizational structure to accomplish his envisioned end.

Davis was a good commander and in many ways he was a good manager. His style was formed by the structure he sought to change. The changes Davis sought were changes which embraced some of the values that are present within Rost's conception of leadership. Davis wanted to move policing from a coercive, power over mindset, to a more influential mode of

behavior and thought among the force. He empowered others to experiment with these ideas of collaboration and cooperation and then, with the help of his followers, implemented these values by changing the entire LAPD.

The presence of leadership values in the story told by Smith suggest more than a tacit desire on the part of the players to move from a model of coercive authority to a model of influence. Davis realized that purely an authoritative and coercive mode of policing (and management) was not working so he initiated change. Of course the paradox is that Davis used the old methods to attain what he saw to be a new and better way.

This story demonstrates the emergence of postindustrial values within an organization grounded in the industrial paradigm.

Story Fourteen: John Halagan's Story of Leadership

John Halagan is 35 and a graduate of the University of California, Santa Barbara. Halagan has been teaching at Woodbridge High School for 11 years and has been the head basketball coach for three seasons. His story concerns a player he coerced last year.

One story about leadership that certainly stands out concerns a kid who was playing guard on my first basketball team as head coach at Woodbridge two years ago. This was not your typical run-of-the-mill student athlete who was a visible kid on campus and was really full of himself. This was a very quiet kid. He was a classic example of how kids who are not very extroverted can still exhibit a great deal of leadership through their actions.

This kid was very well mannered and soft spoken. He was also someone who had gone through a great deal of personal adversity.

The summer before his senior year his sister was killed in an automobile accident. He was very close to his sister which made it all the more tough for him. He also was quarterback for our football team. That team, quite frankly, was not a good team and lost a lot of games. After football he was our starting point guard on my basketball team . This kid was someone who not only had a lot of personal adversity but his first love was always football. His personal tragedy coupled with the fact that he had a very disappointing year in football would have made it very easy for him to only go through the motions during the basketball season. But right from the get-go, it was obvious that he was going to be our team leader. When we voted for team captain every player voted for him.

You know a lot of people confuse true leadership with the guy who is the biggest rah-rah guy and the guy who yells the most and who is the most extroverted or visible guy. But this guy, in my opinion, exhibited true leadership because he commanded leadership and attention from his peers. His peers perceived him from the very start as the team leader. It is really interesting to watch a kid go through four years of high school and never once hear a negative word about him from his peers. He was able to elevate the performance of those around him just by leading through example. Because he was not a big rah-rah guy his teammates would watch him work

and watch him pay great attention to detail. As a result, his work ethic would carry over to the other members of the team. It would definitely rub off. And that, to me, is what true leadership is all about. There are a lot of guys who want to be leaders or perceive themselves as a leader but the beauty of this guy's particular situation was that he never asked to be that kind of guy. He was a totally selfless guy. He never put himself before the team or his teammates. Kids perceived that and picked up on it, and that's where he commanded a great deal of respect from his peers. That's how he was able to exhibit true leadership: through example.

A lot of people get leadership wrong because they think that you can make yourself into a leader by yelling the loudest or cheering the loudest or doing things in the most demonstrative way. They think that therefore they would be the leader. It was kind of neat to watch it from the point of view of a head coach because this kid basically came from a totally different approach. He exhibited a lot of inner strength. He showed a lot of great positive characteristics that other kids picked up on.

I specifically remember a particular tournament game on a Saturday. This is a very difficult game to play because we were not emotionally ready to play. It was obvious from the get-go. We fell behind by twelve points early. I called a couple of early time-outs. The first time in the huddle, it was just me talking to the team. Nobody else was talking. We went out and fell even farther behind. I called a second time out and in the second time out he

pulled me aside and said: "Coach can I just say a couple of things real quick?" And I said: "Sure." He just pulled the team in and looked at them and said: "Guys, you know, we're better than this. Let's get it going." He said this in a very calm, low voice. He didn't have to yell or didn't have to chastise his team mates at all. He just said: "Hey, we're not giving a good account of what we are all about. Let's go out and turn this thing around now."

We went out after that time out and within three minutes we had the lead [chuckle]. It was just amazing. It really was humbling as a coach. As a coach you like to think that you have a lot to do with your team's performance, but in that particular instance I had absolutely nothing to do with that team overcoming that deficit. This time the response was all something that came from within a guy who was perceived as the leader. At some point he took the bull by the horns and was very assertive and yet very positive and the kids immediately responded. Their performance level rose as a direct result of interacting with the leader in a game situation.

That is one specific example I remember over that season. It was something that as a coach I had to just sit there and marvel at. As a coach I wish I could bottle what he did and be able to get inside my team to motivate them team to perform on command at that level. I've coached a lot of years and had a lot of guys complain to each other and say: "C'mon let's get this thing going." Then they go out and the same thing keeps happening over

and over again. A lot of times that comes because the guys aren't pulling in the same direction. There are people who are perceiving themselves as leaders and don't have leadership authority within the group dynamic because the other guys don't perceive them as a leader.

It is quite obvious that this kid was perceived as the leader by everyone. Time and time again it affected the team's performance in a positive way. Whenever we were in practice and things were starting to get a little bit loose or we were losing our concentration, all he had to do was clap his hands a couple of times and say: "C'mon, let's get through this" and immediately it would just happen. There was never a kid who showed any kind of descent toward him. His leadership role in that particular group was acknowledged from kid to kid. He basically was the leader of that group.

You could look in the sports world and about the only person I could compare this to is the years that you would watch Magic Johnson. This is the type of guy who literally would pick a team up with their boot straps and have to carry them across the line sometimes. My player was the same way. He was very competitive yet very, very positive. He never ever showed disrespect toward an official. He never griped at another kid on the team. His teammates, his peers respected that. He was a very genuine kid who wanted to win and he wanted to work hard to do it. As a result, other kids picked up on it. That's the biggest thing: you don't make leaders.

I think after watching so many kids compete in so many different competitive theaters that leaders are born. There are some traits, some innate quality that kids perceive and pick up on. Whether it is a genuine character trait of a particular individual, I don't know. But some people just seem to have a charisma that will have others fall in line. They are able to command respect. At least they don't have to demand it. They are able to command it on demand. They get results. And to me that is what a true leader is all about. A true leader is somebody who can get other people to pick it up a notch and step outside themselves to work toward a greater goal. A leader gets others to not worry so much about their individual situation. He gets them to become more group oriented or team oriented. It is just amazing. True leaders do that.

Same thing about politicians. They can motivate groups of people to bigger and better things or greater goals than the individual has set for themselves. I think you are probably on that first step towards being a leader. That's what great leaders do. They motivate groups of people. I mean you can say you're self-motivated, but you can't be a single person and be a leader. A leader has to interact with others through the leadership dynamic, whatever that is. He raises the performance and expectations and abilities of those people with whom he interacts. The beauty of it is a leader will do it through the willing support of those other people. You know it is not a dictator type of thing. A leader doesn't dictate to other people. A

leader, through charisma or whatever it is gets other people to fall in line. He gets them to perform or to try to achieve the goals that the group has identified.

The leadership dynamic or event occurs when one person somehow rises above the group and somehow motivates or gets the group to achieve goals that they would otherwise not achieve without the leader's intervention. To me that is when I see leadership occurring. When an individual influences a group to attain positive results, that to me is a leadership dynamic. Obviously for that to happen the group has to be receptive to a certain leader. It is a two way street: somebody has to be in tune with what it takes to be a leader, and the group has to be receptive to that person who is being the leader. When you get that give and take, that ebb and flow going, then you have a chance for the leadership dynamic to occur. For me leadership would occur when you see one individual somehow inspire a group to a greater good or goal that they might not have attained if that person was not present. To me, that crystallizes what true leadership is.

This idea about leadership doesn't necessarily have to stop at athletics. It could be in business or politics, in education or whatever career or field you want to chose. You could probably think of a lot of examples where somehow one person was able to elevate the performance of others. I think that's when you have a leadership dynamic occurring [end of Halagan's story].

The domains of meaning that reflected an influence relationship in Halagan's story were:

- The team leader lead by example.
- He paid attention to detail which carried over to other team members.
- Kids perceived his actions and picked up on them.
- He exhibited positive characteristics and others picked up on them.
- He said: "Guys, you know we're better than this. Let's get it going."
- He was assertive and the kids responded.
- Their performance rose as a result of interacting with the leader in a game situation.
- He would say: "Let's get through this" and it would happen.
- A leader can get others to step outside themselves and work toward a greater goal.
- He gets them to become more team oriented.

The domains of relevant meaning that indicated that Halagan saw leadership as a leader-follower relationship were:

- He never put self before his team-mates.
- He asked (the coach) if he could talk to the team.
- A leader has to interact with others through the leadership dynamic.

- A leader does it through the willing support of the other people.
- The group has to be receptive.
- Their performance rose as a result of interacting with the leader.
- It is a two-way street.
- When you get that give and take, that ebb and flow, then you have a chance for leadership to occur.

The domain of relevant meaning that indicated that Halagan saw leadership as producing goods and services resulting from coordinated activity was:

- The leader gets them to achieve the goals that the group has identified.

The domains of meaning reflecting the management elements of authority and manager and subordinates do not emerge in Halagan's story. The leadership domains of meaning reflecting intended real changes and changes that reflect mutual purposes also do not clearly emerge.

For Halagan leadership is known by the actions and traits of one person. Even though these actions emerged as being influential, leadership is primarily identified as traits by Halagan. For Halagan true leadership is known when one person elevates the performance of others. For Halagan the idea of leaders and followers emerges as an important element and one might suspect that this is a good example of leadership according to Rost. However, the nature of the story does not allow for intended real changes that reflect

mutual purposes to occur. For Halagan, the leader-follower dynamic emerges on the basketball court where the intention is to attain a goal, namely, the winning of a game. The relationship is not intended to effect real and lasting changes.

Head coach Halagan's story of leadership does indicate how important influential relationships are for him in recognizing leadership. Halagan's view of leadership is heavily influenced by the postindustrial values of noncoercive behavior and the interaction between leaders and followers. This story is yet another example of the tacit recognition by some of the storytellers of the difference between leadership and management. It also demonstrates a tacit desire on the part of some of the storytellers to realize the postindustrial values of cooperation and collaboration within the activities they recognize to be leadership.

Story Fifteen: Jeff Glazer and Developing a Mentoring Program

Jeff Glazer is 43 and has taught part-time at San Diego State University. He has just completed his doctoral degree at the University of San Diego and is a private investor. His story concerns a program he started at San Diego State University.

The story about leadership I will tell you is one in which I was involved. I would have to consider myself the leader in this story. About seven years ago the College of Business at San Diego State University tried forming an alumni association. It was the first time an alumni association at

the College of Business had been formed. The administration made a futile attempt by forming a board to create this association. It eventually died and folded. I was a member of the initial board of the alumni association. After the attempt failed, I came up with an idea of bringing alumni and other people on campus to get them involved with students. Instead of just going out and asking people for money, I felt that what was important was to try to get people back on campus and involve them with students. Eventually money and other support would come from those participating in the program.

My idea was to develop a mentorship program. The goal of the mentorship program was to match people in the business community with juniors and seniors at the college of business. The mentors and students would start out the semester by having a breakfast meeting together to become acquainted. At that meeting I would talk about the program and its goals and give the participants some direction. Then throughout the semester students and mentors would meet periodically to discuss topics of mutual interest. Some people met monthly. Some met two or three times and some met more often.

I presented this idea to the College of Business Advisory Board. This was a very bureaucratic group. They said that they wanted me to write up a proposal, because they were concerned about funding the program. As a

result I got a graduate student to do the research and write a proposal. I then presented it to the board.

The board said: "OK we will do this." But they were still very concerned about the funding and whether or not it was feasible to do. Finally they decided not to start it for a year. I said: "No, we might as well just start it next month, why delay it considering most things don't get done on projects such as this until the last month anyway?" I went on to tell them not to worry about the funding. I basically funded the project myself.

The program started with 92 students. I went out, personally phoned 92 business people to be mentors. We had a perfect match. Every student had a mentor. I asked each student what exactly they wanted. I asked if they wanted someone in sports or PR or accounting, or whatever? I was able to match each person with a mentor in their profession almost to the tee.

I ran the program with a student assistant for a couple of years until I got burned out. The way I set the program up so that the Associated Business Students would run it instead of leaving it to either the business advisor counsel or the alumni association to run. The ABS ran it for a while, but they had trouble getting people in the business community to support their effort. After about four years, the thing has pretty much died. People still talk about it. But when it was in existence it was a fabulous program because about a quarter of the students ended up getting jobs out of it. They were able to get jobs because of the mentor relationship that developed.

As an example there was this student who wanted to work in real estate. I set him up with someone in the real estate industry. They met weekly. They had a great relationship. The professional then sent the student out to meet a few of his colleagues. The result was that without ever interviewing for a job, the student was offered five positions in the real estate industry.

Initially I was the driving force and had the vision for this project. The purpose of the project was for the benefit of the students. The purpose was accomplished because other people bought into the vision and joined into the project. As a result of this project, many personal relationships developed and people's lives were changed. And that is my leadership story [end of Glazer's story].

The relevant domains of meaning that emerged in Glazer's story that reflect the leadership element of influence were:

- Glazer presented this idea to the board.
- He funded the project himself.
- He went out and phoned people to be mentors.

The relevant domains of meaning that emerged in Glazer's story that reflect the view of leadership as authority were:

- I came up with the idea.
- My idea was to develop a mentorship program.
- I would give participants direction.

The domains of meaning that reflected leadership as a manager-subordinate relationship were:

- I set the program up so students would run it.
- I ran the program with a student assistant for a couple of years.
- I would give participants direction.
- I got a graduate student to work and write a proposal

The domains of relevant meaning that reflect goods and services were:

- The purpose of the project was for benefit of students.
- Students ended up getting jobs out of it.
- The student was offered five positions.

The domains of meaning that reflect goods and services resulting from coordinated activity were:

- I set him up with someone in real estate.
- The professional then sent him to colleagues.
- The student was offered five positions.

No domains of meaning reflecting the leadership elements of leaders-followers or intended real changes that reflect mutual purposes emerged in Glazer's story.

For Glazer leadership is concerned with accomplishing unilaterally determined goals: Glazer identified the leadership dynamic with a program he conceived, promoted and then managed. Even though Glazer used influential behavior to sway the board, the most significant behaviors Glazer

exhibited were managerial in nature. The results of the program and the intent were beneficial and perhaps transformational, but there is no indication that “followers and leaders together do leadership” (Rost, p. 122). Furthermore, the purpose did not promote intended real changes that reflect mutual purposes of leaders and followers. For Glazer, leadership is a very loosely coupled style of management.

Story Sixteen: Christi Valestro’s Leadership Story

Valestro is 23 and a recent graduate from Stanford University in California. She has been working for the Disney Institute since 1992. She is an assistant to the program development department at Disney Institute and is in charge of developing financial reporting for the programs in the Institute. Her story is about the death of her grandmother.

I have decided to share a very personal experience with you. It was very helpful for you to send the instructions to me because it made me reflect on my past. In high school I was captain of my track team and in college I was in different leadership roles also. The one experience that I have never really thought of as leadership--and maybe I have tried to block the whole experience out of my mind--was when my grandmother died. But I would like to take a step back first.

While I was growing up I was probably the luckiest person in the entire world. My family had absolutely no tragedies. There was just no sadness in my entire life. My mother’s parents, my grandparents, were

extremely close with my family. They lived about three hours away from us. However, they would come and stay with us for weeks. When my parents would go away, they would come and live with us. They were the best people in the entire world. They were almost like second parents to me. My mom was absolutely best friends with her mom. She would call her every day. When she wanted to talk to someone, she would always talk to her mom.

I guess it was my junior year in college when I got a phone call from my brother saying that grandma died. It was totally unexpected. I flew home from Stanford. My brother picked me up at the airport that is about an hour and half from my grandparents' house. On the way home he said: "Christi, it's horrible, it is a nightmare."

I think that no one in our family had ever experienced anything like this. No one knew what to do. I take that back, because my father has experienced tragedies like this since he is from a large family. He was at home the morning my grandmother died. He took charge of everything and everything was great. My father is a physician so he had to get back to his office and his patients. He was coming back a day or two later. But by the time I got there he had left and the family was in turmoil. My brother said: "We have to do something! I don't know what, but everybody is upset and mom is trying to take charge of things." She is probably the most emotional person in the entire world, and we both knew that she would not be able to deal with it.

When I got home, my aunt was yelling and everyone was wandering around in a daze. All of a sudden it struck me that someone had to do something. Usually it would be my father who would take charge. He was gone so I said: "OK fine, I'm going to go get Sherry from the airport. I'll be back in three hours." I told my brother Trevor to go and get everyone food. No one had eaten for quite a while. Trevor is the best cook in the whole world. Elise, my littlest sister, and all of our younger cousins were there so I said: "Why don't you guys just watch TV? I'll go get you a movie before I go to the airport."

My aunts and uncles and my mom were dealing with grandpa. One of my aunts was dealing with some of the legal things. She was O.K.; so I said: "Please leave mom out of these legal matters, you can handle them and everyone trusts you."

There were all of those horrible things that had to be done the next day for a funeral like pick out the flowers and organize the reception, talk with the priest, and pick out the music. My mom wanted to do many of them but she couldn't, and no one else seemed able to either; as a result I did most of them. I designated people to do different things. I told Trevor to be in charge of making sure people were fed and to deal with the guests who were going to come by after the service.

Somehow, I don't know how, I just handled everything and we got it under control and everything was fine. My dad arrived that night and we sat

down and did a quick update and everything was O.K. The next day we had the funeral. During the funeral mom stood by my grandfather and helped him because he needed the help.

When I look back on all that happened, it was probably one of the most challenging things I've ever had to do. I had deep emotions that I never had before that I had to put aside. I had to figure things out and make sure things were O.K for the family. The funeral was hard. It was also hard because I had to deal with people that were older than me: I mean, my parents, my grandfather and everyone for whom I have the highest respect. Anytime they ever told me to do anything, I would always do it so I was just used to them leading me around and them taking charge and guiding me. It was an entire role reversal.

I think I learned a lot about myself. I learned how much people mean to me. I learned how you can feel so empty after someone is gone. In terms of leadership I learned how to get things done so that I did not have to do them myself but I had others do them instead. It was clear that I was trying to take charge and get everything done. I was not used to telling my mom or my grandpa or my aunt or uncle or my older brother what to do, but I think I did it in a way that worked out fine. I recognized that it was a time that things needed to be handled and that I could actually handle them [end of Valestro's story].

The domains of meaning that emerged in Valestro's story that reflected leadership as an authority or manager-subordinate relationship were:

- I was captain of my track team and in different leadership roles.
- He took charge of everything and everything was great.
- We have to do something.
- My father would usually take charge.
- I told Trevor to get food.
- You guys watch TV.
- I'll get a movie for you.
- I said to my aunt: "Leave mom out of legal matters, you can handle them."
- There were all of those horrible things that had to be done.
- I did most of them.
- I had to figure things out and make sure the family was all right.
- I was used to them taking charge and guiding me.
- It was clear I was trying to take charge and get things done.
- I recognized that it was a time that things needed to be handled and I could handle them.
- I designated people to do different things.

The domains of meaning that emerged that reflected leadership as the management element of producing goods and services were:

- I told Trevor to be in charge of food and make sure people were fed.

- We got it under control and everything was fine.

The domain of meaning that emerged that reflected leadership as the management element of producing goods and services resulting from coordinated activities was:

- I learned how to get things done so that I did not have to do them myself but I had others do them instead.
- I designated people to do different things.
- I told Trevor to be in charge of making sure people were fed.

There were no domains of meaning that emerged that reflected Rost's four elements of leadership.

For Valestro leadership is known by what one person does to or for others. It does not involve seeking real and lasting change that reflects the mutual purposes of leaders and followers. It could be argued that Valestro's actions were not based on authority or a manager-subordinate relationship because there was no coercion present within the story and thus they were based on influence. I would suggest however, that because Valestro framed leadership as a positional role, namely, "I was captain of my track team and in different leadership roles," that the images and values with which she framed her vision of events was grounded in a manager-subordinate relationship. Her image values reflect leadership as an authority relationship. Even though the relationship may not strictly cohere with Rost's definition of management, the essential elements for management are

present within the domains of meaning and in Valestro's behavior to support this view. A further analysis of this suggestion follows.

The manager-subordinate relationship as noncontractual. "Leaders and followers can have a relationship that includes no managers and no subordinates" (Rost, p. 150). In Valestro's story the images and values that informed her actions were not those of a leader-follower relationship. The characteristics of the behaviors she demonstrated were more directive than influential. But they did not fit particularly into the description of the manager-subordinate relationship as put forth by Rost. Rather, Valestro's image of leadership is formed by the metaphor of control by a single person doing things to and for others. By viewing her life-world through this metaphor, Valestro's relationships with her family took on the *characteristics* of a manager-subordinate relationship. Furthermore, the relationships did not reflect Rost's leader-follower description where "in the new paradigm, followers and leaders do leadership. They are in the leadership relationship together. They are the ones who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes" (p. 109).

Valestro's story demonstrates that the manager-subordinate relationship need not only be contractual or positional to be present. The context of the story provides a dynamic that emerged *only* because of the context, situation, motivating metaphors, images and actions of the people involved. In that sense, a strictly logical and linear delineation (read

definition) of leaders-followers or manager-subordinates does not adequately convey the multilevel and dynamic reality present within Valestro's story.

The behaviors that Valestro demonstrated within this story seem to have set up a managerial dynamic that is not contractual and is also different from being a leader-follower relationship. Valestro's underlying assumptions, her foundational metaphors, her image values obscured her from acting in an ulterior way to a manager-subordinate relationship. Even though the necessary elements of coercive behavior, contract and being part of an organization were not present Valestro acted as a manager would act.

"Managers may be leaders, but if they are leaders, they are involved in a relationship different from management. Subordinates may be followers, but if they are followers, they are involved in a relationship different from management" (Rost, p. 150). For Rost the three essential differences between the two groups are based on coercion, being part of an organization and that of contract (p. 147).

It could be argued that there was an authority structure present within this story, namely, the familial structure represented by Valestro's father. Even though he wasn't there and the structure wasn't operating well, I would argue that the structure was still present. But the story told by Valestro does not indicate that her father authorized her to act in his stead. In fact, Valestro stated that "by the time I got there he had left and the family was in turmoil." And even if one argues that the nature of the

familial organizational structure were present, Valestro was not part of the accepted or recognized authority within that structure -- which suggests that a different type of action had to arise. This type of action was not dependent upon structures that would traditionally be present within her family. This type of action is different from influence as Rost defined it because it was more directive than persuasive.

The immediate context of the event called for different behaviors on Valestro's part than she, or other members of her family, were accustomed to having her do. It called for her to become the one who would take control and get things done even though she was not the traditional authority figure. In Valestro's story, management took place between her as a subordinate (i. e., a filial subordinate to family authority figures) and her elders a contractual or a traditional organizational authority structure being present. Things had to get done. People had to be fed, and the grandmother had to be buried. Accomplishing these goals calls for managerial behavior. The context of the event--Valestro's viewing leadership through the metaphor of a unitary actor--as well as the actions and image values of the players in the story are all elements that determined the presence of a manager-subordinate behavior.

Some analysts may counter the above argument by saying that what occurred with Valestro and her family was a leadership dynamic. They would say that this episode was leadership because there was no coercion in

the behavior of the people in the relationship and that Valestro's behaviors reflected the leadership element of influence. However, within Valestro's story there is no indication that those involved in the events were attempting to fulfill mutual purposes, nor were they attempting to effect real and lasting changes. Rather, the immediate goal was to create some sort of order out of chaos, feed people and soothe their anguish, take care of legal needs, and make preparations for the grandparent's burial. At best there was coordination of activities, not fulfillment of intended changes that reflect mutual purposes--two essential elements necessary if leadership is to be present. These events and behaviors cannot be classified as leadership. Rather, Valestro's behaviors demonstrated a noncontractual manager-subordinate relationship, a relationship that emerged only within and because of the context of the event.

Story Seventeen: Greg Copps' Story of Leadership

Greg Copps is the founding principal at Woodbridge High School, in Irvine, California. His story concerns the changes he instituted and how he has maintained those changes.

I started Woodbridge High School in 1980. I was the original principal here. Prior to that I spent seven years as an assistant principal, five at University High School in Irvine and two at Irvine High School. Before coming to this district I had taught mathematics for eleven years at La Cerna High School in Whittier; Huntington Beach High School in Huntington

Beach; and Fountain Valley High School in Huntington Beach Union High School District.

I did my bachelor's and my master's degrees at Long Beach State College. They were separated by about eight years. I am 54 years old.

I think I have seen leadership develop in myself and with people that have been subordinates of mine. Leadership has developed through empowering them. It has developed by giving them a great deal of latitude and flexibility in making decisions while I was bumping them around the edges a little, like a sheep dog might do to keep the herd going in the right direction.

In terms of leadership, I guess I was brought up by working for a principal at Fountain Valley High School. I thought he was an excellent manager. In a matter of seven years, he allowed me to move from a classroom teacher to a good administrator of people. I think he did that by allowing me to have a great deal of latitude. He told me what he wanted done but did not give me a great deal of step-by-step direction. I think that allowed me to become a pretty strong leader. His style forced me to decide how to do things, rather than using some of the other models I have seen where someone tells someone step-by-step what they should be doing and then have them report back daily. I think I have tried to use his approach in working with people who have worked here at Woodbridge.

The story that I will tell is about the one assistant principal I had when we started Woodbridge. The school was much smaller and so there was a principal and only one assistant principal. I selected that person to be assistant principal based on his being a person of high quality. He did not have a great deal of leadership experience of being in charge of things. I knew, however, that he had good moral values and a good work ethic. As he came on deck it was the first time he had ever been placed in charge of anything substantial. I placed him in charge of teacher supervision and hiring. I think my trusting him and giving him a little bit of guidance here and there--what I call nudging guidance--with a great deal of flexibility allowed him to grow by leaps and bounds over a three year period. Now he is an athletic director of a Division I school here in California. He has no trouble making decisions and being in a leadership role.

In talking about leadership I think a lot of it is in people. I think leadership is inherently there. Leadership is probably not in all people, but people who have it are squared away and have good values. It is just allowing them the opportunity to have it develop.

By giving people a great deal of freedom, I think I have seen the horizontal structure work very well. I try to operate this school that way. I am called principal but whether it is our basketball coach or someone in charge of our English department, they make the decisions about their program. I might meet with them from time to time and ask them to share

how things are going. I might ask them what they think their strengths and weaknesses are. I will also do some reflective thinking with them. But I think the best decisions come from the people who are responsible for their programs, rather than from the top-down direction. I have not seen the top-down approach work very well. I think it didn't work with me. I didn't like working when people told me exactly when, where and how to do things.

When people did take the top-down approach with me, and I have been in that environment from time to time, I felt: "Why think?" That approach made work just a mundane task of going out and implementing what somebody else had said. I felt very boxed in and I wanted out of there. I mean I just didn't like that. I liked the approach of painting with broad strokes what the administrator would like accomplished by the end of the year. I like that approach and I like the freedom it gives. I did not mind the accountability under that model.

Under that approach I made a quantum leap. Maybe it's wrong, or maybe it's right, but I have assumed that most people like that kind of freedom and like operating that way. I've tried to manage people in that manner. I think you would find from the faculty and staff here at Woodbridge that they all have the latitude they need to make the best decisions to run their particular area of responsibility. They might choose to come to me and ask for advice from time to time or an opinion or they might not. But because I do not see myself as an expert and because they have the

freedom to come or not, they just go on with their responsibilities and become stronger and stronger people.

We've had five different assistant principals through this school since it has opened. They are now either principals, or in one case, the athletic director of a Division I school. Because I allowed them to make and be accountable for their decisions I think that they became strong leaders and capable of standing alone, yet in each case most of them came to me with not very much experience in leadership. They were, however, always bright people. They were hard working people and dedicated to task. I think that is an important element in leadership. In other words, if you are going to appoint someone and send them out in the field and let them learn by doing, then there has to be certain ingredients that those people have. I mean I don't think a person who is prone to laziness will succeed. I think the person has to have a certain amount of moxie. If that is the case, then you can let them go and I think it's better to let them go.

When I see people who have come here in subordinate positions and who go on to become successful leaders in other places, I see what I consider to be leadership. Leadership is like a gardener who sprinkles a little water from time to time and makes sure the weeds do not eat the flower as the flower blossoms and goes on and becomes something different. I mean it's not a paternalistic feeling that I have, because I think paternalistically I would give much more guidance and I would let go of the string much more

slowly. It would be like a father in bringing up a kid. I don't think it is like that. But I do think that when I've been in a nudging experience--by nudging I mean suggesting, not mandating--that I bounce the person just a little bit if I saw them getting in trouble. I do this nudging by making a slight suggestion, not by mandating. By making suggestions pretty soon people discover that they don't need me at all. They discover that they don't need to come into this office and ask for advice. They discover that they are capable of leading. That feels very good to me because I've never been a person threatened by other people's strengths. I like to be around strong people. I don't like to be around weak people.

I'm uncomfortable when someone comes in and says: "This is happening. Greg, what decision should I make?" I like it better when people share, when someone says: "This happened, I'm thinking of doing this, give me a reaction to that." I think that's neat. I think that's when people become colleagues. Sometimes we may disagree and sometimes they might say: "Greg, I think you're all wet because of these reasons." Then I might say: "Well I haven't thought about that. Maybe I should rethink what I just said." I'm more comfortable with that approach. I like the horizontalness of that type of management. I tend to be more uncomfortable with the vertical. It is not that I don't see myself capable of making all of the decisions. I just don't believe in that. I don't think that makes a healthy organization. I'm most comfortable when the people I work with make decisions about their area

and are willing to accept responsibility for their decisions. I believe very much in the model of sending people out.

The horizontal approach allows for sending people out and making stronger people. For instance each year we sometimes flip assignments around or people are responsible for different areas. I have three assistant principals here, I have an activities director, an athletic director and so on. This approach allows us to talk through job assignments. I don't just sit in a room and make the assignments. We talk through them: "What haven't you done in a high school?" And I try to rotate the assignments, so that within three years all my assistant principals will have done every function in the high school. But this is not mandated by me. It's been a mutual vision with where they wanted to go. It is my belief that if someone becomes an assistant principal, that within three years they should be qualified to be a principal. Not only to be able to do any of the processes that we do, such as teacher evaluation, making a master schedule, writing a newsletter, delivering a speech to five hundred parents, or to two thousand at a student body. But also within that three years, if I didn't come to work on a given week, the person should be comfortable and not feel: "Oh gee, I'm here alone. What if something happens? What am I going to do?" In all of the cases of my assistant principals that development has been mutually agreed upon.

What makes me happy is when they take responsibility and make decisions and are able to stand on their own. It makes me happy when they

don't need to check with me, because they feel confident enough to make decisions. I try to support all their decisions, even when I sometimes disagree with them. Because I've encouraged them so much to make the decisions, I feel obliged to support them even if the decision is a 180 degrees in the other direction of how I would have handled it.

In some cases I've had conversations with them about their decisions but never during the times when they were making the decision. Sometimes I would say, after all the people are gone and all the commotion is over: "Boy I wouldn't have done it that way. I would have done it this way because of these reasons. How did you feel about doing it that way?"

And sometimes they would say: "I feel I did it right" And I would respond by saying: "Well that's great!" I think that sometimes they feel: "Well, do you I think I should have done it another way? I think I might have done it the way you said or somewhere in between."

I think that is sort of neat, too, because we have had a discussion and I've been included in reflecting upon the decision. I'm not real comfortable, with the idea that, "Greg, you've been a principal for a long time so tell me how to do this. Tell me what I should say to that parent. "My response is usually something like: "This might work for you or it might not. But you have to decide."

I try not to let the mandated bureaucratic structure get in the way of the relationships and developmental process with my staff, especially here at

the local level. I strongly believe in a horizontal structure. The bureaucratic structure gets in my way all the time as I move from the site level through district and county offices of education. In those places people are always seeking permission from someone else before they make a decision. That frustrates me a great deal.

Often in school organizations, especially as you leave the site, there's a lot of people wanting someone else to make the decision or wanting a group to make a decision. This is because they're comfortable in the group. "The committee decided that we should do it this way." I'm very uncomfortable with that. I don't want a committee to decide those things. Yet, if someone wants to use a committee for input, use a committee and endorse their decision and then go out and implement it, I support that. I'm most comfortable and feel better about department heads who own the decision themselves.

Even though my style is interactive and team oriented, I don't like someone not taking responsibility. For example, in the English department I encourage the teachers to meet as a department and to involve all of the teachers in the process of coming up with the best decision. I mean, I don't mandate that all decisions should be by consensus or anything like that. Consensus would be ideal, but once they come up with the decision, I don't want a department chairman saying, for example: "Well, the English teachers all met and we decided eight to six that we should teach *Romeo and*

Juliet.” I would rather have an English chair say: “We have discussed this issue in committee and so on, but it is my feeling that this book should be taught and these are the reasons why.”

In other words when the English teachers have to talk to parents or the school board, or if someone has complained--I like them to use the “I” statement. I don’t like: “Well the committee decided that this book was OK.” I like: “I might have been part of the committee, I used the committee to help make the decisions, but this is what I’ve decided to do.”

So, not only do I want to empower people (I hate that word, but I can’t think of another one), but I want to pass the baton to them. I want them also to hold that baton. Be proud of what they do. I want them to get the credit for what they do. But if some flack starts, I want them to be able to stand in there toe-to-toe and justify what they have done [end of Copps’ story].

The domains of meaning that emerged that reflected leadership as an influence relationship were:

- I give people a great deal of freedom and I think I have seen the horizontal structure work very well.
- I am called principal but they make the decisions about their program.
- I might meet with them from time to time and ask them to share how things are going.
- I will also do some reflective thinking with them.

- I think the best decisions come from the people who are responsible for their programs, rather than from the top-down direction.
- I liked the approach of painting with broad strokes and I like the freedom it gives.
- They might choose to come to me and ask for advice from time to time or an opinion or they might not.
- They have the freedom to come or not, they just go on with their responsibilities and become stronger and stronger people.
- By nudging I mean suggesting, not mandating.
- By making suggestions, pretty soon people discover that they don't need me.

The domains of meaning that reflect leadership as authority were:

- Leadership has developed through empowering subordinates.
- My first principal allowed me to move from a classroom teacher to a good administrator of people.
- He told me what he wanted done.
- I placed him (the assistant principal) in charge of teacher supervision.
- He (an assistant principal) has no trouble making decisions and being in a leadership role.

The domain of meaning that reflected the leadership element of leader-follower relationship was:

- I support their decisions even if I sometimes disagree with them.

The domains of meaning that reflected leadership as a manager-subordinate relationship were:

- Leadership has developed through empowering them.
- Leadership has developed by giving them a great deal of latitude and flexibility in making decisions.
- Leadership developed by bumping them around the edges a little, like a sheep dog might do to keep the herd going in the right direction.
- My first principal told me what he wanted done but did not give me a great deal of step-by-step direction.
- I gave him (an assistant principal) what I call nudging guidance.
- Leadership is like a gardener who sprinkles a little water from time to time and makes sure the weeds do not eat the flower.

The domains of meaning that emerged that reflected the leadership elements of intended real changes and intended real changes that reflect mutual purposes were:

- We develop a mutual vision with where they want to go.
- The assistant principals' development has been mutually agreed upon.
- I think its neat because I've been included in reflecting upon the decision.

The domains of meaning that emerged that reflected the management elements of producing goods or services or producing goods or services resulting from coordinated activities were:

- We talk through personnel assignments.
- The staff taking responsibility for coordinated decisions.
- Personal commitment to group decisions
- Assistant principals dividing their responsibilities yearly.

Copps saw leadership as a mentor or coaching relationship where guidance and a nudging type of management are present. Even though Copps preferred to take a back seat approach in developing (empowering) his staff, there is a sense of the manager-subordinate relationship mentality in his story. Copps' feeling that the bureaucratic structure gets in the way of staff development coupled with his interactive and developmental approach to personal responsibility suggests a very close parallel with Rost's definition of leadership. The postindustrial values of collaboration, cooperation, and inclusive behavior are present within Copps' approach, but most importantly Copps seems to have set up a dynamic that is based on influence rather than coercion.

The bureaucratic structure within which Copps works reinforces a metaphor of management, authority and ultimate responsibility upon his part. But for Copps, continued "instrumental control" over his relationship with his staff seems to hinder the cooperative, collaborative and noncoercive

aims he wishes to achieve (Sullivan, 1986, p. 16). The presence of all four elements of Rost's definition within the domains of meaning in Copps' story is another indication of the emergence of postindustrial values within the life world of people. The emergence of postindustrial values is also reflected in the literature: "The literature has demonstrated quite clearly a collective desire of many within the business community to shift from a paradigm that limits and excludes to a paradigm that is expansive and inclusive" (Israel, 1994, p. 1).

The presence of these values is a tacit reminder of the inadequacy of isolationist models. The presence of all four leadership elements in Copps' story also demonstrates a heuristic that runs through many of the stories told in this research. The heuristic is recognized as a tacit desire to become more inclusive and humanizing. These desires remain tacit. They will have a difficult time emerging because most people lack an adequate language to express their inner desires to move toward humanizing values within the workplace. The common language that is available to most people is a language formed and framed by the industrial paradigm. Without an adequate language, the tacit desires and values that have emerged within the literature and within this project will not be expressed in their fullness. Thus, people's ability to describe the difference they know and sense between leadership and management will not be able to be communicated clearly and effectively. The difference between leadership and management is embodied

in the actions of Copps and others, even though “it requires explication to realize its own development” (Sullivan, p. 21).

Freedom is a very important element for Copps. His understanding of leadership is imbued with values that speak to the development of the person. Copps’ approach to developing competence in his staff is concurrent with the freedom to become more of a person. Copps is not concerned with just providing tools or utility in training his staff. He is concerned with the emergence of freedom, “of observation and of judgment exercised in behalf of purposes that are intrinsically worth while” (Dewey, 1963, p. 61). For Copps freedom is grounded very much in the civic-republican tradition where “freedom is ultimately the ability to realize a responsible selfhood, which is necessarily a cooperative project” (Sullivan, p. 21). Even though Copps has been very influenced by the industrial organizational structure within which he works, he saw leadership as an interactive dynamic and a cooperative project made real in practice. As a mentor-coach, Copps trains, nudges and gives his staff the baton and lets the staff run with it.

Story Eighteen: Katherine Russell’s Leadership Narrative

Katherine Russell is 29 and from Connecticut. She studied film, writing and communications in college. Her story demonstrated the influence she had as a support staff person on three managers of programming at Disney Institute. I asked Katherine to explain her position at Disney. She responded by saying that she did:

Probably a lot of what you think of as traditional secretarial stuff-- typing, filing, making sure the managers have conference rooms and once in a while making sure they have lunch, coordinating meetings and that sort of thing. But also, what's wonderful about this group is that I've been involved in writing some courses. I've written some courses for the humanities track about folk festivals. I do a lot of presentation work. I create the slides and design what they are going to look like. I have a lot of input into the questions that might be asked. I'm sort of a sounding board, which is a nice position for me. I feel really involved and that makes me feel really good. I really want to contribute more.

My experience of leadership has to do with this group and my position with these three managers. Since it's not my role to be the leader, I'm not thought of as a leader. As a result it has been very hard for me to take charge when I feel I need to. It's been hard for me to put myself in that position. But twice I've called the three managers all together in a meeting. I put the request out on our *Meeting Maker* so they would all get the request at the same time. I also asked them in person. I said: "I think the four of us need to sit down and talk about how we work together because I'm feeling swamped, and I think some things are not being taken care of that I wish that I could. I need your help in figuring out how to organize things." I tried to say that very calmly. I also went to the human resources department and said: "Now what do I do? I have an agenda, but can you help me?"

I went through two or three steps in order to arrange the meeting. The last one was going to the human resources department at Disney Corporate to ask them to help me in organizing it. When the meeting finally happened, my personal gut feeling was terror!

I was really afraid that they were all going to sort of brush me aside and say, "Oh, you don't count enough. You don't have enough power to ask for our involvement." But the real experience was: "What do you need? What can we do? And this is how I feel: You're doing a good job." They gave me a lot of really wonderful feedback. That was the first meeting.

The second meeting was a little easier, and I felt like I had some better ideas of how to organize it for myself. I didn't feel as if I needed much help, because the first experience was so positive. The second meeting was even better than the first. I think they were used to the idea, and I was used to the idea of asking those whom I saw as having power to come and support me or to work with me. The outcome was much the same as the first. We talked again about having to do things a little bit differently, and how we're working well together. We also had a good discussion about some things that didn't work for them and didn't work for me. For instance, we talked about the filing systems. Everybody hates that! One of them asked me to talk more slowly when I leave her a voice mail message.

I tried to set the tone of the meeting to be that we are all together. I wanted there not to be a competition. I think that we needed to put out our

feelings--not feelings so much as our experiences and what we needed--and that we would work from those instead of from: "You know you really pissed me off the other day," or stuff like that. I hoped we could work together to accomplish our mutual goals. I think that desire is there sort of under the surface. But it can easily be pushed down. One person's needs can easily take over the group. In the meetings we agreed to let that happen if someone is under a crunch and they are in need. But for the most part we try to be fair about it.

Within the meeting Louise dealt with those little detail type of things, such as: "What do you need with filing?" Ray talked about supporting me going back to school. He was really enthusiastic about that. Bill's thing was, I forget what it was. Within the larger group, when we're not in a meeting like that, Ray's sort of in charge of goofing around. Bill's sort of in charge of dry humor [Gleeful chuckle]. Louise is in charge of earth mother kind of stuff. In work they have their own roles; we all go back and forth.

Lately, Richard and I have been challenging each other a lot. I've been getting a lot of feedback, particularly from the women in the group, that they really appreciate my challenging Richard. Sometimes it is terrifying, but I need to say that I don't agree or don't yell at me, or something like that.

I'm also the one to whom people come when they have presentation sorts of questions, but not all the time. It's not that Katherine is the guru, but it is a nice position. I play with it a lot and I work with it a lot. People

see my work and they like it. And they say, "Oh! Katherine can help with this." That's nice. I'm also the one who really knows how to juggle things really well. So people come to me and ask: "Will you do this for me? Don't teach me but do it for me."

I think there is leadership in inviting people to come along on a project, inviting them because I might need what they know. I think having a goal and organizing the people and resources to get to that goal is one element of leadership. I think there are other elements of it, like on longer projects that are nurturing, organizing, having a vision or a goal and communicating it, really asking people to join with you in that vision. Those are all parts of longer term leadership [end of Russell's story].

The relevant domains of meaning that reflect leadership as influence that emerged in Russell's story were:

- I needed help in organizing things.
- I called them together for a meeting.
- I didn't think I had the power to seek others' involvement.
- They (the four managers) gave wonderful feedback.
- We had some good discussion about things that didn't work for them and didn't work for me.

The relevant domains of meaning that emerged reflecting the dynamic of leaders and followers were:

- Katherine can help with this.

- People come to me with presentation questions.
- We all go back and forth in our work situation.
- Richard and I have been challenging each other a lot.

The domains of relevant meaning that emerged reflecting intended real changes were:

- We needed to change the way things were done.
- We talked about having to do things differently.
- We sought to change the working environment.

The domains of relevant meaning that reflected intended real changes that reflect mutual purposes were:

- There is a desire to work together (to effect a change).
- There is a give and take when someone is under the crunch.
- I invited people to come along on a project.

Relevant domains of meaning reflecting leadership as a manager-subordinate relationship or produce and sell goods services from coordinated activities did not emerge in Russell's story.

The context of Russell's narrative is extremely important. The values from which she works, her intention, the situation in which she exists and where she wants to go and how she intends to get there are all elements that constitute the context of the events in the story. It is the context that provides an insight into the values, images and metaphors that allow the elements of postindustrial leadership to emerge.

It is well to note that this is a story about several events. Thus, it is the underlying values that are important if we are to be able to see a connection to the essential elements of leadership put forth by Rost. For instance, this story will not speak to real and effective change as it would apply in the long term or as it would apply to society in general over an extended period of time. However, the underlying value of seeking change that reflects mutual purposes and the common good is very clearly demonstrated by Katherine Russell's story and as such is a foundational value that gives context meaning.

This story demonstrated the influence Katherine Russell, a support staff person, had on three program managers at Disney Institute.

In the following pages I discuss Russell's story using the four criteria of leadership established by Rost.

The first criterion: Leadership as an influence relationship. Russell's initial description of leadership demonstrated the influence of the industrial paradigm when she used the metaphors of "tak[ing] charge" and putting herself in "that position" and "it's not my role to be the leader." However, as the story progressed and the domains of meaning were elicited, the values, images and metaphors of the postindustrial paradigm began to emerge more clearly. Russell "called them together for a meeting" even though "she [thought she didn't] have enough power to ask for [their] involvement." Even though she was afraid to be brushed aside by her actions, she acted anyway.

This was influential behavior in that it did not depend upon position or power but was driven by the intention to create a dialogue between the other players and to effect a change. Russell's behavior was influential and noncoercive. Russell requested rather than demanded. By acting in such a manner she used her vulnerability and lack of position as an influential resource by inviting participation, viz., a request to meet and ask for assistance. Russell saw leadership as asking people to come together. The values present in this action are inclusive and collaborative. These are values that reflect the metaphors and values of the postindustrial paradigm and leadership as put forth by Rost.

Furthermore, the response of the management staff was not what Russell had expected. It was not a response that reflected their managerial positions. Rather they responded as one would respond after having been influenced, with open, willing support. Russell described their response as different from what she had expected: "the real experience was . . . a lot of really wonderful feedback We had some good discussion about things that didn't work for them and didn't work for me." The behaviors are noncoercive and the influence is multidirectional (p. 105).

The second criterion: Leaders and followers. The necessary elements for leaders and followers versus managers and subordinates are also present within the above behaviors. The leader within the above scenario does not remain the same. The followers are active as is demonstrated by the

discussion. The leaders and followers in this group take on different roles of being leader or follower when they are involved with other groups within the Disney organization (p. 108). And finally the followers in this scenario do leadership as is exemplified by Russell's interactions with the three managers. Both followers and leaders in this scenario "do leadership together" (p. 109).

Within the every day working situation, the following domain of meaning also demonstrated the leader and follower values present within this group. "Katherine can help with this.' That's nice. I'm also the one who really knows how to juggle things really well. So people come to me and ask: 'Will you do this for me? Don't teach me but do it for me.'" This domain of meaning demonstrates that "followers and leaders develop a relationship wherein they influence one another as well as the organization"(p. 109).

The characteristics of unequal relationship and fluctuating patterns of influence are demonstrated in the domain of meaning describing the group's relationship outside of formal meetings: "And within the larger group when we're not in a meeting like that, Ray's sort of in charge of goofing around. Bill's sort of in charge of dry humor [Gleeful chuckle]. Louis is in charge of earth mother kind of stuff. In work they have their own roles, we all go back and forth." The suggestion is that during work each has not only a positional role to play but an informal role that influences the others and is a fluctuating influence (p. 112).

The third criterion: Leaders and followers intend real changes. The value of intending real changes within this story is demonstrated by the initial meeting Russell called, that is to say, a meeting seeking to change the way work was done within the organization. The response of those involved, their actions, demonstrated their intention to accomplish a change in the way work was done. It is well to remember that again it is the value of intending real changes for the organization that has emerged within the domains of meaning. The behavioral response of the players provided the heuristic which allowed for an insight into the value of change being present within the narrative to be recognized. If one strictly interprets Rost's definition, the presence of a real change within this story is inadequate. The real change appears to be minimal and mundane. However, the point to be remembered is that this is a story told by Russell about what she considered to be a leadership experience. Furthermore, the elements necessary for leadership to be present have emerged within the story. Russell's story demonstrates how the players effected a change in the way they did their work.

The fourth criterion: Reflect mutual purposes. The idea of mutual purposes is demonstrated in the narrative by the aim of this group which had a long range frame of reference. The story Russell told indicates that the work the group did together to accomplish their long range goal did not thwart the real concern the players had with the "who we are [rather] than what we do." Even though what the group did was important, the response

of the members of this group to Russell's request demonstrates a concern for her as person and not simply as a functionary: "And Ray talked about supporting me to go back to school. And he was really enthusiastic about that."

"Reflects is meant to eliminate the hierarchical notions built into the industrial leadership paradigm" (p. 120). Within the context of this story, the group idea of reflecting emerges in that Russell's influence flattened the hierarchical nature of the organization. The communication process was interactive and multidirectional, and the leaders in this story did not always have the right answers.

The story of effecting a change in how the players did things provides context. Within the context of the story, the common purpose of the group to change their working relationship was "achieved by the interaction of the leaders and followers" (p. 120). And it was developed by using noncoercive methods which allows "followers to influence leaders (and other followers) as well as leaders to influence followers (and other leaders)" (p. 120).

Within Russell's story emerges the four heuristic notions of leadership: "Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes (p. 102).

This research demonstrates a confusion between what the storytellers expect leadership to be and their ability to convey what their expectations and desires are. The confusion exists because the storytellers did not posses

an adequate language and alternative metaphors which they could use to describe what they imagine and expect leadership to be.

Story Nineteen: John Dohse's Leadership Story

John Dohse is 39 and a graduate of the University of Southern California. His undergraduate degree is in electrical engineering. He is in charge of a systems support group at Intel in Folsom, California. His story concerns his experience with a start-up company.

I have been at Intel for four years. I was brought into a human resources group in Santa Clara. It was a new systems support and training group. Intel is much into training their people. They may have fifteen projects that are all started simultaneously, and the group I went into centrally supports all the groups connected with the new projects. I write some of the common routines that these new projects would use.

The leadership story I have is about a start up company I was involved with before I came to Intel. It was a company called Qronos Technologies. We were providing manufacturing software for IBM. We were designing it and developing it specifically to fill a gap that IBM had then. It was a pretty tight group of people. I mean for three years after the company had gone defunct, we still had annual picnics. That gives you an idea of just how quirky we were.

We were all workaholics. When we were first starting, there were about 23 people in the company. Every Friday, we would have a potluck.

Everybody would bring something. The potluck would go from about noon to two o'clock and everybody would have a good time. But after we ate and cleaned up everybody went back to their desks would work until 8:00 or 9:00 p. m to make up for the time we had just wasted away. People were very interactive and worked very well that way. My particular manager at that time was Larry Hill. He was visionary as to the development of ideas and concepts. He seemed to have a rare talent for being able to look at an idea or a concept and see right through to where it could lead. He could go down logical paths and see the pros and cons of the idea. He also had the ability to communicate very technical subjects by very nontechnical language. If people had been brought into a meeting and needed to understand what we were doing, he could talk to them and bring them up to speed in a relatively short time. He would gradually lead them while getting information from them, and at the same time he would bring them up to the where they needed to be in order to contribute to the project.

As far as actual leadership was concerned, Larry became the chief architect of the company. Most of the technicians recognized that Larry had talent and vision. The technicians realized that they could provide input to him and that he would listen and respond. When a new idea or project was beginning, people would be rankling back and forth about what was needed and what should be done. Larry would come in and sit down in back of the room and listen for a while; then he would simply throw out little thoughts

and insights. He never asserted his presence, but his suggestions or thoughts were never ignored. People responded to his approach by saying things like: "Well you've got a point." People always listened to him.

Larry's way of managing was not to take full control of the situation and dominate it. He would rather let people do the work and present the ideas. He would let them run with it and guide them toward what they should be doing. He would throw information out to them every now and again. His idea of leading the group was not to sit down and say: "I'm the leader. What are we doing? This is what we need to do. We need to do one, two, three, four."

His way of leading was more in line with letting people lead themselves. He felt that most people were intelligent. He would say things like: "If everyone knows where they are going, then they know where to go. People are better at managing their own task lists, and they are better at trying to keep themselves going in one direction." Larry thought that people would be more successful by coordinating informally amongst themselves, rather than having a strong leader leading them. He took this approach and massaged it along the way. It was a very interesting dynamic.

Eventually as the company grew, we were starting to talk with some larger manufacturing companies, particularly steel companies. They were interested in our product because our product was customer centered. Our product allowed them to make steel to the customers' specifications rather

than just offering the customer what had been manufactured. It allowed the steel company to not be product driven but to be able to be customer specific. By using our product, the company would not just be making stuff and having people buy it. Rather, our product would provide the company with the capability to manufacture to their customers' specifications. For our customers, trying to go from just making steel and: "do you want it or not," to: "what kind of steel do you want" was a real change for them. They were looking at our product to do that for them.

This was all being handled by our marketing people. Marketing people were real good at selling, but technically they had no idea what these steel people were talking about or needed. As a result, the marketing people brought in Larry because he was able to talk to the steel people and find out what they needed. He didn't take over the meeting but he was the central focus of it and of all the subsequent meetings with marketing and the steel people. He would facilitate the meetings so the steel people and the marketing people could communicate. That's the way Larry tended to direct things throughout the life of the company. It was an interesting dynamic. He never asserted himself, but people always deferred to him because they recognized his expertise. He wasn't aggressively taking charge of leading the company, but he was leading the company. So it was an interesting tactic to take.

He never talked unless he really had something to say or saw that somebody was having problems communicating with somebody else. If what was needed was his particular expertise, then he would speak but he was more likely, to draw out others' thoughts. He would say things like: "I think that is good but I think John knows more about that. John, why don't you talk about that?" He always made sure that there was a balanced mix of who was more knowledgeable in a needed area. He may have been very knowledgeable, but he always let the other person go with it and run with it.

Working with Larry was actually very exciting. He opened up whole new areas for you to explore. He didn't contain you. He never said: "You have to do this job, this is your job and this is your only job." He would let you go as long as you're doing your job and you were interested in it. He would talk with people about where they were in their projects and try to keep everybody in touch with where the company was going. If he found out that you were interested in a concept, he would pull you in. For instance, if there was a meeting on something and you showed a little bit of interest, he would say: "Come here John, I want you to sit in the back of the room to listen what is going happening." He would nurture people to rise to their potential.

Larry led the group by not leading, but rather by guiding. This approach seemed to be a lot more effective than having somebody telling you where to go and what to do. He seemed to let people who were relatively

strong and knowledgeable find their path. He would help them along the way if they needed it. This approach seemed to be a lot more effective because people worked better together and were more cohesive in what they were doing. They seemed to be more consistent in what they were doing among themselves. It seemed that by knowing what everyone else was doing they were able to move as a unified group in the same direction. Informal communication seemed to be much more effective than formal communication [end of Dohse's story].

In describing Larry Hill, Dohse demonstrated a view of leadership as influential and noncoercive:

- Hill would gradually lead them and bring them so they could contribute.
- He would ask questions and offer alternatives.
- He never asserted his presence, but his thoughts were never ignored.
- He did not take full control and dominate situations.
- He would speak to draw out others' thoughts.
- He would nurture people to rise to their potential.

Dohse saw leadership as management when he described Hill:

- Hill facilitated meetings so people could communicate.
- He helped people when they needed it.
- He would tell someone to come and listen to what was happening.

- He would not let people go as long as they doing their job and were interested in it
- Hill could find out what the customers needed so the marketing staff brought him to meetings with them.
- Hill could talk to staff members and bring them up to speed in a relatively short time.

The domains of meaning that reflected leadership as a leader-follower relationship were:

- Technicians provided input to Hill, and he responded.
- He let people present ideas and then run with them.
- People responded by saying "You've got a point."
- He let people do work and present ideas.
- He let people lead themselves.
- He let the other person go and run with it.
- He would speak if what was needed was his particular expertise, but he was more likely to draw out others' thoughts.

The domains of meaning that emerged that reflected producing goods and services that reflected coordinated activities were:

- We were providing manufacturing software for IBM.
- We were designing it and developing it specifically to fill a gap.
- People are better at managing their own task lists.

- People would be more successful by coordinating informally amongst themselves.
- Hill would facilitate the meetings so the steel people and marketing people could communicate.
- If Hill found out you were interested in a project, he would pull you in.

The domains of meaning that reflected intended real changes and intended real changes that reflected mutual purposes were:

- Hill would make suggestions when a new idea or project was beginning, and people would be rankling back and forth.
- He may have been very knowledgeable, but he always let the other person go with the idea and run with it.
- He would talk with people about where they were in their projects and try to keep everybody in touch with where the company was going.
- For our customers, trying to go from just making steel and: “do you want it our not,” to: “what kind of steel do you want?” was a real change for them. They were looking at our product to do that for them.

Even though Dohse framed leadership as authority when he stated: “As far as actual leadership, Larry became chief architect of the company,”

Hill's actions are not authoritative or coercive as far as the rest of Dohse's story goes.

For Dohse leadership is very relational and has a mentoring quality to it. Dohse's identification of Hill as embodying leadership by being able to elicit people's points of view and talents speaks to the inclusive, postindustrial values of cooperation, collaboration and influence. Hill was inclusive. He brought people into the process, he brought them up to speed. He didn't take over meetings even though he became the main focus of them. This suggests that as a leader Hill was skillful at putting his "power resources to work to influence others in the relationship" (Rost, 1991, p. 112). In this case his expertise and knowledge of the subject were his resources.

By using his ability to facilitate and allow people to lead themselves, Hill was able to elicit the knowledge needed to fulfill the purposes developed by the group.

Dohse also framed leadership as being similar to the great man/woman and trait theories of leadership in that Hill never asserted himself, but people differed to him because they recognized his expertise. For Dohse, Hill was a great man, who never used coercion nor was he assertive and domineering. He was also able to "nurture people to rise to their potential." Hill demonstrated many great qualities which Dohse admired.

Dohse's description of Hill also reflects the managerial element of manipulation in that he "wasn't aggressively taking charge of leading the company but he was leading the company." The question must be asked is what did Dohse mean by leading the company? We do not have any indication of Hill's outside dealings or his involvement in company business decisions that may affect the direction of the company. But we could surmise that if his behaviors were as inclusive within the company as Dohse suggested, then any corporate decision affecting company direction most likely occurred as a cooperative and collaborative dynamic. This suggests that Hill used resources to influence rather than coercive (manipulative) behaviors that only reflected his unitary desires.

Even though Hill's behaviors were framed by the industrial metaphor, viz., the structure of the company, it does not appear from the story that the end consequence was his sole motivation for action. He made working exciting by opening new areas to explore. Hill didn't contain or limit the potential of those within the organization, even though he did do management. He would draw people into different projects if he found out they were interested in them, and he would direct people when it was necessary. Hill was a guide, a mentor and a leader.

This story appears to have the qualities necessary to be classified as management except the domains of meaning that explicitly reflect intended, real changes that reflect mutual purposes. The domains of meaning I

selected above suggest these attributes but are not clearly demonstrative of these elements. However, I would argue that the manner in which Hill facilitated the staff to develop products reflected intended real changes in that both he and the staff entered into a leader-followers relationship. The leader-followers relationship was influential and called for each one's expertise in the development of products. I would also argue that because these products were developed within a healthy, communicative team, these products reflected mutual purposes. To paraphrase Rost: managers and subordinates joined forces to really change the ways they produced and sold their goods/services, they also really changed the kind of goods/services they produced and sold. These managers and subordinates appear to have transformed their managerial relationship into a leadership relationship. (1991, p. 151). Dohse's example of the way Hill and the marketing staff worked with the steel company is a prime illustration of the manner in which intended, real changes and intended, real changes that reflect mutual purposes were present within this organization.

Even though Dohse's description of Hill was framed as positional authority, Dohse did not convey a sense that Hill was coercive or authoritative in his behaviors. Dohse, for lack of a better metaphor, was unable to see the forest for the trees. His conscious frame and vocabulary only allowed him to identify the actions of a positional authority figure with the process called leadership. He identified his idea of leadership with one

person. Dohse's story is an example of a person not having an adequate vocabulary to describe the leadership dynamic. Leadership was occurring within this organization. All four elements of Rost's definition were present within Dohse's story, even if Dohse couldn't describe them. John Dohse's story describes an experience of leadership as Rost explicated.

Story Twenty: Bill Mullen's Leadership Story

Bill Mullen is in charge of personnel training at Intel in Folsom, California. His story concerns the change that occurred in his approach to managing after attending a first line manager's school.

My name is Bill Mullen I've been at Intel for six years now. I came here from National SemiConductor. I started in fabrications (fabs). That's the leadership story I'll tell you about--in the fabs. I started as a senior supervisor and then moved into a shift manager position down in fab one, which has since closed.

When I came to Intel, it was a very different organizational culture than at National SemiConductor. National ran more like the old Pulman organization of the 1930s. National was very autocratic: it was old style management. As a result, they spent a lot of time fighting unions.

When I came to Intel the management style was very different, in that at Intel you always looked for root causes of problems. You didn't really hold operators wholly responsible for mistakes: for example, if they dropped wafers or had a misprocessing or something like that. This approach took a

little getting used to, but I pretty much got over that hurdle. It's not a real difficult management style to get used to; it is just different.

When I moved to fab one in Santa Clara, I was able to go to what we call the first line manager school. First line manager school is a week where we would just do all kinds of leadership type things.

While I was there we had a speaker come in, Daniels I think his name was, who told us about this management style of never giving negative feedback. The manager simply accentuates the positive things and lets people set their own goals. The manager holds them to those goals. But if they don't make their goal, the manager would not say anything negative. He would just say something positive. If the manager did say something negative he was to make it as positive as possible. That's it in a nut shell. Then Daniels gave several examples of where that had worked.

I went back to my shift in Santa Clara, which had been noted as being the worst shift in Santa Clara. The shift had some leadership problems prior to my coming to it. It had run without a supervisor for about four months and had infighting between the lead operators, and other problems. So I brought these ideas back and said: "O.K. guys here's what we are going to do. We're going to blow the socks off of everybody and be the best shift here."

There are four shifts, and of course we were way down. We did about a third less than the best shift there. We had a significant drop of production on my shift, so I went around and spoke individually with all twenty of my

operators. I got buy in from them individually and then formed them into groups and got buy in from them as groups that we were going to go ahead and try this new approach. I got them to agree that they would set their own goals, police themselves and hit their goals. All I would have to do would be to keep score.

Now this doesn't sound like leadership at this point. Really it was empowering people and letting go of the reigns. This is a way, I guess, of leadership: not controlling, but simply informing people of what they are to do, someone getting the rocks out of the road while others drive the car, steering, showing them the map, showing them where we wanted to go and letting them pick the roads.

I brought this idea to the fab manager and said this is what we are going to do. I said that in the litho area which is significantly bad, we were going to blow the socks off everybody. He said: "OK, fine, give it a shot. You can't get any worse than what you are right now." We started using this style and we improved significantly. I simply kept giving positive feedback. If people would miss work, rather than the normal grilling most of the supervisors gave them, I would recognize the people who showed an improvement in attendance. I made sure that at the start-up meetings they were recognized for their attendance. I would say something like: "Hey, this is better, it helps the team. Everybody's here, look at our attendance last week." I never cited individuals, but always going for the team. Then I

would individually go to people and say: "Hey, you know I really appreciate you being here." It made a big, big difference. I was really kind of impressed with it.

We were showing significant improvement at the end of the project. We were beating the socks off of everybody and as fate would have it, the shift manager left. I was the senior supervisor at the time so I took over as the shift manager. I went to the fab manager and said: "Look I'll make you a bet. You know that this litho group that I had been leading will run on its own. It will out perform the other three litho groups on the other three shifts. If we do, then you'll come in and give us a bar-b-que."

Now we're on shift six, which works seven at night till seven in the morning. I said, "You come in at midnight and put on a bar-b-que for us for lunch."

He said: "OK if you can beat them, great."

Four weeks later we beat them. And I had him, the fab manager, come in and we set up a bar-b-que. Everybody came out. Since I was shift manager, I brought everybody out to share in litho's success. We had him out there flipping burgers at midnight, and it caught on.

People were pleased, so they promoted me. I was able to bring this idea to the other supervisors who had heard about it, but of course there's a lot of skeptics out there.

We were able to get the other supervisors, the other lead operators and the staffs to buy into it. We turned the worst shift in all of fab one into the best shift. That shift had the lowest loss rate and the highest production rate and the best attendance. Everything turned around all based on the simple premises that people want to be at work.

I went to business school and learned all this stuff. I learned Theory X, Theory Y and Theory B and all this BS. These theories were not real applicable. They didn't transfer from Harvard to fab workers in bunny suits. The stuff Daniels gave us was real practical stuff. It transferred perfectly. It worked like a charm. I could not believe how well it worked. At the end of the day when we shut the fab down, we were the best shift out there. We had more pride and more *esprit de corps* than the others did.

I got everybody to buy T shirts and we made up our own logo for them. Once, we had our business update that the fab manager gave, the whole damn crew of forty people were all sitting there in team shirts. Six months previously most of them wouldn't even talk to each other. The team spirit and what we were able to do by giving people the opportunity to really work well blew people away.

I think, and maybe it's egotistical, but I think that is leadership: to be able to give people the opportunity. I think the biggest thing that holds up leadership today is the leader's ego and having to be the person who makes the decision. We went on a very simple premise. We weren't there to make

decisions. We were there to see that decisions were made. Letting the operator or the person who is closest to the piece of equipment make the decision on whether that piece of equipment was ready to run. Letting them make the decision as to the best way to run it and what needed to be done to meet these goals for that shift. He knew what the best way was because he set the goals for that week. By just making that switch and getting the other supervisors to buy into it, to me, is an example of the kind of leadership we need more of [end of Mullen's story].

The leadership domains of meaning that emerged suggesting that Mullen viewed leadership as an influence relationship were that:

- He let people set their own goals.
- He only gave positive reinforcement.
- He got buy in from them individually.
- He thought the biggest detriment to leadership is the leader having to be the only one to make the decisions.
- He made that switch to participative decision-making and got other supervisors to buy into it.
- He saw not controlling others as a way of leadership.

The domains of meaning that emerged suggesting that Mullen viewed leadership as a leader-follower relationship were that:

- He simply informed people of what they are to do.
- He got the rocks out of the road so others could drive the car.

- He let them pick the roads.
- He brought the idea into the litho manager who said to give it a shot.
- He got other supervisors and lead operators and staffs to buy in.
- He let the one closest to the equipment make the decision whether or not to run.
- He let them set the goals for the shift.

The domains of meaning that reflected the leadership elements of intended real changes and intended real changes that reflect mutual purposes were:

- He got buy in from others to go ahead and try this new approach.
- He saw the litho area as significantly bad and they intended to blow the socks off everybody by using this new approach.
- Everything turned around because people wanted to be at work.

Mullen's narrative did not demonstrate significant domains of meaning that reflected the four elements of management. Mullen did do behaviors that one could argue were management. However, the significant behavior was noncoercive and demonstrated influence.

Within the hierarchical structure at Intel, the leadership process emerged. Mullen did not engage in coercive behaviors. He seemed to have only engaged in influence relationships by being part of the development of a culture in which participative decision making emerged and in which he saw

“not controlling others as a way of leadership.” Mullen was also inclusive in his behavior in that he got buy-in from others.

Mullen’s account demonstrated the presence of a leader-follower relationship in which he led at times and in which others led at different times. He would get rocks out of the road so others could lead and he would also let them pick the road. This suggests a give and take and a dynamic that evokes the talents and resources of both leaders and followers. Mullen’s behaviors also demonstrated his changing from the role of leader to the role of follower in his relationships with those in positions of authority within the organization.

Mullen brought to his group a new way of approaching what they were doing. In presenting this idea he was able to get buy-in from the others and they appropriated it. This idea becomes mutual in their embracing of it and making it their own. The discussions that occurred suggest that the development of the implementation of this idea, its practical application and the fact that they all wanted to blow the socks off of everybody else suggests that these real, intended changes reflected their mutual purposes. They did not just want to effect an immediate goal. Rather this group wanted to change the culture in which they worked and how they worked within that culture. These were purposes that brought more depth to their presence at Intel. Mullen and his group experienced leadership.

One of the interesting aspects of this story is that this leadership dynamic evolved out of what appeared to be a management workshop that Mullen attended. A couple of interesting questions arises about this story: What part did the needs and wants of the players have to do with the emergence of leadership? And why did Mullen's actions not remain that of a contingency manager?

Story Twenty-One: Debbie Setzer's Leadership Narrative

Setzer is 40 and has worked as a supervisor, a detective and as a sergeant in internal affairs for the El Cajon Police Department. She created and obtained state funding for the career criminal apprehension program which she now runs. Setzer's story concerns the response she saw from colleagues who were working a tragic shooting incident at an apartment complex in El Cajon.

I've been with the El Cajon Police Department for 14 years. This is the only police department for which I have worked. Prior to working at this P. D., I was a homemaker. My father was a lieutenant for the San Diego county sheriff's department. That's where I got my interest in law enforcement. I have two kids, and I was 26 year old when I joined the force.

The incident I'm going to talk about today is a recent situation that happened here in El Cajon. It is the mass murder that happened over on north Walleson. The incident started a little bit after three o'clock on a Saturday, the day before Halloween. The squad that had to handle the

family fitness center mass murder, sixteen days before, had to deal with this one on north Walleson.

In fourteen years on a police force, there are so many stories about leadership that I could have told. But because this one is fresh in the mind and because there were some real heroes in this story, I have chosen this one. I differentiate heroes from leaders. There were some real heroes and there was some real leadership out there that day. I saw people that are leaders, not only by assignment but by nature, collectively come together and work together. How this tragedy, this catastrophic event, was brought under control and calmed in a relatively short period of time was amazing.

We were dealing with a 63 year old male who had a lot of problems. If he had some mental and emotional problems, we'll never know. He possibly had some physical problems that he was not addressing with his doctor. I think he was a very lonely man who had some physical differences. The kids in the complex probably were taunting him. I guess man's inhumanity to man might have precipitated this incident--people not having a kind word for him and or acknowledging him as a human being. I mean, I think it is kind of typical when somebody has emotional, physical, and mental problems, mixed in with isolation and loneliness that you will get a situation like this.

He had an arsenal in his apartment. He had at least a rifle and a gun. He set the apartment on fire as the shooting was going on. It was completely destroyed. There was very little to sift through.

The incident began at a little after three o'clock on Saturday afternoon. We don't know exactly what set him off. He took a high powered rifle and began shooting rounds out of the front and back windows of his apartment. He killed a woman. There was a multitude of kids and adults outside. It was a nice afternoon. Whatever set him off, he began shooting and he dropped one woman in the parking lot. She was dead. He shot her several times. He shot a two year old and took his eye out. He shot a nine year old girl in the chest, and she was dead at the scene, even though we life flighted her to try to save her. Her mother was shot in the hip and in the leg. There were injured people everywhere. There were people pinned down. There were a lot of young children, teenage children that were grabbing smaller children and running with them.

I was there. I am the team leader for the hostage negotiation team. I am married to a sergeant with the El Cajon Police Department who is the team leader for the SWAT team, the special weapons and tactics team, so whenever there is an incident like that they always call the SWAT team and the Hostage Negotiating Team (HNT). We both responded from our house in Jamul. We were at the scene by four o'clock. We were there within 30-40 minutes after the shooting started.

The incident commander and our captain of operations were there when I arrived. In the absence of the hostage negotiation commander, which is a lieutenant in rank, I took over as the commander for HNT. There were

four commanders of four separate units there. There was the captain of operations, the incident commander who was a lieutenant, the SWAT commander who was a lieutenant, and the HNT commander who was me.

The way I saw people working together was incredible. We set up throw phones so we could communicate with the suspect. We knew in a relatively short time that the apartment was fully engulfed with fire.

The fire department was also out there. With the battalion chief out there, we had five different commanders in the field. The way the everyone worked together to take care of this tragedy was amazing. I have to say the leadership skills and the ability to take charge of something like that and bring it to a closure, to make calm out of chaos, is what my leadership story is about.

When I talk about leadership there are a lot of elements involved in leadership. I think that a leader is willing to take responsibility. A leader is willing to listen to others. A leader is willing to make decisions. A leader is willing to take charge and do what needs to be done to take care of the person or take care of the task. The cooperation among the four individuals that I saw was inspiring.

I think when you're talking about this type of personnel, you're talking about a certain type of ego. These four people have very strong personalities. They have a lot of leadership abilities and technical capabilities in order to work together like they did at the command post. I think we tend to have our

own value system. Our own opinions about the way we should lead people in order to take care of a situation. We may tend to be closed minded or not be willing to listen to somebody else. But at the command post that day, I saw four individuals stay together. I mean it was almost like one moving body made up of these four individuals who were responsible for different things. They were not only responsible by rank to their squads, but they were responsible by nature. The leadership abilities I saw out there that day--to move as one unit and to talk to each other, to share, to give, to take and to take care of people and make people the most important issue at that scene--were incredible.

You know, I talked earlier about law enforcement changing. Before we would go, pull up to a situation and handle it, we would eliminate the threat, transport the wounded and that was the extent of our responsibility. But I saw this group become a leadership body and take care of the people out there for the long term.

We called TIP, Trauma Intervention People, to get the psychologists and counselors out there. I'll tell you that ten years ago in law enforcement there's no way we would've considered the witnesses or people who weren't shot or directly affected. If their apartments weren't burned, or they weren't shot, we wouldn't have considered how they felt or what the long-term effect on them was. Now you're seeing these leaders think: "Wait a minute. Our

responsibility goes beyond that as leaders.” Besides just protecting them, we want to give them some control back over their lives.

Policing is more than just taking care of the technical aspects. You’ve have to take care of people. You have to start caring about the long-term effects of how an event is going to affect them. As a result, we got TIP and the Red Cross out there to get housing for people to keep them safe. We asked, “What do you want? Do you want to go to this house? Do you want to go to a relative’s house? Do you want to go to a hotel? Do you want to find an apartment? What do you want us to do for you?”

In my fourteen years of employment here, I was probably most impressed that day to see that we are taking a leadership role in taking care of one another. Out of concern for his men, I saw one of the commanders out there call the department psychologist to come and help members of the squad, [the one that had dealt with the mass murder at the Family Fitness Center]. He was not going to just give them some overtime slips to fill out and send them home. He took some responsibility to make sure that he had taken care of everybody out on the scene. He had done everything humanly possible he could to make sure people are O.K. We were taking care of our own. We did debriefing and got the psychologist out there. These decisions were made by these leaders that were out there.

These decisions occurred by dialogue and communication and by people being open minded and not being so concerned with their own egos.

There was none of the, "I am a higher rank than you are." Or, "I have more knowledge in this than you do." There was a very strong dialogue.

I think there was a mutual concern for people. There was a mutual concern to take care of what needs to be taken care of. There was a common thread between those four individuals to not let their egos get in the way. There was a mutual concurrence to not let their own value systems get in the way. There was none of, "Well, this is the way I think it should be, therefore, it is going to be this way." Even though they were dealing with four different individuals, four different value systems, and four different ideas about how things should be, the communication was very good. I was personally there and listened to the open dialogue: "What do you think about this? Well I'm really uncomfortable with it, how about lets approach it this way? Or should we do this?" I think their communications and their willingness to listen to one another were probably a key factor in their dealing with the incident as effectively as they did [end of Setzer's story].

The relevant domains of meaning that emerged in Setzer's story reflect the elements present within the management definition and the leadership definition put forth by Rost.

Setzer saw leadership as an influence relationship when she saw that her colleagues:

- Were not only concerned with rank.
- Were not only willing to give direction but take it.

- Made decisions by dialogue.
- Worked together at the command post.
- Shared (responsibility) and talked with each other and engaged in give and take.

The domains of relevant meaning that emerged indicating that Setzer saw leadership as a manager-subordinate relationship were:

- Leaders are willing to take charge and do what needs to be done.
- I took over as the commander for HNT.
- They had skills to take charge and bring it to closure.
- Leaders are willing to make decisions.

The relevant domains of meaning that emerged reflecting leadership as a leader-follower relationship were:

- She saw four individuals come together like one moving body.
(Each commander took the role of leader and follower at one time or another during the event.)
- She saw open dialogue occur.
- She saw willingness to listen to one another.

The domains of relevant meaning that indicated Setzer saw leadership involving real, intended changes were:

- They talked about law enforcement changing as being concerned about needs of people in long run.

- This group became a leadership body and took care of people for the long term.
- The commanders demonstrated concern for their associates' well being by calling department psychologist.

The domains of relevant meaning that indicated that Setzer saw leadership as producing goods and services were:

- They had the leadership skills and the ability to take charge and bring it to closure.
- They were able to make calm out of chaos.

The domains of relevant meaning that indicated Setzer saw leadership as intending real changes that reflected mutual purposes were:

- Leadership is the taking care of one another, not just doing policing.
- Policing is changing from simply doing the technical aspects to taking long-term care of people.
- Policing is not just protecting them, but giving them back some control over their lives.

The domains of relevant meaning that indicated that Setzer saw leadership as goods and services resulting from coordinated activities were:

- The group moved as one body.
- The communications and the willingness to listen were the key factors in effectively dealing with the incident.

- The people working together set up phones to communicate.
- There was mutual concern to take care of people's needs.
- Everyone worked together to take care of this tragedy.

The relevant domains of meaning categorized as intended, real changes taken from this narrative have emerged because of the context of the story. The values demonstrated by the behaviors of the players were not values simply inherent in a manager-subordinate relationship. Setzer stated that she saw leadership because:

- I saw them exhibit leadership abilities that day--to move as one unit to talk to each other, to share, to give, to take care of people and to make people the most important issue at that scene.
- I saw this group become a leadership body, take care of the people out there, long term.
- I heard him ask if we were going to take some responsibility in making sure that we had taken care of everybody out on the scene and had done everything humanly possible to make sure people were O.K.?

Setzer's story is very complex. It is a good example of the emergence of postindustrial values and leadership within a work situation that is very hierarchical and authoritative in nature. The reader will notice the presence of both management and leadership elements within the behaviors of the players. A close look at the story will reveal the presence of leadership in

Setzer's story. Leadership emerges only within the larger context of this narrative.

The above domains of meaning must be viewed as reflecting behaviors which are influenced by the decision of the department to change the way policing is done. It is with this view that the actions become representative of intended, real changes.

Intention, changes and mutual purposes: An analysis Apparently for Setzer leadership is somehow connected with an individual leader and his/her actions, as is evidenced by the statement that, "when I talk about leadership there are a lot of elements involved in leadership. I think that a leader is willing to take responsibility." But there is a conflict with this unitary metaphor and Setzer's statements that "this group became a leadership body," a statement she made more than once in her narrative. This is an indication of an emerging metaphor that is in conflict with the dominate leader-as-manager metaphor. The emergence of values and metaphors more in tune with a postindustrial view of the world also became evident within the interpretation of the data with regard to the intention for real and lasting changes.

The intention for real and lasting changes within this department was contextualized by Setzer when she talked about changing the way policing is done.

You know I talked earlier about law enforcement changing.

Before we'd go, pull up at a situation and we would handle it, we would eliminate the threat, transport the wounded and that was the extent of our responsibility.

Viewed from the context of changing the way policing is done, the above statement suggests a mutual intention of those involved in this event to change policing from being concerned solely with the immediate crises to helping people with their lives in the long term. Keeping in mind the underlying value and the actions of the "leadership body [to] take care of the people in the long term," the manner in which the leadership body worked together demonstrated their intention. The leadership body was not simply concerned with the immediate tragedy and its immediate response to it. Rather, the police people were concerned with the effect the tragedy and their response will have upon the community in the long term. They had an intention for real changes.

The variety of departments, e. g., the fire department and Red Cross, along with other agencies, plus the different groups within the police department that were involved in this story, demonstrated that "different people in the relationship emphasize[d] different but related purposes" (Rost, 1991, p. 117).

The department's context of seeking to make a long-term and fundamental change in policing indicated that the relationship of the players

“need not break up, because those involved in the relationship ordinarily have other changes they intend” (p. 117). Setzer’s story demonstrates that the leaders and followers were concerned about more than just one change, they were not only concerned about the victims but they were concerned for their own as was evidenced by calling the department psychologists.

The final point necessary for the leadership element of changes to be present for Rost is that:

Changes connotes that the intentions regarding one or several changes may themselves change--develop maturity, be reassessed, undergo revision, even disappear--as time passes. Events impact on the relationship, words and actions take on new meanings, different networks or coalitions are formed, and the people in the relationship grow and develop. As a result, the people in the relationship reformulate their intentions. (Rost, 1991, p. 117)

This process was demonstrated by not only the value of changing the way policing is being done but, also for instance, by Setzer relaying that she saw one of the commanders out there call the department psychologist to come and help members of the squad [the one that had dealt with the mass murder at the Family Fitness Center]. He was not going to just give them some overtime slips to fill out and send them home. He took some responsibility to make sure that he had taken care of

everybody out on the scene. He had done everything humanely possible he could to make sure people were O.K.

This story demonstrates that those involved were seeking to effect a change in the organization and as a result a change in our society. Both the underlying value of changing the way in which the police people do policing and their concern for the long-term effect on the community, shows the fundamental change they had in mind.

You know, I talked earlier about law enforcement changing. Before we would go, pull up to a situation and handle it, we would eliminate the threat, transport the wounded and that was the extent of our responsibility. But I saw this group become a leadership body and take care of the people out there for the long term.

We called TIP, Trauma Intervention People, to get the psychologists and counselors out there. I'll tell you that ten years ago in law enforcement there's no way we would've considered the witnesses or people who weren't shot or directly affected. If their apartments weren't burned, or they weren't shot, we wouldn't have considered how they felt or what the long-term effect on them was. Now you're seeing these leaders think: "Wait a minute. Our responsibility goes beyond that as leaders." Besides just protecting them, we want to give them some control back over their lives.

Effecting lasting change was an operative value in Setzer's leadership story.

Mutual purposes were evident in the story. Rost stated: "If the purposes are mutual, the changes cannot reflect only what the leaders want or only what the followers want. They must reflect what the leaders and followers have come to understand from numerous interactions as the mutual purposes of the leaders and followers" (p. 118).

A good demonstration of reflecting mutual purposes in the story is the communication that was present among the four commanders during this event. The give-and-take that was present and the description by Setzer of their moving as one body of leaders and followers was a result of their cooperation and collaboration. One must suppose that within this give-and-take a mutuality of purpose beyond the completion of immediate goals, must have occurred. And one can surmise that within the underlying assumptions of developing and changing the way policing is being done that with the "four different egos" present, each would have a different vision of how to accomplish immediate and long-term purposes. This is not clearly stated within the narrative and is a bit problematic. However, within the context of the story and from the numerous interactions of the players resulting in changes in their immediate actions, coupled with the reflections they must have had during debriefings, any changes certainly would have reflected what both the leaders and followers wanted. This is to say that the context of the story does not suggest that decisions which involved the direction of the department were unilateral or authoritarian in nature. The behavior of the

members of the team at the situation suggested the presence of the leadership element of mutual purposes.

To reflect their mutual purposes, leaders and followers must come to some agreement about their purposes. That agreement must be consciously achieved by the interaction of leaders and followers. It must be developed using noncoercive methods. It must be forged in the relationship that leaders and followers have, on which allows followers to influence leaders (and other followers) as well as leaders to influence followers (and other leaders). (Rost, 1991, p. 120)

Setzer's narrative demonstrates the emergence of leadership within the El Cajon Police Department as they responded to a tragic event.

Story Twenty-Two: Chris Corr's Leadership Story

Corr is 29 years old and was born in Lansing, Michigan. He is currently in charge of developing the health and fitness component for *Celebration*, a town dedicated to health and good living being developed by the Disney Institute. His story involves being elected to the Florida House of Representatives and his relationship with his constituency in rural Florida:

When I think about the question you asked, the development of the *Celebration* project itself could be the leadership experience. But the story that first popped into my mind is an experience that I had before coming to Disney.

When I sat down and tried to think of a story in the terms you outlined, I wondered: "Was it really leadership? Or was it just a unique confluence of events? Or was it just being in a position to do something?" That is interesting. I thought that maybe I'm overanalyzing.

Before I came to Disney, I spent a term in the legislature as a house member in the House of Representatives of Florida. Since I had been in a small community, as I mentioned, I had a lot of opportunities for leadership. One thing led to another, and I was running for the House one day, not ever having thought I would be politically involved or anything like that. It just kind of happened. I ended up winning and traveled to Tallahassee to represent the district for a term.

One of the most unique events that happened was in South Hillsborough County. Hillsborough is mainly the Tampa area. South Hillsborough is the rural portion of this big urban county. What we ended up with is a rural county with an urban government, a city government with the mayor and city council who were interested in the downtown area, and a commission that was mainly dominated by urban folks. So what we had was a big part of the county that had little representation because it is the rural part. It also was the growing part, the future of that area. But a lot of its needs were not those of the urban section of the county.

We had a group there that was rebellious and whose members never thought they were getting their appropriate representation. Rumblings of

this group went on for years. The group came from the suburbs of Tampa: Rusk, Sun City, Apollo Beach and South Brand. They never felt like they were getting a fair shake. There were large areas of property with few residents. They were big property owners that contributed a lot to the tax base, but somehow didn't get the representation they deserved. They always were rebellious and rumbling: "Gee, we are not getting a fair share." It created an unhealthy environment having friction between these guys in the government [and their constituencies]. When it came time to vote, the suburbs of Tampa actually had a small portion of the electorate total. So it was always hard to make change.

While I was a member of the House, a group from this area began talking about seceding, believe it or not, from the county. This was a group of farmers and big land owners and folks that eventually said, "We've had enough! We're going to secede to Manatee county," which is the adjacent county. "We're going to split off of Hillsborough and go to Manatee."

The newspapers immediately loved it, because here's this great story: "A group of people down here who want to get out of their government, who can't stand it anymore, and have had enough. They are saying that they have been taxed enough and they are getting out of town." So this movement began. Being in the position I was as representing that area, I was also sharing some of the same feelings they had. I eventually became a leader of

that movement. We said, "Why stop with secession? Why join another county? Let's start our own county."

Florida has 67 counties and has never started another one for over a hundred years. Boy! The papers loved that too (laugh). "These guys want to start their own county. How can that be?"

We had all kinds of information and ammunition to start this great movement of people who wanted to take the government into their own hands. They believed that they were the government in the first place, and that they should be allowed to do this. What happened was that we ended up with a couple of huge town meetings where 2,000 or so people gathered in local churches to share ideas and strategies. For about a year I found myself leading the effort of a rebellious group, and being up against the legislature, governor, county and all of those governments.

We never did it. In fact, eventually we voted ourselves not to continue to try to work within the current system because of the fallout of going through the effort and it not working. With all of the political realities associated with the effort, it might have been too much [for the community]. But being in the position of trying to do that over a period of time was an overwhelming sense of responsibility, because everybody took it very seriously. Being in the legislature and being able to actually go to Tallahassee and write a bill to do something like this was a good amount of power. What made it interesting was that we had the potential to actually do

it. Now there were a lot of political realities that made it seem next to impossible, but I was in the position to actually go and give it a shot. So it made it an interesting process [end of Corr's story].

The relevant domains of meaning that reflected leadership as influence were:

- I was in the position to give it a shot.
- My being in the position of representing that area.
- We are not getting our fair share.
- The movement began to have an impact on the issue.
- We had all kinds of information to start this great movement of people.
- People gathered to talk about how to go about doing it.
- A group from this area began talking about seceding.
- We voted not to continue

The relevant domains of meaning that emerged that reflected leadership as a leader-follower relationship were:

- The movement began.
- I emerged as leader of movement.
- The people believed that they should be allowed to act (and they acted).
- People wanted to take government in their own hands (and they acted).

- They believed they were the government.
- They shared ideas and strategies.
- I found myself leading this group and being up against the legislature.

The relevant domains of meaning that emerged which reflected intended real changes and intended real changes that reflect mutual purposes were:

- We're going to secede.
- I was sharing some of the same feelings they had.
- This group wanted to get out of the government.
- Let's start our own county.
- The people wanted to take the government into their own hands.
- We voted not to continue.

There were no relevant domains of meaning that reflected the management elements of a manager-subordinate relationship or of producing goods and services and producing goods and services from coordinated activities present within Corr's story.

Corr's story is an excellent example of leadership within the political process. It is also a bit problematic in that there appears to be both influence and authority acting within the event. Corr is in an authority position within the political organization. He is a representative. And, as he stated: "As a legislator I had the power to write a bill to start a new county." This

power and the writing of the bill will include a lot of management and use of authority and thus could be construed as a domain of meaning representing the management element of authority. However, if one looks closely at the story and keeps in mind the context, Corr never used his positional authority (read coercion) within the leadership dynamic that occurred between him and his constituency, at least as far as we know from his story.

The leadership story concerns his relationship with his constituency. Corr's use of positional power was noncoercive, that is it was more influential than authoritative. He used his position within the legislature to act as a legislator would, that is, to write and promote a bill in the House. In this case it would have been a bill that would have furthered the intended, real changes that reflected the mutual purposes of both leaders and followers. The story does not indicate that Corr used any coercive behaviors with his constituency nor does it indicate that the relationship was "primarily top-down as to the directives given and bottom-up as to the responses given" by his constituency (Rost, 1991, p. 147). This story is a prime example of leadership being episodic and context bound. This story also indicates that at times leaders can be managers and that one's role may not necessarily prevent the leadership dynamic from arising. It also indicates that one may use one's role to promote the possibility of leadership behavior emerging between leaders and followers.

An analysis of the leader-followers relationship. Because Corr's story illustrates very clearly the leader-followers dynamic, an in-depth analysis follows of the leader-followers domains of meaning that emerged in his story. Again, the domains of meaning that emerged in Corr's story that reflected the leader-follower relationship were:

- The movement began.
- I emerged as leader of movement.
- People wanted to take government in their own hands (and they did).
- The people believed that they should be allowed to act (and they did).
- They shared ideas and strategies.
- They believed they were the government.
- I found myself leading this group and being up against the legislature.

The reader will notice the manner in which Corr described the movement: "the movement began." This did not indicate that he was the motivating force of the movement's genesis. Also note how he stated that he "emerged as leader of movement." Placed within the context of the entire story this statement suggests that, even though he was the elected representative of this constituency, the constituency actually empowered him to be a leader in this particular project. No doubt his influence within the

government was of benefit. But this relationship was noncoercive, even though it was unequal in power resources.

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. (Rost, 1991, p. 112)

In Corr's story the five points put forth by Rost that "give the concept of followers substance and clarity" are fulfilled (p. 108).

The followers were *active*. "First, only people who are active in the leadership process are followers. Passive people are not in a relationship" (p. 108). The statement that "people wanted to take the government into their own hands" indicates that these are active people. This is especially so considering the fact that they mounted a campaign to effect a real and lasting change.

"Second, active people can fall anywhere on a continuum of activity form highly active to minimally active" (p. 109). The mounting campaign to take the government into their own hands, coupled with the fact that they all "shared ideas and strategies," indicate active followers. Because of the number of people involved, they would most likely fall on different places on a continuum of activity.

“Third, followers can become leaders and leaders can become followers in any one leadership relationship”(p. 109). This is indicated by the statement that the constituency, “believed they were the government” and they acted by placing influence upon the leader and on the system. The actions of the constituents in influencing Corr and the system reflected the leadership dynamic. They were noncoercive. The decision to end the campaign prior to succeeding is another indication of the activeness of the followers. During this decision process some followers must have also become influential leaders.

“Fourth, in one group or organization people can be leaders. In other groups and organizations they can be followers. Followers are not always followers in all leadership relationships” (p. 109). This point is made by Corr’s behaviors in that within the House he was a leader as representative of his constituency, while with the constituency at times he became a follower. For example, he was a follower in acceding to the wishes of the constituency to not continue the campaign to secede from the county.

“Fifth, and most important, followers do not do followership, they do leadership. Both leaders and followers form one relationship that is leadership Followers and leaders develop a relationship wherein they influence one another as well as the organization and society, and that is leadership” (p. 109). The give and take between Corr and his constituency

demonstrates that these followers and leaders developed an influence relationship and that the followers did leadership.

The story of Chris Corr and the constituency who wanted to secede from a Florida county demonstrate Rost's fifth characteristic of followers quite vividly. These were not people doing followership. These were people involved with the political and leadership dynamic. They did not simply elect a representative. They had a relationship with him and he had a relationship with them. The constituency influenced him, as he influenced them. The constituency was involved. This was a unique group of people seeking to bring effective and lasting change that reflected its mutual purposes. As Corr said in conversation toward the end of our time together:

I guess we set up a lot of inhibitors to leadership in our society.

Maybe it is a way to control the masses (nervous laugh). But what happens is we find a few unique people that kind of ignore those things and look to create ideal futures instead of just living in these everydays. [They chose not to live the] kind of lives of quiet desperation, which so many people do.

These were active followers engaged with a noncoercive, yet influential leader. Corr and his constituency experienced leadership.

Summary Analysis of Leadership Narratives.

I interviewed 25 participants for this research project. However I included and analyzed only 22 stories. Two of the stories told to me were

non-responsive to the research question and the third was repetitive of another story and did not provide any new information to the project.

Domains of Meaning Reflecting the Definitional Elements of Management.

The management element identifying leadership as an authority relationship emerged in 16 of the 22 stories and 17 of the 22 stories identified leadership as a manager-subordinate relationship.

In 8 of the 22 stories, producing goods and services emerged as a relevant domain of meaning, and in 12 of the stories producing goods and services resulting from coordinated activities emerged as a relevant domain of meaning.

At least one element reflecting leadership as management was present in 20 of the 22 stories.

Domains of Meaning Reflecting the Definitional Elements of Leadership.

Influence emerged as a significant domain of meaning in 10 of the 22 stories. The domain of meaning reflecting the leadership element of leaders and followers was also present in 10 of the 22 stories.

Intended, real changes emerged as a significant domain of meaning in 6 of the stories, and intended real changes reflecting mutual purposes emerged in 7 of the 22 stories.

At least one element of leadership reflecting Rost's definition was present in 11 of the stories. Five out of the 22 stories contained the four definitional elements necessary for leadership to be present according to Rost's definition of leadership.

Some Reflections

For most of the participants in this study, leadership is reflected in actions that gain their meaning from management values. With the industrial purview of management as the frame from which the participants responded, their descriptions of leadership were content laden. For them, leadership was described as accomplishing certain specific ends by authoritative means. This conclusion gives an insight into why so few domains of meaning reflecting intended, real changes and changes reflecting mutual purposes emerged in the narratives. The management view by its very nature and definition is *status-quo* oriented and does not seek lasting and effective changes.

The narratives reinforce images of content and objectivity which preclude the possibility of an alternative description for action. The prohibition of an alternative description reinforces metaphors that are coercive, isolationist and dehumanizing: In describing the effect of metaphor, Bateson stated that:

There is a tendency today among subatomic physicists to use metaphors taken from life to describe the events inside the accelerator To liken the mountain to a man and talk of its "humor" or "rage" does little harm. But to liken the man to the mountain proposes that all human relationships are what Martin Buber might call *I-it* or perhaps *it-it* relationships. The mountain, personified in our speech, will not become a person, will not *learn* a more personal way of being. But the human being, depersonified in his own talk and thought, may indeed learn more thingish habits of action. (Bateson, 1979, pp. 100-101)

In analyzing the metaphors that the participants used to describe leadership as management, this research shows how much they bought into views of leadership as great men and women, traits, authoritative behaviors and effective or successful activities.

However, because the narrative form allows for personal interpretation and because stories are "reconstruction(s) [which] aim at a distillation of the essential aspects of thought and action," tacit desires and values were able to emerge (Widdershoven, 1993, p. 17). The tacit desires and values that emerged in the stories reflect the postindustrial paradigm. The clarification by people of their tacit desires and values is necessary if their thoughts and actions are able to transcend the limitations of the industrial paradigm. As long as people's thoughts and actions are contained

by the images and metaphors of the industrial paradigm, their tacit desires and values will not be able to emerge and become leadership behavior.

Conclusion

The data in this study reinforce what common sense would have us believe, namely that the industrial paradigm holds sway on the way most people view leadership. The data also provide an insight into the presence of an alternative value system that emerges in the descriptions given by some of the participants. These values emerge because each participant told me a story that each one believed was about leadership. The participants did not attempt to nor were they asked to tell a story about good management.

The emergence of postindustrial values in almost half of the stories suggests that some people sensed the difference between leadership and management to be something deeper than behavior and traits. The emergence of all four of the leadership elements put forth by Rost suggests that some participants saw the difference between leadership and management to be grounded in certain values. Half of the stories reveal the presence of postindustrial values and five of these eleven stories that reflect an understanding of leadership that is similar to Rost's definition. These eleven stories suggest a transition from the industrial paradigm to the postindustrial paradigm of leadership may well be in progress.

Change is not an easy, clear-cut, clean or linear process. It occurs when we least expect it, and quite often not in the manner we expect. Neither is the process of growth linear. It involves our intellect, emotions, spirit and soul. In short the growth process involves our consciousness. The presence of one or more leadership elements in half of the stories shows that some of the storytellers have been influenced by postindustrial values in a real and significant way. These values are within the experience and consciousness of these eleven storytellers. At the time the participants told the stories, they had no adequate language to express these values so I as the analyst had to bring these tacit, inarticulated values to the surface and make them explicit by categorizing them into domains of relevant meaning. Rost's definition helps to give form and meaning to the tacit values that emerged from the stories within this study. His definition provides an adequate language to describe their experience and helps articulate the tacit values that are basic to their experience. I will explore this notion in Chapter Five in conjunction with answering the research questions.

CHAPTER FIVE

LEADERSHIP: THE EMBRACE OF EXCHANGE

Introduction

**“Consciousness is known in the world and the world in consciousness”
(Kung, 1987, p. 195).**

The purpose for studying the 22 stories gathered for this project is to advance and clarify our understanding of people’s experiences of leadership. This study of the nature of the leadership phenomenon is the first to specifically elucidate how Rost’s leadership definition relates to people’s lived experiences.

Leadership narrative research is grounded in a phenomenological method. In leadership narrative research, stories of participants are used to gather data. The researcher listens to and reviews the uninterrupted stories of the narrators in order to get as close as possible to the experience of the participants. The analysis within this method of research is designed to provide interpretations which are “meant to represent a more detached conceptualization of that reality” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 22).

Using stories for data gathering is different from other methods employed by researchers who utilize the narrative form in research. Other

researchers have used the narrative form but usually to report the data gathered through their research. In other qualitative projects the researcher asks questions (which tends to guide his or her informants) throughout the interview process. Or if the researcher asks informants to tell a story, quite often the story line is interrupted by clarifying questions from the researcher. The researcher then transcribes the interview into the narrative form to report the data.

In contrast to this approach, I asked each participant one essential question. I asked: "Would you convey to me in the form of a story a time in your life that you have experienced what you would consider to be leadership?" This was the only question I asked the participants. Upon receiving the instruction, each storyteller began his or her leadership narration. After the story was completed, I encouraged the participants to complete this thought: "I see this story as leadership" Upon the completion of the sentence, I would ask if there was anything else they would like to say about leadership. Quite often people would reflect upon the story they just told in a capsule form, recalling certain instances that impressed them and the meaning they may have attached to the instance. Other times people would simply say they had said all they wanted to say about leadership.

At this juncture the participants and I would talk a bit about leadership. I would provide them with Rost's definition and describe very briefly the essential differences between Rost's conception of leadership and

management. Upon hearing Rost's definition, 12 out of the 25 participants responded by saying something like: "That's what I was trying to say." Because this conversation was not part of the study, this description is anecdotal but still enlightening.

I edited and transcribed the stories to make them more readable. I then drew out relevant domains of meaning that I categorized as either falling under one of the four elements of management or one of the four elements of leadership as defined by Rost (1991). The analysis of these stories is in Chapter Four. I interviewed 25 participants for this research project. However, I included and analyzed only 22 stories. Two of the stories told to me were nonresponsive to the research question and the third was repetitive of another story and did not provide any new information to the project. Eleven of the stories included values present within Rost's definition of leadership. They were stories told by Copps (story 17), Corr (story 22), Dohse (story 19), Glazer (story 15), Halagan (story 14), Mullen (story 20), Setzer (story 21), Russell (story 18), Shannon (story 11), Smith (story 13) and Sypolt (story 12).

Five of the stories demonstrated the four elements necessary for leadership to be present as stated in Rost's definition: "Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes" (1991, p. 102). They were the stories told by Corr (story 22), Mullen (story 20), Russell (story 18), Setzer (story 21) and Smith (story 13). A matrix of these data is found in Appendix C.

The stories told by Bailey (story 2), Cross (story 10), Dunn (story 8), Furness (story 3), Kalaf (story 6), Moreau (story 5), Morrison (story 9), Nakoue (story 7), Palm (story 4), Pratt (story 1) and Valestro (story 16), reflected management elements. They did not reflect any of the four criteria necessary for leadership to occur. A matrix of these data is also found in Appendix C.

In the first part of Chapter Five, I answer the research questions. In answering these questions I also provide a second cut into the analysis of the data. It is most appropriate to develop this deeper insight by the answering of the research questions because the questions speak to the nature of the leadership phenomena as it is experienced by the people involved in the study.

Following the discussion regarding the research questions is an overview of the study which speaks to the significance which this research to leadership scholars and practitioners. I then develop a brief critique of leadership narrative research as a method. The chapter concludes with some suggestions for future research and additional remarks.

Rost's Definition: Descriptive or Prescriptive

The first research question: Is Rost's definition of leadership descriptive or prescriptive? That is, does Rost's definition of leadership reflect the lived experience of people? Does his definition solely prescribe what leadership *should* be in the future?

People's life experiences are multifaceted and not easily captured in a linear mode of description. Our lives are continually evolving in a tapestry of events, feelings, thoughts and experiences. Answering the question as to whether Rost's definition of leadership is descriptive or prescriptive is to venture into the nuances of our lived experience.

There is no simple yes or no answer to whether this definition fully describes the way life is or prescribes the way it should be. Rather, as with most of life, what is seen on the surface is quite often the least there is to know about an event; definitions are the least we know about an experience. Definitions attempt to focus more clearly the shades of gray that are present within the dynamic progression of living. They do not provide us with a clear distinct picture. They do not tell us all there is to know about what it is they attempt to frame. The same is true about Rost's definition of leadership.

For 5 out of the 22 participants, the leadership definition represents their lived experiences. For 6 of the participants, the leadership definition partially describes their lived experiences and partially prescribes what else they would have to do if they want to engage in leadership behavior. Thus, Rost's definition of leadership is partially descriptive of the underlying desire of 11 of the 22 participants to move toward a model of leadership that is different from one based solely on the values present within the old paradigm of leadership where leadership is identified with good management.

Because the data demonstrate the emergence of postindustrial values within the behaviors and experiences of many of the participants, Rost's

definition is descriptive. At the same time Rost's definition prescribes the necessary values that must emerge if the socially constructed reality of leadership is to be reconstituted to reflect postindustrial values. If, as the data demonstrate, there is a difference between management and leadership, then Rost's definition of leadership prescribes the values (elements) necessary for leadership to be present and be recognized as such.

In asking if Rost's definition reflects the lived experience of the people involved in this research, I would have to conclude that Rost's definition of leadership does not *fully* reflect the lived experience of 17 out of 22 participants in this study. This became quite evident with the descriptions in many of the stories that identified leadership with achieving end results and authoritative power of the leader.

Rost's definition does not solely prescribe what leadership should be in the future because many participants' descriptions of leadership in this project (11 out of 22) tacitly embodied values that reflected the postindustrial paradigm. And in five stories postindustrial values explicitly emerged as behaviors that embodied the four elements necessary for leadership to be present. The tacit, and in some cases, explicit presence of postindustrial values and behaviors within the narratives demonstrates that Rost's understanding of leadership is already present in and is being expressed in the way some people do leadership in the early 1990s. The definition

describes values and behaviors that some people embody, but the postindustrial model is not yet fully realized. It is, in a word, emerging.

As a bounded definition, Rost's model does not perfectly describe the explicit portrayal of the participants' leadership actions. But if the concept of a definition is viewed as the least we know about something, then this definition of leadership can be an illuminating guide for the language and behaviors necessary to more fully realize the tacit values already present within many people. By grounding leadership in the postindustrial paradigm, Rost's definition provides the milieu in which the habits, skills and traits necessary to transform and empower people to become more human may emerge. Actions and behaviors grounded in Rost's definition allow for participation which makes a person "an active . . . aware . . . subject rather than a passive object of . . . control" (Sullivan, 1986, p. 218).

Rost's definition of leadership is both descriptive and prescriptive of the lived experiences of the people interviewed in this research.

Experiences of Leadership

The second research question is: What are the processes people experience within the leadership dynamic that are manifested as external phenomenon?

This question seeks to discover the presence of "criterial behavior" within the stories (Koethe, 1976, p. 620). Do the behaviors of the actors in the stories reflect the management elements of coercion, manager-

subordinate relationships and relationships that produce and sell goods and services resulting from coordinated activities? Or do the behaviors experienced by the participants reflect the criteria necessary for leadership to be present, namely, that the relationships are based on influence and intend real changes that reflect mutual purposes?

What is process? There is a difficulty in defining a dynamic, especially when one seeks to describe “a potential differentiation between action in context and action or behavior which defines context or makes context intelligible” (Bateson, 1979, pp. 115-116).

In general, process is concerned with the dynamic of action sequences that occur in change. Process is what we characterize as the means by which differences emerge. Change is how we label the differences that emerge because of processes within our life episodes and events. In narrative research on leadership, changes can be recognized by the different values that emerge while the storytellers are describing a life event or by the concomitant behaviors. When descriptions of values or behaviors don't fit into a general scheme of a story, a difference of type emerges and a change is present, even if the change is only a paradox that is created within thought itself. Sometimes while listening to people describe the meaning of an event, we may say that they contradict themselves. This discrepancy quite often is the difference between the event and the description of the values the story represents. Or quite often within their stories, people will state that they are

having a hard time saying exactly what they mean. Similar discrepancies have arisen within this study.

The data in this research indicate that the majority of storytellers identified process as being the use of tools, traits or abilities by a person in accomplishing predetermined goals. They saw process (as manifested by behaviors) as being linear, functional actions aimed toward reinforcing *status quo* values and ends. In short for 17 of the 22 storytellers, process is related to the notion of object. The storytellers did not identify process as dynamic or as effecting real, intended changes. They did not see process as the sequence of actions out of which an end result *emanates*. The main focus of most of the storytellers was on the behaviors of authority figures by which they provided direction to other people in order to attain a specified goal or end. The process in attaining the end or goal was a necessary function. In the two metaphors that follow, I want to show the contrast between process as seen as function and process as a dynamic notion.

The metaphor of a journey or sea voyage is a good example of how many storytellers experienced the process of leadership as being a function that was used to attain external goals. As I stated in chapter two, a journey has a goal, a purpose, a specific destination. Being on a journey suggests that one is on or in a vehicle of some sort, for instance, a ship. One follows a *charted* course when on a journey. The course will guide the traveller to where he or she wants to go. The entailments of a sea voyage elicit images of

strong captains who pilot their vessels to safe shores. We can place our trust in these men (and I use this word decidedly), because of their expertise, strength, wisdom and confidence. We see them as strong men of character, leaders who are able to keep their crews in shape, in line, fit, disciplined going in the right direction. The leadership image that emerges from the metaphor of a journey is a good representation of how the majority of storytellers identified process as being the functional use of tools, traits or abilities by a person seeking to accomplish predetermined goals. For 17 of the 22 storytellers, process is a functional necessity for leadership. It is concerned with attaining end goals, objects. They experienced behavioral processes that reflected the management criteria.

For five of the 22 participants, the behavioral processes they experienced reflected the leadership criteria as put forth by Rost. For them the criterial behaviors of leadership were different from the criterial behaviors in management. For them the criterial behaviors in leadership were related to the notion of change and not function as is present in the criteria set forth for management.

Functionalism is different from dynamism just as the new leadership paradigm is different from the old paradigm in which leadership is seen as good management. A second metaphor of a conversation demonstrates a view of behavioral processes as being concerned with the notion of dynamism out of which leadership emerges. A conversation is not dependent upon results. A conversation between people emerges when all are engaged. All

may not be speaking, but each is engaged and as a result energizes the event. The leader of the conversation shifts depending upon what someone may have to offer to the group. The group intends real changes that reflect their mutual purposes, usually to gain a deeper insight into whatever the subject of the conversation might be. However, if a deeper insight (object) is not attained, and the elements of a good conversation are present, namely, engagement, give and take, openness to other's insights, etc., then the conversation still exists. A resolution or the attainment of an object is not necessary for a conversation to have occurred.

Conversation, as with leadership, is concerned with the notion of process in time, i. e., change. Neither leadership nor conversation is dependent upon attainment of an object. Both are contextualized (gain meaning) by a dynamic process and not by a static object. Neither leadership nor a conversation gains its context (meaning) from a mandate by an authority figure. I stated above that some participants had some difficulty in describing their leadership narratives. The participants were unable to provide a description of their tacitly held values because leadership is a *different type of process* than management. Leadership is related to the notion (type) of dynamism in time, not to the notion (type) of object. Leadership is more like a conversation than a debate; it emerges and evolves *because* of the interaction of the conversants. Leadership is not formed by outside mandates nor is it considered, like a debate, successful because of the

attainment of an end goal, i. e., winning the debate. The language used to describe a debate is not adequate to describe a conversation, just as the language used to describe management is inadequate to describe the dynamism of leadership.

This research demonstrates that some of the participants do not view leadership and management as the same phenomenon. The emergence of postindustrial values as recognizable behaviors within the leadership narratives are the processes some participants experienced. Postindustrial values emerged in 11 of the 22 stories, and 5 of the 22 stories demonstrated all four criteria necessary for leadership to be present.

Storytellers' Descriptions and Rost's Definition

The third research question is: How closely do the descriptions of the experiences of leadership that the informants provide agree or disagree with Rost's definition of leadership?

The descriptions of the informants experiences do not agree closely with Rost. Rost is concerned with *how* leadership occurs and most of the participants were concerned with *what* occurred as evidenced by the result of the actions with which they identified leadership. Many of the participants experienced leadership as the result of the process or as someone directing them in some manner to the attainment of a certain end result. That is to say their descriptions could be characterized as management. They generally

did not reflect relationships that were noncoercive or influential. Their descriptions did not reflect mutual relationships that intended real changes.

Rost is concerned with the process, the dynamic which arises and emerges in the interactions of the actors. The analyses in Chapter Four demonstrate the elements of Rost's definition of leadership in some of the stories. These stories conveyed a tacit recognition by the participants of the presence of an interactive and relational dynamic within their leadership narratives. The domains of meaning suggest that there is a stratum of consciousness which reflects a movement toward a noncoercive form of relationship. This noncoercive form of leadership is hindered in its full expression by the limitation of language and metaphors available to the participants to describe the event. As a result most of the descriptions of leadership in this project are not close to the description Rost provides of leadership.

The Significance of What Was Found.

This research demonstrates that those interviewed generally proceeded on one level of discourse. The level of discourse used by the participants was primarily concerned with the attainment of end goals by authoritative (coercive) means. The participants were concerned with object. However, within some of the stories emerged a level of discourse that was concerned not with goals or objects *per se*, but with relational qualities that are recognized and are present only within action sequences which can be

characterized as leadership. These values and behaviors were necessarily located in a specific time and existed only during that time. Upon telling a leadership story, the values are recognized and re-emerge as recognizable phenomena that help explain what happened.

Eleven out of the 22 stories included at least one value that was based on a definitional element of leadership. As the leadership values emerged, the variables which are characteristic of management began to fade into the background or were incorporated into the syntax of leadership. This became most clear in 5 of the 23 stories that had all four elements necessary for leadership to be present. The presence of values that represent both the industrial and postindustrial paradigms within the events of the stories suggests that leadership is not necessarily devoid of some types of behaviors that could be classified as management.

The process of leadership is related to the notion of change, not to the notion of object or goal such as management is. Because it is concerned with intended, real changes, leadership is concerned with time (Rost, 1991, p. 114). Leadership is *not* (i. e., it does not exist) except at those dynamic sequences in which values arise that make the possibility of intended, real changes emerge. Leadership is related to the notion of change rather than to the notion of object. Object is not necessary for leadership to be present. *Actions* imbued with the intention to effect real changes that reflect mutual purposes are necessary for leadership to *exist*. And leadership only exists

during those sequences of events, at those times in which the actors are engaged in behavioral processes that we have characterized as leadership.

An illustration by Bateson (1979) demonstrates how values “fill the stage at one level of discourse and vanish into the background at the next-higher or lower level”(p. 108). Bateson considered:

the referent of the word *switch*, which engineers at times call a *gate* or *relay*. What goes through is energized from a source that is different from the energy source which opens the gate.

At first thought a “switch” is a small contraption on the wall which turns the light on or off. Or, with more pedantry, we note that the light is turned on or off by human hands “using” the switch. And so on.

We do not notice that the concept “switch” is of quite a different order from the concepts “stone,” “table,” and the like. Closer examination shows that the switch, considered as a part of an electric circuit, *does not exist* when it is in the on position. From the point of view of the circuit, it is not different from the conducting wire which leads to it and the wire which leads away from it. It is merely “more conductor.” Conversely, but similarly, when the switch is off, it does not exist from the point of view of the circuit. It is nothing, a gap between two conductors which, themselves exist only as conductors when the switch is on.

In other words, the switch is *not* except at the moments of its change of setting, and the concept “switch” has thus a special relation to *time*.

It is related to the notion “change” rather than to the notion “object.”

(pp. 108-9, emphasis in the original)

Like the switch, leadership is related to the notion of change rather than to the notion of object. Leadership only exists during the confluence of influence relationships between leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes.

Perhaps Jack Solomon (1988) said it best: “We look upon our languages as objective reflections of reality, when they are actually codified system of signs Signs [words] are not windows through which the light of meaning innocently shines. They are screens that let through only those meanings that belong to the code” (pp. 2-3).

This research suggests that Rost’s definition can provide people with a code to describe experiences that are more complex than the management code. By framing their stories as leadership stories, the participants engaged the circuit through which the values that were tacitly present within their stories could become more dominate and recognizable as phenomena. The values of the postindustrial paradigm are emerging even within the metacommunication of the industrial paradigm. We are experiencing a shift in consciousness and thus a shift in paradigm.

Limitations of the Narrative Approach to Leadership Research

In developing this new method of research, I encountered obstacles and limitations I never suspected would arise. My hope was that by having participants tell me about leadership in the form of a story in which they recounted the facts of the events, that an emotional response to the events would emerge. The participants' emotional responses, I hoped, would provide for a more nuanced understanding of the meaning in the events. To my disappointment only two of the storytellers conveyed any emotional response while they were telling their stories. These responses were not significant and did not affect the analysis or understanding of the stories they conveyed.

Another difficulty was the language I used to ask the question to the participants. I formed the question to the participants in a very vague and general way. I did this because one of the most important elements within this research was to discover what the participants' experiences of leadership were. I did not want to influence them by providing any indication of what I thought leadership was. This approach was, on the whole, very successful in that I did not influence the participants' choice of or manner in which they told their stories. However, three participants were unable to form a story about a leadership experience. As a result their stories simply reported some events about their lives. The researcher could have alleviated some confusion for the participants by clarifying the question and by being a little less stringent in not helping the participants decide on an episode to relate.

Because the question was vague some of the participants told stories that were episodic and some told stories that lasted over a long period of time and did not focus on the episode of leadership. This variation of stories caused some confusion during the analysis. However, it became an asset in that it forced me to maintain the perspective of story. Within the narrative form, meanings arise as known and experienced and conveyed by the participants. These meanings are not necessarily limited by time sequences and that is one of the benefits of narration. The significant thoughts and actions experienced by the storyteller arise during narration. As Widdershoven (1993) put it: "A reconstruction aims at a distillation of the essential aspects of thought and action" (p. 17). In the distillation of the thoughts and actions time may be collapsed or it may be elongated depending upon the need of the story. In stories the importance of temporal sequence is meaning dependent, that is it is only important if it enhances the meaning of the story.

Advantages of the Narrative Form

Using the narrative form frees the researcher from having to be thinking of questions to ask during the interview process. This allows the researcher to focus more upon the dynamic that is occurring during the storytelling. Using the narrative form also allows for more freedom of expression by the participant. I discovered that after the participants became comfortable, they got into their stories. It became important to them that their story expressed the experience they had of leadership. The more

they entered into their narrative, the less self-conscious they became and the more interesting the stories were.

Probably the greatest advantage in using this form of research however, is that listening to people tell stories about their leadership experiences gives the researcher a view into the person who is telling the story. It provides a window through which to see the images, values and experiences that are most important to the participants and that influence their thoughts. Telling stories about the self reveals the structures that give meaning to our lives.

Suggestions for Methodology

My strong suggestion to anyone who wants to use this methodology would be to emphasize to the participants the importance of relating a single incident in leadership. Because some of the stories in this project were episodic and others were over a long period of time, I found it difficult to gain coherence in the meanings of the stories.

Because this is a new method I used a bit of trial and error. The next time I use this method, I will interview a larger population. Perhaps I would interview 30 participants with the thought of using only 20 stories. This would give me the option to discard stories that are not episodic or that do not significantly add to the data.

Suggestions for Further Research

One of the exciting aspects of leadership studies is the myriad of research areas available to the researcher. As I did the analysis of the data in chapters four and five, some further questions arose that would be of benefit in advancing leadership studies.

1. When does influence become coercive behavior? The question about the quality of relationship arose for me while analyzing the relationships between authority figures and subordinates. Shannon's and Halagan's relationship to their teams and Copp's relationship to his staff come to mind. When coaching an individual at what point do subordinates begin to feel coerced? When do subordinates begin to feel that they must live up to expectations of authority before they are rejected?

2. What effect does individual (and societal) consciousness have on the presence of the leadership dynamic? What are the characteristics of consciousness that are present within the leadership dynamic? These two questions arise because of the effect language and paradigm have on the social construction of reality. If the metaphors, images and values we base our actions on affect our conscious view of the world, then what characteristics must be present if we are to engage in the leadership dynamic?

3. How do assertive behavior and managerial actions close the possibility for alternative behaviors to arise among people in a group? This

question arose from the analysis of Furness' story about Katmandu. There was no formal structure present in this story to suggest coercive behavior, and yet Furness' assertive behavior prevailed and people seemed to acquiesce to her direction.

4. For leadership to occur, individuals must take responsibility. What societal structures and attitudes reinforce acquiescence to the form of control present within the industrial paradigm? What attitudes and societal structures reinforce peoples' dependence on and comfort with the model of leadership that is identified with someone telling others what to do? This question also arose from the analysis of Furness' leadership story and is somewhat connected with the second question regarding consciousness. The effect of these socially constructed realities on people is pretty much accepted, but if we are to be free individuals then, being aware of the attitudes and structures that reinforce our behaviors is of great importance.

Some Concluding Remarks: Consciousness and Exchange

There is a transition going on and an axial shift in consciousness, if you will, in the emergence and recognition of the underlying values present with the postindustrial paradigm

The values are tacitly present and are emerging. It is up to each one of us whether or not to engage in actions that are freeing for self and others. Whether we respond to the dynamic of immediate events or react in a pre-scripted unidimensional manner, Rost's definition provides us a referent

from which to choose. Will we choose to be motivated by the contextualizing actions of others? Or will we freely choose to gain impetus from *responding responsibly with* others to form context out of which new and more complex meanings and freedoms arise?

Three essential elements are necessary for an authentic life as suggested by the rise and decisiveness of the axial period (Thompson, 1977, p. 28). They are rationality, individuality and freedom. Until Rost provided a defining clarification of the difference between management and leadership namely, a grounding on freedom and influence relationships versus a grounding on coercive and dominating relationships, the third element necessary for an authentic life, freedom, was not an acceptable alternative in leadership studies because the dominate paradigm delimited the possibilities of noncoercive relationships within leadership.

The industrial paradigm prevents the emergence of freedom that is unencumbered by social constructions which are designed to limit what it is to be human. Defining leadership beyond the reductionist strictures of coercive behavior contributes to the possibility of a breakthrough event of consciousness within individuals and society. By appropriating a definition of leadership grounded in the necessity of freedom, one expands and complexifies one's consciousness. When one complexifies one's consciousness one complexifies and develops one's abilities, options and responsibilities. This research demonstrates a "recognition of several factors which [seem to

be] central for our own authentic existence" (Thompson, 1977, p. 28). This research shows the presence of values that transcend the dominant paradigm. The emergence of freedom from coercion and the freedom to act in concert with others to create a context and construct a reality that reinforces freedom are notions emerging and challenging the present structure. By willfully deciding to appropriate these values, individuals can now make a clear distinction between the dynamism of leadership and the function of management.

As I have stated above in this project Rost's definition suggests that, on the value level, when the dynamic of freedom is present within the actions of people a different *type* of socially constructed reality emerges. It is a type that is concerned with dynamic change and not solely with object. Change and dynamism are essential elements in living and in being human. Two other elements necessary for being human are to know and to love. Knowing and loving are dynamic by their very nature. And to know and to love are basic humanizing habits. When we do these habits we become more authentic as human beings. To be free is to love. To love is to act freely because one willfully elects to love another without seeking return, thus consequence is not determinative of action. To participate in humanizing habits is to enable self and other to be more free. The more free we are, the more human we become.

The converse is also true. The less freedom of choice we can exercise the less human we are. The more alternatives that are accessible to us the more complex and varied are our possibilities. By choosing and experiencing different possible alternatives in thought, action and experience, our consciousness becomes more complexified. Thompson characterized this as the complexification of experience (1977, pp. 8, 77). The opportunity to choose knowingly, freely and willfully between alternatives is a dimension of the complexification of experience. With complexification of experience come greater knowledge, wisdom and the development of consciousness. To delimit freedom delimits what it is to be an authentic human. And to be limited to only one model out of which to work and view the world is surely a limitation to freedom and knowing. The presence of values that reflect the postindustrial model and the presence of an alternative to management, even if it is a constructed definition, provides an alternative and a complexification of experience which allows for more freedom to emerge in people's behaviors.

Some will say Rost's definition will not work. They are correct in that it will not reinforce the *status quo* of our identity, whether that be personal or organizational. Nor does it reinforce the notion that there is always someone else above us who knows what is best for us as human beings. The definition will not work if there is a refusal to release the models we have embraced and with which we have become accustomed. If we refuse to

acknowledge the circumstances that necessitate a fundamental change in the reason for our actions, it will not work. It will not work if there is a refusal to acknowledge the inadequacy of the predominate paradigms.

The emergence of a definition such as Rost's suggests that the present circumstances opened a way for a further definition and complexity of exchange to emerge so that life would not break down to nonlife (Haughton, 1981, pp, 88-9). Life, by its very nature, necessitates meaningful exchange. If there is no change, life ceases.

To appropriate leadership a la Rost is revolutionary and a breakthrough event. It is an exchange and a breakthrough event in that it is a radically different way to approach living and working together. As with any breakthrough, there will be "an element of violence about it; the energy of the exchange thrusts, hard and painfully, at the weak spot in order to rediscover itself beyond . . . so there is a kind of resistance to exchange" (Haughton, 1981, p. 89). Rost's definition will not work if resistance by leaders to exchange their need for power over others persists. It will not work if the insistence by followers for paternalism continues to obscure their want to live more authentically human lives. It will not work if the ego-mind insists upon control and the narcissistic spirit refuses to embrace difference. The more exchange is resisted, the more violent and difficult the change will be.

The exchange will also be frightening to us. Perhaps it is the fear that prevents our ego-mind from changing. To appropriate a definition grounded

on inclusive, freeing and collaborative values is different: "To carry out the human task in this way involves a distinction, a differentiation . . . which has [the] painful quality of leaving behind forever something which is perfect in its own way in order to respond to the demand for a higher experience of being" (Haughton, 1981, p. 92). Change is not a simple matter. It includes not only our willfulness, it includes our emotions, our intellect our body and soul. In short, it includes our consciousness.

No definition is perfect. As I said earlier, a definition is the least we know about something. This is true with Rost's definition of leadership. It is only the first glimpse into the possibility of exchange. Rost's definition is the first venture into the uncharted territory of leadership behaviors. It doesn't provide clear established patterns of behaviors. It only outlines with broad strokes. It is limited by its very nature because it is a representation of a model and models are limited. But one limitation it does not possess is limitation of and by purpose. If people appropriate an idea of leadership that is grounded in the free and continual exchange of mutual intent and human purposes, then they have the possibility of striving to be as human as they can be by doing those things that make humans be humans. They will have the possibility to strive to act as beings who by knowing and loving live authentic and free lives.

Rost's definition is not the most we know about leadership. It is not the final word or the Parousia. It is the least we know about a very dynamic and complex social construction. However, by differentiating leadership from

management, Rost provides new horizons of possibilities, possibilities that because they are grounded in free, responsible and mutual action can lead beyond knowledge to wisdom.

REFERENCES

- Altree, W. (1973). *Why talk?: A conversation about language with Walter J. Ong*. Novato, CA: Chandler & Sharp Publishers, Inc.
- Arendt, H. (1993, Summer). Power and the space of appearance. *Kettering Review*, 18-24.
- Astin, H. S., & Leland, C. (1991). *Women of influence, women of vision*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Bacon, F. (1870). *Novum Organum*. In J. Spedding, R. Ellis, & D. D Heath, (Eds.), *The works of Francis Bacon*. London: Longmans.
- Barker, J. A. (1992). *Future edge: Discovering the new paradigms of success*. New York: W. Morrow.
- Barnett, B.G., McQuarrie, F. O., & Norris, C.J. (Eds.). (1991). *The moral imperatives of leadership: A focus on human decency*. Memphis: The National Network for Innovative Principal Preparation.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bateson, G. (1979). *Mind and nature: A necessary unity*. New York: E. P. Dutton.
- Bausch, W. J. (1984). *Storytelling: Imagination and faith*. Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications.
- Beane, W. C., & Doty, W. G. (Eds.). (1976). *Myths, rites, symbols: A Mircea Eliade reader*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Bennis, W. (1990, May). Leadership in the 21st century. *Training*, pp. 231-234.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.

- Berger, P. L. (1967). *The sacred canopy: Elements of a sociological theory of religion*. New York: Doubleday.
- Birnbaum, R. (1992). *How academic leadership works: Understanding success and failure in the college presidency*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bittel, L. R. (1984). *Leadership: The key to management success*. New York: Franklin Watts.
- Blackmore, J. (1989). Educational leadership: A feminist critique and reconstruction. In J. Smyth (Ed.) *Critical perspectives on educational leadership* (pp. 93-127). London: Falmer Press.
- Blanchard, K. H., Zigarmi, D., & Nelson, R. B. (1993). Situational leadership after 25 years: A retrospective. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1, (1) 21-36.
- Blohowiak, D. W., (1992). *Mavericks! How to lead your staff to think like Einstein, create like Da Vinci, and invent like Edison*. Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1992). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Breech, J. (1989). *Jesus and postmodernism*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Brookfield, S. D. (1990). Using critical incidents to explore learner's assumptions. In J. Mezirow (Ed.), *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning* (pp. 177-193). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bryman, A. (1993). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Burke, K. (1969). *A grammar of motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Caroselli, M. (1990). *The language of leadership*. Amherst, MA: Human Resource Development Press.
- Castaneda, C. (1968). *The teachings of Don Juan: A Yaqui way of knowledge*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Castaneda, C. (1971). *A separate reality: Further conversations with Don Juan*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Chester, C. M. (1936-1937). The great highway. *Vital speeches*, 3, 57.
- Clancy, J. J. (1989). *The invisible powers: The language of business*. Lexington, Mass: Lexington Books.
- Clark, B. R. (1970). *The distinctive college: Antioch, Reed, and Swarthmore*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Codd, J. (1989). Educational leadership as reflective action. In J. Smyth (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on educational leadership* (157-178). New York: Falmer Press.
- Coles, R., (1990). *The spiritual life of children*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Coles, R., (1989). *The call of stories: Teaching and the moral imagination*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Conger, J. A. (1992). *Learning to lead: The art of transforming managers into leaders*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- D'Antonio, M. (1994, March). The atomic trail of tears. *The Los Angeles Times Magazine*, 14-18, 20, 54.
- Deal, T., & Kennedy, A. (1982). *Corporate cultures*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- deLaurentis, H. (1990). Models of ministry. Unpublished lecture. San Diego: University of San Diego.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, G. (1980). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia* (B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Denhardt, R. B. (1981). *In the shadow of organization*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- DePree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an art*. New York: Dell.
- Dewey, J. (1963). *Experience and education*. New York: Collier Books.
- Dilenschneider, R. L. (1990). *Power and influence: Mastering the art of persuasion*. New York: Prentice Hall Press.

- Donnelly, J. H. (1992). *Close to the customer: 25 management tips from the other side of the counter*. Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin.
- Downs, T., (1977). *A journey to self through dialogue*. West Mystic, CN: Twenty-Third Publications.
- Duignan, P. A., & MacPherson, R. J. S. (Eds.) (1992). *Educative leadership: A practical theory for new administrators*. London: Falmer Press.
- Dunne, J. S., (1973). *Time and myth: A meditation on storytelling as an exploration of life and death*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Eliade, M. (1963). *Myth and reality*. New York: Harper Colophon Books.
- English, F. W. (1994). *Theory in educational administration*. New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- English, F. W. (1993, Spring). A poststructural view of the grand narratives in educational administration. Organizational Theory Dialogue. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.
- English, F. W., Frase, L. E., & Arhar, J. M. (1992). *Leading into the 21st century*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Fay, B. (1987). *Critical social science: Liberation and its limits*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Fisher, K. K. (1993). *Leading self-directed work teams*. San Francisco: McGraw-Hill.
- Ford, H. (1923). *My life and works*. New York: Doubleday.
- Foster, W. (1986a). *Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration*. Buffalo: Prometheus Books.
- Foster, W. (1989). Toward a critical practice of leadership. In J. Smyth (Ed.) *Critical perspectives on educational leadership* (pp 39-62). London: Falmer Press.
- Foster, W. (1986b). *The reconstruction of leadership*. Victoria: Deakin University Press.
- Foster, W. (1986c). Toward a critical practice of educational administration. In T. J. Sergiovanni, & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), *Leadership and*

- organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Freire, P. (1990). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (2nd ed.). New York: Continuum.
- Gardner, J. W. (1990). *On leadership.* New York: The Free Press.
- Geertz, C. (1971). *Myth, symbol, and culture.* New York: Routledge.
- Gier, N. F. (1981). *Wittgenstein and phenomenology: A comparative study of the later Wittgenstein, Husserl, Heidegger, and Merleau-Ponty.* Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Greene, M. (1991). Texts and margins. *Harvard Educational Review*, 61, 21-39.
- Greene, M. (1990). Realizing literature's emancipatory potential. In J. Mezirow (Ed.), *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1991). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness.* New York: Paulist Press.
- Gronbeck, B. E., Farrell T. J., & Soukup, P. A. (Eds.). (1991). *Media, consciousness, and culture: Explorations of Walter Ong's thought.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Harman, W. (1988). *Global mind change: The new age revolution in the way we think.* Sausalito, CA: Warner Books.
- Haughton, R. (1981). *The passionate god.* New York: Paulist Press.
- Hodgson, T. A. (1994). Understanding leadership's moral dimension. *Journal of Leadership Studies*. 1, 67-77.
- Hosmer, L. T. (1994). *Moral leadership in business.* Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin.
- Hughes, R. L., Ginnett, R. C. & Curphy, G. J., (1993). *Leadership: Enhancing the lessons of experience.* Boston: Irwin.
- Hunt, J. G. (1984). *Leadership and managerial behavior.* Chicago: Science Research Associates.

- Hunt, J. G. (1985). Organizational leadership: The contingency paradigm and its challenges. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), *Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 113-138). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hunt, J. G. (1991) *Leadership: A new synthesis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hycner, R. M. (1982). *Some guidelines for the phenomenological analysis of interview data*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Israel, R. D. (1993). *Leadership as meaning making in collective experience: A response*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Israel, R. D. (1994). *Of process, values and vision: Some essential steps for effective organizational change*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Jocques, E., & Clement, S. D. (1991). *Executive leadership: A practical guide to managing complexity*. Arlington, VA: Carson Hall.
- Johnson, M. (1990). *Business buzzwords: The tough new jargon of modern business*. Cambridge, Mass: Oxford Press.
- Jones, R. S. (1982). *Physics as metaphor*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kanter, R. M., Stein, B. A., & Jick, T. D. (1992). *The challenge of organizational change*, New York: Free Press.
- Kellerman, B. (Ed), (1984). *Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Khare, R. S. & Little, S. (1984). *Leadership*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Koestenbaum, P. (1987). *The heart of business: Ethics, power, and philosophy*. San Francisco: Saybrook.
- Koestenbaum, P. (1991). *Leadership: The inner side of greatness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Koethe, J. L. (1977). The role of criteria in Wittgenstein's later philosophy. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 7 (3), 601-622.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.

- Kotter, J. P., (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York: The Free Press.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1988). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1993). *Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it, why people demand it*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolution* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kung, H. (1987). *The incarnation of God*. (J. R. Stephenson, Trans.). New York: Crossroad Publishing. (Original work published 1970)
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lewis, C. T., & Jobs, S. M. (1993). Conflict management: The essence of leadership. *The journal of leadership studies*. 1, 47-59.
- Lincoln, Y. S. (1985a). Epilogue: Dictionaries for languages not yet spoken. In Y. S. Lincoln (Ed.). *Organizational theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution* (pp. 221-228). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lincoln, Y. S. (1985b). The substance of the emergent paradigm: Implications for researchers. In Y. S. Lincoln (Ed.). *Organizational theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution* (pp.137-160). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lynch, R. (1993). *Lead! How public and nonprofit managers can bring out the best in themselves and their organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- MacIntyre, A. (1984). *After virtue*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Manneheim, K. (1940). *Man and society in an age of reconstruction*. London: KeganPaul, Trunch and Trubner.
- Maxcy, J. S. (1991). *Educational leadership: A critical pragmatic perspective*. New York: Bergin and Garvey.
- McLean, J.W., & Weitzel, W. (1991). *Leadership--Magic, myth, or method?* New York: AMACOM.

- Mezirow, J. (1990). *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mitchell, J. G. (1990). *Re-Visioning educational leadership*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of organization*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Moriarty, D. F. (1992). The president as moral leader. In Vaughan, G. B., & Associates, *Dilemmas of leadership: Decision making and ethics in the community college* (pp. 51-70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Morrison, A. M. (1992). *The new leaders*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nanus, B. (1992). *Visionary leadership; Creating a compelling sense of direction for your organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ong, W. J. (1982). *Orality and literacy: The technologizing of the word*. New York: Routledge.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Perinbanayagam, R. S. (1985). *Signifying acts: Structure and meaning in everyday life*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Perkins, D. F. (1994). Leadership for effective service. *The journal of leadership studies*. 1, (3) 131-136.
- Peters, T. J. (1987). *Thriving on chaos: Handbook for management revolution*. New York: Knopf.
- Peters, T. J., & Austin, N. (1985) *A passion for excellence: the leadership difference*. New York: Random House.
- Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Phillips, R. L., & Hunt, J. G. (Eds.), (1992). *Strategic leadership: A multiorganizational-level perspective*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Phillips, D. T., (1992). *Lincoln on leadership: Executive strategies for tough times*. New York: Time Warner.

- Pondy, L. R. (1978). Leadership is a language game. In M. W. McCall, Jr., & M. M Lombardo (Eds.), *Leadership: Where else can we go?* (pp. 87-99). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Potter, E. H., & Fiedler, (1993). Selecting leaders: Making the most of previous experience. *The journal of leadership studies*. 1 61-70.
- Quinton, A. (1983). Character and culture. In C. Sommers & F. Sommers (Eds.), *Vice and virtue in everyday life* (pp. 612-622). San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Ramey, D. A. (1991). *Empowering leaders*. Kansas City, MO: Sheed & Ward.
- Ricoeur, P. (1990). *Soi-même comme un autre*. Paris: Seuil.
- Robert, M. (1991). *The essence of leadership*. New York: Quorum Books.
- Ross, R. R. (1972). *Storyteller*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York: Praeger.
- Rost, J. C. (1993). Leadership development in the new millennium. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*. 1(1), 91-110.
- Rost, J. C. (1993a). *Leadership: A discussion about ethics*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Rost, J. C. (1994). *Leadership: A new conception*. Holistic Health Journal.
- Roszak, T. (1973). *Where the wasteland ends: Politics and transcendence in postindustrial society*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Sadler, P. (1988). *Managerial leadership in the post industrial society*. Aldershot, England: Gower
- Salomon, G. (1991). Transcending the qualitative-quantitative debate: The analytic and systemic approaches to educational research. *Educational Researcher*, 20 (6), 10-18.
- Sayles, L. R. (1993). *The working leader: The triumph of high performance over conventional management principles*. New York: The Free Press.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.

- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral Leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Shea, J. (1980). *Stories of faith*. Chicago: Thomas More Press.
- Sloan, A. P. (1965). *My years with General Motors*. New York: McFadden Books.
- Solomon, J. (1988). *The signs of the times*. Los Angeles: Jeremy P. Tarcher, Inc.
- Spradley, J. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Starratt, R. J. (1993). *The drama of leadership*. Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1991). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sullivan, W. M. (1986). *Reconstructing public philosophy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tesch, R. (1984, April). *Phenomenological studies: A critical analysis of their nature and procedures*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Thompson, W. M. (1977). *Christ and consciousness: Exploring Christ's contribution to human consciousness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Thomson, S. D. (Ed.), (1992). *School leadership: A blueprint for change*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Tichy, N. M. & Devanna, M. A. (1986). *The transformational leader*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Turner, V. (1974). *Drama, fields and metaphors; Symbolic action in human society*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Vail, P. B. (1984). The purposing of high-performing systems. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. Corbally (Eds.), *Leadership and organizational culture* (pp. 93-101). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Vaughan, G. B., & Associates (1992). *Dilemmas of leadership: Decision making and ethics in the community college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Wall, B., Solum, R. S., & Sobol, M.R. (1992). *The visionary leader*. Rocklin, CA: Prima.
- Walters, K. S. (1990). Critical thinking, rationality, and the vulcanization of students. *Journal of Higher Education*, 61(4), 448-467.
- Weber, M. (1963). *The sociology of religion*. (E. Fischoff, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Weick, K. E. (1985). Sources of order in underorganized systems: Themes in recent organizational theory. In Y. S. Lincoln (Ed.). *Organizational theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution* (pp. 106-136). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Wheatley, M. J. (1992). *Leadership and the new science: Learning about organization from an orderly universe*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Widdershoven, G. A. (1993). The story of life: Hermeneutic perspectives on the relationship between narrative and life history. In R. Josselson & A. Lieblich (Eds.), *The narrative study of lives*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Wills, G. (1994). *Certain Trumpets: The call of leaders*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1973). *Philosophical investigations* (G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans.). New York: Macmillan.
- Zaleznik, A. (1993). *Learning leadership: Cases and commentaries on abuses of power in organizations*. Chicago: Bonus Books.

APPENDIX A

January 4, 1995

Mr. Recipient
Chief Executive Officer
Any Company, USA
1234 Main Street
Any Town, CA 92222

Dear Mr. <Last Name>:

I am writing to thank you for agreeing to participate in this study on the experience of leadership. Please find enclosed a one page request which includes some simple directions that should help you formulate your story.

I would like to emphasize three additional points. First, if you wish any person within your narrative to remain anonymous for any reason please simply use a fictitious name. Second, if you also wish the organization to which you are referring remain anonymous, also use a fictitious name. Third, our interview will be open and on the record so the data analysis and reporting can be as life like as possible. This unrestricted approach will insure effective and meaningful interpretation and application of the data by scholars within the leadership field.

Again, thank you in advance for your cooperation. I will see you on [insert date].

Sincerely,

R. Daniel Israel

Encl: Participant's Request Memo

Memo

To: Recipient
From: R. Daniel Israel
Date: January 4, 1995
Subject: Interview Memorandum

In this research I am attempting to discover what experience selected individuals have had of leadership. You have been selected as one of these individuals. I am not asking you to define leadership. Rather I want to gain an insight into your personal observation of an experience you may have had of the leadership dynamic.

In order to accomplish this objective, I would like you to take a few minutes to reflect upon a time in your life in which you feel you have experienced leadership. After your reflection please follow these guidelines as you convey your story:

1. Please tell this experience in the form of a story. A story consists of a beginning, a middle and an end; the identification of main character(s); and the identification and elucidation of a main theme or plot. In your retelling of this event, be as detailed in your description as possible; include pertinent interaction with other people and outcomes if appropriate. Include your emotional response to the situation, i. e., how the experience of leadership felt to you.
2. Place the event within a context, within a relationship from the beginning of the event and to the desired outcome of the actions. By doing so your narration will again become a lived and meaningful event in your life.
3. Please end your narration by indicating how this event was an experience of leadership. (I see this event as an experience of leadership . . .)

APPENDIX B

Consent Form - Participant who will be Identified by Name and Position

I understand I am being asked by R. Daniel Israel, a doctoral candidate at the University of San Diego, to participate in a study of individuals' understanding of leadership. The following is an agreement for the protection of my rights in this study.

1. The purpose of this study is to analyze individuals' understanding of leadership.
2. The source of data will be gathered through an interview in which I will relate a story about a personal experience I have had of leadership. I give my permission for this interview to be audio taped and transcribed verbatim. I will receive an analysis of the interview prior to Mr. Israel's use of the data in his dissertation. At that time I will be invited to amend the analysis, if necessary, so that it accurately reflects my point of view.
3. If any quotes from my reviewed interview are used in any part of the study, I give my permission to attribute those to me in my position.
4. My participation is completely voluntary and may be withdrawn at any time without risk of penalty.
5. There is no agreement, written or verbal, beyond that which is expressed in this consent form.
6. No risk or discomfort is expected as a result of my participation in this study.

I, the undersigned, understand the above explanation and on that basis give consent to my voluntary participation in this study.

Signature of Participant

Date

Signature of Researcher

Date

Location

APPENDIX C

**MATRIX OF THE
ELEMENTS OF MANAGEMENT BEHAVIOR**

ELEMENTS OF MANAGEMENT BEHAVIOR	Authority Relationship	Manager/ Subordinate Relationship	Produce/Sell Goods and Services	Coordinated Activities
Bailey	X	X	X	X
Copps	X	X	X	X
Corr				
Cross	X	X	X	X
Dohse		X		X
Dunn	X	X	X	X
Furness	X	X	X	
Glazer	X	X	X	X
Halagan				X
Kalaf	X	X	X	X
Moreau	X	X		
Morrison	X	X		
Mullen				
Nakoue	X	X	X	
Palm	X	X		
Pratt	X	X		X
Russell				
Setzer		X	X	X
Shannon	X	X	X	X
Smith	X	X	X	X
Sypolt	X			
Valestro	X	X	X	X

**MATRIX OF THE
ELEMENTS OF LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR**

ELEMENTS OF LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR	Influence Relationship	Leaders and Followers	Intended Real Changes	Reflect Mutual Purposes
Bailey				
Copps	X	X	X	X
Corr	X	X	X	X
Cross				
Dohse	X	X	X	X
Dunn				
Furness				
Glazer	X			
Halagan	X	X		
Kalaf				
Moreau				
Morrison				
Mullen	X	X	X	X
Nakoue				
Palm				
Pratt				
Russell	X	X	X	X
Setzer	X	X	X	X
Shannon		X		
Smith	X	X	X	X
Sypolt	X	X		
Valestro				