University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

1999

Games Leaders Play: Collaborative Leadership Development through Simulations in Knowledge-Based Organizations

John Paul Dentico 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

Dentico, John Paul EdD, "Games Leaders Play: Collaborative Leadership Development through Simulations in Knowledge-Based Organizations" (1999). *Dissertations*. 652.
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/652>

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.

GAMES LEADERS PLAY:
COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT
THROUGH SIMULATIONS IN
KNOWLEDGE BASED ORGANIZATIONS

by

John Paul Dentico

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

Doctor of Education
University of San Diego

1999

Dissertation Committee

Joseph C. Rost, Ph.D., Director
Edward F. Kujawa, Ph.D.
Mary M. Williams, Ed.D.

© Copyright 1999 by John Paul Dentico

ABSTRACT

Games Leaders Play: Collaborative Leadership Development Through Simulations in Knowledge Based Organizations.

John P. Dentico, Ed. D. University of San Diego, 1999, pp. 248.

Director: Joseph C. Rost, Ph. D.

New concepts of leadership and new methods of imparting these concepts to individuals are needed in the knowledge society of today. This study presented a practitioners model of collaborative leadership and a new experiential simulation methodology called LeadSimm as a way in which organization members could learn this new model of leadership and develop confidence in its ability to engage complex issues.

Using the LeadSimm simulation method, two scenarios were developed and two simulations were played. The San Jose Police Department played one simulation and the Economic Development Institute of the World Bank played the other. The researcher conducted eighteen interviews from the 54 participants in the two simulations. These interviews dealt with participant learning, shifts in the participant's mental model of leadership, the willingness to put collaborative leadership to work, and observed qualitative or quantitative changes in the organization as a result of using the collaborative leadership model.

LeadSimm demonstrated its ability to immerse participants into a leadership dynamic and to engage 50% of those participants in mental model shifts. As a result of playing in the simulation, four participants used collaborative leadership which resulted in higher work group morale, greater community participation, cost savings, and directly transferable knowledge on a press interview.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATIONS.....	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
CHAPTER ONE	
USING SIMULATIONS IN LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT	1
Introduction	1
Background	2
The Current State of Leadership Development.....	2
The Failing Leadership Myth.....	4
Leadership Thought and Practice	6
The Contextual Praxis of Leadership	6
The Genesis of Collaborative Leadership	8
The Need for Power	10
From The Case Study to Simulations.....	12
Purpose of This Study.....	16
Research Questions.....	17
Terminology	17
Organization of This Dissertation	19
CHAPTER TWO	
THE KNOWLEDGE SOCIETY AND A	
NEW PERSPECTIVE OF LEADERSHIP	21

Introduction	21
From an Industrial to a Postindustrial Perspective	24
Foundations of Modernity: A Brief Review	24
The Iron Cage of Bureaucracy	27
A Time of Great Paradox!	29
A Postindustrial Perspective	30
Leadership—The Debate Rages On	32
The Leadership Debate: An Introduction.....	32
Collaborative Leadership: An Integrated Model	33
Collaborative Leadership and the Learning Organization	40
Changing the Dynamics of Power	44
Changing the Notion of Power	44
Power With: The Basis of Collaborative Leadership	48
The Leadership Interdependency Scale.....	50
Knowledge and Learning—The New Power for the Next Millennium	55
The Epoch of the Knowledge Worker.....	55
Towards More Democratic Organizations	60
The Efficacy of Social Capital	61
The 21 st Century Organization, An Essential Need to Learn.....	63
Learning to Learn Together.....	63
Stories as the Basis for Learning	66
Stories Can Transform Organizations	68

A Brief History of War Gaming and Simulations.....	71
Simulations as an Instrument for Learning.....	74
Play as a Tool for Learning	76
Summary.....	78
CHAPTER THREE	
SIMULATION PROTOTYPE DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION	80
Introduction	80
Background into Leadership and Business Simulation Methods.....	81
LeadSimm: Prototype of a Simulation Process	82
Introduction of the Simulation Concept	82
The LeadSimm Prototype	86
Part One: Research Design and the Two Simulations	93
Overview of Research Design.....	93
San Jose Police Department.....	94
Economic Development Institute.....	96
Part Two: Evaluation of the Simulations.....	98
General Evaluation Structure	98
Using Qualitative Research Methods in This Research	98
Reporting and Analyzing the Research Data	100
Limitations	101
Protection of Human Subjects.....	101

CHAPTER FOUR

THE LEADSIMM SIMULATION AT WORK.....	103
Introduction	103
General Chapter Format	103
First Cut Analysis—The San Julian Police Department	103
Background to Simulation One: The Scene—The San Julian Police Department	103
Episode One: Gang Against Gang.....	105
Episode One: Participant Actions.....	109
Episode One: Phase Two—Press Conference.....	111
Episode One: Offline Discussions	122
Episode Two: Domestic Violence.....	124
Episode Two: Meetings and a Second News Conference	127
Episode Three: Time for Collaborative Leadership	131
Episode Three: Meeting of the Stakeholders	132
Second-Cut Analysis—The San Julian Police Department.....	137
Participant Learning	138
Shift in the Participants Mental Model of Leadership	142
Putting Collaborative Leadership to Work.....	148
Implementation of Collaborative Leadership in the Organization	153
Participants Comments on the LeadSimm Prototype.....	157
First-Cut Analysis—The Global Development Bank.....	168
Background to Simulation Two: The Scene at the GDB.....	168

Background to Episodes One and Two.....	170
Episode One: A New President.....	172
Episode One: Participant Actions.....	173
Episode One: GDB Press Conference	177
Episode Two: A Change At EEI	183
Episode Two: Participants Actions and Offline Discussions.....	184
Episode Three: A New President is Elected.....	187
Second-Cut Analysis—The Global Development Bank.....	188
Participant Learning	189
Shift in the Participants' Mental Model of Leadership.....	195
Putting Collaborative Leadership to Work	198
Implementation of Collaborative Leadership in the Organization	200
Participant Comments on the LeadSimm Prototype	200
CHAPTER FIVE	
LeadSimm Prototype: Conclusions and Discussions	208
Review of the Purpose and Focus of This Study.....	208
Research Questions.....	211
Participants' Learning.....	211
Changing the Mental Model of Leadership.....	214
Putting Collaborative Leadership to Work	218
The Impact of Collaborative Leadership Activities on the Organization	220
Comments on The LeadSimm Prototype	221

Conclusions.....	225
Strengths and Weaknesses of This Research	232
Recommendations for Future Research	234
Concluding Remarks.....	236
APPENDIX A.....	240
APPENDIX B.....	242
REFERENCES.....	244

DEDICATIONS

My Father, Nicholas V. Dentico

Who once told me that education was the great equalizer among men

My Mother, Josephine Dentico

Who remains the wind beneath my wings

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A funny thing happened to me on the way to law school, I met a guy named Joe Raffa who said to me that the leadership program at USD had my name on it. He was right! Joe, you have been a constant source of existential wisdom and life to me as well as a most valued friend. I am eternally grateful. This journey of mine, which lasted six and one-half years, was less like going to school and more like a religious experience. I once referred to this study as the sum total of my entire life. My career as a United States Naval officer, businessman, and student of leadership seemed to converge in this endeavor. It is how I knew I was on the right path, it all seemed to fit.

I have been sincerely grateful throughout my life for my parents, Nicholas V. Dentico (deceased) and Josephine Dentico. They have always believed in their sons. My father loved two things, his country and his family. He sacrificed his life for both. He believed in education, much as many of his generation did, as the key to a better future. He supported me in many ways from the start of this venture in 1993. His sudden death in 1997, left me numb. I wish he were here so I could hear him say the words "Dr. Dentico" and that he might sit and read his son's work. I love you Dad, very much!

My mother too has been unswerving in her devotion to me and my brother, Mike. Mom, I am indebted to you for being there in body and soul and for all the pain and suffering you have endured in your life for your children's welfare. You have always put us first. Now it is our turn. There are many words in this document but none of them used in any combination could ever express

the love and gratitude I have for you. You have truly made this possible. I love you!

I am also blessed because I have a great brother. Michael V. Dentico, Attorney at Law who graduated from the University of San Diego Law School in 1985. Over the course of the last six years, you have also endured much. I remember the many times you came to San Diego and took me to dinner or to play golf. You provided respites for me as I was so immersed in this endeavor. I thank you for your patience and your love. I love you.

I also wish to thank all my teachers especially my two greatest teachers, Neil F. Byrne (Capt. USN. Retired) and Dr. Joseph C. Rost. Neil Byrne may very well be the finest tactician to ever wear a United States Naval uniform. Neil, you taught me simulations, gaming theory and Naval tactics. More than that, you taught me how to think like a tactician, to see the big picture and to understand how things on the battlefield related to one another. Today, we call it systems thinking. Three years ago, on one of the most traumatic days of my life, I called you to talk about my plight. I will carry to my grave, the sight of you arriving at my home at midnight wearing the shirt and hat of a United States Army Cavalry Colonel's uniform circa 1880. In the midst of my pain, I knew everything was going to be alright. Neil you are more than a friend to me, you are my brother.

Joseph C. Rost is one of the unsung heroes of leadership. Joe was the anchorman of the leadership program at USD. I think I would find unanimous agreement for my previous statement among the students who were privileged to be in one of Joe's classes. Joe, you taught me how to think of leadership in a

completely different light and to look at leadership at a very deep level. I learned that without relationships leadership is not possible. Sometime during Chapter Three I realized I might be your last doctoral student. It was an honor and a great responsibility to try to do something significant with this work. I hope I measured up to the task. You have become a great friend, and you remain one of the foremost leadership theorists who walks the planet. You have given to all of us the promise of a new land. Thank you Joe, for all you have done for me.

To Dr. Ed Kujawa, Jr. and Dr. Mary Williams my sincere gratitude for hanging in there with me through thick and thin while I completed this work. Your comments were always welcomed. From the start I knew I had a great doctoral dissertation committee. You helped make it all possible.

To the rest of the professors that I had the privilege to learn from, I thank you as well. I wish you the all the best in your future endeavors.

A mission of this nature required more than just family and great teachers, it required great friendships. I am blessed because I have so many good friends. Throughout the years they were always there for me, even when I might not have been there for them.

To my great friend Steve Miller a.k.a. Dr. Shame, your friendship has been like a block of granite upon which I could rest and find strength. Ten years ago we started a conversation by asking the question, "If we weren't who we are today, who would we be?". It was the beginning of an exploration of the role our upbringings played in our lives. The conversation continues. The respites at Stony Hill Manor were oftentimes what the doctor ordered, so to speak. It

restored my confidence, my faith and renewed my commitment. The wines were pretty good too. You are my third brother.

To Glenda Miller, thank you for your hospitality, the dinners and your friendship over the years. Congratulations on your new career.

To Lynn Russell, who was there for me time and again. You are a person of great compassion and soulfulness. While your journey has not been easy, you have been a constant source of strength. Many times I felt as though I asked too much of you, and I probably did. I hope I was able to return part of my debt when things did not seem so bright for you. You are simply wonderful.

To Chuck and Dana Adams, who found the time to call me, take me to dinner and believe in me when I lost my way. I can never repay you for your generosity and your faith. During a low point in my journey, Dana once said to me that while many of your friends complain about their lives, you are doing something about yours. I remembered those words whenever I felt like the going got too tough. I love you both very much.

To Paul and Becky Roeder, whose friendship has always meant a great deal to me. While most of the time Paul remained silent, I knew he was on the sideline cheering me on. Becky, you brought tears to my eyes on the day of my dissertation defense with your eloquent description of me, the passionate and compassionate soul. Wow! What did I do to deserve this?

To Carol Leuck, who has become like a sister to me. We are like two mountain climbers scaling the same wall. We have taken turns helping each

other over the hurdles life has put in front of us. You have suffered much in these most recent days. I am honored to be your brother.

To Blake Mills, who says there are no such things as angels. You are one. You appeared out of nowhere and guided me through some very difficult times. Every time I called or wrote, you were there. Your words of encouragement, meaning and spirituality come from deep in your soul. They carry meaning, they are real, they are not imagined. Thank you for being there.

To Barbara Chronowski, who from the beginning believed in me and my message when it was just a dream. It was at your urging that I called Bruce Dunn at UCSD to see if he could use some new ideas in leadership. You lit the fuse. I am indebted to you for your care, love and positive perspective.

To Danuta Pfeiffer, who brought my attention to the works of Joseph Campbell. In the early days of this venture you helped me formulate the essence of human motivation. The basis of my concept of leadership is steeped in the human struggle to search for the experience of being alive. What a gift you were to me. Thank you!

To Anne Doshier, who spent two hours with me in a coffee shop and taught me about the work of Jerome Bruner. You brought meaning to my work.

To Dirk Metzger, Attorney at Law and fellow life traveler. In speaking about change, I once mentioned to Dirk that we often go to the table of life looking for a small cheese sandwich. We search for something to curb our appetite for renewal. However, life has a way of dropping a 400-pound block of cheese on our heads. Not only that, but then life asks us to carry that block of

cheese around for at least two years until we find a place to put it down. You have been a great friend and wonderful sounding board. Many times when I could not find the words to explain my feelings, they seemed to magically come from you. Semper Fi!

To Buck and Karly Cobb, the owners Karly Wines, one of the finest wineries in California. I am humbled to be part of your web of friends. If there is one thing over the last six years that has mattered to me most, it was pouring wines during the barrel tasting and the harvest festival. The Karly Ranch has been an oasis for me during this journey. I don't know what I would have done had I not been able to look forward to these two events. Being with you remains one of the highlights of my life. Thank you from the bottom of my heart.

To Roberta Costa, who expressed care for me and called me from time to time to make sure that I was alright. Your calls were timely and during a time when I needed them the most. I had a lot of fun planning Neil's retirement with you. We make a good team. Thank you Ro, you are very special to me.

J.R. and Judy Reiss, who kept in touch and took me to dinner over the years. Remember J.R. that 20 years ago you believed in another simulation effort, NAVTAG. You are just unable to get away from us!

To (Professor, Capt.) Dr. Tom Grassey, Ph. D. editor of the Naval War College Review and professor at the Naval War College, Newport, RI. I appreciate your support and sage advice throughout the years. It has meant a lot to me. Yes, I finally finished.

To the officers, men and women of Tactical Training Group Pacific Reserve Unit 119 during the years 1984-1992. What a team we were. I remember the numerous simulations we played in San Diego and at the Naval War College in Newport, RI. Little did I know at the time that the experience would be the foundation of my efforts in this study. I am grateful for all you taught me and all we accomplished together for the good of the Republic.

To Ralph Scaffidi, friend and fellow wargamer and SNL impressionist, and his lovely wife Anne. Many times during this journey I would look back to the times when we laughed and did our Saturday Night Live skits. I never knew how handy those memories would be in this undertaking. Thank you for being my friend.

To Lisa J. Aldon. You were a catalyst for change. I have become the person I am today because you were a part of my life. I wish you love and happiness in all that you do.

I would also like to mention some others who, in one way or another, were part of this journey. Tom and Jolene Acierno, Earl Aldon, Rick Bridges Ed. D., Patty Burton, Sara Casares, Jeff Jones Ph. D., Beth Generis, Bobbi Kaye McGuire, Jenny Offner, Jeff Partrick, Julia Olmstead, Carolyn Salerno Ed. D., Debbie Schramm, Karen Smarr, Yvonne Slater, Andy and Shelly Taylor and Kathie Walker. I am grateful for your friendships, your good wishes and your kind support.

This study would not have been possible had it not been for several people and groups who believed in me and my work.

To Bruce Dunn and Gail Phillips, who gave me the opportunity to create the Professional Certificate in Leadership at the Extended Studies Program of the University of California, San Diego. I am indebted to both of you. You gave me an open space wherein I could create, teach and work to bring my ideas to fruition. To the students of this program, both present and past, you provide willing ears, ideas and feedback for my words. Many of you were even brave enough to go out and try some of these ideas in your workplaces. You are the leaders of the future. I am encouraged by your actions.

To the men and woman of the San Jose Police Department and especially Capt. Don Anders and Capt. Scott Seaman, the LeadSimm participants and the nine interviewees (who must remain nameless). Without your help and belief in me, this study would have never become a reality. Together we have set the pace for the value and the worth of the LeadSimm method of simulations. You made LeadSimm a reality. I am eternally grateful. I couldn't have done it without all of you. Together we will do great things in the future.

To the caring souls of the New Programs and Outreach Division of the Economic Development Institute of the World Bank and especially Phil Karp , all the participants and the nine interviewees. I owe a large debt to you for your willingness to provide a forum for the second LeadSimm simulation. You taught me much and you have helped me make LeadSimm better. I am also eternally grateful for your participation and your efforts.

To all of you, I am humbly grateful for the roles you played in my life and in this study. In the presence of God, I stand and salute you!

CHAPTER ONE

USING SIMULATIONS IN LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

During modern or industrial times, organizational leadership development has overwhelmingly been directed towards the training of the leader. This practice has stemmed from the perspective that the leader was a unitary actor and the sole active member of a leadership dynamic. This concept prevailed in a society which demanded homogeneity and compliance and seemed relatively simple and stable.

The rise of postindustrial influences developed a need to reconceptualize the notion of leadership. In the diverse, turbulent and ambiguous organizations of today people are searching for intrinsic satisfaction from the work they do. Concomitantly, human intellectual power has become the most significant source of leverage in a society immersed in what contemporary writers call the knowledge era. Knowledge, information that has meaning, (DiBella and Nevis, 1997), represents the innate capability of postindustrial organizations to achieve some end or purpose. It is a simple fact, that a society in which over 85% of the people are engaged in non-production work (*United States Bureau of the Census*, 1997) and where the knowledge worker has risen to the apex of economic strength, is no longer industrial. We truly live in a knowledge society! Members of organizations and communities require a new covenant which seeks

to provide a greater sense of equality and equity by involving them at all levels of decision making.

However, this notion is antithetical to the basic tenets of the industrial mindset, wherein people are treated as interchangeable parts and leaders—executives who hold the highest positions—make all the decisions. Changing organizational cultures to a more open, relational, decentralized and collaborative premise requires that organization and community members engage in a transforming process by which they, themselves will be transformed. The focus and intent of this research study is to create interpersonal simulations for play by decision makers, organization and community members and other stakeholders and to evaluate the ability of these simulations to instill collaborative leadership beliefs and practices in said participants. This process includes the ability of decision makers to use consensus, facilitation, and collaboration, develop mutual purposes, shared vision, common goals, influence relationships and to acknowledge the need for and make transformative change.

Background

The Current State of Leadership Development

Imagine for a moment that you are the coach of a professional football team. Every week instead of the team practicing together; you have decided that what each of the starting offensive and defensive players needs is direct individual tutelage. Therefore, you send each of the 22 starting players to 22 different practice fields to practice with competent and capable people who are experts at their positions. On Sunday, you bring the team back together to play

in the real game. Do you think the team will do well? After all, they have been trained by the best. Clearly, this philosophy of practice will not work. A team needs to work together as a team, in realistic practices, in order for the team to **be** a team.

While this training analogy might seem ludicrous, this individually focused approach to team/organization/community effectiveness is exactly how leadership development has been conducted. This reasoning corresponds to the basic industrial philosophy already mentioned that leadership is something only the leader does. It has been and remains the most prevalent thread running through almost all leadership development programs. Even more astonishing is the amount of money devoted to this current type of leadership training.

In the April 8, 1996 issue of *Forbes Magazine* in an article entitled *Leadership Can Be Learned?*, a Penn State Report estimated that organizations in this country spent over \$15 billion in 1995 on leadership training (defined as training executives or the hierarchy) (Rifkin, 1996). Fifteen billion dollars divided by 52 weeks, comes to \$288,461,539 spent on leadership training per week. This weekly expense equals 14.5 tons of twenty dollar bills. (One million dollars in twenty dollar bills weighs 101 pounds).

If we spend 14.5 tons of twenty dollar bills on leadership training every week in America, what is our return on investment? If we are spending freight cars full of money every week on leadership training, where are all the leaders? Where is the leadership?

The Failing Leadership Myth

Leadership may be much like a magic elixir sold from the back of a horse-drawn wagon. The power of its effects have been extolled and invoked as the cure for all our ills, even while its promoters gather around to sniff and taste the contents of the bottle, never agreeing on contents. In modern or industrial times this potion came from one source, the leader, and was used to build machines that would propel society into the twentieth century. By contrast, the evolution of postindustrial society sees the leadership recipe undergoing a major transformation. This leadership metamorphosis is marked by the evolution of the hierarchical, command and control, authoritarian, modern leadership model into an emerging model of leadership which is practiced as a collaborative, relationship oriented ethical process whereby people *do leadership* together to make real change. In this postindustrial leadership approach the leader's job is primarily twofold. First, the leader must craft an environment where healthy relationships can flourish. Healthy relationships based on values contain a high degree of safety, trust and openness which are the intrinsic motivators that foster commitment and bind people to each other and to the purpose at hand. Second, the leader is required to facilitate these collaborative relationships.

With a world seemingly in chaos and mired in crime, drug addiction, child abuse, failing companies, adversarial politics, rapid technological advancements, information overload, dissatisfied employees, corporate downsizing, illiteracy, failing education, AIDS, cancer, and unsustainable environmental abuse, the concept of leadership in the 21st century suggests that one resource, the single

leader, is no longer adequate to respond to such complex issues. More importantly, if one accepts the foregoing statement as true, how can the United States as a society hope to engage complex issues in such a way as to generate hope for the future?

Historically, for people engaged in their daily activities, relationship building and collaboration were antithetical to the competitive nature of organizations and to the understanding of what a leader must do. Decision makers in organizations steeped in the industrial mentality lack trust in their employees, so they use control and authority to get things done. Lack of trust was a foregone conclusion and a thread which has remained constant ever since the re-introduction of the concept of organization by Frederick the Great in 1742. The reasoning was simple; the concept of organization was born out of control dictated by fear. To Frederick II, fear was the major motivating force as Gareth Morgan reminds us. "To ensure that his military machine operated on command, Frederick fostered the principle that the men must be taught to fear their officers more than the enemy" (Morgan, 1986, p. 24).

Authoritarian thinking, which has been inextricably linked to the organizing principle of bureaucracy, requires stability in the working environment, and demands workers adhere to organizational rules and regulations to gain acceptance and succeed. The modern authoritarian system is ill fitted to foster a collaborative and creative climate because compliance to rules and regulations, as well as a premise of fear of one's superiors, suppresses risk taking associated with creative initiative.

By contrast, the postindustrial tendency is mired in turbulence and ambiguity and decision makers are confronted with massive change on an almost daily basis. To deal with chaos, postindustrial times demands innovation and creativity from organizational members instead of compliance. Bolman and Deal cogently stated that “an overemphasis on the rational and technical side of organizations has often contributed to their decline Quality, commitment, and creativity are highly valued but often hard to find” (1991, p. xv.).

However, an awakening seems to be occurring. Decision makers in organizations are beginning to realize that every member’s full abilities must be engaged in order for organizations to survive and thrive in an environment which is information rich, where turbulence and ambiguity persist and complex change is the norm. What is even more perplexing to organizations today is that a significantly larger number of people are searching for intrinsic satisfaction from the work they do. Changing the modus operandi of organizations requires substantive changes at the fundamental level of organizational culture and philosophy. More importantly, organizations need to institute processes built on trust and relationship and then promote these processes through learning experiences which engender meaning and confidence in postindustrial philosophical concepts.

Leadership Thought and Practice

The Contextual Praxis of Leadership

No matter what concept of leadership an individual might align with at this point, people understand that leadership is not attempted in a vacuum.

Leadership is always contextual, that is, performed in a particular setting. This notion is not the same as situational leadership. Situational leadership is a specific theory of leadership which defines a set of particular behaviors (telling, coaching, participating, selling) that leaders are encouraged to perform depending on a particular situation. Instead, understanding the contextual nature of leadership provides people with the ability to note the congruency and consistency of the practice of leadership across several contexts. Without a context in which leadership can be applied, leadership remains a meta-philosophical discussion, an idea without a purpose. Leadership would remain a high octane fuel with no engine within which to run. Therefore, leadership requires an engine to run, or organizationally speaking, an organizing approach, or philosophy in which it can be used, efficiently and effectively. The collaborative leadership perspective presented in this research is most congruent with the organizing strategy and principles of the learning organization as espoused by Argyris (1982, 1993, 1998) and Senge (1990, 1995). In fact, collaborative leadership, the learning organization and interpersonal simulations form a triad of congruency. This triad is an implementation strategy for bringing both collaborative leadership and the learning organization to fruition. Not only are interpersonal simulations a new learning methodology, they are, in the final analysis, an experiential drama, a setting-in-motion of the very principles of a new mental model. Learning becomes the linchpin in the transition process from the industrial to the postindustrial organizing strategies. It is the very rampart

upon which the journey will take place and forms, with collaborative leadership, the crucial elements of this study.

The Genesis of Collaborative Leadership

Collaborative leadership is a term derived chiefly by integrating the leadership models of Burns (1978), Rost (1993) and Foster (1989) and melding them with the characteristics of the learning organization presented by Senge (1990). Since no one theorist's model is rigidly adhered to, the term *collaborative leadership* is used to connote the extension and integration of these ideas into a model for praxis. Collaborative leadership is a more congruent organizing basis for a society standing at the threshold of the 21st century. Melding these different perspectives into an integrated perspective fosters a praxis of ideas with the complexities of a postindustrial society.

The emergence of the postindustrial perspective and its impact on organizational life are captured by organizational psychologist William Bergquist (1993). He described this paradigmatic metamorphosis in what he referred to as the postmodern organization. For Bergquist, the postmodern era is emerging out of a melding of the premodern and modern eras.

The postmodern organization is a combination of the premodern and the modern organization, yet it has certain distinctive features—notably, an emphasis on small-to-moderate size and interinstitutional cooperation to meet turbulent organizational and environmental conditions. Clarity of mission is emphasized, in part to compensate for the increasingly diffuse boundaries in these institutions. While management is still critical in the

postmodern organization, leadership is often defined as something quite different from management Capital in the postmodern organization takes the form of information and expertise, and knowledge workers are often much more influential and expect more intrinsic satisfaction from their work than did workers in either the premodern or the modern organization. (1993, p. xiii)

Bergquist elucidates the essence of the postmodern tendency and his work raises several questions relating to the establishment of new guiding philosophies for postindustrial organizations. Are the purposes and values of the organization and the individual member inseparable? How do we generate enthusiasm, creativity, innovation, commitment and ownership by participants in organizations? What must we do to generate in organizations an enthusiasm and acceptance of change as a normal occurrence of today's work and social environment? What kind of processes are in place now or need to be put in place in the near future which are compatible with postmodern society? How do organizations learn to build faith in these new processes? What must happen to the understanding of power by participants in organizations in order to facilitate the workings of these processes? These questions will pervade organizations well into the 21st century but they are not the focus and intent of this research. This study is the beginning of a process of creating a method and framework whereby people can start to find the answers to these and other questions as society moves into the new millenium.

Postindustrial times require different attitudes, philosophies and tools which will help organizations survive and thrive in turbulent times. No longer is leadership viewed as an indescribable attribute possessed only by the leader. As Bergquist implies, leadership in the postindustrial era steps out of management's shadow to be viewed as a transformative process all its own. Leadership acknowledges that existing organizational structures, no matter how efficient, can be ineffective and makes provision for the creation and implementation of new orders. Postindustrial leadership fosters a collaborative process in which people do leadership together because no one person is capable of possessing the knowledge needed to deal with any one subject, let alone the issues involved within an ever-changing environment.

The Need for Power

Power is defined as "The ability or capacity to perform or act effectively . . . Strength or force exerted or capable of being exerted; might" (*American Heritage Dictionary*, 1997). Power is inherently a paradoxical proposition. Those who don't have it want it, and those who have it shun its existence and will go to extraordinary means to make sure it is not reduced or lost. "Some use of power depends on its being concealed—on their submission not being evident to those who render it" (Galbraith, 1983, p.3). Be that as it may, the fact of the matter is simple, without some form of power a person is unable to mobilize resources to achieve a desired end. Traditionally those resources have meant money, people, authority and position. Yet to admit that a person wants power is to admit to committing a crime of great proportion. If someone is

labeled as one who aggressively seeks power, he or she may conjure up in our collective imagination the Star Wars movie character, Jabba-the-Hut who chains people to his throne and whose appetite for money, people and overwhelming influence can never be satisfied.

In an industrial organization power traditionally resides at the top with individuals who by virtue of their position own and exercise it. Yet as Professor Jeffrey Pfeffer has noted, the ability to achieve and maintain power is not solely about the position one has. In a manner of speaking, position will only get one so far.

But the power of position and the use of that power, is more than just formal authority. It entails building and maintaining a reputation for being effective, and it entails the capacity to get things implemented. Without these two components, the power of formal position tends to erode.

(Pfeffer, 1992, p. 128)

Emerging from this quote is a word which becomes key to facing the challenges presented by the complexities of postindustrial contexts. That word is *effectiveness*. Creating effective processes and resolutions for issues in the 21st century drives our need to reflect upon the practices currently in use and ask ourselves, “Is this the best we can do?” and “Are our current practices good enough to survive and thrive in a world filled with rapid, complex change, turbulence and ambiguity?” If our collective answer is no, then linked to this conclusion is the notion that our organizing practices and the dynamics and understanding of power must change as well. To do otherwise is tantamount to

driving an automobile while looking into the rearview mirror. Also emerging from these understandings is a need to accept that the lifeblood of an organization is the need to continuously update and recreate its knowledge through the use of a vibrant and renewable learning process.

From The Case Study to Simulations

For years, the case study methodology, pioneered at Harvard University, has been the preferred learning technique for teaching advanced analytical skills. The case method has traditionally used the rational model for devising solutions. Management educator John Reynolds describes the modern concept of managerial problem solving that is the foundation for the case study method as

Identifying the problem(s) or areas of improvement; setting objectives or goals for achievement (introducing a standard of values or criterion by which improvement is to be measured; identifying possible alternative courses of action; predicting the likely outcomes or consequences of each course of action (using the ideas of “cause and effect” and “probability”; and choosing and implementing the course of action whose expected outcome most nearly matches or exceeds the desired outcome or objective. (Reynolds, 1980, p. 17)

The managerial case study method uses the rational model as the foundation for decision making. The rational model assumes that there is one best answer to the situation or problems at hand. For the most part, managerial case studies offer single-loop learning opportunities (Argyris, 1982) because the “error” which is being addressed is attributed to a defective strategy. When a

problem is encountered with a particular option, a new option must be selected in order to make the overall strategy viable.

Simulations go further than cases because they routinely offer double-loop learning opportunities (Argyris, 1982). During simulation play the results of actions taken can be examined as to the validity between what stakeholders say and what they actually do, i.e., the congruency between theory espoused and theory-in-use. Simulations create context for the development of collaborative leadership practices through the use of realistic scenarios. In effect they are the stage, the script and the action within which the actors can create and inhabit experience. These experiences and actions form mental models from which meaning is derived and engagement with others occurs. Simulations can provide opportunities for decision makers to foment understandings which develop confidence in leadership relationships that bridge the gap between organizational effectiveness and the needs of the postindustrial society.

Building these new experiences requires that people comprehend the workings of cognition within the human mind. Stories and arguments play a vital role in ordering experience and constructing reality. Harvard professor Jerome Bruner (1986) asserted that arguments search for a universal truth while stories seek meaning and connections between two events. Stories build meaning for the observers or participants and constitute drama as a way in which experience is created. Starratt stated that "the intellectual structure of drama possesses the capability of assembling the conceptual and theoretical building blocks of leadership, i. e., values, change, power, structure and action" (1993, p viii).

Narrative learning is the use of stories or drama in which the why or meaningfulness of life events is understood (Parry & Doan, 1994). Systems thinking looks at events not as snapshots of a part of an isolated system but as part of a holistic conceptual framework in which the invisible fabrics of interrelated actions are revealed and understood (Senge, 1990). Using narrative learning and systems thinking to teach postindustrial leadership skills attaches holistic meanings and their corresponding effects to events. Coupling narrative learning, systems thinking and interpersonal simulations based on double-loop inquiry into a framework for complex experimentation provides an environment where participants are given the opportunity to generate proactive and innovative strategies to solve issues. This represents an extension of teaching methodologies, such as the case study, which are essentially historical recounts of particular situations or which, as in business case studies, primarily use the rational model for resolution. For the most part, in case studies the results of the actions taken are already known. In interpersonal simulations the actions are works in progress.

Teams, groups, collectives or collaboratives become the nexus that joins people to the postindustrial organization. Teams and total organizational learning have emerged as the postindustrial concept of choice because teams possess myriad talents and knowledge that are more aptly suited to deal with chaotic times. However, team training in its current form cannot adequately address the requirements for building a postindustrial organization because it does so in a simple pristine environment which has little, if any similarity to the

complex organization from which most organization members come. The creation of more realistic microworlds, a microcosm of reality where it is safe to play (Senge, 1990, p. 314) is necessary if we are to bring play and reality closer together. As Senge asserted, few existing microworlds develop individual or team capacities to deal productively with complexity (p. 315). Yet, innovatively constructed microworlds provide bridging experiences which play a vital role in the development and acceptance of postindustrial leadership ideas. Creating a framework in which organizational members engage in systemic, true-to-life, experiential learning can create trust in and help effect the transition to postindustrial leadership practices in organizations.

The prototype microworld I propose to establish is, in fact, an interactive extension of the case method because it puts the participants into the case or situation and allows them not only to develop possible solutions but to modify or change those solutions as the level of complexity is increased through interactive feedback. Additionally, a situation can be developed where no historical case data is available and futuristic problems can be explored in a “what if” mode when necessary. In its most valuable moments, the interactive simulation allows for individuals to engage each other in a collaborative problem-solving endeavor and supports the apparent needs of the postindustrial organization as described by organizational development consultant Margaret Wheatley:

In the postmodern organization, no longer is it believed that organizations can be changed by imposing a model developed elsewhere. There are no recipes or formulae, no checklists or advice that describe reality. There is

only what we create through our engagement with others and with events.

(1994, p. 7)

Considering this reality a systemic learning methodology or microworld that encourages organizational members to use a holistic approach to learning is sorely needed.

Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study is to create interpersonal simulations for play by decision makers, organization members and other stakeholders and to evaluate the ability of these simulations to instill collaborative leadership beliefs and practices in said participants. This prototype uses true-to-life organizational scenarios in which elements of the rational, political, symbolic or cultural, and human models are introduced to produce a complex context which examines the participants' willingness and abilities to engage in the formation of consensus groups, facilitation, collaboration, mutual purpose, shared vision, common goals, influence relationships, and transformative change.

This prototype, called LeadSimm, consists of two distinct pieces: scenario development and simulation facilitation. The supposition of this researcher is that these two parts of the prototype can be used with varying groups and settings by various people in different occupational settings. While each scenario is custom designed and specific for each group setting, the framework is applicable to almost all organizational issues and environments.

Research Questions

As with all studies of this nature, the research is directed towards answering questions about the effectiveness of the simulation prototype to make some difference in the participants as a result of being in the simulation. The following questions form the baseline for this research.

1. As a result of participating in the simulation, what did the participants learn?
2. As a result of participating in the simulation, did the participants provide evidence of a metanoia or shift in their mental model of leadership?
3. As a result of participating in the simulation, did the participants put collaborative leadership to work in their positions?
4. What impact did these collaborative leadership activities have on the organization?
5. As a result of participating in the simulation, what positive or negative factors did the participants comment on regarding the LeadSimm prototype?

Terminology

It is important to be clear about the following terminology in this study.

Collaborative Leadership - A influence relationship, which engenders safety, trust and commitment, among leaders and their collaborators or partners who hold mutual purpose, shared vision and common goals together to bring about transforming change.

Double-Loop Learning - Learning that occurs when a person diagnoses an error as incompatible with one's governing values or as an incongruity between an organization's espoused theory and its theory-in-use.

Knowledge - Information that has meaning for a particular context.

Knowledge Worker - A worker with a commitment to continuous learning, who applies theoretical and analytical knowledge acquired through formal education to the development of new goods and services or to the resolution of issues within particular contexts.

Learning - The act, process, or experience of gaining knowledge or skill.

Microworld - A microcosm of reality where it is safe to play.

Narrative - A descriptive account; a story.

Offline Mode -A mode used during simulation play where the participants are not role playing members of different stakeholder groups. During the offline mode of play underlying assumptions about the decisions made by the participants are examined and double-loop learning occurs.

Online Mode -A mode used during simulation play where the participants are role playing members of different stakeholder groups.

Postmodern - Art, architecture, literature, or conceptual models that react against earlier modernist principles, by reintroducing traditional or classical elements of style or by carrying modernist styles or practices to extremes: an emerging school of thought which is interpreted as a mixture of the attributes of both the premodern and modern times.

Postindustrial - A period in the development of an economy or a nation in which the relative importance of manufacturing lessens and that of services, information, and research grows.

Prototype - An original type, form, or instance that serves as a model on which later stages are based or judged.

Safe Environment - An atmosphere wherein the seminar participants are not threatened and feel comfortable to take risks in order to learn new behaviors and new models of behaviors.

Simulation - Representation of the operation or features of one process or system through the use of another; an environment which resembles reality.

Systems - A group of interacting, interrelated, or interdependent elements forming a complex whole.

Organization of This Dissertation

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. In Chapter One I provide an overview of leadership from the industrial and postindustrial perspective. This perspective offers the reader the notion that if leadership in the postindustrial era is truly different, then a different method of imparting collaborative leadership practices must be used. In Chapter Two, using an extensive literature review, I then discuss the theory behind an integrated model I call collaborative leadership and depict this model in graphic form. From this model of leadership I discuss the need for changing the concept of power and organizations as a lead-in to my explanation of the learning organization, knowledge workers and the need to embrace democratic principles in the workplace. I then discuss the reasons and

benefits of using interpersonal simulations to instill the collaborative leadership model in organization members. In Chapter Three, I begin by defining and describing the genesis of the simulation prototype, called LeadSimm. In the second part of Chapter Three, I explain the qualitative research method used to determine whether or not the leadership simulations were effective in changing or reinforcing the collaborative leadership model in simulation participants. In Chapter Four, I discuss the simulations in detail and the statements made by the participants in terms of the value of the LeadSimm as a viable leadership development tool. In Chapter Five, I discuss the conclusions of the research, strengths and weaknesses of the research and the recommendations for doing further research.

CHAPTER TWO

THE KNOWLEDGE SOCIETY AND A NEW PERSPECTIVE OF LEADERSHIP

Introduction

The Industrial era is over! Ever since 1955, when the number of service workers surpassed the number of manufacturing workers, the death knell for the age of enlightenment began to sound (Toffler & Toffler, 1995, p. 23). This is an amazing change considering that at the end of World War II America stood at the apex of its might, uncontested as the greatest industrial power in the history of humankind. The Industrial Revolution, on which that power was based, had taken some 200 years to run its course. By the end of World War II, a shift from labor as a physical force to that of human knowledge as the prime mover of America had already begun.

But change is not easy. It has never been. The principles and practices of the industrial era are still with us. These industrial or “modern” times were a thing of beauty. We could revel in the precision of their accomplishments and the measurement of outputs and success. Using the scientific principles of Newton, we could calculate their worth and its effect on the world. But most of all, these achievements were evident in great buildings, automobiles, airplanes, homes, central heating, air conditioning, railroads, oil, enormous amounts of food and great wealth. They became the masters of our imagination. These gains did not come without a price. Upton Sinclair’s *The Jungle*, (Sinclair, 1906, 1981)

provided a vivid picture of that cost and its effect on those who became indentured to it. Our hope was to become more precise, more rational and to work harder, and hopefully someday share in the fruits of our toil. For many this dream became a reality. Modern times demanded obedience and rationality, and we organized ourselves to do just that. Yet, as we strove for greater precision, we paradoxically lost the reasons for doing so. Worth was measured in material possessions, and the value of a human being was his or her ability to produce at a higher rate than the next person. We accepted that successful companies must be well managed, and therefore well led. "Leadership was management, and management was leadership" (Rost, 1991, p. 93). Generating success, revolved around the idea that all we had to do was find and harvest great men, get them into the highest positions and follow their instructions.

In that regard, the predominant work done in organizational theory was concerned with mobilizing people to do something. The focus of the discussions, dialogue, writings and speeches aimed at the questions how best do we organize and why? In terms of leadership, theorists and practitioners ought to understand what is it that makes certain individuals more effective in organizing or mobilizing people not only to do something, but to do seemingly impossible things. In effect, the issue was: what does it take to be a leader to mobilize people to do something significant?

In Chapter One I mentioned that since 1900 the leader has been viewed as a single unitary actor who dispenses, gives direction or guidance, or compels compliance from the followers. From him or her all leadership activity flows, and

it is senseless to talk about leadership unless one talks about the leader only. Followers were viewed as passive and were only needed to carry out the wishes, mission or vision of the leader. This perspective has been the cornerstone of the major leadership theories of the industrial era, including the great man, group, trait, behavioral including contingency and situational, transactional, charismatic, excellence and heroic theories. The lion's share of the work in leadership has been to distill these factors into discernible elements or qualities which can be replicated or taught to others for the purpose of creating more and better leaders. The theme has been if we make better people, we get better leaders and the result is that we will get better leadership. We have tried every conceivable scientific and nonscientific way to reduce these leadership abilities to a replicable form. While many of the theories have been debunked, the best that the others have been able to do after 25 years of research is prove that they are themselves inconclusive by the very people who have espoused the theory to begin with (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Nelson, 1993, p. 34).

Concomitantly, it is important to remember that these industrial theories of leadership used a bureaucratic form of organization as the field upon which leadership was portrayed. To that end, the governing rules for the operation of a bureaucracy can be attributed to French industrialist Henri Fayol whose administrative theory has been the stalwart of almost every introductory management textbook (Robbins, 1993). The five functions of Fayol's theory include: plan, organize, command, coordinate and control and remain the method upon which bureaucracy demands order, rationality, compliance and efficiency.

It remains today the quintessential pronouncement of classical management theory. A binding and viable congruity exists between the industrial leadership theories, Weber's model of bureaucracy and Fayol's expression of administrative theory, and even today these models provide the foundation upon which organizing is effected. During a time of seemingly great stability, where organizations were founded in perpetuity, and where people were much like interchangeable parts, this system produced results.

To better understand these constructs, I would like to begin by briefly examining the genesis of modern times and bureaucracy as an organizing strategy. This understanding will provide the contrast required to differentiate the industrial from the postindustrial phenomena later in the chapter.

From an Industrial to a Postindustrial Perspective

Foundations of Modernity: A Brief Review

According to New Zealand sociologist Barry Smart (1990), the term *modern* can be traced back to the fifth century Latin term *modernus* which differentiates the Christian from the pagan era. The term offered a clear and distinguishable break between worship of idols and the worship of a "true God." In the same way the modern era indicated a need to break with the past and formulate a new foundation upon which civilization could be conceived and built. In the words of the German sociologist philosopher Jurgen Habermas:

The quarrel over the respective merits of old and new effectively ended the blind veneration of classical antiquity and prepared the way for the eighteenth century Enlightenment philosophical project of developing the

spheres of science, morality, and law, and art in accordance with their respective inner logic in order to achieve a “rational organization of everyday social life.” (Habermas quoted in Smart, 1990, p. 17)

Modernity's links to rationality takes it even further back in time.

While its beginnings are generally agreed to as the post-Enlightenment era occurring at the turn of the Eighteenth century its legitimacy for the rational experience dates as far back as Augustine's radical reformation of the philosophy of progress and exploration of “the physics, the logic and the ethics of modern experience.” (Habermas, 1981, p. 22)

Modernity's methodologist was Sir Isaac Newton, whose explanation of phenomena through the use of science was seen as only the beginning of understanding all phenomena through the use of science sometime in the near future. Newton's influence on history as the fundamentalist of the modern era was powerful and consuming and remains with society today. However, more than other theorists the role of modernity's spokesperson rests with one man, sociologist Max Weber.

Weber remains as the iconic image of modern times. As the founder and promoter of bureaucracy and the science of sociology, he sought to create institutions which promoted the general welfare of the populace. Bryan Turner (1990), a contemporary sociologist, gives us a more involved perspective on Weber.

Weber is often narrowly associated with a debate about the origins of capitalism in the famous Protestant Ethic thesis. It is more appropriate to

interpret him as a theorist of modernization, of which the key component can be identified as rationalism. Modernity is thus the consequence of a process of modernization, by which the social world comes under the domination of asceticism, secularization, the universalistic claims of instrumental rationality, the differentiation of the various spheres of the lifeworld, the bureaucratization of economic, political and military practices, and the growing monetarization of values. (Turner, 1990, p. 6)

Weber's theories and Newton's science are the roots of the modern perspective. Rationalization becomes a form of religion as people search for the one truth. Like God, people are taught that there is one right answer out there in the great unknown, all we need to do is search for it. Newton has given us the means, through science, to find *the* answer. How convenient, how simple, how efficient it all seems to be! However, Turner suggested that while modernization brings order, it is devoid of meaning.

Modernization brings with it the erosion of meaning, the endless conflict of polytheistic values, and the threat of the iron cage of bureaucracy.

Rationalization makes the world orderly and reliable, but it cannot make the world meaningful. (1990, p. 7)

Let us now examine bureaucracy in greater detail in order to gain a clearer differentiation of interpretations and understandings between the concepts of leadership of the industrial with postindustrial times.

The Iron Cage of Bureaucracy

“Bureaucracy is something we all love to hate. It presents simultaneously the contradictory images of bungling inefficiency and threatening power” (Beetham, 1987, p. 1). For many, bureaucracy has become the object of our present day dismay with organizational rules and regulations. Yet during the time of its development and implementation, people saw it as an organizing strategy which could bring great efficiencies to organizations. As people migrated from the agrarian to the industrial base, bureaucracy gave form, fit and function to literally thousands who sought employment. As Weber stated:

The decisive reason for the advance of bureaucratic organizations has always been its technical superiority over any form of organization. This fully developed bureaucratic mechanism compares with other organizations exactly as does the machine with the non-mechanical modes of production. Precision, speed, unambiguity, knowledge of the files, continuity, discretion, unity, strict subordination, reduction of friction and of material and personal costs—these are raised to the optimum point in the strictly bureaucratic administration. (Weber, 1958, p. 214)

Bureaucracy is classless and was promoted as a technically superior approach to organizing. As Weber’s statement implies, people were merely interchangeable parts in the wheel of precision and efficiency. To that end, bureaucracy does not consider our humanness. As author Dan Clawson explains: “Bureaucracy has deadening and chilling effects, which applies to everyone equally” (Clawson, 1980, p. 17).

Yet for bureaucracy to be viable, certain assumptions must be made about the environment in which it functions. Professors Lee Bolman and Terrence Deal outline these six assumptions:

Organizations exist primarily to accomplish established goals. . . . For any organization, a structural form can be designed and implemented to fit its particular set of circumstances. . . . Organizations work most effectively when environmental turbulence and personal preferences are constrained by norms of rationality. . . . Specialization permits higher levels of individual expertise and performance Coordination and control are essential to effectiveness Organizational problems typically originate from inappropriate structures or inadequate systems and can be resolved through restructuring or developing new systems. (Bolman & Deal, 1991, p. 48)

Additionally, one of the hallmarks of bureaucracies was their promise of lifetime employment as they provided to each working member a covenant of security for their careers. The title “company man” was bestowed upon those whose loyalty to the organization was above reproach, and who accepted the social and professional responsibilities of their position. Bureaucratic organizations remained closed systems whose goals were explicit and required a minimum of turbulence in the external environment which provided the stability for any organization to exist. Yet it was we the people who inherently believed in these institutions that made us quiescent in our lives and our organizations. But

the world in 1998 is very different from that of 1950, as we have entered a period of seemingly great contradiction.

A Time of Great Paradox!

We live in a time of great paradox! In 1989, the Berlin wall tumbled and Germany became unified again after 54 years. Who could have imagined that 5 years prior? Today we can send electronic mail to any corner of the globe and never leave our dens or kitchens. Who could have fathomed that in 1975? Today over 85% of the American population are engaged in nonproduction type industries (*United States Bureau of the Census*, 1997), and yet following World War II we were the greatest industrial manufacturing power on earth. Could Caesar's soothsayer have foretold this change? Yet for all the wonderment of these achievements and changes, the shadow side of our existence seems to have grown darker and gloomier at the same time. Layoffs from the public sector, a once unheard of practice, have become commonplace. Downsizing and rightsizing have taken high-level executives, middle managers, professionals and hourly workers on an emotional roller coaster ride of unimaginable proportions. These layoffs have not only affected those who have been let go, but they have served as a debilitating effect on the people who have remained. Health issues such as cancer and AIDS are like KGB enforcement squads of the cold war who can visit any home, any time and extract a toll on our families which cannot be measured, only endured. Political campaigns, which are rife with an adversarial character so strong and so caustic that they have become the personification of the gladiatorial arena crying out, "Win at all costs, but

remember save yourself,” have deadened the nerve endings of our enthusiasm and cause us to wonder, “Will it ever change?” Trust in our fellow Americans and our traditional concern for our neighbor appear to be disappearing as quickly as the Amazon rainforests. I wonder: Is it possible for us as a community of people to respond to concerns or issues in the face of seemingly overwhelming circumstances? What puzzles me even more is, how do we do this? What ideas offer us the best opportunity to guide our journey?

Albert Einstein is credited with saying that, the world that we have made as a result of the level of thinking we have done thus far creates problems that we cannot solve at the same level of thinking as when the problems were created. If this phrase serves as a fundamental starting point, then we must rethink our approach to life at work and in society at all levels.

A Postindustrial Perspective

The relationship between the postindustrial perspective and the modern paradigm remains a controversy. “It is not possible to impose, by a definitional fiat, an agreed set of terms for debate, precisely because these issues are essentially contested” (Turner 1990, p. 1). Smart (1990) and Turner (1990) cited the work of Harvard Professor Daniel Bell (1973) in *The Coming of the Post-Industrial Society* as a seminal piece in the construction of the understanding of the postindustrial inclination and the issues which are born out of this movement. Bell discussed what Turner referred to as the “uneasy amalgam of three distinctive realms”: social structure, polity and culture (Turner, 1990, p. 19).

The social structure comprises the economy, technology, and the occupational system. The polity regulates the distribution of power and adjudicates the conflicting claims and demands of individuals and groups. The culture is the realm of expressive symbolism and meanings. (Bell, 1973, p. 12)

Using Tocqueville and Weber as symbols of the issues, Bell portrayed Tocqueville's message in *Democracy in America* (1835) as the drive for equality. On the other hand, Weber's process of bureaucracy underscores the need for rationalization of all life in modern society (Bell, 1973, p. 8). This dynamic tension between equality and rationalization is manifested in future societal dilemmas.

Looking ahead to the next decades, one sees that the desire for greater participation in the decision-making of organizations that control individual lives (schools, hospitals, business firms) and the increasing technical requirements of knowledge (professionalism, meritocracy) form the axis of social conflict in the future. (Bell 1973, p. 8)

The postindustrial perspective provides questions for the polity, culture and social structures of a society which seeks to have greater direct control over its own destiny. This surge towards greater personal meaning through individual expression conflicts with the rules and regulations of bureaucracy. The work of the postindustrial society is to create the understanding that the needs of the individual and the goals of the organization can be and should be congruent. This tension also extends to the role of the leader whose work in large part in the

new millenium is devoted to bringing this level of congruency to fruition. But to do that requires that the concept of leadership be transmuted from one where we seek to find the solution to our contemporary issues in a single active voice to that where many voices form a harmony of effort and comprise a whole which is greater than the sum of the parts.

Leadership—The Debate Rages On

The Leadership Debate: An Introduction

Imagine you are building a house with a friend helping you. You ask your friend to bring you a hammer. He goes to the toolbox and returns with a screwdriver. Amazed, you remark: "I asked for a hammer." He replies, "this is a hammer!" So goes the world of leadership studies. The only problem is that if you ask a leadership scholar to bring you a hammer, i.e. a definition of leadership, you might find yourself buried under everything from a small jeweler's screwdriver to a bulldozer, and yet some wouldn't bring you anything at all because for them leadership is an indefinable phenomenon. As University of Michigan professor Andrew Crawford wrote "Leadership has as many definitions as it does manifestations. In 1985, Bennis and Nanus cited over 300 definitions of leadership in their research. It is not surprising that we chose not to define leadership for students" (Crawford, 1998, p. 1). In 1989 Dr. Joseph Rost surveyed over 587 books and articles to find no less than 221 definitions of leadership (Rost, 1993, p. 44). While leadership scholars and practitioners conduct a meta-leadership debate, the image of Nero, emperor of Rome, who fretted while the city burned, comes to mind. What is most amazing about this

debate is the while it rages on, over \$15 billion was spent in 1995 on leadership training in the United States. What an interesting paradox. If we are spending so much on leadership training, how is it that our understanding of leadership is so ill defined and our practice of leadership is so poorly done?

Collaborative Leadership: An Integrated Model

As previously outlined, the predominant thrust of leadership development since the 1950s has been directed at one individual, the leader. After all, if all power and authority emanates from the leader, why would you want to train anyone else? The industrial concept of leadership saw that one individual, the leader, held positional power in a bureaucracy and dispensed leadership by making “good” decisions. The great man, group, trait theories, as well as the behavioral theories of contingency, charismatic, situational, and excellence, are nothing more than the institutionalization of leadership from only the leader’s perspective. In contrast, the postindustrial emergence with its movement towards greater participation in decision making underscores the need to reinterpret the concept of leadership. In the postindustrial paradigm, leadership requires participants to be engaged in a collective cause in which they seek to evoke intrinsic personal meaning from their efforts.

Yet leadership work which addresses the needs of organizations in the postindustrial sense is not a given. For example, Robert Starratt (1993) noted a glaring omission of a postmodern sensibility to leadership studies in reviewing Stodgill and Bass’s *Handbook of Leadership Studies*. Starratt noted that out of 7,500 references listed in that book not one author used a postmodern

foundation upon which to base his/her ideas (p. 16). This seems to be somewhat paradoxical in light of the fact that the focus and intent of leadership studies and practice have shifted. Starratt's call for a postmodern approach to leadership reinforces the intent of what Einstein might advise, that is, create a new consciousness from which to solve problems. Starratt wrote:

In a postmodern world, the challenge to leadership is not so much to raise productivity of the factory or the agency; it is, rather, to secure even a modicum of trust in the ordinary structures of society, to maintain some institutional credibility, not by repeating false claims to legitimation, but by redefining the institution as a community seeking a new legitimation, a legitimation grounded in the pursuit of human values and community service. (Starratt, 1993, p. 157)

However, the path to the 21st century is one on which several key discoveries and statements about leadership have been made. In this regard, the transformation in leadership thought took a giant step forward with the work of political science professor and Pulitzer-Prize-winning author James MacGregor Burns. Considered by many as the patriarch of modern leadership thought, Burns clearly states the plight of those engaged in leadership study when he wrote, "One of the most universal cravings of our time is a hunger for compelling and creative leadership. . . . [yet] Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (1978, pp. 1-2). For Burns there are two types of leadership: transactional and transformational.

Transactional leadership is where leaders approach followers with an eye towards exchanging one thing for another: jobs for votes or subsidies for campaign contributions. Transformational leadership results in a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents Moral leadership emerges from, and always returns to, the fundamental wants and needs, aspirations, and values of the followers. (p. 4)

Burns is an intellectual pioneer who dared to take us to understandings in leadership where no one had truly gone before. Burns brought us to the reality that.

If we know all too much about our leaders, we know far too little about leadership. . . .We fail to grasp the essence of leadership that is relevant to the modern age and hence we cannot agree even on the standards by which to measure, recruit, and reject it. (Burns, 1978, p. 1)

Burns takes the first step in developing the understanding of the potency of relationship to leadership when he articulated the idea of transforming leadership. To that end, Burns referred to the work of Erikson as the motivation to go beyond the concept of leader to that of followers as he describes Ghandi's complete involvement with his followers. Erikson's explanation of the politics of communality, where Ghandi was able to translate his personal conflict into spiritual and political renewal in the lives of a large part of his contemporaries, provides the basis for Burns' premise for the transformational leader.

In putting his disciples to work, “giving direction to their capacity to care, and multiplying miraculously both their practical gifts and their sense of participation,” in Erikson’s words, he created followers who were also leaders, “aspirants for highest political power, “ and makers of modern India. The shaping of the leader-follower by Ghandi and by all other effective leaders suggests the inadequacy of the conventional distinction between leaders and followers: it also forces us to examine in more depth the complex interrelation of different kinds of leaders, subleaders (or cadres), and followers. (Burns, 1978, p. 129-130)

It is this concept of relationship between leaders and followers which springs forth and gives us the opportunity to see for the first time the other side of the dynamic called leadership. Burns causes us to think even more critically about transforming leadership as he describes the interdependency of leaders and followers as occurring when “ one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (Burns, 1978, p. 20). The importance and subtlety of this statement is, I believe, often overlooked. What Burns is saying is that transforming activities occur in a collective, i.e., “raise one another to higher levels of motivation.” This represents a very different perspective from the concept that leadership is done by only one unitary actor and his or her actions alone are the implement of transformation (industrial model). Burns’ recognition of the values of the followers are ribbons which bind people together in meaningful

relationships and could be considered the genesis of the postindustrial concept of leadership.

Rost introduced his readers to the concept of postindustrial leadership. Postindustrial leadership is an interdependent relationship among leaders and followers, now called collaborators (Rost, 1993), who hold a mutually agreed upon purpose, and who have equivalent involvement in the transforming process. While Rost agreed with Burns that a distinction between being a leader and leadership is correct, his detailed investigation of the definitions of leadership equates Burns' transactional leadership with management. Rost termed this the "industrial school of leadership" (Rost, 1993, pp. 93-94). It is a school of thought which uses leadership and management as interchangeable terms and depicts management as an optimization process, built on authority, control and the creation of stability. By contrast Rost's definition of leadership, "Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and their collaborators who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes" (1993, p. 1), recognizes the need for a postindustrial society to be fully involved in the decision-making process. For Rost, leadership is a collaborative, relational process of people intending real or transformative change. In essence, leadership and management are complementary but distinct processes. In effect, leadership in the postindustrial world parallels the democratic ideal and is implemented by those who seek equality (of which Tocqueville spoke) while management implements order and rationalization (symbolized by Weber). The former director of the University of Southern California's Institute for Leadership Studies, James O'Toole agreed.

"The leader's vision becomes *their* vision because it is built on the foundation of their needs and aspirations" (O'Toole, 1995, p. 10).

William F. Foster of Indiana University, a critical leadership theorist, also clarified the difference between being a leader and leadership. Foster stated that a leader is an embodied individual, and leadership is a shared and communal concept (1989). He advised us to look to the collective interaction among a community to truly find leadership.

Leadership, in the final analysis, is the ability of humans to relate deeply to each other in the search for a more perfect union. Leadership is a consensual task, a sharing of ideas and a sharing of responsibilities, where a 'leader' is a leader for the moment only, where the leadership exerted must be validated by the consent of followers, and where leadership lies in the struggles of a community to find meaning for itself. (Foster, 1989, p. 57)

In 1998, David L. Bradford and Allen R. Cohen confirmed the constructs of collaborative leadership which they described in *Power Up: Transforming Organizations Through Shared Leadership* (1998). Bradford and Cohen describe the collaborative leader as Post-Heroic.

Extraordinary results require a new system of leadership and followership in which leaders and team members act more like partners. . . .The leader must create the conditions where team members develop their ability and commitment to sharing management, where interpersonal and group

problems can be resolved through open, creative and tough-minded collaboration. (Bradford & Cohen, 1998, p. 47)

From this understanding other scholars and writers agree that the relationship between the leaders and followers is where the action truly is. "We serve best through partnership, rather than patriarchy" (Block, 1993, p. 6). "Leaders and followers are all parts of a circle" (DePree, 1992, p. 22). "They will freely respond only to individuals who are chosen as leaders because they are proven and trusted as servants" (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 11). "Any discussion of leadership must attend to the dynamics of this relationship" (Kouzes & Posner, 1993, p. 1). "Leadership is a reciprocal relationship between those who choose to lead and those who decide to follow. Of course, leaders can do nothing without followers" (Starratt, 1993, p. 2). "The ties needed to develop the "we" of community come from practicing leadership by bonding and binding. . . .both depend upon the emergence of a community of mind" (Sergiovanni, 1993, p. 6). "Leadership is *always* dependent on the context, but the context is established by the *relationships* we value" (Wheatley, 1994, p. 144).

Starratt viewed this interchange, this search for meaning as a drama, a stage upon which all the participants are engaged. Constructing a stage upon which organizational members can engage each other can foster new meanings of leadership in the evolution of postindustrial ideas. By using the power of narrative learning or storytelling, participants can build new experiences from which trust, relationship, and meaning in a postindustrial world can be generated.

Collaborative Leadership and the Learning Organization

Today, decision makers seek to have people take ownership for their work and their communities in an environment of complexity, chaos, ambiguity, and information overload. As eluded to, relationships become the vital links to engaging the tempo of issues which face postindustrial organizations. MIT's Edgar Schein provides the reasoning for this:

In a stable environment it is safe to be completely task oriented. In a complex, turbulent environment in which technological and other forms of interdependence are high, however, one needs to value relationships in order to achieve a level of trust and communication that will make joint problem solving and solution implementation possible. (Schein, 1992, p. 371)

To that end, the relationship-rich construct of collaborative leadership finds the home of bureaucracy cramped, uncomfortable and exceedingly detrimental. The creation of relationships is antithetical to the core beliefs of bureaucracy because impersonality, avoiding involvement with personalities and personal preferences of employees, is a fundamental tenet of the bureaucratic foundation (Robbins, 1993).

In contrast, the organizing principles of organizational learning as described by Argyris or the learning organization delineated by Senge, which include personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, team learning and systems thinking, form congruent and compatible components with the collaborative leadership perspective. I will explain the basis of my assertion for

three of these elements personal mastery, shared vision and team learning at this point and cover the last two, mental models and systems thinking, later in the chapter.

First, the learning organization is intensely personal and human. Senge described this human orientation through the use of his term *personal mastery*. For example, in describing the beliefs of Kazuo Inamori, founder of Kyocera, a large high technology ceramics firm, Senge wrote:

Tapping the potential of people, Inamori, believes will require new understanding of the “subconscious mind”, “willpower” and “action of the heart . . . sincere desire to serve the world.” He teaches Kyocera employees to look inward as they continually strive for “perfection” guided by the corporate motto “respect heaven and love people” (Senge, 1990, p. 140).

In essence, personal mastery is about “approaching one’s life as a creative work, living life from a creative as opposed to reactive viewpoint. . . . The ability to focus on ultimate intrinsic desires, not only on a secondary goal, is a cornerstone of personal mastery” (Senge, 1990, p. 141 and 148). From a bureaucratic perspective, the idea of personal mastery would be considered frivolous and inefficient at best. But relationship and trust building are intensely human endeavors and as Schein asserts the foundation that provides for a way in which many talents and abilities can be brought to bear on the most complex issues standing before society at the threshold of the 21st century.

Figure 1: Integrated Model of Collaborative Leadership

Shared vision is another principle of the learning organization which also finds congruency with the collaborative leadership model. Shared vision has been directly incorporated into the collaborative leadership model, which is graphically represented in Figure 1. Mutual purpose, shared vision, and common goals provide the meaning and focus, desired future state and necessary activities which are vital in setting a course of action for those engaged in the leadership dynamic. "Shared vision is a vision that many people are truly committed to, because it reflects their own personal vision. . . . One of the reasons people seek to build a shared vision is their desire to be connected in an important undertaking" (Senge, 1990, p. 206). In contrast to this view the industrial leadership models and bureaucratic practices preached that it was only

the leader's vision from which all efforts should be directed for accomplishment. Collaboration would be allowed only if it was directly related to making the leader's vision a reality. In effect the leader's agreement was to elicit compliance to his or her picture of the future. And compliance, not commitment was exactly what they were able to evoke from their followers. "There is nothing that you can do to get another person to enroll or commit. Enrollment and commitment require freedom of choice" (Senge, 1990, p. 223). Collaborative leadership provides for an environment where participants are free to choose to define, participate and commit to the mutual purpose and shared vision of the collective dynamic.

Team learning provides another essential element of the supporting structure for collaborative leadership. As mentioned, inherent in the industrial models of leadership was that the "grand strategist," was the only one required to learn, to detect and provide guidance to correct error. "Team learning is the process of aligning and developing the capacity of a team to create the results its members truly desire. It builds on the discipline of developing shared vision (Senge, 1990, p. 236). Within the collaborative leadership model, shared vision stands on the foundation of mutual purpose, and it is this mutuality of commitment within which a team transforms information that has meaning to knowledge. Directly related to the ability of the team to learn is the nature and state of their interdependent relationship. "Outstanding teams in organizations develop the same sort of relationship—an 'operational trust,' where each team

member remains conscious of other team members and can be counted on to act in ways that complement each other's actions" (Senge, 1990, p. 236).

Collaborative leadership is a relational, trust-based model. It acknowledges the need for people to work with a great deal of openness towards one another so that the information flow is unencumbered. In this type of environment, knowledge creation and recreation are possible, and the talents and abilities of the team can be applied to the issues at hand. Collaborative leadership and the tenets of the learning organization are congruent models wherein teams and not individuals alone are the problem solving method of choice. However, no discussion about a changing leadership model could be complete without a continuing and corresponding explanation of the meaning and uses of power.

Changing the Dynamics of Power

Changing the Notion of Power

Leadership and power are like nitrogen and oxygen, both parts of the same breath. As previously mentioned, power in an industrial organization has traditionally resided at the top. Its use by senior organizational members made the bureaucracy a model of rationality and efficiency. However, while the organization appears efficient, its ability to be effective has been greatly overshadowed.

In consideration of this, power can no longer be about position only. And this message seems to be getting through to senior managers. To that end a substantial amount of effort has been devoted to the transmutation of traditional

authoritative, hierarchical mindsets for the development of new mental models in which participation by the greater majority of any organization's members occurs. The realization that the autocratic leadership style of the industrial era is no longer adequate to address the needs of organizations is all too evident. Today, organizations must respond to rapid complex change in an information-rich environment where people are searching for intrinsic satisfaction from their work and where the knowledge base of the people has become the organization's capital asset.

However, what is even more paradoxical is that while the leader as unitary actor has fallen out of vogue many of the industrial practices remain cloaked in new clothes. One of the most illustrative of these is the force and expression given to the empowerment movement. An illustration follows which helps the reader grasp the basic assumptions associated with empowerment.

Imagine, for a moment, you are the CEO of a middle-size company employing about 200 people. In the morning after arriving at work, you get behind a large cart filled with 200 bottles of water, and you go down the hall distributing these bottles to each and every employee. Once all the bottles are distributed, you return to your office. After some time, you begin to get thirsty so you return to one of the employees, see the water bottle, pick it up and take a drink. You don't necessarily ask for permission, you just do it. The employee becomes a bit perturbed because he or she thought the bottle was his/hers to use. But, of course, as CEO you dispensed the bottles, and as far as you are concerned the bottles are still yours. The word gets around to the rest of the

company, and you begin to notice that either the people drink the water right away, decide to leave the bottle alone, or wait for some direction about how much they can drink. The reason for this is they anticipate your unannounced arrival to reclaim the bottle.

Instead of water in the bottle imagine that there is another mixture called *power* in them. If your name is Emmett or Emily, you can understand why the employees referred to your morning distribution of power bottles as “EM *powers* us.”

This little story provides the basic metaphor which helps us understand the act of empowerment. In essence, the leader gives followers power to perform their organizational tasks. The employee can act but never really knows when the person in authority might come back to get the bottle, that is take back the power, or when the leader might tell the follower it is OK to take a drink, that is use the power.

Empowerment is a movement which has received wide support and endorsement as a transmutation of power from the highest to the lowest organizational levels. It is represented as a true diffusion and trust-building practice that gives both responsibility and authority to people throughout organizations. Yet for all its hype, empowerment remains a hollow practice and a failure in its ability to deliver what it has promised. Argyris explains this paradox:

Thus, despite all the best efforts that have gone into fostering empowerment, it remains very much like the emperor’s new clothes: we praise it loudly in public and ask ourselves privately why we can’t see it.

There has been no transformation in the workforce, and there has been no sweeping metamorphosis. (Argyris, 1998, p. 3)

Political philosopher Charles Handy provided an explanation for the phenomena which Argyris described. Handy's comments are summarized by Professor Nancy Dixon.

Empowerment assumes that, by right, power resides in the corporate office and can therefore be bestowed upon organizational members. One of the reasons empowerment has been so difficult to implement is that it is inherently contradictory. If power is bestowed, it can also be withdrawn and is therefore no power at all; it is at best benevolence, at worst manipulation. A unit or individual has power only if it is their right to keep the power or to give it away. (Dixon, 1994, p. 131)

Pulling the mask from empowerment, it is revealed as being from the same industrial mindset, i.e., the leader bestows power only to withdraw it on demand. Empowerment represents an industrial approach to leadership. Leadership derives from the top and is dispensed temporarily and as required. People who are empowered find themselves in a contract of inconsistency, one which provides them control over their destinies at one time and strict compliance to the leader's wishes at others. Argyris again described the psychology of the people in this predicament.

It is a fundamental truth of human nature and psychology that the less power people have to shape their lives, the less commitment they will have. When, for example, management single-handedly defines work

conditions for employees the employees will almost certainly be externally committed. That commitment is external because all that is left for employees to do is what is expected of them. The employees will not feel responsible for the way the situation itself is defined. How can they?

They did not do the defining. (Argyris, 1998, p. 99-100)

For many, empowerment was the answer to the dilemma of diffusing power from those who traditionally held the highest positions in the hierarchy to those in the lowest points in an organization. In practice, it has not solved the dilemma.

Power With: The Basis of Collaborative Leadership

Collaborative leadership is founded upon a precept of human values, including safety, trust, dignity, and respect that provide an intrinsic base for human satisfaction and identification. In consideration of this, power is no longer about position but about identification or reference. Referent power is defined as when one person wishes "to establish or maintain a satisfying self-defining relationship" (Cartwright & Zander, 1968, p. 225). Within the collaborative leadership relationship, the interdependency of those in the dynamic is predicated upon each member establishing and maintaining a self-defining relationship, a relationship within which each member engages in a transforming process and where he or she are themselves transformed. "The reward to the person in these instances is not so much a matter of gaining social recognition or monetary rewards as of establishing his self-identity and confirming his notion of the sort of person he sees himself to be" (Cartwright & Zander, 1968, p. 226).

People in a collaborative dynamic are propelled not by coercion but by their identification with the mutuality of their purpose. Mutual purpose and shared vision define the focus not only of what they intend to achieve but their own innate ability to “raise one another to a higher level of motivation” (Burns, 1978, p.20). The use of power and its interpretation in the organization sets the stage for and introduces us to the controversy which surrounds the study and practice of leadership and is, for this researcher, the nucleus of this study.

In this regard an expression of power must be made whereby people possess a freedom and innate right to contribute or retain their individual sense of power. It is, after all, part of what it means to be a member of a democratic society. Handy provided us with an interpretation of power which supports a democratic notion and the tenets of collaborative leadership. He does this by explaining subsidiarity.

Subsidiarity means that power is located at the corporation's lowest point. It assumes that power naturally resides at this level and that it can only be relinquished to a central body through a contractual agreement. The center governs only with the consent of the governed. Moreover, that consent is established within the framework of a constitution which sets the boundaries of power and responsibility (Handy, 1992, p. 63)

During the 1960s, a familiar phrase was coined during the civil rights movement—“Power to the People.” Subsidiarity means that the people always have had and retain the power to be influenced, persuaded or moved to action.

It is their choice and only they can decide to be motivated from quiescence to action when they have become dissatisfied and desire to make change.

The Leadership Interdependency Scale

Do leadership theories or movements have a least common denominator? In other words, is there a way that leadership movements or methods of governance can be compared to some common factor and to each other? Deciphering the theories and movements of organizational development that are in vogue is no easy matter. Trying to answer the question: "How is this leadership construct different from what we already know?" is important to those who would spend thousands and in some cases millions of dollars to buy a leadership development program which will hopefully take an organization down the road to greater effectiveness. In order to summarize the leadership perspectives discussed and in keeping with the age-old and well worn Chinese adage that one picture is worth a thousand words, I created the Leadership Interdependency Scale (LIS), which is displayed on the next page as Figure 2. The graphic of LIS depicts the most significant theories of leadership as circles and the organizing philosophies, methods of governance and interpretations of power are portrayed as triangles. Each point on the scale is compared to one factor, the level of interdependence between the leaders and followers. Stated differently, the factor could be viewed as the level of influence of each member of the leadership dynamic. I positioned each theory along the scale on a relative continuum according to time, early to late 20th century, but grouped according to whether the theories are individualistic in nature (left side) or communal, team

Figure 2. The Leadership Interdependency Scale

or collective in nature (right side). LIS provides a graphic that helps people better understand the espoused nature of the leaders/followers relationship of each of the theories.

Superimposed upon the LIS are two other graphical representations. First, a simple graph is used to indicate a high or low level of member influence within the espoused nature of the leadership construct. The graph shows how likely all members of the leadership dynamic are able to use persuasion and influence to leverage the decisions at hand. Secondly, the communication intention graph as delineated by (Senge, Kleiner, Ross, Smith, & Roberts, 1995) has been added. It is worthy of note that the communication intention graph relates directly to and complements the focus and intent of the espoused theory of leadership and describes the information exchange methodology that was used by leaders and followers in the respective leadership dynamics.

The left side of the scale—the individualistically based leadership theories—represent the leader as unitary actor who dispenses, gives direction or guidance, or compels compliance from the followers. From him or her all leadership activity flows, and it is senseless to talk about leadership unless one talks about the leader only. Followers are passive and are only needed to carry out the wishes, mission or vision of the leader. This perspective has been the cornerstone of the major leadership theories of the industrial era which include those of great man, group, trait, behavioral (contingency and situational), Burns' transactional, charismatic, and excellence. In other words these leadership frameworks promote the leader as a single person who by positional authority or

by nature possesses some significant set of traits, greatness, charismatic personality, who has the ability to know the right kind of positive or negative motivation depending on the situation, who has a sense of excellence which can be communicated, or who has the ability to trade in such a way that followers will do whatever the leader wishes. The lion's share of the work in leadership studies has been to distill these factors into discernible elements or qualities which can be replicated or taught to others for the purpose of creating more and better leaders. The theme has been if we make better people, we get better leaders, and the result is that we will get better leadership.

The right side of the leadership interdependence scale sees the followers as absolutely essential to the leadership dynamic; in fact they are the essence of the dynamic in the first place. From this perspective leadership doesn't get done unless the leader and the followers are engaged together and committed to a common purpose or vision. This is not merely the followers carrying out the wishes of the leader; instead it represents the leader and followers together in the leadership dynamic. The creation of purpose, vision and the goals of a particular issue becomes a mutual endeavor. This view of leadership does not negate in anyway the fact that the leader or another member can have a powerful and creative vision of his or her own. Instead, as each person relates his or her own vision to those of other members of the leadership dynamic, their confluence together provides for an emergent relationship, an emergent sense of purpose and vision. The most important message is that the leader and the followers, now called partners or collaborators, are in a relationship together. To

that end the term *followers* is no longer preferred and collaborators or partners have become more acceptable because they connote a more equivalent relationship among the members of the leadership dynamic. As noted earlier, intrinsic to understanding the leadership frameworks placed on this scale is the use and essential character of power because the use of power in the frameworks on the left side of the scale is different from the meaning and use of power in the frameworks on the right. Empowerment is replaced with subsidiarity.

If we accept that leadership is first of all a relationship, then new interpretations and new meanings must be given to the interactions of people engaged in this dynamic. In effect, the individual is viewed as one member in the dynamic, and the confluence of people is considered of primary importance where relationship and leadership converge.

These two perspectives form the predominant camps of leadership. Looking into the faces of these two perspectives, we can see the images of what Daniel Bell in *The Coming of the Postindustrial Society* called the future tension of societal dilemmas. Bell uses the iconic images of Max Weber and Alexis DeTocqueville to portray the tension between order and rationality and equality. As Americans seek greater equality, a greater voice in their lives, the disruption in order will grow greater and greater (Bell, 1973). With this in mind, it might serve us well to pose a question about leadership and democracy. What form of leadership would best serve the interests of a society whose culture is deeply

embedded with democratic ideals? Which leadership camp is more closely aligned with a democratic people?

It would appear that the second perspective is. This being so we must pose another question? Can an organization imbued with democratic leadership practices produce, serve or accomplish its stated purpose in the world of today? Can democratic leadership practices truly organize people to do something significant in times of great chaos and ambiguity?

Knowledge and Learning—The New Power for the Next Millennium The Epoch of the Knowledge Worker

At the beginning of Chapter One, I asserted that, at least in the United States, the knowledge worker had risen to the apex of economic strength. As Peter Drucker (1994) stated: “Knowledge workers will give the emerging knowledge society its character, its leadership, its social profile. They may not be the ruling class of the knowledge society, but they are its leading class” (p. 64). Yet this fact seems to have eluded many who remain deeply ensconced in the physically labor-intensive, production-oriented, industrial mindset. These industrialists remain imbued with the belief that, for example, lower labor rates overseas have been the most significant contributor to the loss of industrial jobs in America. Drucker disagrees:

Practically none of the decline in American manufacturing employment from some 30 or 35 percent of the work force to 15 or 18 percent can be attributed to moving work to low wage countries. The main competition for American manufacturing industry—for instance, in automobiles, in steel,

and in machine tools—has come from countries such as Japan and Germany, where wage costs have long been equal to, if not higher than, those in the United States. The comparative advantage that now counts is in the application of knowledge. (Drucker, 1994, p. 64)

Indeed, the validity of Drucker's statement is underscored by the work of Professor William E. Halal of George Washington University.

Today knowledge is the most powerful force on earth, primarily responsible for the collapse of communism, restructuring of economies, and the unification of the world. After decades of glib talk about the Information Age, companies are becoming "learning organizations," developing their "intellectual assets" and hiring "chief learning officers" because we now see that knowledge is the source of all productivity, innovation and competitive advantage. It is suddenly blindingly clear that knowledge is a boundless source of infinite power that promises to flood the world with creative progress. (Halal, 1996, p. xxii)

Drucker also reiterated the need for organizations to accept the changing paradigm for work and understand that this transformation "be far more than a social change, it would be a change in the human condition" (Drucker, 1994).

With this in mind, successful knowledge-driven organizations have become aware that the knowledge worker of today is vastly different from the physical laborer of the industrial revolution. Knowledge workers are informed, aware, independent, well skilled, formally trained, analytical and seek intrinsic satisfaction from their daily activities. And they need to be because "knowledge

work is characterized by unpredictable, multidisciplinary, and nonrepetitive tasks with evolving, long-term goals which, due to their inherent ambiguity and complexity, require collaborative effort in order to take advantage of multiple viewpoints" (Janz, Colquitt, & Noe, 1997, p. 882).

To better understand the needs of the knowledge worker and the environment which is essential to doing knowledge work, it is important to review the key characteristics of knowledge work. Some of the most interesting research on the effectiveness of knowledge teams was completed by Professors Janz, Colquitt and Noe who studied the role of four factors—autonomy, interdependence, team development and contextual support—variables to try to ascertain the importance of each of these variables as they impacted team effectiveness. A brief summary follows:

Autonomy "may be the most critical concern in knowledge worker teams, as knowledge workers prefer autonomy more than any other job characteristic" (Janz et al., 1997, p. 879). Cheney (1984), and Goldstein & Rockart (1984) agreed. In particular, Janz et al. specifically recommended that "to maximize team member motivation, managers need to consider what type of autonomy they are willing (or able) to give. Providing discretion over goals, budgets, training needs, and scheduling (i.e., autonomy for planning) may be an especially effective means of instilling job motivation (1997, p. 900). I agree with their findings that autonomy is essential for knowledge workers. However, implied in this statement is a notion that empowerment of responsibilities and authority is conferred to the knowledge team. Janz et. al.'s (1997) recommendations agree

with Argyris' (1998) perspective that employees must be involved in the defining of the work before a high level of internal commitment (motivation) can be expected. Organizations must adopt a mindset of subsidiarity from the outset so that a proper appreciation for the work environment can be initiated. Drucker agrees, "In the knowledge society the most probable assumption for organizations—and certainly the assumption of which they have to conduct their affairs—is that they need knowledge workers far more than knowledge workers need them" (1994, p. 71).

Interdependence is also a necessary factor that is also critical to the functioning of a knowledge team because it is the fundamental characteristic for collaboration. Janz et. al. cited the work of Tjosvold & Tjosvold (1995), stating that "given the importance of collaboration in knowledge work it seems likely that the most effective knowledge teams will be those who make the most of each member's ideas and abilities" (Janz et al., 1997, p. 901). Interdependence can be counterproductive to the desired of a knowledge team to be autonomous. Over time, a healthy balance or tension between autonomy and interdependence must be achieved in order for the team to be viable and productive.

Team development is another factor considered in the Janz et al. study. Team development, as defined by Campbell & Hallam (1994) framework for examining team development, rejects the use of age or tenure to determine how well developed a team might be. Instead, their assessment defines team development based on mission clarity, coordination, and unity that a team possess. "Mission clarity refers to the extent to which there is a shared

understanding of the team's purpose, coordination refers to how organized a team is, and unity refers to how cohesive the team is" (Janz et al., 1997, p. 882).

Their findings reveal that:

Teams must be motivated to engage in effective process behaviors, but must also have the organization and unity that comes with development. Indeed, such maturity may be especially critical to knowledge worker teams because of the increased complexity inherent in the work they perform (Janz et al., 1997, p. 899).

Contextual support focuses on the efficiency with which information is transmitted to the team, the frequency with which feedback is provided, the quality of the team's goals, and the time pressure present. Because of the complex nature of knowledge work, time constraints may force the teams to revert to old-style problem and decision models in order to meet a deadline. This regression will usually thwart a team's creativity since its most immediate need is to respond to the present crisis. Knowledge teams require time and a clear sense of purpose, organization and cohesiveness in order for the members to share information openly and gain a synergy from their endeavors. In effect the right environment is critical to creating and sustaining effective knowledge work.

It is the creation of this environment, then, where autonomy and interdependence are imbued with mutuality of purpose and feelings of cohesion that provides for the team a level of maturity, to learn together, create balance and do the knowledge work. Therefore, the environment becomes of primary importance to organizations who seek to engage the full talents of knowledge

workers. To that end, democracy offers to knowledge workers a freedom of expression, a construct of subsidiarity and the understanding that freedom and autonomy belongs to them.

Towards More Democratic Organizations

Suggesting that organizations move towards democracy as a suitable form of organization in the workplace might seem not only paradoxical but downright ludicrous. How would anything get done? Who would control the resources, the outputs and the quality of the work to be performed? Yet, it is democracy in its purest form which provides, as a matter of course, the inherent elements of subsidiarity and autonomy, and an understanding that people in community are interdependent beings who must find a balance between their own individual desires and the needs of society in general. Daniel Bell called it “the cultural contradictions of capitalism”—that destructive clash between the hard necessity of survival in a market economy and the ideals of human cooperation and social welfare that we aspire to in a democratic society” (Halal, 1996, p. 79). Interestingly enough, democracy during turbulent and ambiguous times is a preferred approach to effecting change. Slater and Bennis suggested that: “Democracy . . . is the only system that can successfully cope with the changing demands of contemporary civilization. . . . Democracy becomes a functional necessity whenever a social system is competing for survival under conditions of chronic change” (Slater & Bennis, 1990, p. 168-169). This perspective might seem counterintuitive. After all we have traditionally resorted to high degrees of control in order to get the turbulent situation stabilized and

calmed. Yet democratic principles offer to knowledge workers the requisite environment within which they can do knowledge work. Autonomy and interdependence are mirrored in the democratic ideals of individualism and relationship as the fundamental ideals underpinning the United States. Moreover, it is the healthy tension between these two, autonomy and interdependence, which become the foundation of the postindustrial age.

The Efficacy of Social Capital

The previous sections of this chapter have been dedicated to bringing the reader to the realization that we find ourselves in an era of human existence that may very well live up to Halal's expectation as the advent of the "Second Copernican Revolution." It is a time that by all indications seems to be manifesting what Drucker described as not just a change in the social condition but one of the human condition (Drucker, 1994). In 1998, Drucker made plain the fundamental issue at hand, "most of our assumptions about business, technology and organization are at least 50 years old. They have outlived their usefulness. As a result, we are preaching, teaching and practicing policies that are increasingly at odds with reality and therefore counterproductive" (Drucker, 1998, p. 152). Leadership models that find at its root the relationships of people together founded upon such qualities as safety, trust and commitment bespeak an acknowledgement and acceptance of the evolution of our human condition within the structure of organizations. These seemingly intangible factors are no longer nice-to-haves; they are absolutely essential to the validity and viability of

an organization not only to exist, but to run effectively and efficiently under conditions of complexity and great change.

Social capital can be considered the strands that form the web of connection which makes collective endeavors such as collaborative leadership possible. While it does not reside in a single person, it exists in the relations among persons (Coleman, 1988). Like collaborative leadership, social capital finds the connections of people together as the essence of the real value in organizational capability. Putnam explains this and the benefits of ensuring viable links of social capital

For a variety of reasons, life is easier in a community blessed with a substantial stock of social capital. In the first place, networks of civic engagement foster sturdy norms of generalized reciprocity and encourage the emergence of social trust. Such networks facilitate coordination and communication, amplify reputations, and thus allow dilemmas of collective action to be resolved. When economic and political negotiation is embedded in dense networks of social interaction, incentives of opportunism are reduced. At the same time, networks of civic engagement embody past success at collaboration, which can serve as a cultural template for future collaboration. (Putnam, 1995, p. 4)

Couto described social capital as “the moral resources and public goods that are invested in the creation and recreation of people in community” (Couto, 1998, p. 5). Yet social capital is not something that can be created as a direct result of concerted action to create it. For example, a discussion about creating

trust within a context of a group activity will not enhance or degrade the level of trust experienced by that group. Instead, the group which finds itself engaged in the activities for which it was created, i.e., develop a new manufacturing process or solve a law enforcement issue in the community, builds trust by doing the tasks which it sets out for itself to do. Trust forms as a byproduct, as a positive externality, of other activities (Couto, 1998, p. 5). Putnam (1995) also supports the view that “Trust and engagement are two facets of the same underlying factor—social capital” (p. 7).

In the knowledge society of today where autonomy and interdependence are key to the effectiveness of the members of an organization, the need for social capital cannot be overemphasized. It is this intangible yet vital element which forms the transparent support structure that makes collaborative leadership possible. Paradoxically, social capital results from people engaged in the collaborative leadership dynamic in which they act to transform a context. The importance of developing and nurturing *social capital* within and without an organization may very well be the greatest challenge and the most significant task of our postindustrial society.

The 21st Century Organization, An Essential Need to Learn Learning to Learn Together

Building a bridge to the 21st century requires that people learn their way through complex issues in an effort to find creative solutions for today. Learning in the 21st century organization will be everyone’s job. It will not be relegated to

people occupying the highest positions in the organization. The Society for Organizational Learning's founder, Peter Senge, stated:

It is no longer sufficient to have one person learning for the organization, a Ford, a Sloan, or a Watson. It's just not possible any longer to "figure it out" from the top, and have everyone else following orders from the "grand strategist." The organizations that will truly excel in the future will be the organizations that discover how to tap people's commitment and capacity to learn at *all* levels in an organization. (Senge, 1990, p. 4)

Unfortunately, with all of our efforts, the creative solutions of today only bring us to the threshold of tomorrow's complexities.

Harvard Professor Chris Argyris described learning as "a process in which people discover a problem, invent a solution to the problem, produce the solution, and evaluate the outcome, leading to the discovery of new problems" (1982, p. 38). In 1993, Argyris indicated that learning is "that which occurs when we take effective action, when we detect and correct error" (Argyris, 1993, p. 3). DiBella and Nevis described organizational learning as having three distinct processes: knowledge creation or acquisition, knowledge dissemination and knowledge use in the achievement of some purpose (1998, p. 28).

As already mentioned, the learning about which Argyris and Senge wrote is not what people traditionally view as learning. These authors are not referring to rote memorization of procedures or protocols which provide a formularized approach to problems. Compliance to rules and procedures are no longer the order of the day. Dealing with complexity demands risk taking and collaboration

in an effort to bring a myriad of talents and knowledge to bear on critical issues. Learning, the foundation of creative expression in the 21st century has been explained by Argyris in the formulation of Model II learning systems and his distinction between single-loop and double-loop learning. Argyris described single-loop learning as relatively straightforward because the errors are usually attributable to defective strategies or actions (1982, p. 104). When an error is detected, an inquiry is made and diagnosed; a response is invented, produced and implemented. If evaluated as successful, learning ceases and the error has been corrected.

On the other hand, double-loop learning occurs when an error is detected and is diagnosed as an incompatibility of governing values or as an incongruity between organizational espoused theory and its theory-in-use (1982, p. 106). This requires the invention of a response which approximates the organization's espoused theory. Bringing the actions of the organization into closer proximity with what the organization proclaims a learning process which

should decrease dysfunctional group dynamics because the competitive win/lose, low-trust, low-risk-taking processes are replaced by cooperative, inquiry-oriented, high-trust, and high-risk-taking dynamics The results should be that participants will experience that double-loop learning is possible for themselves and their organizations, that organizations can change Hence we have a learning system that is simultaneously stable and subject to continual change. (Argyris, 1982, p. 106)

Simply stated, organizations require opportunities to practice that which they preach. An implementation strategy which models, to the greatest extent possible, double-loop learning fosters acceptance of not only authentic learning methods but of new mental models such as collaborative leadership. By so doing, people come to fully understand their actions. By immersing themselves into the dynamic of learning, people experience what Professors Geoffrey and Renate Caine call “brain-based learning,” which “involves the entire learner in a challenging learning process that simultaneously engages the intellect, creativity, emotions, and physiology” (Caine & Caine, 1994, p. 9). Engagement with brain-based and double-loop learning methods of inquiry provide participants with a way to feel, know and live the ramifications of their actions. It creates new stories of experience which can modify culture and create new mental models from which people take the right action. It fulfills Senge’s idea of learning, which he described as “those who continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together” (1990, p. 3). People engaged in a mutual purpose to collectively learn together is a melding of the tenets of the learning organization and the collaborative leadership framework, and stands as an example of what is truly possible in a world full of chaos.

Stories as the Basis for Learning

Narratives or stories are a potent tool for learning and creating new realities and a new culture within organizations. Once upon a time, everything

was understood through stories. Stories made things understandable (Parry & Doan, 1994, p. 1). Stories have been the root of learning since antiquity because all belief systems are composed of stories. Without stories, without narratives, there is little meaning. "We dream in narrative, day-dream in narrative, remember, anticipate, hope, despair, believe, doubt, plan, revise, criticize, construct, gossip, learn, hate, and love by narrative" (Hardy quoted in Macintyre, 1984, p. 211). However, narratives and storytelling are art forms whose use has been subjugated to rational argument. But argument and storytelling are complementary processes which form cognition.

Bruner discussed this complementarity in his explanation of the two modes of cognitive functioning. "Arguments convince one of their truth, while stories of their lifelikeness" (Bruner, 1986, p. 11). Arguments seek to set forth objective reality through empirical proof, while stories convey meaning or verisimilitude, that which has the appearance of truth. Neither method or function is reducible to the other; they are complementary forms. "Stories must conform to canons of logical consistency, but they can use violations of such consistency as a basis of drama" (Bruner, 1986, p. 12). It is Bruner's work which establishes the reasoning for using stories to portray the drama of leadership, a drama seeking to create a new reality, new skills, and a different way of engaging participants in a postindustrial world.

The imaginative application of the narrative mode leads instead to good stories, gripping drama, believable (though not necessarily "true") historical accounts. It deals in human or human-like intention and action

and the vicissitudes and consequences that mark their course. It strives to put its timeless miracles into the particulars of experience, and to locate the experience in time and place. (Bruner, 1986, p. 13)

Narrative is a powerful tool which can transform participants in a way that logical argument alone cannot. Logical argument is the continuous search for objective truth until the very argument itself has been rid of meaning, of lifelikeness, of its sense of connection with the participants (p. 13). On the other hand, stories possess a duality which creates a landscape of action and consciousness upon which learning or knowing is achieved.

A story must construct two landscapes simultaneously. One is the landscape of action, where the constituents are the arguments of action: agent, intention, or goal, situation, instrument, something corresponding to a “story grammar.” The other landscape is the landscape of consciousness: what those involved in the action know, think or feel, or do not know, think, or feel. The two landscapes are essential and distinct. (p. 14)

Stories provide participants connection to and meaning of events and are the basic building blocks to rewriting the beliefs and understandings for organizations and their members.

Stories Can Transform Organizations

Earlier in this chapter I discussed three of the guiding principles of the learning organization, personal mastery, shared vision and team learning in terms of their congruency with the collaborative leadership model. Team

learning serves another very important purpose as it is a natural bridge to the viability of using simulations to demonstrate the need for collaborative leadership and the learning organization. Team learning uses simulations as a vehicle to access individual mental models, those memories, experiences, and stories which act like shards of pottery lining the caverns of our beliefs and driving our actions. Mental models are, in fact, the ideas and thoughts which are the theories in action people actually use. These models of action are different from what people often say, i.e., their espoused theories (Argyris, 1982, p. 85).

Senge discussed the basic core learning dilemma that confronts organizations by saying: “we learn best from experience but we never directly experience the consequences of many of our most important decisions What we carry in our heads are images, assumptions, and stories” (Senge 1990, pp. 23 & 175). The stories of which he speaks form mental models of behavior in the members of organizations. If our model for understanding takes root in the rational and bureaucratic world of Weber, then it is those models to which we adhere. For Senge, creating new mental models is fundamentally a transforming activity required in creating new understandings about organizational life.

The discipline of managing mental models—surfacing, testing, and improving our internal pictures of how the world works—promises to be a major breakthrough for building learning organizations Mental models are active—they shape how we act. (Senge, 1990, pp. 174-175)

Viewing how the world really works provides organizations with one of the most seemingly intractable challenges—systems thinking. The mechanistic

perspective of bureaucracy provides for a “stovepipe” perspective of an organization and its vital communication relationships. Each part of the organization views itself as an entity unto itself with no causal or reactive effect on the rest of the organization. For example, if a decision to change an aspect, service or procedure of a particular department is made, the only people or parts of the organization that will be affected by the decision are those in the said department. This perspective is naïve at best. Systems thinking sees organizations as interrelated and interdependent holistic structures whose cause and effect are systemic, i.e., wholly connected. If a change is made in one part of the organization, the effect will be felt in another part. It is very much like dropping a pebble in a pond, the rippling effects of the change move outward into other parts of the pond, or in this case, the organization. Understanding the nature of systemic effects and the need to view the organization as a system underscores the need for organization members to collaborate and learn together. Systems thinking is, in and of itself, a new mental model for looking at organizations from a different frame.

Argyris (1993) said, “The study of learning that serves action reaches to the core of human social life. Action is how we give *meaning* to life. It is how we reveal ourselves to others and to ourselves” (p. 1, italics added). I propose a shift in Argyris’ idea to that of *action for knowledge*: The creation of stories as scenarios provide participants with opportunities for creating new realities, new mental models, and new experiences not only promote learning but alter human attitudes. If it is true that people in a postindustrial society create intrinsic

meaning from their efforts, then portraying the drama of leadership through a play, story or simulation can be a potent force for real change.

A Brief History of War Gaming and Simulations

It is hard to determine when games were first invented, perhaps in the caves of the dawn of human development. However, games which somehow expressed or mirrored human endeavors such as war, seem to have a long history. The game of chess was derived from an ancient Indian game of war in which the pieces represented the various components of the armies of the time: cavalry, elephants, foot soldiers, and so on (Perla, 1990, p. 1). In the military services, the terms *game* and *simulation* are used interchangeably in reference to the activity of creating a bona fide environment within which people gather to ascertain the effect of actions taken during play. In fact, the terms *wargaming* or *wargames* are familiar terms to almost all military officers. Wargaming in the military services has, over time, gained a high level of support for the benefits it brings to the study and choice of tactics and strategy, not only on the battlefield, but in determining United States global policy. One of the most famous examples of this is captured in quote from then Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz given at a lecture to the Naval War College on October 10, 1960. In speaking about the war with Japan, said

The war with Japan had been reenacted in the game rooms at the Naval War College by so many people, and in so many ways, that nothing that happened during the war was a surprise—absolutely nothing except the

kamikaze tactics towards the end of the war; we had not visualized those.

(Hartman, 1990, p. 180-181)

While the fundamental information or ideas used to derive the particular game or simulation are different, the reasoning is the same and is summed up in the phrase: What happens if?

The key to successful wargaming is the close approximation of the simulated event to the “real world” facts or conditions. Without this close association the simulation truly becomes a game, it can be fun but frivolous. The greatest proportion of funding spent by United States military services on wargaming of any type is on creating a synthetic reality which represents to the greatest degree possible the real, anticipated, or expected facts, circumstances, situations or events which those engaged in the simulation might encounter. Most simulations are complex, unpredictable, systemic in nature and if properly derived and played, realistic in almost every way. The lessons learned from simulations have proven themselves to be so true-to-life, that the result of the simulations were eerie in the representation and accuracy of the actual event simulated. There is no greater story for this author, that provides a more vivid example of the worth and accuracy of simulations to predict future events than the Battle of Midway as gamed by the Japanese during World War II. A short summary of the event follows.

It seems that following the very successful strikes by the Japanese on Pearl Harbor, Admiral of the Fleet Isoroku Yamamoto, Commander of the Japanese Imperial Navy decided to begin stage two of the Pacific Campaign to

solidify the holdings of the Japanese in the Pacific by attacking Midway Island. Midway is so named because it is approximately midway between Pearl Harbor and the mainland of Japan. After receiving a letter from Vice Admiral Kondo expressing reservations about the very ambitious plan to attack Midway and the Western Aleutians, Admiral Yamamoto ordered that four days of wargames be initiated to determine the expected movements and tactics of the American Navy if he chose to attack Midway, his primary target. The wargames were overseen by Rear Admiral Ugaki, the Combined Fleet Chief of Staff. During the table-top maneuvers, situations and events occurred which from time to time required that officers playing the role of umpires be asked to roll dice to make determinations concerning movements or engagements between the Japanese and American forces. This they did with a most forthright intent and impartial action. During one engagement American land base bombers had found one aircraft carrier element at sea and took it under attack. The umpire, Lieutenant Commander Okumiya, rolled the dice and ruled that the Americans had scored nine bomb hits on two Japanese aircraft carriers and both were sunk. However, Admiral Ugaki reversed this decision and scored only three hits on one carrier (Fuchida & Okumiya, 1992, p. 125). Admiral Ugaki did this repeatedly, reversing several rulings during the wargame. Ugaki, who was extremely loyal to Yamamoto, was determined that nothing would stand in the way of Yamamoto's plan, consequently, any derogatory information or outcomes were disallowed. In fact, the actual results of many engagements, and other problems noted during the war games, anyone of which could have had a dramatic impact on the outcome

of the battle, were never addressed. When the results of the wargame were taken to Yamamoto, he was encouraged to begin his plan immediately because the outcomes were so favorable.

During the actual Battle of Midway, June 3-6, 1942, much of what the Japanese had envisioned before the rulings of the war games were altered came true in an eerie foretelling of the events of those four days. After the action had concluded the Japanese had lost all four of its mainline aircraft carriers and most of its experienced pilots as American aircraft carrier forces scored nine bomb hits. Midway marked the turning of the war of the Pacific to Allied Forces favor just a mere six months after the bombing of Pearl Harbor.

Midway remains a story of the power of simulations to accurately depict reality to a level that can aid and even predict events in the preparation of participants to anticipated future dilemmas. For this author, the focus and intent of my work in simulations are to bring this level of reality into the training realm of leadership development.

Simulations as an Instrument for Learning

People can simulate everything that they consider important, vital or dangerous in their daily lives. Simulators are used to train pilots, run a nuclear power plant, train emergency response teams, or in this case establish a new mental model for leadership. Simulations provide a way for human beings to experiment or play with processes and outcomes in hopes of creating effective approaches to the dilemmas they face. To some people, simulations are pictures of computers, incredibly real graphics, and joysticks. However, simulations have

been around for decades, long before computers came into the picture. The most frequent users of simulations have been the military services, who have used them to experiment with and teach tactics and strategy or develop proficiencies in the more inexperienced personnel.

What is meant by the term *simulation*? Simulations are problem-based exercises. To be a simulation interactions must fulfill two criteria.

First, a specific issue, problem or policy is posed that precipitates a variety of actions. Second, roles are defined that interact with the proposed problem or issue in particular ways . . . [In other words], simulations involves the experience of functioning in a bona-fide environment and encountering the consequence of one's actions as one makes decisions in that role . . . Second, the participants address the issues and problems seriously and conscientiously. (Gredler, 1992, p. 14)

There are two basic types of simulations: content and process. For the most part, content simulations are hosted on computers and explore the “what” of actions taken. That is to say, if an individual makes a decision and implements it, **what** will happen? On the other hand, process simulations examine the how and why of actions taken. In other words, the focus of the simulation considers the outcomes as they pertain to the congruity of the interpersonal processes and motives used, the **how and why** a particular decision was reached. Process simulations usually precede content simulations because effective processes for decision making should be explored first. Process simulations are more interpersonal by nature. Developing effective strategies among various

stakeholders requires that people experiment with and validate their needs for information and coordination using a facilitative process wherein consensus on a particular decision can be reached.

In our postindustrial world computers and technology have greatly overshadowed the benefits and uses of process-type simulations. Yet computers are unable to provide the requisite environment for the development of human processes. Gredler provided a rationale for not using computers to do crisis-management-type simulations

Crisis-management simulations in which the participants interact exclusively with a computer are not recommended. The problem is, of course, maintaining reality of function for the participants. Computers are not the root cause of crisis situations (unless, of course, they crash).

Thus, the possible disadvantages of a computer-delivered exercise for crisis-management simulations are a) the lack of interaction among decision-makers; b) the false sense that time is not a variable; and c) the possibility that the exercise will be perceived as a game. (Gredler, 1992, p. 81)

Interpersonally based process simulations provide an intensive cognitive learning experience that reach deep into the human psyche to effect change in habits and mental models.

Play as a Tool for Learning

Play is an important part of human development and growth. As psychologist Erik Erikson explained:

Play, then, is a good example of the way in which every major trend of epigenetic development continues to expand and develop throughout life. For the ritualizing power of play is the infantile form of the human ability to deal with experience by creating model situations and to master reality by experiment and planning. . . . In constructing model situations not only in open dramatizations (as in "plays" and in fiction) but also in the laboratory and on the drawing board, we inventively anticipate the future from the vantage point of a corrected and shared past as we redeem our failures and strengthen our hopes. (Erikson, 1982, p. 51)

Play provides the participants with a way in which new realities and the meaning of those realities can be imagined, constructed and internalized as part of their habits or tendencies. Psychologist Jean Piaget reinforces this idea when he declared that,

Play constitutes the extreme pole of assimilation of reality to the ego, while at the same time it has something of the creative imagination which will be the motor of all future thought and even of reason. (Piaget, 1951, p. 167)

Games are the manifestation of play. They are the form in which the context of play activity is created and expressed. Games can be found in every culture and are intrinsic to learning. Professor Betsy Watson of Rutgers University asserted that games and play are cultural phenomena that have been with us throughout human history. "The playing of games exists in all cultures, and indeed can be viewed as a universal feature of human societies" (1975, p. 42). Games provide opportunities to practice activity within a social and cultural

framework. They are a particular way of structuring human interaction. Games serve as vehicles through which the individual can practice communication skills and experiment with strategies and tactics of social interaction. In games the individual is able to learn about and try out new or potential social roles (Watson, 1975, p. 43).

Professor Cathy Greenblat of Rutgers University and Professor Richard Duke of the University of Michigan described the concept of simulation games in the following way.

The term “game” is applied to those simulations which work wholly or partly on the basis of players' decisions, because the environment and activities of participants have the characteristics of games: players have goals, sets of activities to perform; constraints on what can be done; and payoffs (good and bad) as consequences of the actions. The elements in a gaming simulation are patterned from real life—that is the roles, goals, activities, constraints, and consequences and the linkages among them simulate those elements of the real-world system, (Greenblat & Duke, 1975, p. 14).

Creating a very real world system of which Greenblat and Duke refer is the purpose of this study and holds a significant potential for teaching collaborative leadership.

Summary

Leadership in modern times has been thought of as interchangeable with management and has been viewed as emanating from the leader who occupies

an authority position. In consonance with the postindustrial philosophy, leadership is viewed as a collaborative relationship designed to bring about transformative change. Adhering to modern concepts and methodologies without making allowance for the transition of society to postindustrial tendencies is tantamount to driving an automobile while looking in the rearview mirror. Without acceptance of the reality of a society which seeks intrinsic meaning from its daily organizational activities, decision makers fail to engage the full potential of human beings. In effect, modern decision makers treat people as interchangeable parts of a mechanistic assembly which defends its rule and substantiates its existence on the rational model of Max Weber. Instead, postindustrial decision makers understand that relationship and trust are the fundamental underpinnings not only of life but of organizations that are able to deal with massive change, use information openly and seek to fulfill the needs of individuals to derive intrinsic satisfaction from work. Transforming organizations to make allowance for a postindustrial philosophical base is difficult as modern decision makers are reluctant to let go of established ways of conduct and problem solving in organizations.

The focus and intent of this research study is to create interpersonal simulations for play by decision makers, organization members and other stakeholders and evaluate the ability of these simulations to reinforce or instill postindustrial leadership beliefs and practices in these participants.

CHAPTER THREE

SIMULATION PROTOTYPE DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to assess and evaluate the ability of a simulation prototype microworld in which organization members are provided the opportunity to understand, reinforce, accept, develop, and engage in collaborative leadership beliefs and practices. The evaluation is accomplished by putting the simulation prototype to work during a three-day seminar in one organization and a two-day seminar in a different organization. The methodology uses narrative learning coupled with the principles of simulation and gaming theory to create stories in which participants find new meaning for themselves and for others as part of a community holding mutual purpose and shared vision. These simulations incorporate elements of the modern rational model used primarily in the case study, along with the influence of the political, symbolic or cultural, and human resource frameworks, as discussed by Bolman & Deal (1991), into a context which provides a way in which organizational members learn to deal with the intricacies of a complex world. In essence, the simulations provide opportunities to engage in integrative, vicarious learning in an atmosphere wherein it is safe to play. Senge asserted that such a learning methodology can provide an important link to preparing organizations for the future.

Perhaps most importantly, few existing microworlds develop individual or team capacities to deal productively with complexity. Few capture the dynamic complexity that confronts the management team when it seeks to craft new strategies, design new structures and operating policies, or plan significant organizational change. . . . Microworlds will, I believe, prove to be a critical technology for implementing the disciplines of the learning organization. (Senge, 1990, p. 314)

This simulation prototype is an effort to provide a microworld that satisfies to the greatest extent possible Senge's call for a microworld steeped in complexity. It has been designed to represent real-world events that are inherently complex and require the application of leadership while attempting to achieve some form of transforming change.

Background into Leadership and Business Simulation Methods

The purpose of the evaluation is to measure and assess this prototype microworld as a learning tool for developing collaborative leadership beliefs and practices. I corresponded with two gaming authorities: Professor J. Bernard Keys of Georgia Southern University and Professor Stephen Stumpf of the University of Tampa (FL). Dr. Keys is the founder of the Association of Business Simulations and Experiential Learning Society (ABSEL), and Dr. Stumpf is the director of the Leadership Center at the University of Tampa. My objective was to survey those simulation methodologies and measurement instruments currently in use in order to assess if any of these simulations would be helpful in developing or evaluating this prototype. Interviews revealed that similar gaming

methodologies, called “behavioral gaming,” were currently in use at the University of Tampa and at the Stern School of Business at New York University. A review of the materials that Drs. Keys and Stumpf generously provided revealed that the foundation for the behavioral games currently in use is reflective of the industrial leadership mentality where leadership and management are interchangeable terms. Additionally, a review of the evaluative instruments used by the University of Tampa indicated a strong leaning towards the behavioral inventory listing as a means to identify leader abilities and leadership as one and the same. Since views of postindustrial leadership see leaders and leadership as two distinct concepts and since the prototype described in this proposal uses collaborative leadership as a foundation for the creation of the simulations, the instruments reviewed were evaluated as incompatible with the needs of this study.

LeadSimm: Prototype of a Simulation Process

Introduction of the Simulation Concept

The leadership simulation prototype, hereafter referred to as LeadSimm, is a derivation of the non-computer seminar wargaming simulations used by the United States Navy to train its most senior battle group commanders. I learned this technique as a member of the United States Navy’s Tactical Training Group Pacific 119 Reserve Unit during the years 1984-1992. I had used the technique on several occasions and found it to be powerful when it was applied to demonstrating and teaching tactical decision-making skills. I was struck by how often participants would come up to me months and years after I had conducted

a seminar game, and enthusiastically begin to discuss the events of a particular situation or move made during simulation play. They could recall in vivid detail the events, the decisions made, the mistakes and especially what they learned and how, in their words, they “would never forget the lessons learned.” Seminar gaming is a process simulation and remains today, in spite of the introduction of high-speed computer systems, as the cornerstone of United States Naval wargaming and simulation capability.

As I contemplated the use of a process simulation to develop collaborative leadership perspectives, it occurred to me that if I could create a simulation which used the basic technique of seminar gaming but was modified to capture the complexities of the issues in different organizational venues, that this might represent a significant leap forward in current leadership training methods. In the summer of 1994, I read *The Fifth Discipline* (1990) by Peter Senge, then the Director of the Center for Organizational Learning at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Chapter Seventeen of his book is dedicated to the discussion surrounding what Senge terms, “realistic microworlds,” which he defined as “microcosms of reality where it is safe to play” (p. 314). After reading this part of the book, I knew that new efforts of simulation work related to collaborative leadership development needed to be undertaken. I was convinced it could be done, but I recognized that modifications to the scenario development and simulation facilitation processes would be required. I began to sketch out the United States Navy seminar gaming process as I had conducted it during military training exercises, listing each step of the methodology. I constructed a parallel

process of steps for the LeadSimm process and extrapolated the seminar gaming process into a mental model image of the participant interactions that would most likely occur and their anticipated responses. In March 1996, operating as a member of the Institute for the Advancement of Leadership, I produced and facilitated the first LeadSimm simulation for the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training, Command College Class 24. The simulation was played on the fourth day of a four and one-half day seminar.

For the previous three days, the paramilitary, autocratic mindsets of most of these police professionals were evident. Many of them expressed doubts as to the efficacy of collaborative leadership as it related to their work. After three hours of simulation play, one officer who had been unusually resistant to the concept stood up, put his hands in the air, as though he was gesturing a sign to give up, and said, "I believe." From that point on, so did I. Even though the simulation was a pilot, the evaluations following the end of the weeklong seminar were overwhelmingly positive and underscored the simulation as not only being relevant but especially worthwhile.

To the reader, it may seem counterintuitive that a methodology for teaching military leaders to conduct war would be suitable for teaching and demonstrating collaborative leadership. Yet, the need to collaborate and to work together prior to military operations is paramount to being effective and saving lives. When a military organization is given the responsibility of achieving an objective, those engaged experience an inherent sense of danger which causes

them to understand that they need to work together to preserve their lives.

Military organizations have endeavored to make their simulations as realistic as possible in order to make the participant learning as transferable as possible to the real-world situation. In the same way, the LeadSimm simulation is designed to be as realistic as possible and represents one of the most critical differences between LeadSimm and other leadership development methods.

Gredler (1992) referred to simulations as providing bona-fide environments within which decisional strategies can be explored. The creation of bona-fide, i.e., realistic or authentic, scenarios is the cornerstone of not only the seminar wargaming strategy, and of LeadSimm, but it is the common ground upon which almost all contemporary simulation development activities are done. To that end, each seminar gaming simulation is distinctly created to represent the actual circumstances of the situation that the participants face or are going to encounter in their daily work lives. This makes the scenario relevant to their everyday lives and to the jobs at hand. This makes realism a most critical part of the LeadSimm method. Traditionally in organizational development, a “one size fits all” strategy for creating games or simulations has been the common practice. The research in Chapter Four shows that this traditional strategy has the effect of making the participants feel as though it is a game and not something that directly equates to their lives. Therefore, the foundation of the LeadSimm prototype is to create a scenario that is as authentic as possible for the participants.

The LeadSimm Prototype

The LeadSimm prototype simulation is composed of two parts, scenario development and simulation facilitation. In their work Keys & Fulmer (1996) assert that cases and games in combination are more effective than cases and games alone (p. 37). To that end, the LeadSimm simulations are both a case and a game together. Using their work as a jumping off point, I considered it necessary to prepare the participants for simulation play by involving them in other exercises that would specifically prepare them for the simulation. Exercises such as the Best/Worst Model, Saving the Titanic, the Leadership/Management Word Challenge, the Creation of Mutual Purpose, narrative storytelling and lectures were used to prepare the participants to confront their traditional notions of leadership while at the same time “tilling” their minds to engage in a collaborative leadership dynamic.

Scenario Development. Scenario development is a complex process which can be likened to detective work and screenplay production all in one. After each sponsor agreed to provide the people and the site, I began to work on the scenario. “Simulator’s license” is a term used to explain the fictitious names and places used throughout the scenario. Historic fiction based on or paralleling real events is done in an effort to avoid the myopic factual perspective of many people, i.e., the ability of some to become mired in the minutia of a particular event or circumstance like the number of actual police officers in a particular department or the number of satellite offices in a particular region for a company. These details are not absolutely crucial to the actions that take place during

simulation play. Instead, the participants are provided a scenario which accurately highlights the general overview issues and presents a medium level of detail about the scenario issues. There are times when a greater level of detail is desired, and those occasions are either specifically planned or facilitated on-the-fly.

Scenario development is not a precise science. It is often difficult to predict what the various stakeholder groups will do during simulation play. It is one of the reasons facilitation is so intricate to the scenario working and this will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter. The scenario development process has three distinct parts: (1) interviews, (2) library and Internet research, and (3) writing.

Interviews are a critical step in creating a realistic and viable scenario. Interviews help the simulation developer to investigate and evaluate the current situation and anticipated future of a particular organization, including the political, cultural and procedural processes and habitual practices. This investigation is required in order to make the scenarios as true-to-life as possible for the participating organization. Learning and participation can occur if decision makers are courageous enough to reveal the intricacies of the complex environment in which they live.

For each scenario any number of interviews can be done. While one interview is sufficient, the fidelity of the scenario can be enhanced by using multiple perspectives. I ask questions that relate to the current problems and anticipated issues that the managers in the organization envision. The answers

provide the baseline foundation from which the scenario is developed. The interviews usually provide the basic action interplay that becomes the central point about which the varying stakeholders are engaged.

Library and Internet research are also important parts of developing a LeadSimm scenario. In Chapter One I stated that leadership is not done in a vacuum and that leadership is always practiced in some context. Much of the flavor for the intricacies of the industry or environment within which each organization must work is discovered during this process. Researching industry facts and figures, political implications, the changing dynamics throughout the industry provide knowledge which helps the scenario writer make the scenario rich in its content and flavor.

During the scenario-writing process the scenario writer attempts to integrate the interviews and research into an episodic presentation. Scenario writing is a complex blend of using the facts gathered from the interviews and research and adding some imagination to create a story line that centers around realism and believability as the linchpins of the scenario itself. Realism and believability are essential to the drama created in the scenario and these are directly related to the level of immersion by the participants. The more realistic, the more immersed the participants become in the scenario. They suspend their belief that the scenario is just a game and is not relevant, and view the scenario as really real. Scenario editing follows the scenario writing phase.

Facilitation of the Simulation. Facilitating the simulation is accomplished in the following manner. First, a scenario sheet is distributed which contains the

necessary general background information about the organization so that participants understand the organization, as well as the problems and issues at stake. Second, the participating members are separated into four or five groups of approximately five members each. For example, one group could be playing the president of the organization and his or her closest advisers. Each group performs a function within the organization or as part of an external group which is affected by the organization's decision. Another group could be participating as the manufacturing or marketing group, or as the employees' union council. The group functions are determined by the scenario and what issues or problems are being investigated.

A LeadSimm simulation is facilitated in two modes, online and offline. These modes are necessary to this particular method of simulation play and allow for the engagement of the issues by the participants in one mode or the other.

During the online mode of play, participants are asked to assume varying roles at each stakeholder table. They have the opportunity to select individual roles at their own discretion. The key to this type of role playing is to give the participants the opportunity to step outside of their normal duties and tasks and to walk in the "moccasins" of other people. The essential element of their participation during the online play is to be themselves, i.e., do not act out an alter ego but instead do what you, the participant, would normally do if faced with the same issues. All that is asked is that the person represent his/her true feelings while playing the person in whatever position is called for in the

simulations. This provides the impetus to become, as Caine & Caine (1994) describe as being “emotionally and psychologically” immersed into forming the leadership dynamic. This is essential to learning and to potentially shifting one’s mental or cultural model. Heifetz (1994) uses the metaphor of a dance floor and a balcony to describe the difference between engaging in a leadership dynamic and stepping back to observe or to reflect on one’s purpose and progress. The online mode represents participants engaged on the dance floor.

The facilitator calls for an offline mode of play following the completion of an episode. Offline modes of play are reflective of the move to the balcony whereby participants have the opportunity to become introspective about their role in the leadership dynamic. During the offline time the facilitator brings the participants in contact with the underlying assumptions of their actions while they were on the dance floor. This is where double-loop learning occurs.

The LeadSimm simulations use a series of episodes whereby the actions of the participants are explored through a series of compounding events representing different circumstances in relation to time. A simulation usually includes three episodes of events to which the participants must respond. Each subsequent episode can either serve to compound the previous set of circumstances or provide an opportunity to build a collaborative leadership dynamic in order to solve the complex problems at hand. As participants make decisions, the extrapolated effect of those decisions is fed back into the simulation process so that the participants are given an opportunity to confront a new set of circumstances. Engaging participants in this sort of a simulation

experience drives to the heart of what Gredler referred to when she wrote “simulations involve the experience of functioning in a bona-fide environment and encountering the consequence of one’s actions as one makes decisions in that role” (Gredler, 1992, p. 14). In addition to creating an authentic simulation, the use of episodes is unique to this type of simulation methodology.

Facilitator’s Responsibilities. The facilitator orchestrates the series of episodes in various ways so as to reveal the basic processes used by the participants to make decisions. At certain times, the facilitator stops the actions and allows the participants to reflect on the decisions they made. The how, what, where and why of particular decisions are examined for their effects on the organization and the other groups. Since these simulations are fully interactive, once a decision is made the facilitator provides feedback or evokes an evaluation of the decision from the participants during the offline mode of play. These feedback sessions introduce a new set of circumstances which the participants will have to address during the next episode. This process allows the facilitator to introduce questions dealing with political and cultural issues that abound in every organization. The participants are faced with organizational happenings that are as real as possible in a simulation so that they are, in fact, dealing with organizational issues on many levels and through many frames.

As a facilitator of LeadSimm simulations, it is my responsibility to effectively move the participants from one phase of the seminar to the next. One of the facilitation methods I use is to ask carefully crafted questions. I found the Socratic method evokes from the participants responses that not only provide the

greatest participation but cause them to reflect critically on the issues and challenges at hand. In effect, these reflective exercises makes the experiential exercises meaningful. While the participants have the beginning scenario of the simulation on a sheet of paper, the facilitator reads the episodic events to the participants. The reasoning for this is twofold. First, the participants have to pay close attention to the reading of the episodes. Failure to do so could mean that the intent of what is being read will be misunderstood. These misunderstandings occur many times as a natural phenomenon of the complexities associated with the sender-receiver communication dynamic. The second reason is that reading the scenario aloud provides the facilitator the opportunity to use different voice inflections and tones to heighten the drama of the scenario. Storytelling, an essential element of the scenario, works best when the audible content is added. As the facilitator introduces new issues or “twists” in the simulation play, participants have the opportunity to demonstrate consistency of purpose as the solutions formulated at each point are compared to their stated mission, vision and goals.

Simulation Analysis. The postscenario analysis and dialogue are vital learning processes that reinforce the actions or results of the game. The simulation analysis becomes a wrap-up of the issues and activities taken by participants because the offline mode of play affords the participants an on-the-spot opportunity to assess and reflect on the actions they take. During simulation analysis, participants have an opportunity to see the big picture in terms of the entire simulation.

Part One: Research Design and the Two Simulations

Overview of Research Design

The purpose of this research is to determine how effective the LeadSimm simulation prototype is by using the prototype to conduct two simulations in two different organizations. As a result, there are two parts to the design of this research. Part one deals with scenario design and facilitation of the two simulations using the LeadSimm prototype. Part two concerns the evaluation of what the participants learned and changes they implemented during the simulations and in their professional lives as a result of playing the simulations. This evaluation allows for an assessment as to the worth of this type of interactive narrative learning simulation system. Explanation of both parts follow.

Gaining entry into the two organizations proved to be a longer-than-anticipated process. I entered into negotiations with six organizations that responded to an Internet list service message that I put on two networks—the Organizational Development Network and the Learning Organization Network. The Economic Development Institute of the World Bank responded to the list service note on the Learning Organization Network.

The simulation for the San Jose Police Department resulted from an impromptu call by a lieutenant who had participated in the first LeadSimm demonstration for POST Class 24. Following several months of discussion, I conducted a three day seminar which included a LeadSimm simulation in December 1997 for the San Jose Police Department.

The simulation for the Economic Development Institute (EDI) resulted from an Internet announcement. A learning specialist from the World Bank contacted me and put me in touch with one of EDI's division managers. After some negotiations, I conducted a two-day seminar which included a LeadSimm simulation in June 1998 for the New Programs and Outreach Division of the Economic Development Institute.

San Jose Police Department

Following the agreement to give the seminar for the San Jose Police Department, I worked with one police captain who provided the data needed to create the basic scenario. He gave me several general documents which contained information pertaining to the city, its administration and the police department. I had two telephone interviews with him during which I explored the current and anticipated issues and challenges facing the department now and in the next two years. After the interviews and review of the written documents, I wrote the basic scenario including three episodes. The scenario package was sent to the police captain. I contacted him by telephone and he suggested several minor changes in the scenario. We discussed the anticipated actions that the participants might take. After the telephone conversation, I revised the scenario, and sent a final copy to him for his review. He approved it, and I used the scenario during the simulation for the San Jose Police Department.

Twenty-six participants took part in the seminar out of a possible 1550 employees. They were selected by the police captain who provided the data for the scenario development phase. The group included captains, lieutenants,

sergeants, patrol officers and members of the Bureau of Technical Services (BTS). BTS includes civilian members of the police agency such as administrative personnel and dispatchers. The participants ranged from 27 to 50 years of age and the group was split 50/50 in terms of gender. Ethnicities included White, African-American, Vietnamese American and Hispanic American. From this group I conducted nine interviews which represented the widest selection of age, rank, gender and ethnicity possible. I conducted the interviews approximately eleven months after the simulation play.

During the proposal phase of this study, I had anticipated that the interviews would be conducted approximately two to three weeks following simulation play. Personal circumstances forced me to delay the interview process for some time. However, I began to consider that delaying the interviews might provide more valuable research information in terms of the ability of the LeadSimm prototype to facilitate lasting change. Additionally, I would be in a better position to evaluate the simulation experiences and whether or not they helped the participants extract and transfer the lessons learned and apply them to their work experiences. In essence, I needed to give them time to make that transference. Since I had mapped out this strategy for the first simulation, I continued it for the second simulation.

The simulation set-up for the San Jose seminar included five major stakeholder tables: (1) the news media, (2) police authorities, (3) community leaders, (4) business leaders, and (5) city hall officials including the mayor.

Additionally, there was one individual who represented the police officers association.

Economic Development Institute

I completed the EDI scenario development in much the same way as the San Jose Police Department scenario. After some discussions with the learning specialist from the World Bank, I entered into a contract with the Director of the Outreach Programs of the Economic Development Institute. He provided a substantial amount of information in written form which gave me valuable background information. I also performed an Internet search using EBSCO host hook-up at the University of San Diego. EBSCO provides an online search capability for over one thousand different magazines. During two hours of searching, I downloaded several documents that outlined several historical reference points for the issues and challenges facing EDI. Along with the written information I conducted an interview in which I endeavored to understand the current and future challenges facing EDI. I wrote the basic scenario with three episodes. Once completed, I submitted it to the Director of the Outreach Programs for his review and comments. He requested minor changes which I made in the scenario package, and this document was used as the scenario during the simulation.

EDI's stated mission is to provide training and other learning activities that support the World Bank's mission to reduce poverty and improve living standards in the developing world. EDI's programs help build the capacity of World Bank

borrowers, staff, and other partners in the skills and knowledge that are critical to economic and social development.

In recent years EDI has moved to the forefront of the activities of the World Bank as the bank has sought to change its image from a strictly lending institution to an information resource bank where knowledge is its major resource and export. The New Programs and Outreach Division Director had recently taken over this job and he wanted an experiential leadership development opportunity in order to get to know his new work colleagues. The learning specialist that I had made contact with, as a result of my list service message, recommended me.

Twenty-eight EDI employees participated in the seminar and comprised the New Programs and Outreach division. The participants were from the United States, Great Britain, India, China, Spain, and France. They ranged in age from 25 to 52 and the gender split was 60 percent female and 40 percent male. Educational credentials ranged from Ph. D. to other graduate degrees. From this population nine interviews were conducted approximately six months following simulation play.

For the Economic Development Group of the World Bank the following stakeholder groups were used: (1) media, (2) Board of Directors of the World Bank, (3) Economic Development Institute's senior management, (4) non-governmental organizations, and (5) representatives of member nations of the World Bank. The members of each stakeholder group were selected with an objective of making each group as gender and ethnically diverse as possible.

Part Two: Evaluation of the Simulations

General Evaluation Structure

The structure of the evaluation process was designed to assess the two simulations by observing and interviewing the participants. The facilitator made observations during simulation play and conducted interviews eleven months after the simulation for the San Jose Police Department and six months following the simulation for the Economic Development Group of the World Bank. I interviewed 18 people out of 54 participants. Each person was interviewed only once with additional follow-up conversations as required. I chose to allow several months to pass before conducting the interviews because I wanted to study whether or not the simulations had a lasting effect on the participants. Additionally, I wanted to determine if any quantifiable or qualifiable improvements in the organization could be noted.

Using Qualitative Research Methods in This Research

Leadership is an action-oriented collective experience. It is not imagined nor does it live in contemplation. It lives in action, specifically the actions of people who together are engaged in mutual purpose and who share a vision that focuses their energies on making transforming change. The effects of their actions can be felt, but perhaps not measured. How does one measure human desire for betterment and the corresponding will to be part of that change? It has certainly been a daunting task, especially when the research has tried to quantify the effect of leadership training to make people great leaders. In that regard, it seems that almost all of the efforts to measure the worth of leadership has met

with a paradoxical inability to quantify the effects. As discussed in Chapter Two, Blanchard et al. (1993) seem to have discovered this after 25 years of trying to measure the worth of situational leadership. Their findings simply are inconclusive (p. 34).

Yet if we ask people to give us examples of leadership and people who are good leaders, we are not surprised when almost instantly they recall several examples of people or stories throughout their lives that serve as shining examples. They are able to do this because their leadership experiences live in their minds, in their experiences and in the stories of their life's journeys. As a result this researcher chose to use qualitative methods to examine the effects of an interpersonal simulation designed to cause a shift from using more traditional leadership actions to a more open collaborative leadership process.

The qualitative interviews employed was developed using the list of questions in Appendix A. The questions used were meant to look at the experience of the participants through several different lenses. Those lenses represented learning, making change, personal strengths and weaknesses noted, quality of facilitation, quality of the simulation experience and realism. Some of the questions were deliberately redundant. The reason is that participant recollections of their simulation experience improved after a few minutes of answering questions. I wanted to return to several questions asked earlier in the interview hoping the participants memory might be jogged. The analysis of the observed and interview data is detailed below.

Reporting and Analyzing the Research Data

The focus of this research design is to assess the ability of the simulations to develop or reinforce collaborative leadership practices among the simulation participants. In accordance with the research design, I collected data by making observations and taking notes during scenario play and by interviewing some of the participants of each simulation. The issue then became: How would I choose to analyze and present the data to demonstrate the ability of the simulations to reinforce and develop collaborative leadership practices. Using basic qualitative methodologies to assess the simulations, I chose to divide the data presentation and analysis into two sections. Each section will be devoted to a first-, second-, and a third-cut analyses of the research data for one of the simulations.

First-Cut Analysis. The first-cut analysis provides the reader with a narrative description of the scenario as written. It also includes the continuing episodes of the scenario to demonstrate the compounding quality of the simulation method. The first-cut analysis is presented in an action-oriented format in an effort to put the reader into the scenario itself. The objective is to provide a flow of action and happenings as the participants worked to solve problems, deal with events presented to them by third parties, and resolve the major issues that are part of the simulation.

Second-Cut Analysis. The second-cut analysis centers on the data as recorded through notes made by the facilitator and the interview transcripts. I used color pens to identify data in the notes and interview transcripts and codify categories which were essential to evaluating the worth of the simulations. I paid

special attention to the long-term or lasting effects the simulations had on the participants. Then I transferred all of the items that related to one theme into a consolidated file on my computer. I ended up with five such files. I used these data to write an analysis of each simulation.

Third-Cut Analysis. Using the first- and second-cut analyses, overall conclusions and impressions of how each simulation achieved the stated purpose are presented at the end of the written analysis. These conclusions form the answers to the research questions posed in Chapter One. At the end of the analysis, the researcher discusses the pros and cons of using the LeadSimm prototype to conduct simulations in organizations for the purpose of providing its members the opportunity to understand, reinforce, accept and develop, and engage in collaborative leadership beliefs and practices.

Limitations

The study was conducted using two separate groups who played separate simulations. While the experiences drawn by the participants from these simulations and the conclusions drawn by the researcher are germane to these simulations, they are not generalizable to the population at large.

Since a qualitative evaluation methodology was used to assess the worth of the simulation exercises, these findings are not generalizable to the worker population at large.

Protection of Human Subjects

In accordance with guidelines of USD's Protection of Human Subjects Committee, all participants were volunteers and were fully aware of the purpose

of the scenario and the method of play to be used during the seminars.

Secondly, the participants were asked to sign a consent form before the interviews were conducted. If any of the participants felt that they did not want to be involved in the interview process, they were not interviewed. Any participant who wished to terminate his or her participation at any time in the simulation or interview had that opportunity with no questions asked and no fear of information feedback which might cause reprisals from the person's superiors. Appendix B is the Committee On the Protection of Human Subjects approval form for this research.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE LEADSIMM SIMULATION AT WORK

Introduction

General Chapter Format

Chapter Four is divided into two parts. Each part contains two sections which coincide to the first two levels or cuts of data analysis for each simulation. Chapter Five will cover the third cut of the analysis. My intent is to offer the most complete and holistic picture of the simulation and its effects on the participants as observed by the researcher and as reported by them.

First Cut Analysis—The San Julian Police Department

Background to Simulation One: The Scene—The San Julian Police Department

Welcome to the City of San Julian in the State of California. San Julian has a population of over 780,000 comprised of an ethnic mix wherein 50% of the people are of Hispanic, Asian and African American heritage. San Julian has become a high technology incubator of small start-up companies. Some of these corporations have become internationally famous and responsible for creating jobs and economic wealth in the billions of dollars. Many of these companies call San Julian their home. The economic boom has, as one might imagine, caused a downtown revitalization over the last five years with an emphasis on entertainment, fine dining and nightclubs. Much of this is directed at creating a climate conducive to hosting international business clients.

San Julian has a sworn police force of around 1,150 members and 375 civilians. It is a force which has received national attention as the one of the best examples of community policing in America. Overall crime statistics are on a decline, except for violent crime which has leveled in most areas but has increased in some parts of San Julian, particularly in an area known as the Eastwood District. As expected many of the current political officials in San Julian have taken credit for the decrease in crime while downplaying the crime in the Eastwood District as an anomaly.

The San Julian Police Department has fostered many community partnerships which have resulted in very positive programs. These programs have included: truancy, curfew, adopt-a-school, gang abatements, unified landlord agreements, school emergency response protocols, auto theft task force and others. The police force has relied more and more on volunteers to provide the human resources needed to make these programs viable.

As a business center San Julian is poised for growth in the 21st century, however as with all large cities it has areas which remain a challenge to the rest of the city. As mentioned, the Eastwood District is one of these areas with high crime, deeply rooted gangs, and high turnover of tenants. While the city has worked with diligence to solve these issues, the problems associated with the Eastwood District remain consistently unchanged. Of these problems, turf warfare among the gangs has risen steadily as a problem, which has taken greater and greater resources.

San Julian is beginning to emerge out of a recession which, over the course of the last few years, has required substantial cuts in funding for citywide departments including the police department. Yet, the police department has been seemingly less affected by these cuts than other city departments. In fact, the police department has been cut the least in terms of funds allocated. This has caused hard feelings between the police department and other city agencies. In any case, the citywide efforts to solve the problems associated with the Eastwood District have been hampered because of the lack of financial resources.

San Julian is preparing for city elections in two months. The mayor and several city council members have launched campaigns to get reelected. The competition against the incumbents is expected to be very strong. Many of the new political rising stars on the San Julian scene have determined that the political incumbents are more vulnerable now than ever before. The protracted recession, lack of financial resources, and gang violence are nagging issues that have gained the attention of the public-at-large. Heated political debates have ensued, with the election only two months away, politicians are looking to gain an edge for victory.

Episode One: Gang Against Gang

Located within the city limits of San Julian is an area known as Mt. Miguel. Mt. Miguel is mostly a bedroom community with an affluent population. The houses sell from upwards of \$450,000, and Mt. Miguel is considered one of the most pleasant and safe areas in which to live. The evening shift began like any

other. Potential issues were covered at the police roll call and department memoranda were reviewed. All in all the previous two weeks were quiet and the residents of Mt . Miguel were preparing for autumn. The kids were going back to school and the perennial holiday preparations, which seem to come earlier every year, had begun. It was the second of September near 11:00 P.M. when the cool and clear evening night was shattered with a sound of a police siren. Officer Craig Roberts, a five-year police veteran, responded to a robbery in progress at the home of Sean and Joan Smith of Mt. Miguel.

When Officer Roberts arrived, he found Sean and his wife Joan badly beaten, their house ransacked and their valuables such as jewelry, TVs, a .357 magnum pistol, and a 1997 BMW 325 stolen. Officer Roberts and his backup immediately called for the paramedics. The scene upset Roberts. Sean, a software program manager, and Joan, a human resources manager, were covered with blood and in shock. Roberts knew he needed to interview them. It would not be easy but it had to be done for time was of the essence. During the on-scene preliminary investigation, Roberts questioned Sean. Sean, who was bleeding from the head and nose, told Roberts that he heard something outside his door and went to investigate. As he opened the door, he was rushed by three men whose faces were covered. They brandished guns. From what he could determine, they seemed to be some sort of gang members. The three men entered his house, told them they were going to kill him and his wife, then proceeded to beat them. Sean thought they were gang members because of their dress and the fact that they all seemed to be wearing similar colors. Sean

remembered seeing this on a TV special about two weeks before the crime. The three men took their valuables and the car. As they left the gang members seemed to be celebrating their venture and the loot they were able to get. Sean noted that they were speaking an Asian language, but he couldn't remember much more. His injuries and the state of shock were blotting out his memory.

Sean and Joan were taken to the county hospital for treatment. The neighbors in this closely knit, upscale community stood helplessly by, frightened and aghast at what had taken place. Rumors began to spread. "It was a gang, an Asian gang" said one person. "The gangs seem to be moving out of 'their hood'" said another person." "My God!," said an elderly woman who had lived in Mt. Miguel for 20 years.

Gang crime, it seems, was no longer confined to the areas that had been cordoned off in the minds of the more affluent. Gang crime had finally arrived in Mt. Miguel. For now the disturbance was over as Sean and Joan were taken away in an ambulance.

On the other side of San Julian, not more than 45 minutes later, police sirens blared again. Officer Marsha Jackson, Officer Kwan Lo and Sergeant Dave Richards responded to a call for assistance from one of the residents of the Eastwood District. The initial report indicated that shots were fired. Upon arrival, the three officers found two young boys, one about 15 and one about 17, lying on the pavement outside their homes. The officers can tell by their attire that they are members of a Hispanic gang called "Muerto." Both boys were hit by gunfire, the 15 year old was dead on the scene and the 17 year old was still alive but was

in critical condition and bleeding profusely from the abdomen. Their youth belies the violence of the event. It seems unimaginable. Sergeant Richards called for paramedic support. People were crying and screaming. The parents of the two boys were being restrained, as they knelt helplessly, their faces grimaced as if a dagger had been plunged into their hearts. Neighbors were pointing and shouting. The officers tried to bring calm to the scene. Besieged, the officers started interviewing witnesses. The residents described what appears to be a drive-by shooting. One of the residents identified the occupants of the car as probably members of an Asian Gang. The 17-year-old Hispanic youth was taken to near-by Saint Jude's Hospital. His condition was critical and recovery was uncertain. The coroner arrived and took the 15-year-old boy away.

The *San Julian Herald* reported the event on the front page. Local radio and TV announcers interrupted their regularly scheduled broadcasts to bring their viewers a special report. Not much was known about the event but the investigation continued. Needless to say, the events of September 2nd have raised a great concern on the part of the community in terms of the expanding gang violence. These events came in the wake of a newspaper survey conducted by the *San Julian Herald* not more than three weeks before, in which residents of San Julian expressed frustration over the lack of progress stemming the tide of gang violence in the Eastwood area. A news conference was scheduled for later the next day to provide an opportunity for the police to respond to questions concerning the rising gang violence.

Episode One: Participant Actions

The actions described and discussed in this part of this study were the actual observed actions of the participants who were seated at the various stakeholder tables. During this phase of the simulation a videotape was made of the news conference played out by the participants, and the only copy was provided to me for background. The camera and lights used were a suggestion of the scenario sponsor who thought it would heighten the level of realism. It did just that. It also provided a high level of detail of the events during episode one scenario play. No other episodes were videotaped and I contemplated whether or not to include such a high level of detail in describing this part of the simulation since no other episode benefited from recording the activities of the participants. I decided that it would be wise to do so because it would provide the reader with a true and full picture of the level of interplay and realism capable in this type of simulation. For the other episodes I am able to provide only an overview of the actions taken by the participants. This overview reflects the notes I took after the simulation.

The opening round of the simulation experience for the participants began with a somewhat tenuous response. For the first ten minutes some of the participants tried to decipher what exactly they should do. As the facilitator, I moved from table to table, spending a few minutes answering questions and helping them begin the process. Once this introductory phase was over, the participants participated actively in the simulation.

The police authorities remained at their table and discussed the events of episode one. They were immediately approached by the members of the press who tried to interview them about the details of the events of September 2. The police granted no interviews to them. The police were also approached by members of the community, but again no interviews were given. The police remarked that they needed more time to get the details of the events straight. The police authorities felt very pressured, so much so that after about 15 minutes of simulation play, the police authorities stood up and moved to another room. They closed and locked the door and sequestered themselves away from all the other stakeholder groups.

Several times the community, the press, and business leaders knocked on the door and requested time to discuss the events. No admittance or interviews were granted. However, the city hall officials including the mayor did gain access and remained with the police behind closed doors. In the meantime, members of the press interviewed the community, and business leaders and the Police Officers Association (POA) representative. Prior to joining the police behind closed doors, the city officials granted a short interview to the press. However, the mayor wanted to consult with the police before making any comments or commitments. The disappointment and furor over the police response to requests for interviews by the community and the area business leaders were noticeable. In fact, while the police and city officials remain sequestered away, the community and business leaders began to form a partnership because they began to look more globally at the implication of the crimes which had taken

place. The interview by the press with the POA representative contained controversial information concerning the hiring practices of the police authorities in terms of minority group representation on the police force. As we shall see this became an issue of controversy which reflected in some ways to the connection between the police and the community. For the most part, the police remained behind closed doors until simulation play for this episode ended. The second phase of the first episode of simulation play included a press conference wherein the police and other stakeholder groups would have the opportunity to give their responses and opinions to the media about the events of September 2.

Episode One: Phase Two—Press Conference

The following observations were made during a press conference given at the end of simulation play for episode one. During this phase each stakeholder group was asked if they would like to be given an opportunity to speak at the press conference.

The police public information officer (PIO) gave the opening remarks for the press conference. She was sent by the senior police authorities to brief the participants on the events of the September 2. The PIO began by reviewing the particular events as described in episode one, i.e., the robbery and the shootings later in the evening. The press began their questioning about the specific details of the events with special focus on whether or not there were witnesses, how the reports were received by the police and the implication of the robbery victims being Caucasians. The press wanted to know if these events seemed to indicate a new pattern of gang-related activities in the community. The PIO answered

that she had been sent only to brief them on the particular events of this incident and that she could not make determinations as to the patterns of gang warfare in the community. The PIO mentioned that the chief was aware of the incidence and that the investigation was ongoing. The press continued to ask questions about the patterns of behavior in gang-related activities, and they asserted that this pattern may be a new problem emerging in the communities. The press voiced the concerns of the community with whom they have had several meetings. They said: "There some real concerns in this community." The press continued to ask for more details and more specifics while at the same time expressing the concerns of the community. The PIO said she only had limited details and information regarding the incidents. This comment resulted in a foray of more questions, but she concluded the interview.

The next group before the podium was the mayor and members of the city council. They were joined by the police authorities. They were trying to show a united front. The mayor began by expressing his condolences to the victims and the families of the victims of both Mt. Miguel and Eastwood. He expressed his willingness to work with all community groups, the members of the press, business leaders, and the schools in the community in order to allay their fears and to solve the issues of crime. Taking a positive view towards the events of September; 2 the mayor expressed his view that these events may be an opportunity to mobilize and engage the community to deal with the issues of crime.

The next person to the podium was the Eastwood District's councilman. He acknowledged a high crime rate in the Eastwood District and cited the lack of employment and business opportunities as contributing factors. He talked about the discussions with the business associations and assured everyone that "we've been working on it." He also mentioned that there was just a lot of blight in the neighborhood and that many of the buildings were empty. He repeated again that the high crime rate and low employment were factors that contribute to the volatility of the Eastwood District. He said that the city council and the mayor's office have been working with the business association to provide a tax cut and to establish job programs and that they have gone out and spoken with the community groups in the area.

Next at the podium was the Chief of Police. He said that he wanted to alleviate the fears in the community. He assured them that San Julian is still one of the safest cities in the United States for its size. He asserted that the incident of September 2 was an isolated incident. He also mentioned that both crimes may be connected and that he will dedicate the resources needed to solve this particular crime.

Once he finished giving his presentation, the next person at the podium was the Assistant Chief of Police who gave more details concerning the actions that were being implemented by the police department. He stated: "According to our statistics, crime has only gone up slightly in the Eastwood area." He then related the actions that were taken by the police. A task force has been created headed by a new commander to deal specifically with this crime issue. Several

community meetings were scheduled. A Latino youth forum was just held and an Asian youth forum was planned for the immediate future.

The press immediately took the offensive. One reporter wished to know why the police were responding to the rising crime in the Eastwood District just now after this crime incident. They wanted to know why the task force was just started when the statistics in the Eastwood district have indicated a rising rate in crime for years. The assistant chief responded that the only thing the department had mobilized that day was the task force. "The other programs were in place." The assistant chief ended his presentation to the media.

The new task force commander stepped up to the podium and spoke about the goal of the task force, i.e., to apprehend the criminals of the September 2 incident. The press wanted more details, however. The task force commander resisted because as he put it, "The investigation is ongoing." The news media pressed the issue by voicing again the fears of the community. "Don't you think parents and kids have the right to know what is going on?" One newspaper journalist took the offensive. "One of the things the community has been saying is that they tried to contact you folks but you folks have been keeping things behind closed doors. I am asking you for information to help make the citizens feel safe, and you seem reluctant to want to give us any information." The task force commander responded: "In order to make the citizens feel safe, we needed to solve this crime spree. We need to solve this crime. We need to use the information we have in the police department to do this."

Another news reporter chimed in. "Why, all of a sudden now, why are you taking action now? This Asian gang problem has been going on for a number of years. Is it because a white community has been affected by the crime?" The questions from the press came fast and furious. "Is it because they live in a rich neighborhood? How many Asian officers are there on the police force?" Finally, the task force commander, at the urging of the chief stopped responding to the news media, and he began to give certain information about the specific event so as to draw attention away from the myriad of questions being asked.

The press now wanted to know how many people had been assigned to the task force. The new commander said: "35." A print news reporter asked "How many of those people are Asian?" He wondered if the hiring of Asian officers had anything to do with the rising crime in the Asian gang community. The Chief of Police returned to the podium and said: "We are addressing and have addressed the concerns of the community." Both news reporters then inquired, based on their interviews with the community members, about the lack of apparent responsiveness to the issues in the community. They specifically referred to the "closed door" policy indicated by the closed meetings of the police officers. The Chief of Police responded by inferring the meetings were being held in response to the impression that he did have a closed door policy.

The chief indicated that if any of the concerns of the young community are to be met, *he* and his staff will meet them. The chief said that he was aware of the problems in the community and continued: "We have done two independent telephone surveys of a thousand citizens in all segments the community, and

they were happy with the way the police are performing.” A news reporter responded: “I think you have a bigger problem here, We talked to the POA representative and he seems to be very unhappy with what is going on the police department. The POA has problems with the manpower and the community, and what they are seeing is the same thing. It’s a very closed-door policy and people are not part of the process.” The chief reported that the police had a meeting with the mayor and the city council, and “we’ve decided to work together.” He made no mention of talking to the other stakeholder groups.

The POA representative came to the podium next. He reported that a fund has been established to help the grieving parents of the young Hispanic gang members during this period of need. He called for an adjustment of the transfer policy as well as for changes in the hiring practices so that the police force reflected the ethnicities in the community—at-large. He spoke of a five-year plan that was created some years ago and requested that the recommendations be implemented. “We know the city has been under some financial difficulties, but it seems as though we’re coming out of this and now it is time to move forward with a new plan.” He reported the demographic disparity between what the agency has on-board in terms of people as opposed to what ethnicities exist in the community. The press questioned him. The issues centered around police training, adequate levels of police deployment in the community and the ethnic mix of uniformed officers on the force. The POA representative’s answers are almost universally negative. “There is not enough training, the deployment schedule is incorrect according to the ethnicities and type of people patrolling

different areas.” He questioned the chief’s reactionary methods. “The morale in the department is low” he said. Lack of training, lack of staffing and lack of prioritizing were issues that required paramount attention. Questioned about whether or not the POA would endorse the mayor for reelection, his reply was an emphatic “No.”

The reverend minister of the Mt. Miguel church was the next to speak. He expressed his condolences for the families of those involved in the incidents. He spoke about a meeting that he scheduled two weeks ago to which he invited the district’s city councilman, the police watch commander, and the Chief of Police to attend. He sent out pamphlets to announce the meeting and neither the councilman nor the police representatives attended. “We have some valid concerns about the increasing crime in Mt. Miguel.” Later, he had an opportunity to meet with two representatives of the police department, and they told him that his problems were more perceived than real. He answered that his perception was reality, at least his reality. He took great umbrage with the notion that the police’s view did not represent how he felt about the issues facing the Mt. Miguel community. He concluded: “The increased crime in Eastwood is evidence that the perceived problem is a very real problem.” One reporter asked: “What will the police department be doing in order to address these crime issues?” The Reverend said: “If you’re asking me whether they’re going to start something new, the answer is no. They weren’t even at the meeting. They are giving the same rhetoric. They say that they’re going to attend to the problem, but we have not seen any indications of police presence in our neighborhood.” He stated that

several members of the Asian community in Mt. Miguel who work in the shopping center in Eastwood District have been continuously harassed by the police. He related how these law-abiding citizens were searched as though they were gang members. This indicated to him that the police had become too distant from the community and were not familiar with the neighborhood citizenry. Addressing this issue, he mentioned that he was sent to see the city auditor to talk about the stops that were being made in the Eastwood district. The police said that they don't stop anybody without cause but, in fact, people in the community have been stopped. The news reporter said: "Several minutes ago, the Chief of Police was asked about the safety of the city and he claimed that it is still the safest city of its size in the country. The question specifically is: Does your community, or do your parishioners feel safe?" The Reverend answered "No! They do not care about those other cities, we live here." The questioning continued from the press: "Do you feel safe or do you feel isolated in your own community?" The Reverend answered: "Members of my community feel like they can't go into the Eastwood District without being harassed. We don't feel safe and yes we do feel isolated." Another reporter asked "How often have you met with the chief?" "When asked to attend a meeting at the church, the chief did not show up. We tried to reach out to the police department." When asked whether his dealings with the police department have been a positive experience, the answer was an emphatic no. Asked whether or not he would be willing to work with the inhabitants of the Eastwood district, the Reverend answered yes.

The next person at the podium was the representative from Outreach America. He expressed outrage over the incidents that occurred and claimed that this problem has been growing for the past 4 ½ years. He was disappointed at the way he has been treated by the police department and the city council. It seems as though he was sent off to see an information officer who promptly told him that he, the information officer, had to go to a meeting. He complained that he had gotten the run around from the city council and the mayor's office.

He said "After I spoke with the press, the members of the police department and the mayor's office said they would do something." He was very disappointed and he said he is going to urge the people in the Eastwood community not to reelect the mayor or the city council members. "If there is no change in the police department, we will call for the ouster of the Police Chief as well." He indicated that he will try to get more Eastwood community members elected onto the city council. He said: "I want to see a city council which has a commitment to the whole city and not just one segment of the city." Another member of the press asked "What are the one or two things you need from the police chief to help resolve these problems?" He responded: "I would like to see them come out there to Eastwood sit down and address the issues—whether it is more patrol officers or whatever—and act with us in a partnership. I want to know what they're going to do about the graffiti and the gang problem."

Next to the podium was the vice-chairman of a citizens group. He also stated that he was president of the Lambda Society, a gay rights group in the city of San Julian. He stated that "the actions taken by the police department prove

again to be nothing more than a public relations campaign which is too little too late. I have repeatedly asked for a response from city officials, and I have gotten none. There has been no outreach from the city government or from the police department to the gay community, and it has become apparent that the police department is insensitive to all minority groups including gays whom I represent."

He cited that 50 percent of the community members were African-American, Hispanic or Asian-American and only 38 percent of the police force were comprised of these ethnicities. He called for change. He stated that he owned a bar and restaurant downtown and that his clientele, who were mostly gay, were constantly being harassed because of their lifestyle. When questioned by one of the press as to how making the police department more representative of the ethnicities in the community and yet continuing to act in the same will bring change. He responded: "If the police department continues to behave in the same way, there will be a problem. However, if the ethnicities of the community are represented on the police department in a more equitable way, this might help them change their perspective of the community at large." Asked by one of the press if there has been any outreach by the city council or the police department, he stated: "The only outreach has been gay bashing and harassment. As minorities we're all taxpayers. We have every right to good police service and we're not getting it. We are fed up. My concern is that this is a public relations reaction."

Two homemakers from Mt. Miguel came to the podium. They expressed deep concern and fear. One homemaker said that she stays home with her

children while her husband quite frequently travels on business. She wanted to know if the police could give her assurance that her children will be safe while walking to school. She was disappointed that the city council member was not at the local community meeting following the events of September 2. The other homemaker mentioned that after seeing the press, the police came to them. She was fearful that the incident will cause a Mt. Miguel vs. Eastwood District, them against us mentality. She said "Eastwood District children are bused into Mt. Miguel, so our children go to school together with theirs. This is not the kind of community response we need."

One reporter asked: "What would you like to see happen as a result of these events?" One woman answered: "More police in our neighborhood." "Are you willing to participate with the police since you are home most of the time?" asked another reporter. "Yes" said the woman. "We can keep our eyes opened and report anything to the police using 911."

An Asian member of the Eastwood District community gave a brief interview. He described the problems in the Asian community as being a result of the publicity attributed to this particular event. "It has attracted a lot of attention." Questioned by one of the reporters as to the efficacy of the Asian Youth Forum to address any of these issues, he responded: "I don't know."

A member of the business community who is the CEO of a software company came to the podium next. He expressed his confidence that San Julian is one of the safest cities in the country and that the police department and the city council will respond to these incidents with great expediency.

The last person interviewed was the owner of several restaurants in the Eastwood District. He had intensive meetings with some members of the city council and police department and declared that "we have a game plan." The city council has arranged for tax breaks for businesses to move into the Eastwood District. He declared that "we're going to create jobs for the youth in this area." When one of the members of the press questioned him about the efficacy of using tax breaks to reduce crime, the business owner responded by saying: "We understand that we do have issues and problems." The news reporter cited the example of a person who owned a delivery company and was afraid to send his people out because he was afraid they will be robbed by Asian gang members while making deliveries. The restaurant owner said: "We understand we still have concerns, but many of these concerns have been addressed during our meeting with the police. The police have agreed to come to our businesses to conduct training sessions on how to recognize potential gang activities." The last questioner cited the fact that the \$535 million dollar redevelopment effort for the downtown area was underway and asked whether any of that money will be redirected to the Eastwood District for the redevelopment of businesses there. The restaurant owner said that: "I can't answer that as I don't know." At that point the press conference ended.

Episode One: Offline Discussions

After the various stakeholders had an opportunity to make an appearance at the press conference, the simulation was taken offline. During this time the events of episode one, the interactions observed, as well as the feelings of the

participants were discussed in an open forum. The participants spoke honestly and openly about how it felt to be representing the interests of other stakeholders. As they became more and more immersed in the issues facing groups such as the community, business leaders or members of the city council, they began to truly see and feel these issues from another perspective. This offline period lasted for approximately one hour. During this time, I as the facilitator had the opportunity to relate to their feelings and expectations regarding the events. This kind of introspective time-out provides a tilling of fertile ground where the seeds of new concepts like collaborative leadership could be planted. The participants' realized that the outcomes from their actions during scenario play were different from what they had anticipated.

The offline period began by asking the participants a simple question: "How do you feel about your role and the response you are getting from the other stakeholders?" For a few minutes the participants were silent. Then one Lieutenant responded by saying "not very good. I have learned something, that perception is reality. The police kept telling me that my perception of the problem was wrong. It isn't wrong. It is, after all, my perception." Several others chimed in and nodded in approval that from where each of them sat, the perceptions were different. The responses continued. One officer said: "It is interesting what happens when you are forced to actually become another stakeholder. I feel like the community must feel when we are sitting across from them. We really have to listen to them." For the next few minutes I refocused the discussion around building value based relationships. This included a discussion about safety and

trust which are intrinsic motivators which foster commitment from people. To employ the concepts of collaborative leadership and the learning organization, one must establish the environment wherein these concepts can flourish. From there the discussion moved to the power of symbolic representation. In other words, how important it is for the stakeholders to stand together at a press conference to provide symbolic meaning for their efforts. The first news conference saw each stakeholder group stand individually. As far as the news media or those watching the news conference were concerned, there was a clear division among the different groups, no unified spirit. However, the only way this could be achieved would be to work together to gain consensus about the issues at hand. As the discussions continued, a conversation about the nature of leadership as it pertained to community policing efforts was offered. In effect, community policing was now not being viewed as just another program but in terms of creating an environment wherein the various stakeholder groups could be brought together to effect the creation of relationships. One of the key themes or new mental models was being accepted. The theme of "leadership as a relationship" began to take hold. Following the offline period, several participants were asked to change positions and join other tables.

Episode Two: Domestic Violence

The scenario continued on Wednesday, September 10. On September 9 at 11:00 p.m., an incident occurred in the suburb known as the Cays. The Cays is a fairly upscale residential neighborhood inhabited by young high-tech engineers and managers. The average price of houses in the Cays starts at

\$285,000 and the average age of the residents is 30 years old. There are quality rentals in the area as well.

The incident occurred when a resident, Joan Davis, ran from her home into the street screaming and calling for help. The police were immediately summoned to the scene, and Officers Chuck Adams and Karen Sector arrived within five minutes. They found Joan Davis standing in the street with some neighbors huddling around her. She had several bruises on her face and was bleeding from her nose. Joan explained that she had been beaten by her husband, Sam. They had been married for three years according to Joan. Sam had been having some difficulties at work and the previous night he came home very late, drunk or high on something.

Just then Sam Davis emerged from their house looking for his wife. As the two officers approached him, Sam Davis lunged forward wildly at Officer Adams. After a few minutes Officers Adams and Sector were able to subdue him by wrestling him to the ground and cuffing him. Other units arrived, providing backup, and Sam Davis was taken to the district police station. Sam Davis showed signs of being high on drugs, probably methamphetamines.

Unknown to both Officers Adams and Sector was that across the street in the shadows of a large oak tree stood Robert Blake, another resident of the Cays. It seems that Blake videotaped the entire incident. Blake took his videotape inside his home and called the local TV news station (KRUD) and told them about the incident. Blake agreed to turn the tape over to the his local city council member, but not to the police. The manager at KRUD-TV persuaded

Blake to allow him to make a copy of the tape before he turned it over to the city council member.

On Thursday morning, September 11, the *San Julian Herald* reported that San Julian Chief of Police had been tapped by federal authorities to serve as the next chairperson of the COPS program in Washington, DC. The Community Oriented Policing Program was very influential within the beltway, and it had a large budget as well as many staff members. Thus this was a very prestigious office and it was a chance for the chief to impact the implementation of the Community Oriented Policing Program nationwide. The article went on to state that the preliminary but unconfirmed indications were that the Chief had, in fact, decided to take the job and will be assuming the position in four to eight weeks.

The culmination of the newspaper story, the rising tide of gang violence, the domestic violence incident and the projected loss of the Chief of Police to Washington triggered a substantial lack of confidence among community and church leaders in the focus and intent of the San Julian Police Department needed to do its job.

At the same time the POA, the police administrators and the San Julian City Council were negotiating for substantial pay increases for all uniformed and civilian workers of the San Julian Police Department.

The community was outraged and a march to protest the lack of confidence in the police and city council members was scheduled for Thursday September 25. Community leaders called local news stations with this press

release, and an impromptu news conference was scheduled at 3:00 p.m. on the steps of the City Hall.

Episode Two: Meetings and a Second News Conference

The participants were given one hour to work through the domestic violence issues compounded by the loss of the Chief of Police to serve as chairperson of the COPS program in Washington, DC. At the conclusion of those interactions, another press conference was conducted during which the news media were told to center their questions on the citizens march scheduled for the following week. Unlike the first episode, no video tape was made for episodes two and three so a less detailed overview of the activities of the participants is given herein.

The beginning of episode two demonstrated a dramatic shift in the attitudes and actions of the varying stakeholders. A sense of urgency pervaded the room as members of the varying stakeholder groups huddled among themselves for a few minutes, then began to request and obtain meetings with other stakeholder groups.

As expected, the most noticeable of these changed behaviors was the more open attitudes the police authorities demonstrated. They no longer sequestered themselves in a closed room. Several members of the police group moved to various tables in an effort to create an open dialogue with other groups. The police brought the city council and the business people together at the community table. There they sat and intently listened to the feelings of the community. Still angered by the events of episode one, many of the community

members were hesitant and suspicious of the police officials' intent to really work with them to avoid the march. But the police officials sat at the table together with the city, community and business representatives listening, talking and trying to give the sense that they were in this together. Members of the press were granted several side interviews, and even attended part of the community meeting. The difference was simply dramatic. After an intense hour of negotiations and working through the issues one-by-one, the second news conference began. The difference between the news conference held at the end of episode one and the news conference at the end of episode two was extraordinary. One noticeable difference was that police officials, members of the city council, business leaders and community representatives stood at the podium together.

The minister of the Mt. Miguel Church stepped forward and spoke about the meetings. He was joined by the police authorities, members of the city council including the mayor, and members of the business community. The first news journalist opened the questioning by asking about the march scheduled next week. The minister answered by telling the news media that an intensive set of meetings had been held with the police, members of the city council, and business leaders. The change in the minister's attitude was evident. He spoke about assurances from the police that these matters would be investigated. When one reporter asked if he had faith that what the police promised would in fact occur, he responded, "Yes." After a series of intensive meetings he was relieved and confident that the police would solve the crime issues associated

with the gang problems as well as those associated with domestic violence. Much to my surprise the issues and challenges noted during simulation play for episode one had all but disappeared. Members of the news media pressed the group with questions from several different perspectives. Each time the minister answered the questions by describing the conversations they had had with the police or the mayor's office. He and the other people at the podium were confident that the problems would be solved. Several times during the news conference, the police officials or administration, city council members or the mayor would step to the podium and present a coherent and unified message. There were specific examples of collaborative efforts given by the speakers. These efforts would give all the stakeholders the opportunity to work together. For example, the minister had announced that the members of his congregation had volunteered to work in the Eastwood District to paint out the graffiti and perform repairs on the Eastwood District church.

During the next part of the press conference the media representatives interviewed the POA representative. The attitude displayed by the POA representative had also changed dramatically. When the members of the news media questioned him, he responded by stating that the situation in San Julian had changed significantly. He had been in contact with the police authorities and people at City Hall, and they were working to change the demographics of the police department. He appeared very satisfied with the responses and the apparent openness of the police authorities to engage in problem-solving activities regarding the issue of increasing the number of nonwhite police officers.

This news conference lasted only about twenty to twenty-five minutes. It was over quickly, the news media participants finding that a great deal of agreement occurred among the other participants.

The offline period for the end of the second episode was marked by what I would term a sense of deep understanding and accomplishment. The efforts of the participants as they represented their different stakeholder groups were more collaborative and more effective. Stung by the community comments during the first episode, the police officers were not anxious to go through another occasion in which their individualistic actions resulted in a polarization of themselves from the other groups. Instead, the police officials reached out to the different groups. The dialogue during this offline segment centered around the genuineness of the communications of the police and city hall officials. The way this simulation had evolved from the play of the participants provided an ability to clearly contrast the actions of the participants during episodes one and two. It was an easy matter to cite the differences and to discuss the reactions. For example, one issue that was discussed was the perception of the police and City Hall officials as they entered the episode two negotiation with the community. How damaged were their reputations and the level of trust as a result of their tactics used during episode one? In other words, was it possible for them to repair the damage and move beyond the events of episode one to a new level of cooperation and understanding? The answer to these questions, as noted during the second press conference, was yes. As facilitator, I was curious whether or not moving people from one table of stakeholders to another also affected the dynamic. I

believe it did. The community and business leaders negotiated with different people although the senior officials, the mayor and the Chief of Police, remained the same. These new faces changed the mix of personalities and this seemed to have an effect. But it just wasn't the change in faces that affected the negotiations but the very approach the participants used in engaging the other stakeholders. There was a noticeable sense of humility among the participants. The meetings held had a pervasive atmosphere wherein the elements of understanding and reaching out were clearly in focus. It was this change in the nature of the dealings of the people together which, in fact, brought them together. The participants acted calmly, directly, and took great pains to explain their positions. They also listened intently to the other participants, empathizing with their issues and feelings as well. They were using influence and persuasion in reaching a position of consensus about the march on City Hall. Their ability to create the right environment and work together avoided the need for the march. As community leaders they had, for the first time, been heard. After a few more minutes of discussions, episode three was presented.

Episode Three: Time for Collaborative Leadership

The facilitator read the third episode of the scenario. The time moved forward to November 21, some two weeks after the elections held in San Julian. The elections resulted in changes in the officials who held elected office. A new mayor was elected as well as five of the seven members of the city council.

The new mayor had won the election by a slim margin. She had been trailing in the polls until September when the gang and domestic violence issues

came to the attention of the public. At that point, the mayoral candidate revised her campaign strategies to include these issues. This new strategy, and her promise of making all communities of San Julian safe again, was the turning point of her campaign.

The new mayor realized that this promise was an important commitment, and now wanted to fulfill the promise made during the campaign. The mayor has been attending several workshops on an idea called collaborative leadership and found many of the concepts attractive. In an effort to put these ideas into practice, the mayor called the first meeting of various representatives to bring together the diverse stakeholders affected by these issues into a collaborative effort to begin a new era in community-oriented policing and community redevelopment.

Episode Three: Meeting of the Stakeholders

At the conclusion of the news conference in episode two, some participants were asked to switch tables and assume different roles. For the purposes of the simulation, all other stakeholders except the mayor and the city council were asked to leave the room, so that the arrival of the various stakeholder members could be staged. Part of this episode was designed to create the proper atmosphere in which a meeting of this nature could take place. After this was completed, the third episode began. This episode required no press conference but was created to give the participants an introduction to collaborative leadership and an instance within which they might practice it. This type of episode is a standard part of the LeadSimm simulation and was added to

the simulation in order to provide the participants with this specific opportunity because in many instances the shift in perspective might not have occurred, as it did in this simulation, prior to and during the simulation play of episode two.

Episodes one and two for this simulation were designed to put the participants into a context where doing collaborative leadership is difficult to do. The reason was to demonstrate to them that merely providing direction and control was not leadership, it was simply direction and control. This paradigm of leadership represents the industrial perspective of leadership because it is portrayed as the ability of one person to exhibit strength, control and direction. In contrast, collaborative leadership is founded on the concept of leadership as transforming change. Transforming a context in this simulation required the support of a significant number of people who desired to make the change together. People needed to act proactively to use collaborative leadership to bring about that change. In that regard, the simulation made it abundantly clear that doing collaborative leadership required a proactive approach to the creation of a value-based environment and to healthy relationships. Relationships are not usually built in an instant, they are time dependent. Creating an environment where information is shared openly emerges out of the relationship-building process because safety and trust become the watch words of the leadership dynamic. In that way, the underlying assumptions of the industrial model, i.e., lack of trust and fear were replaced with a mental model of collaborative leadership. Within the context of the simulation experience itself, safety and trust were modeled by the facilitator and the participants in order to create the

simulation dynamic. Consequently, the third episode afforded the participants the opportunity to not only try a new model of leadership as they went about their activities in the simulation but to experience it because the very nature of episode three of the simulation methodology demanded it. In so doing, this episode was particularly consistent with Senge's conception of a microworld as a microcosm of reality where it was safe to play.

During the break between episode two and episode three, I was approached by a member of the Bureau of Technical Services. This person quietly told me of a concern they had about the culture of the police department. This person said: "In our department the culture divides the uniformed police officers from the rest of us. We are not made to feel like we are truly part of the police department. This disappoints me. Even though I do not wear a uniform I am working for the same organization with the same goals in mind." This person alluded to the fact that collaboration inside the police department would be hindered because of this unspoken rule. This emergent issue provided me with an interesting opportunity to use the simulation to challenge this notion of cultural separation. Accordingly, I decided to appoint a new mayor for episode three and chose this person from the Bureau of Technical Services. I hoped to demonstrate to all the participants the validity and viability of the notion that leadership as a relationship could be practiced by anyone who chose to do so. Collaborative leadership is not about the position that one holds but the willingness to become engaged in the dynamic of transforming change.

The new mayor, a woman and a member of the Bureau of Technical Services, took the initiative to set up the meetings and invite all interested parties to explore the feelings and thoughts of the various constituencies of the city. The mayor met each participant at the door and thanked him or her for coming to the meeting. She asked them to sit down in a place whereby they were forced to break up their group and sit with members of other stakeholder groups. This is an important aspect of meeting dynamics which provides an almost natural obstruction to group polarization. Once seated the mayor opened the meeting with an address to all those in attendance. She spoke both rationally and symbolically of the good of the community-at-large and invited opinions and ideas from the people gathered there. Several questions came from the audience. The questions came from members of the community who wanted to know how she intended to make good on her campaign promises to address the issues of gang violence in the community. She responded by saying that it would be something that the interested parties would be invited to discuss. Her job was to create an environment whereby the various stakeholders could come together to discuss different options and seek solutions together. She said: "My job is to provide a place where we can seek solutions together. These are not a police problem or a community problem, these are our problems and we need to work together to come up with the solutions." The reaction to the mayor's statement was positive. The attendees began by listing issues and problems which they felt severely impacted safety and the level of cooperation between the community and police officials. This part of the simulation was designed to give the

attendees the opportunity to experience the beginnings of and create the structure for a collaborative leadership environment. Once this was done and the information flow became unhindered the simulation was stopped. The simulation had achieved what it had been designed to do.

It is worthy to note that the next day following the simulation, many of the uniformed officers came and spoke with me privately about the mayor's actions and conduct during episode three. She was lauded for her work and many of the commentators expressed surprise that a person from BTS could be so extremely capable and competent in doing leadership. For this researcher, these statements were powerful commentaries on the "magic potions" of leadership offered by most of the industrial models. The mayor did not possess some trait or level of greatness nor did she estimate the level of maturity of each of the participants. She offered a safe place, where trust was extolled as the binding force for others to come together to create change in the community.

However, after the simulation ended another event emerged from the results of simulation play. During the break at the end of episode three, I was approached by one of the uniformed executives who participated in the simulation. He inquired whether or not we could continue the facilitative format the simulation had used to address real issues of the San Jose Police Department. He said: "Can we keep this going for a bit? I want to see if we can bring home the lessons learned during the simulation." I remarked that we could ask each table to provide one thing they wished they could change in the San Jose Police Department. I asked him if he would like to facilitate this piece of the

seminar. I thought the timing was very opportune because it underscored the message that collaborative leadership can be practiced by anyone who chooses to do so. When the participants returned from the break, I introduced his concept to the rest of the participants and sat down in the back of the room. He took charge and stepped to the front of the room where he explained how important it would be if they could use the process they had just experienced to build a list of issues which required attention. When asked what he intended to do with the list, he said he would type up the list and submit it to the senior officer who was the simulation's sponsor. The participants seemed satisfied with that idea. They were given 35 minutes for each group seated at a table to generate one item which the group would like addressed by the senior managers. After the allotted time frame, the suggestions were made and discussed in an open collaborative format. The items are not discussed in this study. However, the manner in which the items were brought forward modeled collaborative leadership. There was general agreement that all the items included on the list were valid. The actual meeting lasted about forty-five minutes, after which a discussion about the entire simulation process ensued.

Second-Cut Analysis—The San Julian Police Department

As mentioned in Chapter Three, 26 participants took part in the seminar. They included captains, lieutenants, sergeants, patrol officers and members of the Bureau of Technical Services (BTS). BTS includes civilian members of the police agency such as administrative personnel and dispatchers. The participants ranged from 27 to 50 years of age and the group was split 50/50 in

terms of gender. Ethnicities included White, African-American, Vietnamese American and Hispanic American. From this group I conducted nine interviews which represented the widest selection of age, rank, gender and ethnicity possible. I conducted the interviews approximately eleven months after the simulation was played.

The categories discussed in this section were based on the research questions delineated in Chapter One. For this section pseudonyms are used to replace the names of the actual interviewees and to distinguish the individual comments.

Participant Learning

The first area which was discussed dealt with learning. In effect, I was looking for comments from the participants about what they learned. For the simulation, the responses to the questions concerning learning varied. Participants commented on concepts including collaborative leadership, role reversal, the efficacy of listening and the importance of building relationships. Comments which directly related to collaborative leadership are reserved for another section.

Representing other stakeholders. One of the most valuable factors which emerged from the analysis was the level of appreciation the participants expressed in representing stakeholder groups which were different from their traditional police roles. For many this seemed to provide a powerful learning experience. They were afforded an opportunity, as the old adage goes, to “walk in another’s moccasins.”

Paul noted the effect of this reversal of roles.

I have never been to something like this that made me come out of there saying, “gosh, almighty, I never realized that.” I thought it was very well put together. The thing with role reversal and putting yourself in the position of the citizen, even for just a brief period of time, was that, I actually felt like I was one of the citizens there and I was being put off. I was getting the same old rhetoric and none of my questions were being answered. None of the things that I needed were getting done, and I felt like those citizens probably felt.

Helen too noted that this was a very valuable learning experience in terms of seeing a context from another perspective

People can explain to you, “Okay, this is the pressure of the city council person. This is the pressure that a police chief has. This is the pressure that a reporter has. Here are community members and all of that.” Obviously, doing this as long as I've done it in police work, you see all of that at one point or another in your career but you never really see it except from the angle of a police officer, from what I'm doing. But if you get into a simulation and all of a sudden you're given a task and then somebody tells you, “Okay, you're the council person.” And If you really do what you think the group you were working with really did in real life, if you get into it, then all of a sudden you do sort of—as much as you can from your own perception—you can actually become that entity and start feeling what a city councilman might feel in that situation, or a reporter

trying to get a story. And that's what it did for me because I don't think I ever really understood anything beyond necessarily how I would perceive it as a police officer. So I found it kind of interesting from that perspective.

Perception is reality. Paul learned one of the most important lessons about diversity of interests and about an individual's perceptions.

One of the things I learned was that perceived problems are very real. If I perceive that the city and the police department are not doing anything for me, then they're not doing anything for me even though the police department and the city officials believe that they're breaking their butt to do something. If I feel they're not doing anything, they're not doing anything.

Value-based negotiations. The effect of seeing the world from a different perspective provided many participants the opportunity to understand the importance of value-based negotiations and dealings with other stakeholder groups because listening and trust building are at the center of collaborative efforts. Paul put it best when he said:

But as you go to these community meetings, you start to realize what all these folks are all about and you start saying, "Wait a second! These folks are not any different than I am. They want the same things that I want. They want security, they want to make sure that they can go out at night and they're not going to get bothered. All the same things I want." So they're not any different than I am, and I'm not here to tell them

what they need. I'm here to find out what they need and see if I can fulfill that.

Olivia too echoed the need for values such as trust to be center most in the process.

I tell the people on my new teams that, to me, it is of the utmost importance that they trust me and that I can trust them. We should try to always have a relationship in which honesty is in the forefront. If they don't feel like they can trust me, then I'm not going to be getting any input.

Listening. David complemented the words of Paul and Olivia.

But when you get out of that sphere and into this other area, the new reality of our decade is that if you don't listen to me, then how could you even understand what I'm trying to say. I think that's extremely important. You have to listen to people. They have to be made to feel that at least you understood their message. You can't make an informed decision without itThey could understand how important it is that we listen to people, that we create trust and all these other things, Without that we become largely viewed as people operating singularly as opposed to having some resource of receiving information from people, people who think that what they say really does mean something, that they have some say over the outcome.

Out of the nine people interviewed eight were extremely positive while one was positive about the simulation experience. All had indicated that they had learned much. The most significant advantage of the simulation noted by the

participants was the ability to play different roles. This initiated in them a self-discovery process. The participants learned that (1) the perception of people was, in fact, their reality, (2) listening to other stakeholders is vital if people are truly going to work together, (3) trust is a vital factor if open collaboration is to be achieved, and (4) the people served by the police department value the same things as the officers themselves.

Shift in the Participants Mental Model of Leadership

Much of the discussions and work done in the previous chapters has pointed towards using simulations to cause a personal metanoia or mind shift about leadership. This particular issue represents the central focus of this study, i.e., can simulations be used to create a lasting impression about leadership models in individuals. Comments about personal metanoia follows.

Authoritarian leadership is outdated. Kevin made the most global of statements as to his thoughts about leadership.

It kind of opens your eyes and it really showed that you can't do anything unless everybody participates. Authoritarian type leadership does not get things done as well in this current system I realized that the press has a lot of power, even in a simulation, and a lot of times we address things that appease the press instead of really trying to address the issue.

He continued in this vein and articulated his view of the convergence of collaborative leadership and the community policing concept

What you're trying to get people to do is the essence of community policing. That's what I got from it, and if everybody's not a part of it, if everybody doesn't participate, if everybody doesn't seem like they're part of the plan and part of the solution, then everybody's not going to put enough effort in it to make it a success.

Howard provided an encapsulation of the power of collaborative leadership and its applicability to police work in the contemporary environment.

Obviously, the people who were most successful in the simulation were those who tried to understand what collaborative leadership is. The fact is we're in an environment where it is not just the mechanics of cooperating with other people and collaborating with other people, but it is also the tone that is set. It is a set of attitudes about respect for other people's opinions and the validity of their positions which is engendered by this concept. So this is applied not only within the group that's making the decisions but also to people on the outside, the public generally and to stakeholders that you wouldn't normally take into account. So I think in that respect, it really creates an environment where police can operate successfully.

Collaboration. Certainly a key aspect of the mental model shifts was the value placed on collaboration. In responding to a question concerning how the simulation experience changed her mind, Olivia said:

I think once again it highlighted the importance of that approach and it highlighted the importance of explaining myself in a way which is

pretty much neutral and nonjudgmental . . . to kind of allow things to flow, certainly not to prejudge, to allow people the maximum latitude without trying to control them.

Dirk expressed his appreciation for collaborative leadership as a viable method to address the complexity of police work.

The most important things that I was able to carry from the simulation applied to real life were that in order to deal with issues like a gang problem or any problem that confronts public safety in the community and a police department is that you need to get the input of everybody involved. You can't stand apart from the community, make decisions and try to force feed them or impose them on your constituency. It makes it a lot more effective. It builds relationships rather than tears them down if you can seek their input. A lot of times a community will come up with solutions that we hadn't thought of, and vice versa. And there's that old phrase, "You need to be in diversity." That very issue, which on the surface would tend to divide people, can be used to go down to deeper values, to principles, to create that unity, to look for a mutually arrived at solution.

Transforming experience. Dirk went so far as to say that the experience itself transformed the participants.

While I'm not trying to force feed or spoon feed or just provide information to somebody, the learning occurs within the students. It

transforms them. They learn to operate on that cutting edge of discernment, which is where leadership occurs, I believe.

Building relationships. Chuck also spoke of the importance of building trust and relationships for the long-term because when the situation becomes critical it is too late.

You could see that if you didn't feel the trust in whatever arena you were in with some outside source, when it comes down to crunch time and when you didn't have a lot of time to develop relationships and the situation is critical that there's no way you can exist.

Paul commented on understanding that collaborative leadership was built around the ability to create and develop relationships and that he has adjusted his practice of leadership to be grounded on this idea.

The other thing I learned from the class was that to be able to be a leader you have to build relationships. I have to pay close attention to community members not only by what they are saying but their actions and how they are dealing with things. Well that certainly builds relationships because I'm getting into what they need, and if I didn't care before about what they needed, then how can I be a good leader? So I think it's been a tremendous change in how I deal with folks compared to how I dealt with them before.

Mental model shift. Chuck commented specifically on the effectiveness of the simulation process to change participant mental models.

Yes, and it's needed, because how else would you get the person involved in a different mental model than what he/she came with already. If the purpose of the course is to reeducate you in a process you may not be familiar with, and if you're only coming to this class with past experiences that have been your life's blood before, and you say, "Well, that's worked well before but it doesn't work in the situations I experienced today, then you have to say let's stop this and try something else and see if this works."

Paul also discussed on the personal mental model shift he had made. Much of Paul's comments centered around listening more intently to others, something he had not done very well before the seminar.

I know that many times in the past I would not listen intently. I would go ahead with my own agenda. If I had to accomplish A, B, or C because I thought that was good for whomever I was dealing with, that's what I would go ahead and do without any input or listening to the input and say, "Okay, what do you think the real problem is here? How can I help you?" So now I try to solicit that information and work on that. How am I affecting you or what is it that you think that I can do to make it better for you to do your job more effectively? Before, I wouldn't do that. I knew what the job was. I've done the job. I knew how to deal with that job. Well, that's not really true because everybody's different. I have to pay attention really, really acutely maybe not to what they're saying but their actions and how they're dealing with things and then say, "Okay, now I

see what you really need to accomplish, what I need to give you to get your job done.”

Collaborative leadership terminology. Chuck explained that the seminar and the simulation gave him terms which provided to him “handles” on which he could grasp concepts.

I think you put a name to a phrase that I appreciate working with. When we went around the room and discussed who were the best managers that you worked for were, who were the people you would go back and commit to, it was a person who understood collaborative leadership and allowed it to flourish. I guess I learned some phrases or management theories that are now being applied to these things that I know them to be true and to work beneficially. I think I told you before, I was encouraged to see that people were thinking in these terms and recognizing this type of leadership or managerial ability.

In terms of shifting a participants’ model of leadership the nine interviewees were all very positive about what the simulation experience did for them. Considering their comments and the fact that the interviews were held eleven months after the simulation was played, the LeadSimm simulation method demonstrated its ability to create lasting change in the participants. The mental models which were changed included: (1) authoritarian leadership is inadequate to meet current community policing challenges, (2) collaborative leadership is the essence of the community-policing concept, (3) collaboration that allowed for an open exchange was vital, (4) every stakeholders’ input was important, (5) the

simulation reeducated and formalized the collaborative leadership concept, and (6) the participants clearly understood the importance of building relationships.

Putting Collaborative Leadership to Work

While much has been written about the need to change the mental models of organization members from an individual to a more postindustrial mindset, it seems that effective methods for shifting mental models are seriously lacking. The focus and intent of creating the LeadSimm simulation methodology were to explore whether or not it was more helpful in bringing about fundamental change in how participants acted and approached their work and whether or not those who experienced the simulation put these changes to work in their everyday dealings inside and outside their organizations. Comments pertaining to putting collaborative leadership to work after the simulation experience follow.

Processes opened up. One of the most dramatic themes contained in the comments of the participants centered around how simulation play helped them to “open up” their negotiations and to listen more than was their practice in the past. Olivia commented about how her perspective changed after playing the simulation.

The perceived problem is a problem to the person that perceives it so I look at things differently. Now when I try to handle people's problems I look at things I think more open-mindedly, whether it be citizens or community groups or officers that work with me or whatever Now after this, I looked at it and thought that it's a real problem to them, it's a real issue to them and tried to figure out why. I handled it differently

because instead of just kind of dismissing it or not giving it my full attention, I looked at it more through their eyes, trying to figure out why they were thinking what they were thinking It made me more open-minded.

The simulation seemed to have the same effect for David.

I can't put a handle on anything, but I certainly find myself asking people: "What do you think about this? What do you think we should do?" When I'm presented with a problem, I give my fellow officers some thoughts and concerns. I'll stop and I'll look them square in the eye and I'll say: What do you think? Am I missing this? Take the time to tell me if I'm missing something, if I'm not reading this correctly." It usually brings my staff in at least to the point of now they understand I am completely honest, that I'm willing to listen to them, that I may not agree but at least I'll take the time to listen.

When asked if he was applying any of the concepts or ideas learned from the simulation, David replied: "Constantly At home, and at church."

In responding to a question concerning whether or not he liked the concept of collaborative leadership, Kevin spoke about opening up the process.

I do. In my small room as a lieutenant, I have three sergeants that work for me and work in the Division. I've tried to implement some of the things that I've learned from the class, as far as having them be involved in the process It's just trying to get input from everybody and have everybody feel like they are part of the answer, part of the outcome, that

it's a total buy-in and no one person, entity, or organization has the ultimate say.

Using a different approach. Concomitantly, a substantial shift in personal mental models was noted by the participants. In approaching a particular situation or context, some participants spoke of how they were simply doing things differently. Olivia spoke of how differently she is working with her group of officers.

I'm working with five individuals and letting them come up with ideas. We discuss them as a group. It's not at all a dictatorship or where I tell them what to do. Their input is really important and there is mutual respect. Everything is pretty much done as a team and everybody's ideas count. We listen to one another and I think that if you ask the folks I work with, you'd get that. They would feel very much part of a team and that it was a joint effort and that decisions were made, as much as possible, with everybody's input.

Dirk noted that following the simulation play he and other participants spoke about the experience and how it had changed their minds about things.

In fact we've talked about this afterwards, some participants and I, about just how powerful that learning experience was and how important collaborating with people is and how much more effective and much more constructive it is than the competition and antagonist type of relationships.

Value-based environment. Chuck commented on the value of the seminar in general and of the simulation in reinforcing the idea that people enjoy working

in an environment of safety, trust and shared decision making. For Chuck, this provided an opportunity to step back and reevaluate his approach to getting things done.

Knowing that collaborative leadership is what's being taught and hearing other people say that that is what they enjoy working under also, it kind of allows you to say, "Hey, you know what, I've been a little bit of a dictator here lately and I'm just going to step back on this one. I'd like you to run with it and let this person flourish." So it's just a matter of sometimes coming to these courses and going through this to reinforce what I for myself, know what works best anyway. But just to reinforce this view of leadership, the seminar allows me to say: "Hey, okay, it's time to reevaluate and move forward with this understanding and teach some other people as to what you're trying to do."

Collaboration. Kevin too echoed the same sentiments and added a notation about consensus building.

In general, working in the public and in the world of community policing, it takes everybody to make it happen. It just can't be from the top because everybody doesn't feel like they're a part of the plan and in the plan, if you implement it truly the way you want it done because they're not a part of it I'm just trying not to be as aggressive as I used to be, and I realize in a situation like that if you have something and you put an idea out, don't try to force it down everybody's throat but kind of back off and see if they want to accept it. Once they accept it, try to build on it with

consensus for everyone. Be open enough to say, "Hey, my idea is not, as the kids say, the bomb. Everybody else has got to put a little more powder in and add the fuse on to make it really work."

Creating partnerships. Helen also commented about the collaboration with the community and its value.

I don't think that you can be effective in any organization, not just the police departments. I don't think you can be effective in any organization unless you work collaboratively with whomever it is that you're serving or even working. It's just never going to work. There has to be a partnership. In the police department there has to be a partnership with the community. The police department can't do it by themselves, the community can't do it by themselves, so there has to be some kind of a partnership if things are ever going to get solved Everybody has got vested interests. The more you are able to understand the other people's vested interests, the better you are going to be at what you do.

One of the real tests of the simulation was whether or not the participants would actually take the lessons learned and apply them in their everyday work experience. Of the nine interviewees, eight said they were putting the concepts to work while one remained cautious about doing so. The participants commented on what exactly they were trying to do differently. These different behaviors included: (1) being more open minded and seeing the problem from another's perspective, (2) using questions to evoke input from other officers, (3)

bringing forward the ideas of others, (4) switching from a dictatorial to a more collaborative mode, and (5) creating partnerships.

Implementation of Collaborative Leadership in the Organization

Most of the discussion concerning change has been directed at an individual participant's mental models. How, in fact, have they changed their approach or their thinking in terms of doing leadership? Now the analyses must focus on an examination of the implementation of collaborative leadership in the organization.

Increased morale and creativity. Olivia provided several examples of how changing her approach contributed, in her opinion, to corresponding changes in the organization. In commenting on the question as to whether or not her more open, collaborative approach encouraged other changes in the organization, Olivia said:

Yeah, I think morale-wise for sure, and I think creative-wise for sure, because when they come up with ideas or solutions, I let them play them out "That sounds like it's got possibilities, why don't you go ahead and look into it?"

Paul commented more from an internal perspective in terms of his ability to be more effective. He asserted that the increase in morale among those who report to him has been noticeable. In replying to a question of whether or not doing collaborative leadership has made him more effective, Paul said:

It absolutely has. I have a couple of teams now, a couple of guys come up to me, occasionally at night when it's dark and say, "Hey,

lieutenant, it's nice to see you out here. We've never had a lieutenant out here with us. It's nice to see a lieutenant out here."

I asked Paul to comment on how that kind of response made him feel.

You just don't understand how good it feels to get back in your car and drive away and have somebody appreciate you finally. Not just being a mechanical person here, but being a human being. And when you ask them to do something, they almost run to get it done. It's just taking the extra time to invest in the employee because after all you're with the employees. It's not anything you do any more, it's what they do.

Cost savings. Regarding the ever-mindful bottom-line results, Olivia spoke specifically to an idea generated by one officer who reported to her.

I just got done talking to the Captain about an idea that one of my guys came up with that will potentially save the city a lot of money. It's just in the preliminary stages but we start off with a new team, a new unit. All of us were new and it was like, "let's make this better, let's not just do the same old stuff . . . Just because things were done a certain way in the past, let's look at these things." They've come up with all kinds of new, innovative ideas, which we're just now starting to research . . . There are all kinds of input from everybody from the police data specialist to the officers to the sergeant to the lieutenant.

Reduction in crime. Dirk talked about a situation concerning the opening of a new bar in town and how, in his opinion, collaborative leadership was used by another officer who participated in the simulation to effect a reduction in crime.

Then I interviewed Kevin, whose area of responsibility included the issues surrounding the opening of this new bar, and he related to me how he worked with the bar owner to insure a greater level of cooperation.

The bar opened and I knew the kid that was operating it, and I wanted to make sure that everybody knew who to talk to, who to go to so there wouldn't be any confusion if an incident occurred there. Everybody went down and personally got to meet the bar owner. I had all the sergeants meet him. I had my lieutenant meet him, as well as myself, so if anything went down we wouldn't have to go looking for the owner. We could go straight to the person in charge and handle the problem directly. I asked Kevin to tell me what the overall result was.

There haven't been any problems with the bar, because the officers know who to talk to and the police kind of feel like when you walk into it, it's not a strange environment. I say why wait for a problem to happen? Let's be a little proactive and address the situation beforehand.

Greater community participation. Paul also spoke enthusiastically about using collaborative leadership in working with the community—at-large. He described a community event in which he worked to bring the community members into the process.

My officers and I do it with the community groups, usually towards the end of the community meeting, especially when I go to a brand new community meeting and they're having these issues that haven't been dealt with before. Then they get to me and they give me all these issues,

and I say, "Hey, we've been in business for a long time as a police department. We haven't been able to solve the problems—as you can tell—by ourselves, but with your help, if you give us your help, I bet we can knock some of these issues down." You can hear a pin drop. Nobody's talking, everybody's listening. And then, they come after the meeting, and say "What can we do? Who can we contact? Who can we call?" . . . If I remember those three issues: give me your help, let me build a relationship with you, and let me feel what you feel, I can't lose.

Changed community perception. According to Paul this behavior has fueled a change in the perception of the police as well.

It's unreal. "We can't believe that you wanted us to help with the problems. Oh, that's what we wanted to hear. Nobody has ever said that to us before. Thanks for coming."

The efficacy of collaborative leadership and the simulation experience is summed up by Paul who concluded that

It's 100% better than what we've been doing. Like I said, it has worked for me and I enjoy doing it. I enjoy listening and dealing with that now, and putting that into effect—that relationship—the perceived problem. What's the real problem here? What is it I'm not listening to? What is it I haven't heard? . . . I said I went to a seminar for three days and these are the things I learned in that. I said before that we can't lead these folks, we've got to build relationships with them.

The American organizational mindset has traditionally been bottom–line oriented. Training and development activities are considered important, provided they make some real difference to the organization. Additionally, I have been critical about the ability of many of the so called “leadership development” services to deliver some quantifiable or qualifiable degree of improvement of change. While eight of the interviewees were implementing the principles of collaborative leadership, three described the actual results of their collaborative efforts. The results of using collaborative leadership included: (1) an increase in morale (2) significant cost savings to the City, (3) a zero incident crime incidence associated with the opening of a new bar, (4) an increase in personal meaning associated with work, and (5) greater willingness by the community to be involved in fighting crime and (6) a change in the community perception of the police.

Participants Comments on the LeadSimm Prototype

The LeadSimm simulation is a prototype method. As with most prototypes, room for improvement is an inherent objective, especially when considering the viability and soundness of the methodology. In that regard, comments from the participants about the effect of making the scenarios realistic as well as the importance of proper facilitation of the simulation were critical.

Realism matters. Olivia commented:

I could directly relate it to what I do now and the people that I deal with now in the situations and how they perceive problems. How they feel when they're treated certain ways. It was interesting to be in other

people's shoes and to see things from different perspectives and then to react emotionally to how you were being treated and get that feeling and sensation of this is what it feels like to be in their shoes.

Kevin also commented that he felt pressured to be the person that he was simulating.

Yes, it's important, because if it's not real and you don't feel some kind of pressure, it doesn't work. I felt like being the press and asking questions and interjecting things. That kind of made it more real. Then they had to deal with the press reactions and it made it more real.

Dirk commented about how different this simulation was to him.

I had never been through a simulation exactly like this before. I thought it was very stimulating, I learned an awful lot out of it. It was also very enjoyable. I like to learn by doing things or looking at realistic situations. It made me feel a little uncomfortable at times. I especially appreciated the fact that it was directed for my agency. It was specifically tailored to try to enhance the learning of the participants in my agency. It wasn't just another police department or even law enforcement agency, or just an organization in general. It was about issues that had come up before for my agency and have come up since.

David said:

If you don't make it real, it becomes too much of a game and people don't take it seriously. I think the level of realism increased when the cameras started up, even though we all knew it was a classroom

situation. You could feel the tension, and there was pressure. Most of it was probably self-induced, but there certainly is pressure, and people felt that.

Paul provided a more in-depth reasoning for making the simulation as real as possible.

Like I said, that's the key to it. You have to feel what the citizen feels so when you stand up there and start delivering your stuff as the administrator, the police lieutenant or the police officer, talking to the citizens, you can have some idea of what their envisioning, what their feeling when you start talking to them about how great and safe the city is. We're one of the largest cities in the state of California and one of the safest. It doesn't tell me anything about my neighbor next door who just had his house ripped off. Deal with that.

Dirk noted that the simulation represented the exact same issues he had faced everyday in meetings regarding gang violence.

Having been in meetings with the mayor regarding gang issues, meetings that were comprised of a wide variety of community groups, and some of them not always very complimentary to her as they were somewhat blunted at times, I could see that developing during our simulation and they were very realistic. A lot of issues that were raised by the community or the special interest groups were the exact same ones that occurred with my own mayor My experience was great. I

enjoyed it. I learned from it. Again, I've seen things applied actually in the workplace, based on what occurred in the simulation.

Immersion effect. The importance of immersing people into the dynamic was also explored as a byproduct of making the simulation real and also as a prime contributor for learning. David explained:

To be able to have students for three days where you're not only going to lecture to them and talk to them about things, but you're going to get them to learn through a multifaceted experience where I hear it, I smell it, and I see it, and now I get to do, that's when they learn the most. I think that the strength of the experience is having people go through the simulations that are connected to what they do day-in and day-out with their work is extremely beneficial.

Paul also commented on the result of being immersed in the scenario.

I couldn't believe it. I thought I was the leader of that group there for awhile. I had those folks rallying around me, and they were giving me their input, and then I stood there at that press conference and I actually felt that I was talking to somebody that wasn't listening.

Helen commented that the immersion into the simulation was very real for her.

It was enjoyable. I think it gave me a different perspective by having to be put into a role that I wasn't used to. Even though it's a simulation you actually become that person. I found it interesting The role is going to be my perception of what a council person is or what a PIO

is, visa versa. So it's going to be tainted a little bit by my own perception. But at some point, you kind of, once you become that person and then all of a sudden all those things are flying at you, you really do kind of start, if you're doing it correctly, to feel what someone in that position would feel under those same circumstances. We all kind of became a little vested in whatever interest we happened to be playing at that particular time.

Lasting effects. Paul indicated the effects of this type of simulation seem to last long after the experience is past.

We've talked about it, a couple of guys that went to the class. Every now and then we sit and talk about it and laugh about it, and go, you know what, I felt I was there. I didn't have a uniform, I wasn't in the class any more, it was very real. . . . It was very positive. It was one of the best seminar or classes that I have been to in years.

Different effects for different people. The potential for different types of participants was explained best by Howard.

I think it was a very good experience. I have to say that I think the value of the experience will probably vary according to your past experience, and where you are in the organization. Different people are in different levels. I'm sure there are some people that this was an absolute breakthrough. Maybe they hadn't considered collaborative leadership. For other people I just think it was more of a reinforcing experience.

Paul, whose enthusiasm for the experience stood out, explained about how the experience affected him.

I kind of put the shoes on. I never had put those shoes on to feel what the community feels when you get put off by the police department, the administration, the city. These are those type of issues that the city and police department feel that they're doing something, but the community is not buying into it, is not feeling that We know those meetings occur all the time, and it made me feel that I was put off, that something was being dealt, there was something going on that I wasn't part of, that I didn't have any input to, that I should be able to at least listen to what was going on. Whether I had input to it or not, I should know what they're talking about.

Kevin summed up the value of the experience and its application to policing and especially community policing.

The way law enforcement is changing, the way the community is changing, and with community policing, this is a valuable leadership tool that you are teaching. In order to get the community, police, city, and everybody to buy into the concept, it has to be a group working together to come to a conclusion. You can really take that leadership composite you have here and put it in community policing and make community policing work.

The importance of proper facilitation. The LeadSimm simulation consists of two basic parts: scenario development and simulation facilitation. Examining, from the participants' perspectives, the need for skilled facilitation required investigation, since the mechanics of running a simulation are as important as

developing the scenario. So I wanted to know how important the facilitator was in achieving the desired objectives of the simulation.

Creating a safe environment. From an overall perspective, Kevin spoke to the necessity of creating the right environment for the simulation.

Proper facilitation is critical. For a facilitation to work, there has to be an atmosphere of trust. In order to establish trust, facilitators, at least in my opinion, have to have humility. You have to be in a service orientation. They can't be self-serving, selfish, or ego-feeding. They have to be trust-giving in order to establish a relationship of trust. They have to give something first. So if the facilitator can do that, the other people will open up and they will give in return and then that becomes collaborative relationship. For your exercise, that's what you did. You came in, you shared knowledge with us, and you said, "This is for you, the participants." Plus it was kind of experimental, which is nice, because it allows for a certain amount of flexibility that we could relate to you.

Olivia echoed Kevin in her views about trust.

I think you have to have somebody who is going to make you feel comfortable and that you feel safe, as far as being able to talk and present ideas and act out. So I think it's real important to have the right person do it. And then its also important to have the kinds of simulations you had, which were really relevant and seemed to be well thought out.

Helen spoke of the need for creating the right environment and for maintaining a sensitivity to the issues at hand and the climate in the room.

It's important if you're getting into it as a group, you have to have someone who can stop it and say "time out" and talk about things. So you've got to have a facilitator. Yes, it's important.

Kevin indicated that the facilitator has to create the overall framework.

It was really important because you can put some people in check when some people got too far out. You pulled things from other people and you made it more a learning event. The facilitator is really important because he has to more or less look at it. If he's an experienced person, he can deal with the personalities and how to interact in the groups and make the adjustments and everything.

A need to understand simulations. In terms of an overall perspective, Howard spoke to the need of the facilitator to understand the basic workings of simulations.

You can set up a simulation but unless people have experience with simulations and real specific experience, they either are disinclined or they are incapable of reading the rules of the simulation. I won't say that everybody is, but if you take any group of people and you say, "Let's do the simulation," and if you just have them read the rules about how to do a simulation, chances are that they'll have more of a tendency to kind of go off on a tangent. I think it's important to have a monitor there who reinforces the common tendency somebody might have to make a particular mistake or maybe not to understand some aspect of the

simulation, If the facilitator clarifies certain points, just kind of keep people within the box, participants can continue to operate successfully.

Online and offline facilitation. In examining the mechanics of online and offline simulation play, I was interested to find out whether or not this method was deemed useful by the participants. The following comments pertain to the impressions of several participants and their evaluations of the offline mode of play. The value of taking the simulation offline and conducting what some people call “teachable moments” seemed to be key to the learning of the simulation participants. Olivia commented on the effectiveness of the offline discussion.

What was good is you brought it up right then and there instead of having to wait until the whole thing was done When you went off-line you, addressed certain issues right away instead of waiting till the end when you didn't feel the emotion or you didn't feel strongly about it, or didn't even remember.

Kevin described the offline mode as essential to the way the participants approached the second episode.

Doing those feedback sessions allowed people to step back, you might say, and look at why they made that decision or what their mental models were, so to speak, what their mental models looked like. I think, probably, the second episode would have not occurred the way it did if we have not been allowed to do the offline discussion analysis. If you think about, if you just do the first episode and you go right into the second episode without the ability to critique it at all, you're probably going to get

the same behaviors the second time Yeah, it comes across because you're struggling and you're looking for answers and you're looking for help and that's when people are more conducive to that kind of information input.

Dirk remarked that he believed that the second episode would have turned out much differently if skilled facilitation wasn't made as integral to the simulation.

I think probably the second episode would not have occurred the way it did if we had not been allowed to take the simulation offline and talk about how we were feeling and thinking after the first episode.

Chuck reiterated the need to stop the action and reflect on the simulation process.

Yeah, like any learning situation when people have gone through an experience, if you could stop and talk to them about that experience right there, it's most beneficial because they may not realize what they're going through. Using a facilitator, seeing these things and seeing them in the past, it's good to stop and say, "Hey, this is what's happening here."

Chuck added:

I think the point is the one that you brought up about how the police, in their first approach to the problems, took themselves off in a secluded area. Then you stop the process and say, "Look at how much more information you would have had if you had done what this group was doing, because that's what they did. In politics, they pond jump. They go

from pond to pond to pond and see what's going on. Then they use the information to make decisions and establish their position.

Paul commented on the effectiveness of the offline mode.

Oh, sure. You've got to do that. You've got to vent it out a little bit. You've got to find out where we're going to get us back. If we were going off the wrong path get us back on it. Yeah, I think that was very, very effective. You had to do that.

Finally, David spoke about the offline mode as an essential piece which help capture the dynamics of doing leadership.

Yes, I thought that was essential. I thought that it was a good way to do things, because it's better sometimes to stop and understand what's going on or to reset things a little bit. But sometimes you have to steer it a little bit, explain to people what's happening because sometimes you'll miss those dynamics later on.

The structural comments received on the LeadSimm prototype were extremely helpful in confirming assumptions about the scenario development process. They also helped in fine tuning and confirming the worth of the facilitation method employed in the simulation. Eight interviewees make direct comment about the LeadSimm method. The comments covered a wide spectrum of issues including: (1) the importance of making the scenario realistic, (2) the immersion effect, (3) the level of emotional involvement, (4) the enjoyment of the simulation experience, (5) the lasting effect of the simulation experience (6) the criticality of proper facilitation, (7) the need to create a safe environment

and (8) the effectiveness of the on-line and off-line modes of the simulation process.

First-Cut Analysis—The Global Development Bank

Background to Simulation Two: The Scene at the GDB

Welcome to the Global Development Bank. The GDB was chartered shortly after World War II with the specific mission of reducing poverty and supporting the economic development of underdeveloped countries throughout the world. Financed by the industrialized nations, the GDB has operated for most of its existence with what many researchers have described as a top-down approach to economic development. In other words, the Bank provided loans to countries only if the countries wanting the loans to adhere to the guidelines and policy initiatives the Bank proclaimed to be vital to the economic development of that country.

During the last ten to twelve years, there has been a growing cacophony of voices and articles criticizing the Bank and its policies of economic development. The critiques have been directed specifically at the Bank and its predisposition to superimpose onto a developing nation a technical policy of economic development that is incongruent with their nation's cultural practices. Paradoxically, the Bank's policies have been cited as the cause of more poverty in the underdeveloped country than was present in that country before the economic development began. While the Bank has had several successful projects in the Near East, oftentimes the negative effects far outweigh the positive efforts the Bank has made.

The Bank had eight presidents who managed the Bank using this same basic philosophy of development. In 1995 a new president, David Edwards, was brought into the Bank upon the retirement of Seth Jamison, a president who received much criticism for his adherence to the traditional approach of providing financial aid. David Edwards came from the banking industry but his previous experience was much more entrepreneurial than his predecessor's.

Consequently, Edwards's approach to his new position was to immerse himself in the issues facing the Bank. He first traveled to as many developing nations of the world as he could in order to witness for himself the positives and negatives of the Bank's policies. He followed these travels with many intensive meetings held with the staff of GDB over a period of six months. What emerged from his investigations and analyses was that the Bank needed to be much more sensitive to the specific issues and cultural practices of the indigenous people of each country. He asserted that the reduction of poverty could be achieved if the Bank considered itself not an overseer but a partner with a country in its future development. He had grown very sensitive to superimposing onto the developing nation. Those GDB policies that were culturally counterproductive to its development. He surmised that what the GDB really should do was to create a knowledge-based organization whose chief export was not financial aid but education, knowledge and applied learning.

To carry this out, Edwards opted in 1996 to create a new division called Technology Systems and Knowledge Programs within the Economic Education Institute of the GDB. EEI was formed in 1959 to function as a center for global

learning, providing a forum for the exchange and dissemination of practical knowledge gained by the experiences GDB had had throughout its existence. In that regard, EEI's mission was to build the capacity of clients in their development efforts through education and learning programs. In 1996, EEI's five divisions included: Natural Resources, Regulatory Reform, Macroeconomic Policy Initiatives, Human Development, and the new Technology Systems and Knowledge Programs. TSKP's specific purpose was to provide interactive courses for satellite distribution worldwide. After four years, EEI had made considerable progress towards demonstrating a real change in GDB's attitude towards underdeveloped nations and a new view of economic development. Many of the Bank's critics reserved judgment about its future and even underdeveloped member nations had more optimistic perspectives as to the cooperative economic efforts that had been undertaken in their respective countries. GDB had, no doubt, taken a long-term view, and it will be several years before the true results of the knowledge-based education initiatives are known. Yet there is in 1998, a feeling of optimism and hope that the investments made today in developing nations will go a long way to relieve poverty throughout the world in the future. The GDB seems poised on the threshold of its most important contribution to the global society.

Background to Episodes One and Two

Episodes one and two were chosen for simulation play because they were envisioned as being the "worst nightmare" of many of the participants. Much of participants' current status in the real World Bank Organization, as high level

managers in the New Programs and Outreach Division, was predicated on the fact that the current president had chosen a strategy which, as mentioned earlier, viewed the bank as a prime exporter of knowledge rather than just as a lending institution. In the simulation, the change of president and of the TSKP organization brought with it a fear that bank policies would digress back to that of simply lending money. The intent of this episode was to bring the participants face-to-face with this dilemma. Symbolically, this episode brought into the open many of the substantial fears of the participants and was designed to send the message to them that facing a strong fear and working to resolve it were better than waiting until they became victims of it.

There are two other issues that require explanation before the first- and second-cut analyses are presented. These issues affected, in this researcher's opinion, how the participants engaged themselves in the simulation and how that level of play affected the outcomes of the simulation to make changes in the TSKP. First, I was unaware of the fact that only six months prior to simulation play the participants had attended another leadership development program. The previous seminar experience cast a shadow over the LeadSimm simulation because many participants asked themselves during the seminar: "What is the point to doing leadership development again?" Secondly, there was a driving need for the participants to deal with certain internal issues that many of them believed should have been addressed during the seminar. I did know, prior to conducting the seminar, that part of it would be devoted to working with the participants specifically on these internal issues. As the seminar progressed, I

realized that more time than had been allotted in the seminar schedule of the simulation would be required to work on these internal issues. To that end, I decided to cancel episode three in order to allow for more time to deal with their internal issues. During the analysis of the data for this study, it became clear to me that the LeadSimm simulation was less successful as a result of not having the participants play through a full cycle of events as had been originally planned in the GDB scenario. Curtailing the simulation left gaps in learning and change implementation. These gaps are explored in detail later in this chapter and in Chapter Five. It is worthy to note, however, that the problems encountered during the GDB simulation did more to teach me and to clarify for me what effective simulation processes are. Improvements to the simulation setup and implementation have been made in large part because of lessons learned during the Global Development Bank simulation.

Episode One: A New President

It is the morning of October 17, 2000 and the day has begun as any other day at GDB. Today's agenda includes the monthly "town hall" meeting among all the GDB managers. The meeting is usually held for no longer than 90 minutes and is one in which the managers discuss the most pressing issues facing their individual organizational units. At the conclusion of the meeting, President Edwards announced to the group that he has decided to retire to spend more time with his family and especially his grandchildren. He noted that his career has spanned four decades and kept him on the go. The time has come for him to focus more time and energy on family issues.

He also announced that his successor has been named, and it is an American banker who is well known person in the commercial banking field. He is considered to be very conservative and traditional in his philosophy and approach to banking. He has little economic development experience. As the managers left the meeting, there was an undertone of concern. After making excellent progress towards the vision of making the “knowledge bank” a reality, they are concerned that the newly appointed president will return the bank to its more traditional roots of project and policy-based lending. Edwards announced that a press release had already gone out announcing the change in GDB’s chief executive, and a news conference will be held the next day at the bank’s headquarters.

Episode One: Participant Actions

Consistent with the descriptions given for the first simulation, the actual observed actions of the participants who were seated at the various stakeholder tables are described in this section. The opening round of this simulation began much in the same way as most simulations. There was a tenuous response as people began to work through the issues. Again, I moved from table to table in an effort to help start the efforts of the participants. After a few minutes the momentum increased and the participants were fully engaged in the dynamics of the simulation.

Unlike other scenarios developed for simulation play, specific instructions were provided to the individual who played the new bank president during the simulation. This may not be the usual practice, but for the purposes of this

simulation I thought it would make for a more effective simulation play. The instructions given to him were designed to provide a high level of ambiguity to the scenario. He was told that if any of the other stakeholders tried to get a definitive statement about his future policies concerning the bank's mission or purpose, he was to provide a noncommittal answer. My thought at the time was that if he committed to either taking the bank back to being a lending institution or continuing the current knowledge-oriented strategy, the simulation would not provide the participants an opportunity to practice collaborative leadership or be part of the bank's decision-making processes.

The stakeholder groups used for this simulation included: (1) media, (2) Board of Directors of the GDB (3) Economic Education Institute's senior managers, (4) nongovernmental organizations and (5) representatives of member nations of the GDB.

The participants remained at their tables "huddled" around. They began to explore the issues from the perspective of their respective stakeholder group. No one tried to walk around to the other tables. Each table was in the process of developing its position, its stand on the issues before they ventured forth to converse with others. Members of the news media tried to gain admittance to the different stakeholder groups but were denied access. No group wanted to speak with the press. After about twenty minutes, various stakeholder members moved to discuss the issues that grew out of the President's resignation with the other groups. There were obvious signs of frustration as the answers given by the new bank president were ambiguous. For example, members of the

Technical Support and Knowledge Programs management group tried to get the new president to understand the vital job they were doing in educating the member nations. The new bank president listened intently but then he said: "We will have to see, I need to know more. GDB is getting a lot of pressure about our lending policies, and we must go back and look at everything."

Left hanging by this series of conferences and exchanges, the TSKP group retired to their table just in time to receive some members of the news media. Some of the comments made by the members of the TSKP group in their closed session made it obvious that whatever they said to the press had to be tempered by the fact that expressing a lack of faith or trust in the new bank president could backfire on them in the future. Members of the press inquired how the announcement of the new bank president affected them. The TSKP group spoke of the meeting that they just came from where the future GDB policies were discussed. One TSKP member said: "No future policy direction has been firmly decided. GDB has been under constant pressure to assure various interests that our policies and programs truly help in the reduction of poverty throughout the underdeveloped world." Members of the news media asked more questions concerning the future viability of TSKP. In response, another TSKP member noted: "We are preparing a comprehensive report which will detail our involvement and worth to the GDB organization."

Several members of the TSKP group then moved to the member nations and nongovernmental groups (NGO) which, in reality, had a lot of say in the internal and external affairs of the particular nations to which GDB lent money.

The conversations centered around the value and worth that the TSKP group brought to the development of member nations. What was most interesting was that these conversations dealt more with finding out how the NGO group was feeling about that new president and very little with the formation of relationships. The “we-are-in-this-together” message was not sent as strongly as it could have. The TSKP managers seemed to be using their direct conversations to build and defend their positions again as opposed to working to increase the level of their connection with the other stakeholder groups. During this period of time, the members of the news media asked the TSKP managers to be part of their conversations. They resisted this and asked the news media to come back after they were finished with the NGO group. When their conversations were completed, the TSKP group left the table and the NGO group granted an interview to members of the news media.

The news media queried the NGO group as to its reaction to the retirement of Edwards and the appointment of a new bank president. The NGO group expressed a certain amount of concern about the change in bank president, but was willing to take a wait-and-see attitude towards any future policy announcements. The NGO persons acted calmly and reserved and didn't want to sound alarmed at the change in GDB's chief executive. After a few more questions, the news media retired to their table. After about an hour had passed, a press conference was scheduled and interested parties were invited to attend.

The TSKP group then approached the senior managers at the Economic Education Institute. Both groups sat together and discussed the situation. The

EEI senior managers were also alarmed by the change in GDB's president. The combined group mapped out a strategy to approach the president's group. The strategy was designed to extol the virtues of the knowledge-oriented programs of the current administration. Of course, the EEI managers were not only concerned with the TSKP division, but also the other four divisions which were part of the EEI structure.

The EEI managers requested and obtained a meeting with the new bank president. The results of this meeting were very similar to the results of the TSKP group's meeting with the president. The new president remained noncommittal to either following or changing the bank's current vision or policies. The EEI group became frustrated by the lack of commitment and returned to its table after only about ten minutes of discussion.

Episode One: GDB Press Conference

The first to speak at the press conference was the newly appointed bank president. He gave a statement to the press regarding his views on the state of the bank. He provided a characterization of the types of issues which needed to be addressed in the future in the form of a real life example. His demeanor was calm and controlled, however, his address to the audience was done with a heavy "tongue-in-cheek" style. For instance, an example he gave stressed the needs of people in India to have their own pot. Pot meant being in possession of a private potty or restroom facility. While his address seemed somewhat off the beaten track or even comical, he used this method to send a message of importance about the role of TSKP programs. In effect, his message dealt with

educating the populace about the need for sanitary waste disposal and the importance of public health programs.

As the facilitator I concluded that he was trying to add a quality of fun and levity to the simulation. I decided at the time to allow him to continue his presentation and let the situation play itself out. In retrospect, his actions might have brought the simulation to a point where the participants did not take it as seriously as they could have. Some of the participants did not know whether to follow his lead or not, or try to stick to the story line. This kind of situation in a simulation is a difficult call at times. The facilitator is always working to strike a balance between the seriousness with which the participants deal with issues in the simulation and the enjoyment that the persons have from participating in the simulation. This is a critical issue. The reason it is critical is that full involvement by all participants in the simulation is the most desired state. If, however, people become too stressed or too serious about the issue, the simulation can implode as participants make a mental choice to check out of simulation play.

Following his address, members of the news media asked direct questions concerning the future policy directions of the GDB. One news person said: "Your previous involvement in the banking industry suggests that you are from the old school where banks are thought of as strictly lending institutions. Over the course of the last five years, GDB has developed a reputation as a heavy exporter of knowledge-based programs. What is your view of this and do you intend to change the focus of these knowledge-based programs?" The new bank president provided a substantial amount of praise for GDB's current programs

and GDB's senior managers. He also applauded the substantial involvement of many of its people who were now living in host countries as part of the education improvement programs. However, he carefully avoided making any commitment about the future policies of the bank. He again asserted that what was needed was a complete review of the bank policies and practices. GDB was under great pressure to assure its practices actually reduced poverty worldwide. For many years, GDB had been soundly criticized because of the way in which it lent money had, at times, contributed to an increase in poverty in certain regions. The new bank president was firmly committed to reducing poverty and making the bank a respected organization throughout the world.

The managing director of EEI followed the bank president to the podium. He spoke of EEI's continuing resolve to provide educational programs just as it had been doing over the course of the last few years to member nations. He expressed confidence that when the dust cleared, the worth and value of EEI would be clearly endorsed and most of the bank's current policies would remain. He said: "The value of creating a learning environment is clear to those who have visited our member nations and seen the results of these programs. I am confident the educational and learning future is assured from an EEI perspective." He was then asked by another member of the news media if he had talked to the new incoming bank president. EEI's managing director affirmed that as far as he knew, all the bank's policies were under review. He said that would probably do the same thing himself if he was given a new assignment as large as leading GDB.

The final persons to step to the podium was the NGO group who had taken a wait-and-see attitude during the previous simulation play. They continued to express the same perspective during the press conference. They made it obvious that what they intended to do was to create as much leeway as possible for the new bank president to decide how he should proceed with future bank policies. One news media person then asked: "What are your greatest concerns about the immediate future considering that a new GDB president has been appointed?" One of the NGO members replied that she was concerned that the educational programs would continue in the same vain as before. However, there were current construction programs underway in the country she represented, and the people there expected the funding for those to continue. She hoped that the change in the bank president did not adversely affect the country's position for continued funding. It then became obvious that the NGO group did not want to say or do anything which might have a negative effect on the funding of future projects in the member nations. They took a position of neutrality because to support the educational programs in the face of a new president who had a more traditional perspective about banks and lending might put them in a precarious position for future funding. The news conference ended at the conclusion of this interview. Members of the news media felt there was no point to pressing the issue any further. The simulation was taken offline.

The offline period following simulation play for episode one of the GDB scenario was a lively discussion period during which many people spoke about their perspectives. Almost all agreed that the events depicted were realistic and

did involve one of their worst fears. The participants were members of a group who had been at the forefront of the knowledge orientation of the bank, and to them a change in president might mean a change in the orientation of the bank's policies. They joked about the initial statement by the incoming bank president which centered around each East Indian having his/her own pot. Yet as they continued, they realized that it was a fun way to bring out the public health issues which really represented the need for GDB to communicate and to inform people through the TSKP programs. Interestingly enough this discussion heightened the need that many of the participants felt to discuss pressing internal issues which, as mentioned previously, affected the implementation of the last episode of the simulation.

As the offline period progressed, the conversation switched back to a discussion about what really would happen if tomorrow a new bank president would be announced. A normal reaction and strategy emerged from this conversation which was summed up in the question: What can we do to validate our work at the Economic Development Institute? Along with this, one of the discoveries they had made almost immediately was that waiting to build relationships until the moment of crisis had arisen was too late. They understood the importance for them to go out at the present time and build relationships and to work in linking their efforts to the rest of EDI. As with any LeadSimm simulation, this was an important breakthrough. This discovery led to one of the key internal issues which emerged for the participants. The need to have a more direct, or coherent mission statement was underscored. There was a feeling

among the participants that “we know what we do for EDI, but does EDI really know and respect the things we do?” This question became paramount in the minds of most of the participants.

At this time I noticed that the level of anxiety in the room began to increase. I became concerned that the simulation would not be completed because the participants became more concerned with the issue of developing a more clearly defined mission statement or statement of purpose than with what they might learn from completing the simulation. My own anxiety emerged because the simulation was moving in a direction which did not follow a familiar pattern of other simulations I had conducted. I did not know if the GDB simulation would be able to demonstrate and help the participants develop collaborative leadership and the tenets of organizational learning. The participants’ conversations were focused on their real jobs, and while references to the simulation were made, they had become fixated with the internal struggles which they faced everyday. Instead of the simulation providing a vehicle wherein the actions taken during simulation play could later be extrapolated into collaborative practices that the participants could use when they returned to their jobs, they were bogged down with the recognition that the focus of the division was not clear. The data taken during the interviews clearly demonstrated this conclusion.

However, this does not mean that the simulation did not perform a valuable function. It was only after the data analysis was completed that I reflected on what really did happen during the simulation. I discovered that the

simulation fulfilled another function, that of a basic analysis tool. In fact, the GDB simulation validated the collaborative leadership model as depicted in the first graphic in Chapter Two. The graphic shows that the collaborative leadership model is founded on the concept of mutual purpose, shared vision and common goals. Mutual purpose, a.k.a. mission, is in reality the starting point for the focus of the collaborative efforts. What the simulation revealed was this: Without even some tacit sense of why people are engaged in their work activities, the reason for and the focus of collaborative efforts has little meaning for them.

The discussions continued for a few more minutes, and I ended the offline period. It was the end of the first day of the seminar and so the simulation continued the next morning. I introduced episode two to the participants.

Episode Two: A Change At EEI

Two weeks following the announcement of Edwards' retirement, and as typical of times of organizational change, a rash of other retirements and resignations took place. The most significant of these was the resignation of Ashok Roberts, the Managing Director of EEI. Roberts had been offered what he described as a unique and challenging position as Director General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Roberts had been instrumental in the implementation of GDB's knowledge bank policy, and he was sorely missed. As expected Roberts' successor had been named, she was Jennifer Adams, and she came from a career in training and research on theories of economic growth. If Edwards' and Roberts' departures had not created enough questions and concern, the entrance of a new managing director

had created even more. It seemed that the new managing director had worked with EEI on several occasions as a consultant and had a reputation of being much more teaching than learning oriented, with little interest in (or understanding of) modern information and communications technologies. Her arrival portends a significant change in the attitude and orientation of EEI.

Episode Two: Participants Actions and Offline Discussions

The participant interactions during episode two were much more deliberate. The senior TSKP participant remarked that they needed to seek and develop support for their work and their division from the NGO table. They quickly formulated a message concerning the value they brought each member nation. Their group discussion was open, collaborative and driven by an urgency to meet with the NGO group to be heard. Approximately, half of the group requested and got an immediate meeting with the NGO group. The remaining members of the TSKP group wanted to visit the new managing director who was also given specific instructions prior to the start of episode two to remain noncommitted about future strategies. She did an admirable job in deflecting the specific questions of the TSKP group. She reiterated her background as a trainer. But she also acknowledged her familiarity with the bank's learning orientation. She said that the first item on her agenda was to meet with all the EEI division heads to review the focus and viability of their programs. In her opinion, EEI has achieved much, but she wanted to immerse herself in the details of EEI's current programs and future plans. Several times during the meeting the TSKP members tried to evoke from her a position, a perspective

about her future plans as the managing director of EEI. She acted in a conservative and reasonable fashion, considering the fact that she had taken over a rather high-visibility position. Once the meeting was concluded, the TSKP members left the new managing director and retired to their table. Following them in the interview process, the members of the news media met with the new managing director. Their questioning, albeit cleverly constructed, did not result in any new or revealing facts being reported. The news media were frustrated as the questions were being deflected and no firm, future plans were revealed.

The other members of the TSKP group had been meeting with the NGO group. The NGO members remained noncommitted as to their position about supporting the work of the TSKP group. Again, their fear about future funding of projects in their respective countries kept them from coming out and providing strong support for the TSKP programs.

As the facilitator, I allowed the questioning among the various groups to proceed for a period of time until I noticed that some participants began to “check out.” They had become frustrated with the ambiguity of the scenario and were very much in favor of getting on to the point where they had an opportunity to discuss their real-life, internal issues.

A second short press conference was staged following the group meetings. The newly appointed managing director for EEI stepped to the podium. Members of the news media asked her several questions about her future plans for EEI. Her answers mirrored those she gave at the various group meetings. She reacted in much the same manner as she did during the

interviews. Realizing that the simulation had stalled, I ended online play for episode two.

The offline period that followed simulation play was also short in duration. Several participants commented on their level of frustration when they had to deal with the new managing director of EEI. For many, the simulation had become too confusing. In retrospect, I believe I should not have given any instructions to the new managing director of EEI. Had she been given more freedom to commit to any strategy she chose, I think a more dramatic contrast in positions and policies between the senior managers of the GDB and EEI would have been achieved. It was obvious, that the participants were wallowing in the ambiguity of the simulation. Considering this, I decided to end the offline period review. Realizing that the simulation had lost its appeal, I ended the GDB simulation late in the morning on day two. The remaining part of the morning and all of the afternoon were dedicated to the discussion surrounding the revision to their real-life mission statement.

Using an exercise I created as a starting point for this part of the seminar (which I refer to as the "Creation of Mutual Purpose Exercise") the participants held an open and collaborative meeting and were able to significantly revise their mission statement. However, at the end of the day after they had accomplished the lion's share of the work, they wanted more time to think about the words they had chosen to describe their place in the Economic Development Institute. From my perspective, the work on their mission statement provided an opportunity to

work on something about which almost all of the participants expressed very strong feelings and opinions.

For the purposes of this study, episode three is provided below to complete the reader's understanding of this simulation.

Episode Three: A New President is Elected

Robert Kerrey of Nebraska, whose honest persona and unconventional style had won the support of Democrats and many Republicans to propel his victory in the Presidential election of 2000. Kerrey, a Medal of Honor winner in Vietnam, had the credibility and respect of both parties and his campaign promises seemed aligned with a nation entering the 21st century.

During the campaign, which was not only competitive but also controversial, President Kerrey was questioned by the press, by foreign dignitaries and by many other people about his policy towards the United Nations. Kerrey firmly resolved that he would do all he could to bring the United Nations and the United States together in more complementary ways. He vowed to pay the two billion dollar debt which the United States owed as a first sign of good faith, and he was committed to doing what he had promised.

At the same time, the United Nations had vowed to renew its efforts to work with the United States to foster a democratic perspective in its dealings with underdeveloped nations. Ashok Roberts, now Director General of UNESCO, sensed an opportunity to capitalize on President Kerrey's interest by establishing a knowledge outreach program, one that could possibly rival the programs

sponsored by the GDB. Inside GDB, these programs were in jeopardy, at least in the eyes of the senior management of EEI.

Indeed, the actions of the new GDB President and the director of EEI seem to signal a shift in the focus of GDB from a client-focused, learning/knowledge-based bank to one centered around a more traditional perspective. GDB's programs were now more focused on lending money to member nations in the underdeveloped world and on fostering sound policy (as defined by GDB officials) through the training of governmental policymakers in these nations. Needless to say, speculation was rampant about the future EEI as UNESCO set itself up to take up the cause where GDB left off.

Second-Cut Analysis—The Global Development Bank

As indicated in Chapter Two, EDI has moved to the forefront of the activities of the World Bank in the 1990s as the bank has sought to change its image from strictly a lending institution to an information-resource bank where knowledge was its major resource and export. Twenty-eight EDI employees participated in the seminar. The participants were from the United States, Great Britain, India, China, Spain, and France. They ranged in age from 25 to 52, and the gender split was 60 percent female and 40 percent male. Educational credentials ranged from Ph. D. to other graduate degrees. From this population nine interviews were conducted approximately six months following simulation play. Again, pseudonyms are used in this research to replace the names of the actual interviewees and to distinguish the individual comments.

Participant Learning

The first area deals with learning. In effect, I wanted to know what the participants learned from the simulation. The responses to the questions concerned with learning varied. Participants commented primarily about getting to know their colleagues better, the value of patience, the efficacy of listening, and the importance of building relationships. Comments which directly related to collaborative leadership are reserved for another section.

Proactive behaviors. Janet spoke of the simulation bringing home to her the need for a proactive approach in doing leadership.

I thought it was very useful because it really did awaken in me the idea that when events happen you react and that we were spending a lot of time lobbying about our programs and about the usefulness of them. Then we realized that we didn't have the ammunition to back up our claims about why the kinds of work that we were doing had been useful, is useful, and would be useful in the bank, under the new leadership. Having to advocate for those ideas, for our continuing work and presenting them as something that's valuable, sometimes in the face of skepticism and even hostility, that's tough! . . . I would reiterate that what I learned most from the simulation is the need to be proactive rather than reactive, that is, reacting to events. I realized that sometimes in our manner of working of putting out fires all the time, that we don't take stock of the bigger picture and bigger issues.

Building relationships. Again the simulation drove home the need for building relationships. Janet noted that building relationships requires that it is not just the people who are conveniently accessible that should be brought into the leadership dynamic. Collaborative leadership requires that people step beyond the convenience of their immediate office environments. Janet said:

I think for myself, personally, it helped to underscore that I tend to reach out to the people that are easier to get to or that come to me, rather than to those who are the most important for me to be reaching. Let me just rephrase that. It helped to underscore for me the need to strategically think of whom I need to get on board and then go after them, rather than, again, just going with whoever is more convenient.

Sophia echoed Janet's comments. While she noted the importance of building relationships, she found that it is difficult to do when the everyday issues seem to swallow up one's daily efforts.

I think we all agreed that we should be doing more to bring in the stakeholders, keep them informed, communicate more and all of that. I don't think we've managed to turn that around It made me realize that I probably did not do enough to go out and talk to people I should be talking to and building bridges and making sure who was with me, But in fact I, too, have been just totally enveloped by the day-to-day stuff. I have not really changed my behavior very much.

Getting to know one another. One of the most noted achievements of the GBD simulation was that it provided a forum where people who were new to the

organization as well as those who had been there for some time got to know and appreciate each other on a much more definitive basis. In fact, what the comments revealed was that the participants had an opportunity to observe each other's mental models for decision making. Ben commented on the effect the simulation had on him as he found this a unique opportunity to observe his co-workers.

I think that people saw different qualities of other people they worked with and maybe saw something different or new or came to understand something better about themselves working in certain kinds of situations. I would say I learned from both noticing some characteristics of co-workers that I might not have had occasion to notice before. I also noticed characteristics regarding my behaviors in certain kinds of situations in relation to co-workers that I might not have been clear about before.

Sophia also commented on the part of getting to know her colleagues quickly.

I enjoyed it very much, apart from it being an interesting simulation, I liked the message it was putting over. It was a lot of fun. For someone new to this particular group I could see it as a valuable experience for getting a feel for a team, a group of people working together.

Karen, too, acknowledged that she had learned a great deal about her fellow workers.

You learn something about your colleagues that maybe you didn't know before or see before, and even interact with them in a way that you don't do in your day-to-day life in your job. So for that reason alone it's useful to do it, because it sort of builds collaborative spirit since everybody has gone through the same thing and they're out of the office and they're in a different venue and all that kind of stuff.

Mental models of co-workers. Jennifer did a good job of summing up her experience as more than just getting to know her fellow workers. Jennifer got an opportunity to view the decisional mental model used by many of her co-workers for policy making. She made an astute observation of the nature of collaboration in policy making. Jennifer said:

I thought that it was really interesting to see the organization, if I could be looking at it from the outside, which I ended up doing a lot of. I did learn a lot about the inner workings of our organization. I kind of saw how people reacted to things and a lot of the way people develop policy and how they're going to stand on something and how they're going to put a spin on something. You're dealing with your co-workers, and this is a time when you can either make some bonds and work together in a way that can maybe further future work, future collaboration for working with somebody. But as far as seeing the situation and seeing how people acted in it and seeing hypothetically how your organization could work and what might be some of the ideas and opinions coming out, I think that it was very good and gave it a sense of relevance.

Consensus building. One of the participants made a direct comment on the value of consensus building. Karen said:

One of the things that I thought was challenging was not so much that what you had to do first was to be able to be effective within group. For instance, in the simulation you were with a group of 4 or 5 people, all of whom might have had different ideas as to how to proceed, so it took a lot of energy to work as a group, to have one voice coming out of the group. You have to build a consensus within the group that you are working in first.

Patience. Another participant noted that he needed to concentrate more on being patient. Ben said:

I would say as things evolved in the simulation I also became aware of the fact that I can get somewhat impatient with a situation when it begins to get more and more complicated, more and more complex as more and more people weigh in with more unexpected permutations and interpretations. I get impatient for the clarity that I, at least, imagine was there at the outset. But I learned a lot from that.

Need for a different type of seminar. Yet, for all the positive reactions to the simulation, there were also a set of negative responses. Many of these centered around the expectations of many of the participants for a different type of seminar, one dedicated to working entirely on their internal issues. Many of these comments played a valuable part in understanding the criticality of

preparing the participants for simulation play. Eric provided the most critical comment.

Actually I found it of limited value for me. I can't speak for the entire group, but I found it of limited value because of the kind of work that I do, which has a relatively narrow focus. We had participated in a retreat something like this seminar five or six months earlier, and we were kind of repeating the exercise and really weren't sure what the objective was. If we had known what we were getting into and perhaps a little more about what the outcomes might be—not that you can say in something like this what the outcomes will be—but kind of a general statement of purpose maybe, then it might have been better.

Need to have more time and direction. Ben partially benefited from the simulation, but he felt there was not enough time or specific direction for him to understand the way different people can collaborate.

I think I got a sense of how we build collaboration in the immediate circle. But how we get different circles to collaborate and seek consensus, I think we made less progress on that and maybe we needed more time or we needed more of an explicit command from you as the facilitator: “Now is to take these three tables that have just come up with three different concepts and action plans and proposals and get them to sort of see the world the same way.”

Of the nine interviewees, two provided very positive comments about their learning outcomes from the simulation, five provided mostly positive comments

and two thought the simulation had limited value to them. The participants' comments included: (1) proactive approach to building relationships, (2) getting an opportunity to know their colleagues better, (3) the value of consensus building, and (4) and the need for patience.

Shift in the Participants' Mental Model of Leadership

While the simulation was not completed, some participants indicated that they did learn something about collaborative leadership. For some, the simulation reinforced their current practices while for others the simulation provided new understandings of leadership.

Mental model of leadership. Edward commented that he felt comfortable with the mental model of collaborative leadership. He explained collaborative leadership from his perspective in this way.

Leadership is not only from the leader but the entire group impacts the decisions that leaders take, and each group has a voice and a role to play. So collaborative leadership also means that we question the way we do things as a group and as a team and that we take responsibility as a team. And, of course, in a team somebody has to be the leader, but we have to empower our leader, and the only way we can empower him or her is to basically share with him/her what it is that we feel because otherwise it will be unilateral. He or she could go around doing anything. But the whole notion of collaboration is that what you do impacts or at least is taken into account by the leader and your voice is heard.

Larry realized that position has little to do with practicing collaborative leadership. Larry said:

I think it probably made me focus a little more on the extent to which making things happen within a team is everyone's responsibility, which is a good thing to be reminded of. Even in those situations where one doesn't formally have the authority, your actions are part of the process of making something happen or not happen.

Collaboration. For Karen, the simulation reinforced the importance of collaboration. Engaging complex issues requires collaboration and acting in isolation is really not an option.

I don't know whether it reinforced the idea of collaborative leadership, but it reinforced the idea of collaboration, and that one has to collaborate with various groups to get anything accomplished What the simulation reinforced was that it's complicated but you have to relate to a variety of different groups and you can't get away from that. You can't act in isolation.

Delayed discovery. Sometimes a discovery occurs at the oddest of times. Eric, who had previously expressed his opinion about the limited value of the simulation to provide the experience he was looking for, made an interesting discovery. About twenty minutes after he had voiced his rather negative remark about the simulation's relevance, he spoke about collaboration.

I suppose now that I'm saying it out loud, I'm almost making the connection in my mind about collaborative leadership. If you look at the

exercise of communicating and sharing information among various groups involved in an activity—in this case it's very broad, it's kind of the entire bank and how it interacts with its clients and NGOs, and so forth—then in that sense, yes, it's kind of an exchange of information, hearing what people are saying and so forth that certainly would influence activities and influence the outcomes of what you're trying to accomplish in an organization. Maybe that's the connection.

Such a connection was exactly what the simulation fostered and what I was hoping the participants gained from playing it. Out of the nine people interviewed, eight were very positive about the simulation helping change or reinforce the collaborative leadership mental model. All of the participants had indicated that the value of collaboration had been clearly demonstrated to them. The simulation experience reinforced their views as to the value of collaboration in their work. Five made note of the fact that they were trying to be more collaborative in their everyday life. The most significant advantage of the simulation for them was that it provided an opportunity to reflect on their practices at work. The simulation helped them initiate a self-discovery process. The participants learned that (1) leadership is everyone's job, (2) isolation is not an option when faced with complex issues, (3) collaboration is essential for decision making, and (4) simulations can make subtle changes in a person's perception even if the participant is not immediately aware of it at the time.

Putting Collaborative Leadership to Work

Of the categories which this study covers, putting the tenets of collaborative leadership to work is an area that produced two specific examples.

Opened process. Larry found the simulation provided to him a need to keep attuned to the mutual agenda of the teams. While he noted that it has been difficult to do, he has stayed cognizant of the fact that opening up the process is important.

I would say that since the retreat I've tried to remain more attuned to team dynamics and to my responsibility for making things succeed within the teams I am part of and not just pushing my agenda forward. I wouldn't say I have succeeded in doing that as I have strong opinions. I still have a tendency to be a bulldozer at times.

Collaboration is a normal practice. Heather expressed the notion that collaboration was a normal way of life for her and her colleagues. She spoke enthusiastically about her group's collaborative ways.

We as a division have tried through our divisional meetings and through other ways to sort of keep each other in the loop, because you may know what your team is doing but you may not know what the other teams are doing. So I think the importance of sort of sharing exists, and I think we're doing that quite well. We have a division meeting every week and that goes on for about an hour where my manager talks and then basically the floor is open and people share.

Two interviewees used collaborative leadership practices at work, even though the data showed that people did understand and appreciate the need for collaborative leadership principles. One interviewee actually tried to change his behavior at work, while the other interviewee noted collaboration was a normal practice at work. Two other interviewees offered a reason for this lack of implementation.

Lack of initiative. Edward indicated that around the office environment, several people made reference to collaborative leadership. However, Edward noticed a reluctance on the part of the participants to take the initiative.

The idea of collaborative leadership in the sense of defining, taking responsibility for directions and sort of facing critical issues, that hasn't taken hold as strongly as it could have. I see the manager frustrated at times by people sort of assuming that he as manager will make the decision or handle a challenge when he sort of lays it out and it's something we need to address. There is every opportunity for people to either work with him on it or take responsibility for their own destinies on these issues. It hasn't happened as much as I think he might like.

Need for mutual purpose. Sophia's remarks seemed to indicate that the simulation could really be viewed as a first step in developing a deeper understanding of collaborative leadership as an influence relationship.

I thought it was very cleverly designed. Having worked in the bank for a long time and just recently worked on its annual report, I got a very good overview of the institution. It seems to me that whoever put this

simulation together really knew how things worked apart from everything else. It was very realistic in lots of ways. I sensed some frustration, which I actually didn't share. But there was frustration from some of the other groups that perhaps coming from this experience, we should have come to more conclusions somehow as to where we will be going in the future.

The conclusions from these comments demonstrates that only one interviewee had tried to put collaborative leadership practices to work. The simulation did not have the level of impact on the organization that the researcher had envisioned. One of the nine interviewees put the principles of collaborative leadership to work in his organization while another interviewee noted that collaboration was a normal practice in the division.

Implementation of Collaborative Leadership in the Organization

The simulation did not seem to produce any identifiable results as a function of implementing collaborative leadership in the World Bank Organization. While most interviewees did comment specifically on using collaboration in their everyday jobs, specific changes in policies, cost-saving benefits, or levels in participant morale were absent. As noted, one of the nine interviewees implemented collaborative leadership practices in the organization but no specific quantitative or qualitative resultant of using collaborative leadership was provided.

Participant Comments on the LeadSimm Prototype

Within the context of exploring improvements to the LeadSimm prototype, I asked questions which were designed to examine the viability and soundness of

the methodology. In terms of making the simulation realistic, several comments were made which either directly or indirectly spoke to this point.

Realism matters. Janet explained how shortly after the simulation began, she made the switch from looking at it as just an exercise to something that had relevance to her everyday experiences.

At the beginning of the simulation I was very aware that it was a simulation and that we were all playing parts. Some of it was funny! As we moved along it really sank in to me that we were simulating things that had a lot to do with reality and that these were events that may very well happen. It really reinforced for me the idea that we were really not prepared.

In reflecting on this Janet voiced her opinion about the importance of making the simulation realistic.

I think that I got a lot more out of it because I actually began to feel some of the urgency in a real way rather than always feeling distant from the experience as though I'm just play acting and this won't happen. But, in fact, I thought this could happen. So I think it really conveyed the sense of giving me a chance to do a trial run if something may happen in the short-to medium or long-term future.

Edward commented as well on the simulation to provide an experimental vehicle through which the staff could delve into a possible reality and experiment with the challenges they might face.

I think that it's important to make a scenario that is close enough to the reality of the issues facing the organization where you utilize the approach and also that the changes, shocks, challenges, or whatever you want to call them, that are built into the scenario are things that could happen and possibly are even on the minds of the group involved. It can not only make the exercise of building alliances and getting buy-in for certain approaches more real, but also it may actually have some operational utility coming out of what is discussed by the various groups. Ben also found that making the simulation real might help keep people from becoming reclusive in their offices.

It was highly interactive. It got everybody awake and engaged and thinking about things. I think it was relatively easy for people to get past the defining parameters of the drama that was being staged and to kind of get involved in playing whatever role they had been assigned to play. The fact is a lot of times today we are encouraged to work in teams, but we go to our own offices and close the door and we don't work in teams. Sometimes a simulated exercise helps people learn how to form and work in teams quicker than they would learn how to do it if life just went on.

Larry thought the simulation was valid in the scenario it presented. In his opinion, making the simulation work is a delicate balancing act. He cogently provided the reasoning for the use of "simulator's license" in composing the simulation.

The simulation of the current bank president leaving and trying to make the case as to what issues have to be brought forward at that time, in terms of a choice of subject was a good one, because in fact this is something that an awful lot of people here worry about. It is always a balance on the one hand to create a situation that is separated enough from the actual reality of our lives that we are able to get a little distance from it and think about the issues and not just think about our daily concerns, while at the same time having it be close enough to those concerns that we can get our hands around it and work with it in ways that we find meaningful. The trick, it seems to me, is getting enough critical distance from current reality to create a simulation that doesn't get caught up in petty bickering over current reality while something that is close enough that going through that simulation is meaningful to people in their jobs.

Sophia noted that even though the participants knew it was a simulation, they seemed to act in the same way they would if they were at their jobs and the same series of events occurred.

I would go around trying to get the management to give me an interview. And this is actually quite realistic. They ran away. They're all in little groups trying to confer with one another, and then they were trying not to give out any information. It was kind of difficult for them because they didn't really know what to say. But that's how it is when the press approach you, particularly in this kind of situation. But I was feeling very

much that I had to get a story out and yet these people weren't telling me anything.

Ben expressed the value of this particular simulation to him and his co-workers quite well.

I thought it was valuable and I think I learned some things about myself and people I work with, and I think there was a sense of flow and engagement. We were all taken out of our day-to-day challenges and handed another set of challenges to deal with for two days and that was valuable and sort of accelerating the rate at which we came to understand our own and others' strengths and shortcomings.

Facilitator capability. I also sought comments on the perceived value the facilitator brought to the simulation dynamic. Janet commented on the almost invisibility of the facilitator.

I think the facilitator played a real key role, but once the whole thing got started we really kind of took off and I don't recall exactly what you did during the simulation. Maybe that's the sign of a good facilitator. You were not there calling attention to yourself.

Heather also provided her perspective about the facilitator's role in keeping the simulation on track.

Keeping us on track was very important. I always believe that in participatory things if you don't have a strong moderator or facilitator it can just fizzle out. The momentum can fizzle out very quickly, because it then

becomes just a talk-fest or gabfest. Everyone just talks and there's no focus to it. So, yes, in that way I think that your role was quite important. Karen commented on the fine line the facilitator must walk in order to allow the simulation to do its work.

I think that it's probably a fine line between how much a facilitator intervenes and how much he or she sits back and lets things go. At one point you come in and change the way things are going or make recommendations. So, yes, that's important.

Online and offline facilitation. The online and offline method of facilitation was used, and I wanted the interviewees to comment on the perceived effectiveness of the offline mode of play. Karen commented on how it gave people the opportunity to stop and voice their concerns.

I think it allows different people in the group to voice their concerns that maybe aren't allowed to come up during the role play. It also makes people think a little bit as you're going along. You're not just getting caught up in the role play, but you're stopping and then standing back and looking at certain things. I think that helps as a learning experience to have that opportunity.

Ben said that in his opinion taking the simulation offline is essential to its effectiveness.

Actually, I'd make a generalization. I think that's an essential part of any kind of simulation that I've been part of in the past is that kind of debriefing. I call it debriefing, a session where people can actually

express what it is that's going on with them or that went on in the process of the actual simulation. Otherwise, people have their own experiences but they don't get shared.

Sophia discovered the essence of the intent of the simulation as she reflected on the worth of the offline mode of play.

The online mode got pretty intense at times, but it was good to be able to pull back and relax a little bit to look at what was going on. Maybe this is another reason why it's important to have something that is based on a realistic scenario because then people don't have to worry so much about the substance. You just concentrate on the processes of what you're really trying to get across. This was just very, very new and really seemed to relate to our organization and the way we work. It was great.

Of the nine interviewees seven provided very positive comments while one was positive and one spoke about the seminar being not what the organization needed at that time. The comments included: (1) the ability of the simulation to accelerate learning, (2) the process learning aspect of the simulation, (3) the need for making the simulation realistic, and (4) the need for the facilitator to maintain a delicate balancing act throughout simulation play.

The second cut analysis completed in this chapter gives selected comments of the eighteen interviewees, organized around the five research questions. The analysis is divided into two major parts, each of which dealt with one of the two simulations that implemented the LeadSimm prototype. At the end of each section analyzing a research question, I provided a summary of the

analysis regarding that specific research question. Thus, there are five summaries for the San Jose simulation and five summaries for the World Bank simulation that are the essential components of the second-cut analysis.

Since the second-cut analysis is somewhat scattered and disintegrated, the task ahead in Chapter Five is to bring all of the various summaries and analyses presented in Chapter Four to a head and make an integrated whole out of mass of data for this research. In Chapter Five I present brief and clear answers to each of the five research questions, state eleven conclusions that derive from this research, and discuss future activities regarding the use of simulations in leadership development research and practice.

CHAPTER FIVE

LEADSIMM PROTOTYPE: CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

Review of the Purpose and Focus of This Study

The LeadSimm prototype uses true-to-life organizational scenarios in which elements of the rational, political, symbolic or cultural, and human resources models are introduced to produce a complex context in which the participants examine their willingness and abilities to engage in collaborative leadership practices, i.e., the formation of consensus groups, facilitation, collaboration, mutual purpose, shared vision, common goals, influence relationships, and transformative change. The purpose of this study is to create interpersonal simulations based on the LeadSimm prototype for play by decision makers, organization members and other stakeholders to play and to evaluate the ability of those simulations to instill collaborative leadership beliefs and practices in said participants.

I began this study by stating the problem with industrial leadership development programs and their focus on developing individuals from whom leadership flowed or was distributed. I then provided an overview of the continuing leadership debate with a look at the bureaucratic practices and the need and reasoning for contemporary decision makers and members of organizations to view leadership in a light that was more congruent with a knowledge-based society. A discussion for changing power from a positional to

a referent perspective was stressed along with the idea that the application of democratic principles in the workplace was also more congruent with the needs of knowledge workers. The Leadership Interdependency Scale pictorially displayed the difference between the industrial and the postindustrial perspectives of leadership.

Collaborative leadership is a dynamic wherein people, possessing a sense of mutual purpose and guided by a shared vision, engage in an influence relationship to make transforming change. Along with the changes in leadership models, organizational learning was discussed as an essential characteristic of knowledge-based organizations. Stories and narratives are the essence of an individual's or organization's cultural understanding. Stories have the ability to capture the meaning of events. The roots of the LeadSimm method are an example of the power of non-computer simulations to have an uncanny connection to reality, as discussed in the Battle of Midway scenario. Simulations are an effective method for learning a new model of leadership. To that end this study is concerned with the "real" learning value of the LeadSimm prototype to provide a new and different approach to learning leadership dynamics for a knowledge-powered society.

In Chapter Three I presented the LeadSimm prototype methodology in detail, following the presentation of leadership and learning in knowledge-based organizations. The chapter included a history of the genesis of the LeadSimm idea as well as an explanation of scenario development and simulation facilitation as the two distinct but interrelated parts of the LeadSimm prototype. In this

research I used a qualitative research approach in which data from the simulation experience, along with the stories of selected participants, were examined and analyzed. The two simulations involved in the study were played by members of two different organizations: the San Jose Police Department, a major metropolitan police department in California, and the New Programs and Outreach Division of the Economic Development Institute of the World Bank. Fifty-four participants played in the simulations and eighteen were interviewed. Nine were interviewed eleven months following simulation play and nine were interviewed six months after the simulation.

The research questions at the end of Chapter One were the focal point for the findings of the research. Appendix A lists the 19 questions used by the interviewer, as a baseline for the examination of the research questions. Seventeen interviews were conducted by telephone and recorded using a tape recorder. Each participant acknowledged that he/she was being interviewed at the beginning and at the end of each tape. One interview was conducted in person while the interviewee visited San Diego on business. A tape of this conversation was also made and the same acknowledgements also applied.

Sixteen of the interviewees made positive comments about their learnings during the simulations and their acceptance of the collaborative leadership model. Nine put collaborative leadership to work in their organizations, with four reporting direct results from the use of the collaborative leadership model. The two scenarios used were different in nature. While one operated almost wholly as anticipated, the other put the participants in too much of a defensive posture.

The data show that when the LeadSimm simulation uses a three-episode scenario, it can aid in the shift of the participants' mental models.

Research Questions

The research questions put forth in Chapter One are designed to not only evaluate the simulation's effect on the participants but to, wherever possible, provide quantitative or qualitative episodic examples of collaborative leadership practices at the participants' work environments. The data taken from two simulations included 18 participant interviews, eleven and six months after simulation play. While not originally intended, the extended period of time taken for the interviews after the simulations were played provided an opportunity to evaluate the lasting effects of the simulation experience on the participants. It was, in the end, a most valuable quirk of fate that shaped the evaluative lessons learned from this study. The findings and conclusions regarding these questions are provided in the following sections.

Participants' Learning

The first research question engaged the interviewee in an open dialogue by providing him or her with an opportunity to discuss the simulation experience. The first research question is: As a result of participating in the simulation, what did you learn? As expected, the eighteen respondents noted a variety of things learned during the simulation experience. Sixteen of the interviewees make positive remarks concerning what they learned as a result of simulation play.

One of the key items that emerged from the data about the LeadSimm simulation was that it provided an invaluable opportunity for the participants to

represent other stakeholder groups. For many, the experience of playing a member of another stakeholder group gave them an opportunity to step back and see the world in which they live from a completely different perspective. While it might seem that playing a role would not have such a dramatic effect, the participants noted quite often that they actually felt like they had become the members of the group they were role playing. As a result they discovered that different people can have varying perspectives about the same issue. These different perspectives are, in fact, the realities of the other stakeholders and need to be understood and accepted as such if different people want to establish a common ground to resolve problems through collaborative strategies. The ability for people to step into another's shoes and to experience the feelings of other stakeholders opened the participants up to a new learning experience. The simulation used the basic brain-based learning technique described by Caine & Caine (1994) by immersing the participants into the dynamic of the problem. This immersion also supported new cognitive meanings for the participants as each member took on a different role in the story.

The simulation also underscored the need for a proactive approach to building relationships. Remaining in isolation or working autonomously is at times necessary. However, when dealing with complex issues that require the knowledge and focus of different organization members, seeking to establish relationships at the time the crisis occurs is too late. The need for a proactive approach to building relationships is an essential requirement to creating a collaborative leadership dynamic. In fact, collaborative leadership is truly about

the work people need to do in order to avoid the effect of a crisis. Building relationships takes time.

But the realization that building relationships is difficult to do, especially when people are working at a self-described frenetic pace, also became apparent to the participants. They came to understand that this endeavor must be viewed as vital to the effective and efficient functioning of any organization. Concomitantly, the participants also underscored the conclusion that those relationships are easier to build in an environment where trust, consensus building, and influence flourish. The ability of a group to do collaborative leadership is directly related to the level of trust members have for other members. The participants directly referred to trust as a two-way street because it forms the basis of a relationship. Trust, a part of social capital, is not specifically owned by anyone. It exists in the bonds among people who are engaged together in some collective undertaking.

Listening also emerged from the data as essential to building relationships. Without listening, dialogue is impossible. There can be no transfer of meaning in conversation because one or the other party is not receiving the message carrying the meaning.

For others the simulation provided an opportunity to get to know their colleagues better. Because the interviewees were able to see their co-workers up close and in action during the simulation play, they gained an appreciation for each person's decision-making mental model. In this respect, the simulation was

also a great opportunity for new organizational members to become part of the operations of a group quickly and effectively.

Some data reveal that a few individuals did not learn as much from the simulation experience as others. The conclusion drawn from these data is that everyone experiencing a group simulation does not come away from that experience as a real learner. Also, the data suggest that all the participants in the simulation did not learn the essential lessons of the simulation equally well. Both of these conclusions verify a common sense approach as to the effects of any group exercise. Common sense tells us that when 25 people experience the same learning exercise, there will be various levels of learning acquired by their participation.

In general, the data from this study reveal that the learning curve of the participants engaged in these leadership development simulations resembles a higher curve than normal bell curve. The curve would show a large number of participants at a high learning level, the majority at an average learning level, and a small number at the low learning level.

Sixteen of the interviewees commented on the simulation's ability to demonstrate and to create a positive learning experience.

Changing the Mental Model of Leadership

The second research question is: As a result of participating in the simulation, did the participants provide evidence of a metanoia or shift in their mental model of leadership? This question is the critical focus of this study because the simulation experience is aimed at achieving this shift in mental

models. Would the participants, as a result of the simulation experience, truly change their minds about the nature of leadership from that of a singular actor to that of a collective dynamic.

As already mentioned when 54 people are placed into a simulation, the result will most likely be that each will walk away with different impressions and meanings from the experience. The data indicate that the 18 interviewees had different perspectives about what the simulation experience did to change or reinforce their model to collaborative leadership. The participants comments revealed that 16 interviewees out of 18 felt that the validity of the collaborative leadership model was either demonstrated or reinforced by the simulation experience. The participants called collaborative leadership the essence of the community-policing concept. Creating an environment where people could fully participate in the leadership dynamic helped the participants transcend the notion of community policing as just another program. The approval of eight interviewees for the collaborative leadership model resulted in an a corresponding disapproval for the authoritarian leadership model. The authoritarian leadership model was rejected as inadequate because, as participants reported, it does not have the ability to deal with the complex issues that face law enforcement organizations today. Leadership becomes everyone's responsibility. Collaboration and the reliance on input from different stakeholders superceded the tendency to act in isolation. In that regard, the simulation resulted in a reeducation process. This reeducation altered the participants' attitudes about respect for not only members inside the organization but those

stakeholders that traditionally reside outside of the organization. The importance of bringing the external partners in, no matter how difficult or nontraditional it might seem, became apparent to many participants.

Complex issues and challenges require collaboration and an interdependent set of relationships that take advantage of community input. Often, the solution to issues resides with ordinary community members and not with authority figures. Thus, many of the themes discussed in the previous section on learning were again reinforced by the data reviewed for this section. Collaborative leadership requires a nonjudgmental approach to facilitating the collective dynamic. The most important thing to generate is a free and open exchange of information and knowledge that might affect the issue under discussion. This open process brings all those engaged in the leadership dynamic to a place where learning occurs. This learning transforms individuals and gives them the knowledge, will, and desire to change their contexts. Creating relationships and building trust underscore the need to remain attuned to team dynamics. Actions such as listening, positive and nonjudgmental facilitation, clear explanations of each person's perspective, and collaboration boost the trust-building processes. The reeducation process clarified ideas and provided new terms that connect to the collaborative model which gave the participants the needed terminology to discuss their ideas more intelligently. The simulation facilitated a reduction in discursive mediocrity as it increased the level of reflective dialogue.

Challenging individuals to change their mental model of leadership is not a passive undertaking. While the LeadSimm method is, at times, referred to as a game, it is not child's play. The increase in reflective dialogue may foster a state of cognitive dissonance for the participants. Participants may feel a level of emotional and psychological discomfort associated with learning that their beliefs about leadership are no longer adequate and their mental models must change. The facilitator and the organization's sponsor for the LeadSimm seminar must be aware that a participant may feel a level of anxiety during and after the simulation is played. This period of distress may last until the individual rationalizes his or her current model of leadership or readjusts his or her mental model to a new paradigm of leadership.

Time and again the participants stated the immutable connection between building relationships and listening. Listening may be one of the highest forms of respect one can give to another. In the simulation the participants found out that those who listened intently to others showed respect for them and invited them to be part of the relationship they were building. Listening not only includes hearing the words a person speaks, it calls for attending to the tone, the attitude, and the disposition of the one speaking. The participants saw that listening was an important aspect of collaborating with others, and this seemingly small breakthrough helped them change their mental model of communication. They changed from an authority-oriented telling model to a collaborative-oriented listening model, and in this way moved ever so slightly towards a collaborative mental model of leadership.

Putting Collaborative Leadership to Work

The next question which this research seeks to answer is: As a result of participating in the simulation, did the participants put the elements of collaborative leadership to work in their positions? After the participants emerged from the simulation, were the effects of their learning experience like seeds that had fallen on rocky soil or did they blossom in fertile soil? Since the interviews were conducted six to eleven months after the simulations, the participants had time to demonstrate whether or not they implemented some or all of what they learned during the simulation into their activities in the organizations in which they worked. While the data analysis of the previous two sections dealing with participant learning and changing mental models of leadership resulted in a convergence of findings for both simulations, the data analysis for this section suggests a divergence of the results.

Indeed, the results from the police simulation point to a strong implementation of collaborative leadership practices by the interviewees. The interviewees figuratively described an "opening up" of their methods from an authoritative, even dictatorial stance to a more collaborative approach. This is the most notable theme of the police simulation. For example, the opening up of the process provided the police officers an insight that the perception that the community may have is, in fact, the community's reality. A tenet of collaborative leadership requires the appreciation for diverse perspectives and opinions. A decision maker cannot dismiss a perspective just because it doesn't agree with his or hers. To that end, many of the interviewees said that they provided less

direction and sought high degrees of inputs from the junior ranks than before the simulation. Decision makers wanted others to be more involved, to have a vested interest in the outcome of decisions. It became apparent to them that everyone's ideas truly counted.

Bringing a diverse group of people together required consensus building. This consensus building was necessary to building effective partnerships or relationships with not only the community but all the stakeholder groups. In the opinions of the interviewees, the implementation of collaborative leadership over the course of eleven months proved itself to be much more effective than competitive or antagonistic approaches to police work.

However, the data analysis of the Global Development Bank simulation showed a different result. While seven of the interviewees had a positive, reinforcing experience concerning collaborative leadership during the simulation, the data suggest that they were reluctant to put collaborative leadership to work. Only one person actually tried to implement the principle of collaboration in the organization dynamics with which he was engaged with.

The question of putting collaborative leadership to work resulted in a divergent outcome. Nine of the eighteen interviewees put collaborative leadership to work, with eight of the police group using collaborative practices in their approaches to work. One of the police group did not put collaborative leadership to work. Eight of the World Bank participants did not put collaborative leadership to work in their organization, while one did.

The Impact of Collaborative Leadership Activities on the Organization

The fourth research question is: What impact did these collaborative leadership activities have on the organization? Of the nine interviewees who put collaborative leadership to work, four pointed to specific examples of doing so. The four specific examples came from the police group.

Two interviewees noted an increase in morale both inside and outside of the department as a result of the relationship-building process. Police officials invited the community to be part of the process by listening intently to their concerns, acknowledging the community perspective as reality and by speaking frankly about the need for the police and the community to work together. The community responded with greater participation in policing efforts through the use of telephone call-ins to support police work and to express their feelings of being cared for. The community became more fully involved in the collaborative decision-making process because for the first time they truly believed police officials cared about them.

Within a small police group, the senior officer requested input from the junior officers. One junior officer made a suggestion which, when implemented, resulted in a significant cost savings to the city. The senior officer sighted an increase in creativity because the junior members of the organization were helping to define the future direction of their group.

Another interviewee brought a new bar owner into the collaborative process prior to the opening of the bar. Working together, the police, bar owner,

and employees built a relationship and developed a security plan. The result was zero crime incidents reported for this particular establishment.

One interviewee noted that as a result of playing in the simulation, he learned the importance of giving direct, honest and forthright answers to members of the press. Several months following simulation play, he gave a press interview surrounding a highly visible and controversial issue. Using the simulation as a guide, he answered all questions directly and specifically and received many positive comments about his actions from his superiors. He did not lose trust from either the members of his department or the press.

These impacts demonstrate the influential nature of collaborative leadership. Within their sphere of influence, these officers made substantive change in the level of inclusion and level of involvement in their department.

The Global Development Bank simulation had no corresponding impact on the organization as a result of the participants putting collaborative leadership to work.

The 18 participants only cited four specific examples of impacts on the organization as a result of putting collaborative leadership to work.

Comments on The LeadSimm Prototype

This study concentrated on evaluating the efficacy of the LeadSimm simulation to instill collaborative leadership practices in the participants. In developing any prototype, improvements are of great concern. The fifth research question is: As a result of participating in the simulation, what positive or negative remarks did the participants give regarding the LeadSimm prototype?

One of the most unique discriminators between LeadSimm and other leadership development methods is the use of a simulation which is custom designed for the participants of a specific organization. Of the 18 interviewees questioned, all stated the importance of making the simulation realistic. Realistic simulations provide several advantages over role-playing exercises that are based on a generic issue or problem that might be endemic to a group of organizations. First, the participants engaged in the simulation with a higher sense of enthusiasm and appreciated that the scenario was especially tailored to their organization. Some of them referred to the realistic nature of the simulation to be a case of *déjà vu* for them. For the police simulation the issues presented very similar to the same issues they had experienced prior to or experienced following simulation play. For the bank simulation the issues in the scenario were well within the realm of possibility and represented the worst fear of many of the Economic Development Group employees. This level of realism in a LeadSimm simulation helped the participants to immerse themselves into the simulation. The simulation became real, relevant and in many cases, had directly transferable knowledge to their everyday work experience. To that end, participants felt the pressure associated with the simulated contexts and the job of making decisions. For example, the participants did not have the option of operating in isolation when they were faced with a complex environment. The police simulation demonstrated this because the police officials did isolate themselves from the rest of the stakeholder groups. The participants realized the futility of this isolationist approach and the need to open up their processes and

collaborate with the other stakeholder groups. The participants abandoned their policy of isolation during episode two of the police simulation.

In the bank simulation seven of interviewees also appreciated the level of realism associated with the bank scenario. These respondents noted that the simulation represented a significant fear that a change in senior managers would have a long-term effect on their jobs. Moving to a more traditional banking policy and away from the knowledge orientation under which the bank had been operating for the past five years was a scenario that the bank participants had thought about quite often.

In terms of the offline and online modes of play, all 18 interviewees had positive things to say about the basic method of facilitation. They generally felt that it was important to take the simulation offline to analyze what had taken place during the online play. Waiting until the end of the day would not provide the powerful reinforcement needed to make the analysis clear to the participants. Taking the simulation offline gave the participants the opportunity and the time to reflect on their activities and the impact that their activities had on the other groups and individuals. Using the online and offline mode of play provided an opportunity for the participants to take action and then reflect on their actions prior to the beginning of a next episode. Discussing the underlying issues and assumptions allowed several people to alter their mental models and engage in double-loop learning by questioning the underlying assumptions associated with their decisions and, more generally, their actions.

All 18 participants underscored the role and importance of the facilitator. Many commented that the facilitator was needed to keep the simulation on track as there were times when the direction seemed to be tangential to the focus and intent of the simulated episode. The respondents indicated that the facilitator must know when to let the dynamic play itself out or intervene in order to modify the direction the simulation was taking. The interviewees stressed that the facilitator must have certain knowledge and workings of simulations to be effective.

But the most subtle and yet vitally important facilitator functions had to do with creating the right type of environment for simulation play. The facilitator must establish an environment of trust and safety within which the participants can play out their full stakeholder roles. In essence, the collaborative leadership environment must be modeled by the facilitator in carrying out the LeadSimm simulation. The facilitator and the participants must establish a relationship built on safety and trust. This relationship mirrors the collaborative leadership dynamic so that the participants can express themselves freely and openly during the simulation.

All eighteen interviewees attested to the value of making the simulation realistic and of the complementary relationship between the online and offline modes of play. These two modes of play helped create an environment where it was safe to play, to experiment and to make mistakes which are essential to simulation play and to the sharing of knowledge within and across stakeholder groups.

Conclusions

There are eleven conclusions of the research. They are:

1. LeadSimm is capable of immersing the participants into the leadership dynamic.
2. LeadSimm demonstrated the principles of a learning organization.
3. LeadSimm has a lasting effect on some participants.
4. LeadSimm is a process trainer.
5. LeadSimm validates the collaborative leadership model presented.
6. Doing collaborative leadership requires that the participants take a long-term view of building relationships and facing challenges.
7. LeadSimm demonstrated an end-to-end systemic connection.
8. Realism in simulation design and development is vitally important.
9. The LeadSimm simulation should be developed so that the participants can use a here-and-now situation that allows them to practice a collaborative approach.
10. Participants need to be prepared for LeadSimm simulations.
11. The seminar and the simulation must emphasize the influence aspect of collaborative leadership.

First, the LeadSimm method does immerse the participants into the leadership dynamic. There were many instances when participants spoke of feeling the persona of other stakeholders. The majority of the interviewees noted that playing other stakeholders and seeing the issues from a different perspective were among the most important benefits of the LeadSimm simulation.

Second, LeadSimm demonstrated the value of using the five essential components of the learning organization as espoused by Senge (1990). As a result of simulation play, the interviewees noted that their processes were more open and they engaged in personal growth. The interviewees changed their approach to a more proactive and collaborative outlook. They viewed their jobs and the roles they played with a greater sense of responsibility about their ability to exert far-reaching influence (personal mastery). The simulation demonstrated to 16 of the 18 interviewees the efficacy of the collaborative leadership model. They had the opportunity to surface, test and improve their internal pictures of how the world works (mental models). The interviewees of both simulations came to understand the need for greater input from various people when facing a challenge. Bringing diverse people into that process to join together in a confluence of interest demonstrated the need to develop mutual purpose. Without such a sense of purpose and shared vision, the efforts of the participants became scattered and unfocused (shared vision). LeadSimm is a team-learning method. Collective learning and action are an inherent part of the LeadSimm methodology (team learning). Several times during the simulations the participants saw how the results of their actions affected other stakeholder groups. In the face of complex challenges, polarization of the groups brought the decision-making processes to a standstill. Using the principles of collaborative leadership, stakeholder groups began to build trust and gain commitment for the shared vision they developed (systems thinking).

Third, LeadSimm made a lasting impression and resulted in a lasting effect on half of the interviewees. Those participants who tried to put collaborative leadership to work did so because the simulated experience had altered their perspective about the importance of building collaborative relationships. Several participants called the LeadSimm simulation experience powerful and transforming.

Fourth, LeadSimm is really a process trainer. It is designed to provide a respect for and a working knowledge of the collaborative leadership processes. The format used for both simulations in this study was not designed to fix the exact problems and issues which a particular organization was facing at the time. The reason is that the information used to create the scenario was a hypothesized or anticipated situation. This is true for every simulation. While simulations can have an uncanny connection to real events, as the Battle of Midway example demonstrated in Chapter Three, they are not reality. No one can predict to an absolute level of certainty what will occur if a similar situation truly materializes in the organization. However, understanding the basic processes which could be used to bring the issues to resolution—the focus and intent of the LeadSimm simulation—may help the people in the organization effectively solve the problem. There are many times when the actions taken by the participants in the simulation produced directly transferable knowledge to their lives on the job.

Fifth, LeadSimm validated the effectiveness of the collaborative leadership model presented in Chapter Two. Without a fully understood mutual purpose

and shared vision, collaboration can become aimless and scattered.

Collaboration does not mean that the efforts of the people engaged in the dynamic are not focused. After all, the intent of collaborative leadership is to make transforming change. Instead, mutual purpose and shared vision become like the headlights on a car, lighting the way, the direction in which all the people on board are moving. The simulation demonstrated that having a clear sense of mutual purpose is vital to the collaborative efforts. The participants used words or demonstrated concepts displayed in the model including: collaboration, consensus building, trust building, influence relationships, ethical process, and transforming change

Sixth, collaborative leadership requires a longer-term view about the challenges at hand as opposed to meeting a series of specific short-term deadlines. It does, as one respondent noted, take the decision-making process from a reactive to a proactive basis. This proactive mode of operation inherent in collaborative leadership, complements the tenets of organizational learning because collaborative leadership encourages those in the dynamic to look at the issues at hand systemically. In a reactionary decision making process, a multitude of decisions can be made which seemingly have no corresponding effect on other decisions. The efficacy of this reactionary method has been seriously challenged by those who are engaged in double-loop learning by questioning underlying assumptions of those engaged in the relationship who are committed to making transforming change.

Seventh, the LeadSimm method is a working model that demonstrated an end-to-end systemic connection. Metaphorically, an end-to-end systemic connection is comparable to the first time a house was ever wired for electrical power or the first time a house had a telephone installed. Could power be sent from a generator to the house or could a call be made from someplace and reach the intended recipient? The entire research demonstrated a continuous link between the LeadSimm idea, scenario background research, scenario development, simulation facilitation, the data collection and the data analyses segments that consisted of learning, mental-model shifts, implementation of collaborative leadership and the results of using collaborative leadership in organizations. Now that this first link has been established, improvements and updates to the LeadSimm prototype can be made.

Eighth, the LeadSimm simulation created a dynamic where the participants experienced effects of their decisions in a realistic environment. While good sense dictates that 25 people will take away different learnings from any experiential exercise, the LeadSimm simulation demonstrated the difference between using an authoritarian approach as opposed to a collaborative approach to leadership. The difference is that complex problems require people to work together sharing knowledge openly to make transforming change. In complex decision-making scenarios, no one person can order or command the problem to go away.

The LeadSimm simulation also demonstrated to the participants that they were capable of doing leadership without any immediate need or requirement to

obtain a higher level of personal human development. The comments from the interviewees showed that they had the capability to do collaborative leadership. All that was needed was an understanding of the principles of the model and an opportunity to practice and use of the model in numerous situations.

Ninth, putting the participants on the defensive without giving them an opportunity to work through an issue or a series of complex tasks does not demonstrate the need for nor does it encourage the participants to use collaborative leadership. While not fully apparent during the scenario development phase of each simulation, important nuances of the scenarios turned out to be different. The police scenario gave the participants a series of events which, while challenging, provided an opportunity for the stakeholders to use collaborative leadership. Even though the reaction of many of the stakeholders during episode one in the police scenario was defensive in nature, they had several occasions in the following episodes to use a collaborative leadership approach. On the other hand, the bank scenario did not present such clear opportunities. The simulation was based on a greatest fear scenario as opposed to a series of more present-day issues which would require the participants to use a collaborative approach. The need for building relationships became the prime motivator in the bank scenario. During simulation play, the participants acted more from a motivation of survival, justification, and defensiveness as a result of the events that had occurred in the scenario rather than from a realization that building relationships was important for future policy-making processes about the vision of the World Bank. It is clear to me now that

the police simulation was more successful than the bank simulation because of the issues inserted in the respective scenarios. This research would have been much stronger had a more realistic, here-and-now issue been selected for the bank simulation.

Tenth, one significant area of learning for the researcher is the level of preparedness of the participants needed to play effectively in the simulation. Preparing the participants before the actual seminar during which the simulation is played requires more than just scenario development. While certain preparatory exercises are normally a part of a leadership seminar, I realize now that an additional introductory briefing sheet is also required. The participants need a better idea of what is expected from them and the activities in which they will engage. The results of the research would have been more clear had the participants been better prepared for the simulation by using an introductory briefing sheet.

Eleventh, even though the simulation provided a positive learning experience, the simulation methodology needs to place greater emphasis on understanding collaborative leadership as an influence relationship. The inability to play episode three for the bank simulation might have had a negative impact on the interviewees' perspectives about the influence element of collaborative leadership. A weakness in the research—not playing the third episode in the bank simulation—proved to be a powerful point which could be stated thusly: Three episodes may be essential to effective learning on the part of the participants engaging in a leadership development seminar. So an on-the-spot decision not

to completely implement the research methodology or fully play out the simulation, paradoxically, lead to a significant conclusion in the research findings.

Strengths and Weaknesses of This Research

The research revealed two significant strengths. First, the research demonstrated the usefulness of this type of study to develop and evaluate simulation prototypes. The strength of the qualitative methodology showed how messy and how variable the results of simulations are. This qualitative research showed quite dramatically how diversely human beings react to: (1) different scenarios and different episodes of the scenarios, (2) the significant issues with which they are confronted in the simulation, (3) the actions and reactions of the facilitator (4) and the activities of various players and stakeholder groups. The qualitative methodology clearly indicated the divergent impacts that the behavior of players had on the decision-making process as well as the effects of these behaviors had on individual players and stakeholder groups. The use of a quantitative research approach would not have captured the level of complexity and variability associated with the LeadSimm vignettes.

Second, and somewhat serendipitously, the use of the video tape-recorder during the first episode of the police simulation was a significant strength insofar as it allowed for a much better description of the play action and a more insightful analysis of the first and second episodes of this simulation. The participants mentioned and demonstrated that while they felt and acted somewhat self-conscious in the beginning of the simulation after a short while they became caught up in the action. As noted, the answer to the first research question about

participant learning described how the participants had assumed the roles and felt the feelings of the different stakeholder groups. They became emotionally committed to those stakeholders they represented in the simulation even though they were being videotaped.

Three weaknesses in the research were noted. First, the use of audio or video tapes to record the actions of the participants for all episodes of both simulations would have provided a more complete record of the observations of the participants during simulation play. Except for episode one of the police simulation, the 18 interviews provided the bulk of the data for analyses. The evaluation of the LeadSimm method would benefit from a more comprehensive account of the participant interactions during simulation play.

Second, the line between facilitator and researcher became blurred. This contributed to the fact that the bulk of the research relied on the data analyses of the interviews. It is important to know when to step away from the facilitator role and assume the role of researcher for a study of this nature. While I intensively watched the activities of the participants during simulation play, I did so using a facilitator's lens. An end-of-the-day summation drawn from observing and written from a researcher's perspective would have greatly helped in creating an overall perspective as to the learnings taking place.

Third, data analyses for the simulations would have benefited from interviews immediately following simulation play as well as six or twelve months after the simulation had ended. With two sets of data from two sets of interviews, comparative analyses could have emerged from the two sets of interview data.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research in the area of leadership development of simulations would hopefully grow out of the research started here. There are five recommendations for future research. First, an area of interest is the need to create a computer-generated technological interface for the players. This does not mean that the simulation activities would change from being interpersonal to a simulation where the activities are only done at a computer terminal. I have already described how the LeadSimm type of simulation differs from a computer simulation. However, we need future research about how technology and multi-media can be used to make the simulation more dramatic or more effective by supplying definitive information about such items as news reports, financial operations, or messages received from different stakeholders.

Second, the use of multiple simulations that supports lasting change is an area that requires future study. The participants played one LeadSimm simulation in connection with this research. Simulations have their greatest effect on the participants when issues and problems are simulated more than once. For example, pilots do not simulate landing at only one airfield nor do they simulate landing at that airfield only one time. Pilots spend hours in simulators practicing their flight operations during numerous simulations with different flight conditions. In much the same way, participants in leadership simulations would have a greater opportunity to practice and retain the principles of collaborative leadership if given the chance to practice collaborative leadership several times under different conditions and regarding various critical issues. The lasting effect

and retention of the lessons learned in multiple simulations would be much higher and we need research to validate this conclusion.

The third area for future research centers around the creation of a Leadership Scale of Development. The LSD would provide indicators as to the predominant leadership models of both the individuals and the organization as well as the ability of the individuals and the organization to make change. The groups selected to play the simulation for this research were treated much the same way, in terms of my approach to developing the scenario and facilitating the scenario. I considered the groups to be somewhat homogenous in their preparedness to play the simulation and to take the lessons learned and put them into practice following the simulation experience. Using a survey instrument or some qualitative method to develop a Leadership Development Scale may provide important indications to the facilitator of a LeadSimm simulation as to the individual and organizational preparedness for a LeadSimm simulation experience. The facilitator who is in possession of this information might decide that the participants require different types of preparatory work prior to the simulation. The use of such a scale might make the simulation experience a more valuable investment for organizations while at the same time increasing the effectiveness of the simulation for the participants. Leadership development professionals would profit from such research to determine the cost-benefit ratio of using a Leadership Scale of Development.

The fourth area for future research is the creation of a new model of management. In Chapter Two I reviewed Fayol's administrative theory of

management which included: planning, organizing, commanding, controlling, and directing. This model is incongruent with the principles of collaborative leadership because Fayol's model implies a lack of trust in organization members. This study demonstrated that building trustful relationships is key to the use of the collaborative leadership model. Once trust is built by those in a leadership dynamic, reverting to the use of a complementary model which does not engender trust will provide to organization members an intolerable level of inconsistency. A new management model which is consistent and congruent with the principles of collaborative leadership needs to be developed.

The fifth area for future research concerns the development of a LeadSimm dissemination strategy. The LeadSimm simulation method is complex. In order to make LeadSimm available for others to use, a course of instruction and a handbook need to be developed. The course of instruction would include: collaborative leadership model, scenario development process, simulation facilitation, and a process approach to doing collaborative leadership. Such a course of instruction would take approximately two weeks for others to complete.

Concluding Remarks

The current state of leadership development capability uses an individualistic and unrealistic approach to training leaders. The central theme and the focus of these efforts are directed towards human development and not, as this study asserts, leadership development. These industrially based leadership philosophies center on putting the leader in a higher state of being so

that leadership flowing from the leader will be at a higher level of competency. LeadSimm changes all that. LeadSimm provides for a realistic and collective leadership development process. The focus of this effort is to create a viable leadership dynamic where people are engaged in a mutual purpose and hold a shared vision regarding some specific substantive change in an organization. LeadSimm represents a marked shift away from those leadership development programs that attempt to develop better people in order to make transforming changes in organizations. People in a knowledge-based society, wherein complexity, need for diverse perspectives and searching for intrinsic satisfaction are its driving forces, are not going to be influenced by the old, industrial leadership development models and the seminars based on those models. LeadSimm is a significant achievement towards deriving a more coherent leadership development strategy aimed at the realities of knowledge-based organizations and the people who do leadership in them. LeadSimm is probably the first of many prototypes that will change the face of leadership development in the twenty-first century.

The industrial models of leadership which have pervaded organizational conceptual frameworks since the early 1900s have had a common theme. As noted in Chapter Two, that theme revolved around the idea that all we had to do for organizational success was find and harvest great men (and recently, women), get them into the highest positions and have their subordinates follow their instructions. The job of leadership development was concerned with developing these great leaders by making them better people. Today,

bookstores remain lined with leadership books that tell the story of people portrayed as reaching some indefinable level of mystic greatness or transcendental awareness who were able to change the course of organizational events. The stories stress how these great individuals acted almost single-handedly to bring about significant change. The essence of these ideas is captured in the statement used by many leadership development professionals that leadership is more about being than doing. For them, leadership development and human development are inextricably connected. I remain confused about this notion. If leadership development is about human development, then what is distinctive about human development? Conversely, if human development is only about leadership development when will these leaders be ready to do leadership? Good sense tells us that there is something wrong with this perspective.

Leadership in this knowledge-based, postindustrial society has taken on a new and more pragmatic notion to its meaning. Leadership is what people do together. Leadership lives in action, not in contemplation. Leadership is a relationship wherein people work together to meet the challenges facing them. The LeadSimm simulation methodology, while not a be-all-and-end-all strategy, is a new way to teach and to demonstrate to people that leadership belongs to common people who simply choose to act. The LeadSimm method stands on the foundation provided by the practitioners' model of collaborative leadership that represents a greater level of congruence with the needs and expectations of knowledge workers. There is no doubt that the LeadSimm simulation method

requires more definitive work in the areas of scenario development and simulation facilitation. However, even in its present state it represents a leap forward in leadership development strategies when compared to almost every other leadership development method.

Every single day people come to their organizations in varying stages of human development looking to make a difference. This theme, which pervades every belief system in the world, seems to find validity in leadership development as well. For this researcher, human development and leadership development are complementary but different processes. Leadership is about doing, about experiencing life, about making a difference, about being part of something special. It is these things that motivate and drive humans to wake each morning to venture into the mist and face the world once again. These intrinsic motivators belong to everyone, not just an elite group who have been anointed with some mystic oil. They are the fundamental tenets of free choice and of democracy and form the very foundation for living and for being.

Our contemporary, knowledge-rich, hyper-dynamic world is questioning us everyday. It asks for solutions, for answers and for the creation of relationships in which everyone has a place and a responsibility to bring their knowledge to the table to help create answers. This is the world in which we live, and this is the world that requires leadership of a different sort. What shall we do? How shall we respond? These are, for this researcher, the quintessential questions! The choice is ours. Let us choose wisely.

APPENDIX A

Interview Guide

The following is a list of research questions was used to guide the researcher during the qualitative data-gathering phase of the research.

1. Please describe the tables or roles you played during the simulation.
2. Please describe your overall experience during the simulation.
3. Please describe any positive or negative thoughts or feelings you had about participating in the simulation?
4. Do you think the simulation was well organized?
5. What would you have changed?
6. How would you rate the simulation in terms of its realism?
7. Do you think that making the simulation real is important? Why or why not?
8. How do you feel about the concept of postindustrial/collaborative leadership?
9. Do you think the simulation did anything to change your mind?
10. What did you learn as a result of participating in the simulation?
11. As you participated in the simulation, do you think that your experience helped in any way to highlight personal strengths or weaknesses in terms of your ability to do collaborative leadership or to create a learning organization?
12. How important do you think the facilitator is in terms of making the simulation work?
13. How would you rate the overall experience of participating in the simulation?
14. Would you recommend playing this kind of simulation to a friend or colleague? Why or why not?

15. What do you think are the two or three most significant things you have learned by participating in the simulation?
16. Do you think your simulation experience helped you understand the concepts of the learning organization and collaborative leadership more fully?
17. What did you think about the reflection and feedback sessions?
18. What did you think about the “teachable moments” during the simulation?
19. Now that you have answered a number of questions about the simulation experience, is there anything else you might want to add or say in conclusion?

REFERENCES

- Argyris, C. (1982). *Reasoning, learning and action*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Argyris, C. (1993). *Knowledge for action: A guide to overcoming barriers to organizational change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Argyris, C. (1998). Empowerment: The emperor's new clothes. *Harvard Business Review* (May-June), 98-105.
- Bass, B. M. (1990) *Bass and Stodgill's handbook of leadership*. New York: The Free Press
- Beetham, D. (1987). *Bureaucracy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bell, D. (1973). *The coming of the postindustrial society*. New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Bergquist, W. (1993). *The postmodern organization: Mastering the art of irreversible change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Blanchard, K. D., Zigarmi, D., & Nelson, R. B. (November 1993). Situational Leadership after 25 years: A retrospective. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1(1), 21-36.
- Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship: Choosing service over self interest*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bradford, D. L., & Cohen, A. R. (1998). *Power up: Transforming organizations through shared leadership*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bruner, J. S. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Caine, R. N., & Caine, G. (1994). *Making connections: Teaching and the human brain*. Menlo Park: Addison-Wesley.

- Campbell, D., & Hallam, G. (1994). *Manual for the Campbell-Hallam Team Development Survey*. Minneapolis: Survey Instrument Published by National Computer Systems Inc.
- Cartwright, D., & Zander, A. (Eds.). (1968). *Group Dynamics* (3rd. ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Cheney, P. (1984). Effects of individual characteristics, organizational factors, and task characteristics on computer programmer productivity and job satisfaction. *Information and Management*, 7, 209-214.
- Clawson, D. (1980). *Bureaucracy and the labor process*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94 (Supplement), S94-S120.
- Couto, R. A. (1998, November). Social capital and leadership. website: http://academy.umd.edu/KLSP/klpdocs/rcout_pl.htm, 1-12.
- Crawford, A. S. (1998). *Model for teaching leadership at the University of Michigan*. Paper presented at the Leadership In Management, website: www.mcb.co.uk/services/conferen/sept98/lim/.
- DePree, M. (1992). *Leadership Jazz*. (1st ed.). New York: Doubleday.
- DeTocqueville, A. (1835, 1990) *Democracy in America*. New York: Vintage Books Edition
- DiBella, A. J., & Nevis, E. C. (1998). *How Organizations Learn: An integrated strategy for building learning capability*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dixon, N. (1994). *The organizational learning cycle: How we can learn collectively*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Drucker, P. (1994 November). The age of social transformation. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 53-80.
- Drucker, P. (1998, October 5). Management's new paradigms. *Forbes*, 155-177.
- Erikson, E. H. (1982). *The life cycle completed*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co.
- Foster, W. (1989). Toward a critical practice of leadership. In J. Smyth (Ed.). *Critical perspectives on educational leadership* (pp. p. 40-65). London: Falmer.

- Fuchida, M., & Okumiya, M. (1992). *Midway: The battle that doomed Japan, the Japanese Navy's story*. Annapolis: Naval Institute Press.
- Galbraith, J. K. (1983). *The anatomy of power*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Goldstein, D., & Rockart, J. (1984). An examination of work-related correlates of job satisfaction in programmer/analysts. *MIS Quarterly*, 8, 103-115.
- Gredler, M. (1992). *Designing and evaluating games and simulations: A process approach*. London: Kogan Page.
- Greenblat, C. S., & Duke, R. D. (1975). *Gaming and simulation: Rationale, design, and applications*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership*. Mahwah: Paulist Press.
- Habermas, J. (1981). Modernity versus Postmodernity. *New German Critique* 20-42.
- Halal, W. E. (1996). *The new management: Bringing democracy and markets inside organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Handy, C. (1992). Balancing corporate power: A new federalist paper. *Harvard Business Review* (November-December), 59-72.
- Hardy, B. (1968). Towards a poetics of fiction: An approach through narrative. *Novel*, (2) 5-14.
- Hartman, F. H. (1990). *Naval renaissance: The U.S. Navy in the 1980's*. (3rd. ed.). Annapolis: Naval Institute Press.
- Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Janz, B. D., Colquitt, J. A., & Noe, R. A. (1997). Knowledge worker team effectiveness: The role of autonomy, interdependence, team development, and contextual support variables. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 877-904.
- Keys, J. B., & Fulmer, R. M. (1996). Microworlds and simuworlids: Practice fields for the learning organization. *Organizational Dynamics*, 24(4), 36-50.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1993). *Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it, why people demand it*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Macintyre, A. (1984). *After virtue*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame.

- Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of organizations*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- O'Toole, J. (1995). *Leading change: Overcoming the ideology of comfort and the tyranny of custom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Parry, A., & Doan, R. E. (1994). *Story-re-visions: Narrative therapy in the postmodern world*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Perla, P. P. (1990). *The art of wargaming: A guide for professionals and hobbyists*. Annapolis: United States Naval Institute Press.
- Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Managing with power*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Piaget, J. (1951). Mastery play. In J. S. Bruner, A. Jolly, & K. Sylva (Eds.). *Play-its role in development and evolution* (p. 716). New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Putnam, R. D. (June 1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Current*, 373, 3-9.
- Reynolds, J. I. (1980) *Case method in management development: Guide for effective use*. Geneva: International Labour Office
- Rifkin, G. (1996). Leadership: Can it be learned? *Forbes*, 157(7), 100-109.
- Robbins, S. P. (1993). *Organizational behavior: Concepts, controversies, and applications*. (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the 21st century*. Westport: Praeger.
- Rost, J. C. (1993). Leadership development in the new millenium. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1(1), 90-110.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Senge, P., Kleiner, A., Ross, R., Smith, B., & Roberts, C. (1995). *The fifth discipline field manual*. New York: Doubleday.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York: Doubleday/Currency.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1993). *Building community is schools*. (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sinclair, U. (1906, 1981). *The Jungle*. New York: Bantam.

- Slater, P., & Bennis, G. (1990). Democracy is inevitable. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(5), 167-76.
- Smart, B. (1990). Modernity, postmodernity and the present. In B. S. Turner (Ed.), *Theories of modernity and postmodernity* (pp. 184). London: Sage.
- Starratt, R. J. (1993). *The drama of leadership*. Bristol: The Falmer Press.
- Tjosvold, D., & Tjosvold, M. (1995). Cross functional teamwork: The challenge of involving professionals. In M. Beyerlein, D. Johnson, & S. Beyerlein (Eds.), *Advances in interdisciplinary studies of work teams* (1-34). Greenwich, CT.: JAI Press.
- Toffler, A., & Toffler, H. (1995). *Creating a new civilization: The politics of the third wave*. Atlanta: Turner Publishing, Inc.
- Turner, B. S. (Ed.). (1990). *Theories of modernity and postmodernity*. London: Sage.
- United States Bureau of the Census. (1997). *Statistical Abstract of the United States*. (117th ed.). Washington: US Government Printing.
- Watson, B. (1975). Games and socialization. In C. S. Greenblat & R. D. Duke (Eds.), *Gaming-simulation: rationale, design, and applications* (pp. 435). New York: Sage.
- Weber, M. (1958). Bureaucracy. In H. Gerth & C. W. Mills (Eds.), *From Max Weber* (pp. 196-244). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wheatley, M. J. (1994). *Leadership and the new science: Learning about organization from an orderly universe*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.