A Model and Future for Leadership Studies

by Francis J. Yammarino

In general, I believe the goal of scholarly work on leadership is to understand and articulate the various approaches, models, and styles of leadership and the different and multiple entities or levels of analysis (e.g., persons, teams, organizations, social systems) that are involved. While there are numerous theories and models of leadership (for extensive reviews, see Bass, 1990; Dansereau & Yammarino, 1998; and Yukl, 1994), it is useful to categorize them into four meta-approaches, all of which begin with the letter “I”; hence, the four I’s of leadership. Likewise, while there are various ways to view human beings who comprise leadership systems (see Dansereau, Alutto, & Yammarino, 1984; Yammarino & Bass, 1991), four general perspectives or levels of analysis are useful to identify; hence the four L’s (for levels of analysis) of leadership.

I wish to develop some current and future directions for leadership studies using the four I’s and the four L’s of leadership. Then, through combination and integration, it is possible to describe a “leadership matrix” (4 I’s by 4 L’s) that looks to the past, present, and future. Finally, I will describe some current and future “hot topics” for scholarly work on leadership.

The Four I’s

Various theories, models, and substantive views of leadership can be identified in terms of a four-part classification. I call the four meta-approaches: Instrumental, Inspirational, Informal, and Illusional. These terms are broad-based and integrative, each reflecting and encompassing many theories, models, and variables of leadership.

First I: Instrumental Leadership

Instrumental views of leadership are those approaches that involve a focus on transactions, exchanges, and contingent rewards and punishments. Simply, exchanges or transactions are “tits for tats,” “quid pro quos,” or “you scratch my back and I’ll scratch your back.” Included in this category are many traditional and current views of leadership (e.g., Ohio State work on consideration and initiating structure, Fiedler’s contingency model, House’s path-goal theory, Podsakoff’s rewards and punishments work, and Bass’ and Burns’ transactional leadership). (For detailed reviews of these ideas, see Bass, 1990; Dansereau & Yammarino, 1998; and Yukl, 1994.)

If a follower provides high levels of performance, high levels of rewards should be forthcoming from a leader; if adequate performance is not provided, then no rewards, or perhaps punishments, will be forthcoming. So, rewards and punishments are contingent on, dependent on, and linked to performance.

In particular, instrumental theories and models of leadership tend to describe person- and task-oriented
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Connections From The Director

This issue of Concepts & Connections provides predictions for future trends in the leadership development arena. The future of leadership education does not yet exist; it must be invented. Ideas about what may happen in the future of leadership education must be generated and studied. Such ideas are critically important because our thinking is shaped both by our concepts of what has happened in the past, and images of what we may see in the future. This issue takes on the challenge of examining the past and creating images for the future.

I would first like to reflect on the past by acknowledging my predecessors. Nance Lucas created the National Clearinghouse for Leadership Development (NCLP) in 1991. It was her vision and her direction that launched the program and has allowed us to create a central resource for practitioners and theorists to share ideas about leadership education. Alison Breeze became the director of the NCLP in the Fall of 1994. Today the NCLP has more than 450 members representing colleges and universities around the country and internationally.

Special acknowledgement goes to Dr. Susan Komives, Scholarship & Research Editor, for helping the NCLP to gain credibility on a national scale. I would also like to recognize past NCLP Coordinators and Newsletter Editors, Donna Swartwout and Susan Jones. Without their dedication to supporting the day-to-day operations, the NCLP would not have become the resource that it is today. My last acknowledgement goes out to our current NCLP Coordinator and Newsletter Editor, Sharon La Voy. Sharon has shown a commitment to involve you, the members, in creating the vision for the future. Now, I have been given the opportunity to continue the dream of the past and ignite the passion within the membership to imagine and create the future. I look forward to working with you in shaping our images of what we may see in the future for the National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.

Some would say that we stand at the dawn of a new era in our thought and practice as leadership development educators. Indeed, tomorrow’s advance guard is already transforming the very nature of our world. That, in turn, is calling into question some basic assumptions that just yesterday we considered given. John Naisbitt and Patricia Aburdene suggest that innovation in technology, unprecedented economics opportunity, surprising political reform, and great cultural rebirth are the gateway to the 21st century. Robert Greenleaf shares, “One does not, of course, ignore the great voices of the past. One does not awaken each morning with the compulsion to reinvent the wheel. But if one is servant, either leader or follower, one is always searching, listening, experiencing that better wheel for these times in the making” (1977, p. 9).

Edward Cornish suggests that the purpose of almost everything we do is to improve the situation in which we will find ourselves in the future (1977). “The future’s world does not exist, and yet it is the object of our actions” (p. 38). Even when we think about the past, we are seeking to decide what we shall believe about it in the future. According to Cornish, “The future is the domain of goals and dreams, just as the past is the domain of memories. Thus we can, if we wish, do things today to change the world that we will experience tomorrow” (p. 40).

What is predicted? Richard Beckhard, an organizational consultant who specializes in working with leaders, took a scholarly stab at the task. He raises some important points, that “leaders in the twenty-first century will face greater and more complex demands” (p. 126). He believes that effective leaders for the future “will have personas determined by strong values and belief in the capacity of individuals to grow” (p. 129).

We must be purposeful in our efforts to help people learn to lead for the future. Leaders today sometimes appear to be an endangered species. I believe we can help to shape our future through citizen leaders working from a community-based model. The key to this country’s future will be the development and empowerment of local communities. As educators of our future leaders, we need to create knowledge areas focused on those students not necessarily seeking positions of leadership, but those wanting to be part of the process. I believe that such a focus at our level will empower all students, not just those in traditional campus leadership roles, to organize for social change.

Contributors to this issue of Concepts & Connections challenge our current thinking through their thoughts on the future of leadership development. They each provide thoughtful predictions for future trends in the leadership development arena. We hope you will be challenged to dream and be a part of the creative process in shaping the future of leadership development.

Craig Slack, Director
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leader behaviors that are instrumental to effective follower/subordinate performance (e.g., goal setting, coaching, and use of incentives; showing consideration and being participative, empowering, and delegative).

Instrumental leaders may attempt to satisfy the current needs of followers by focusing on transactions or exchanges through contingent reward behavior. These leaders recognize follower needs and desires and clarify how those needs and desires will be met in exchange for enactment of the followers’ work roles. Because rewards to followers are contingent on performance, performance-outcome expectancies are strengthened. The clarification of task requirements also may contribute to subordinates’ confidence that, with some effort, they can accomplish their assignments. So, effort-performance expectancies are strengthened.

The exchanges or transactions of instrumental leadership may include both tangible (e.g., pay increases) and intangible (e.g., recognition) commodities. When the rewards are contingent on performance, rather than being non-contingent or punishment based, effectiveness of individuals, groups, and organizations is enhanced.

Second I: Inspirational Leadership

Inspirational views of leadership are those approaches that involve a focus on transformation, charisma, and visioning. These theories and models tend to describe emotional and ideological appeals and change individuals’ work values to consider not only themselves but also the larger group (e.g., team, organization, society). Included in this category are many of the newer genre of leadership work (e.g., Bass’ and Burns’ transformational leadership, House’s charismatic leadership, Sashkin’s visionary leadership, and Bryman’s new model leadership). (For detailed reviews of these ideas, see Bass, 1990; Dansereau & Yammarino, 1998; and Yukl, 1994.)

Simply, leadership here is more than mere exchanges of rewards for performance – transactions form the base of leadership while inspiration augments the base. Typical leader behaviors include providing an inspirational vision, communicating confidence in followers, setting challenging performance expectations, and displaying exemplary actual and symbolic behaviors and actions.

Inspirational leaders attempt to raise the needs of followers and promote the transformation of individuals, groups, organizations, and societies. They arouse heightened awareness and interests in the group, increase confidence, and move followers from concerns for existence to concerns for achievement and growth. Inspirational leaders engage in exemplary acts that followers interpret as involving extraordinary abilities, determination, and confidence. Such leadership instills intense feelings in followers along with a desire to identify with the leader.

Inspirational leadership can achieve major changes in the attitudes and assumptions of followers and can build commitment for the group’s or organization’s mission. It is generally agreed that inspirational leadership includes behaviors such as identifying and articulating a vision; providing an appropriate role model for others; fostering the acceptance of group goals; setting high performance expectations; providing individualized support to followers; being intellectually challenging and stimulating; recognizing accomplishments of followers; empowering others; and taking great personal risks for the betterment of others.

Third I: Informal Leadership

Informal views of leadership are those approaches that involve a focus on elected, emergent, and non-appoint-
of a group (team) that a particular individual, more so than another individual, can “lead” the group to attain group goals.

Simply, an individual group member becomes elevated to a position of status and leadership, often without a corresponding formal title or appointment. Informal leaders tend to adapt their style of performance and leadership to the needs of the group (team). If they also are elected leaders, their groups show increased productivity over appointed leaders.

Elected and emergent leaders are considered to be more responsive to followers’ needs, more interested in the group task, and more competent than appointed leaders. Elected and emergent leaders, compared to appointed leaders, gain influence over time. Although more is expected of these leaders in groups, they are given greater latitude to deviate and act on behalf of group goals.

This approach shows that the conforming group member is likely to be elevated to a leadership position – “paying one’s dues” results in an ability to redirect the group and organization and make changes in group norms. Deviation from group norms and expectations is permitted for informal leaders because they bring information, resources, expertise, and the like to the group and organization which would otherwise not be available.

Fourth I: Illusional Leadership

Illusional views of leadership are those approaches that involve a focus on substitutes for leadership, implicit leadership, and non-contingent rewards and punishments. These theories and models tend to view leadership as an illusion, or as elusive, attributing behavior, actions, and performance to leadership when none may exist. Included in this category are approaches like Kerr and Jermier’s substitutes for leadership, Meindl’s romance of leadership, and implicit and information-processing views of Lord and his colleagues (see Bass, 1990, and Yukl, 1994 for detailed reviews).

The functions served by leaders for their followers may be accomplished by means other than the leaders’ behavior. Such substitutes for leadership may be as real as followers’ knowledge, skills, and abilities or an organization’s rules, regulations, and procedures; or they may be symbolic, illusory, or romantic phenomena.

A related view is that leadership is implicit in nature and based on information processing of individuals. Leaders and followers see things differently and respond differently based on their own preconceptions, perceptions, and attributions, and the way they categorize and process information. In a sense, leaders and followers “carry around in their heads” a view of a leader and leadership, and act based on these implicit, prototypical, or ideal conceptualizations. Leadership can then become a romantic notion, and individuals attribute good and bad events to leadership, regardless of the leadership that may exist.

Relatedly, some “leaders” (and I use the term loosely here) seem to reward and punish at random without regard for performance. These acts of non-contingent (non-instrumental) rewarding and punishing are really a lack or failure of leadership. At an extreme, the complete abdication of leadership is called laissez-faire leadership – the leader is never around, never available, never directing, never inspiring; in short, never leading followers.

The Four L’s

Various perspectives on human beings in organizations and society are called “levels of analysis.” The levels (L’s) relevant for leadership include the entities known as persons, dyads, groups, and collectives and can be viewed as different “lenses” through which to view the individuals who comprise organizations and societies.

Levels are typically arranged in hierarchical order such that higher levels (e.g., groups) include lower levels (e.g., dyads, persons), and lower levels are embedded in higher levels. So, as we view human beings from higher and higher levels of analysis, the number of entities decreases (e.g., there are fewer groups than persons in an organization) and the size of the entities increases (e.g., collectives are comprised of a larger number of human beings than are groups) (see Dansereau, Alutto, & Yammarino, 1984; Yammarino & Bass, 1991).

First L: Persons

Individuals who comprise an organization or society can be viewed as persons, independent of one another. Persons display various individual differences in knowledge, skills, abilities, personality, and so forth.

From one perspective, leaders can be viewed as unique persons; from another, followers can be viewed as independent persons. The focus here is on individual employees and society members, both leaders and followers.

Second L: Dyads

Individuals can be viewed as dyads, interdependent on a one-to-one basis. Dyads, a special case of groups, are two-person groups. These are particularly important in organizations because organizations are often viewed as being built through superior-subordinate (leader-follower) dyads. They tend to create the typical pyramidal structure of organizations. The interpersonal relationships in organizations, whether leader-follower, peer-peer, or coworker-coworker, are critical for determining what gets accomplished.

Likewise, dyads are very important and critical in society. Consider, for example, the key societal roles played by the following dyads: husband-wife, significant others, siblings, best friends, parent-child, etc.

Third L: Groups/Teams

Individuals who comprise an organization can be viewed as groups or
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Leadership Education in the Context of the New Millennium

By Cynthia Cherrey and Rachel Isgar

An article describing change and the needed leadership for the 1990's begins with the quote, “Forget your old tired ideas about leadership” (Smith, 1989, p. 48). “The pace of change in the 90's will make the 80's look like a picnic” (Welch, 1989, p.48). Since this issue of Concepts & Connections focuses on the future of leadership, this article will challenge the reader to do just that, to think about leadership in different ways. Our world is changing rapidly, and the speed of change in the 21st century will make the 90’s look like a piece of cake. This article will explore leadership implications for the 21st century and our role as leadership scholars and practitioners. Why? Because leadership in the future requires different ways of believing, thinking and doing, and higher education plays a critical role in educating the leaders for the present and future.

Societal shifts have radically changed over the last 30 to 40 years. Before 1960, the societal context was more stable. The external environment which surrounded our organizations was placid, rather than turbulent (Terreberry, 1985). One way to picture this society is through the metaphor of a wagon wheel; certainty and predictability characterized it. The hub of the wheel represents the stability of a placid environment. The spokes represent different aspects of our society such as education, technology, family roles, religion, economics, government and science. The rim of the wheel, along with the hub, holds the wheel together, and connects the spokes (Allen & Cherrey, 1994).

The world used to be placid, predictable and orderly. In this world, hierarchy worked well because stable environments supported its structure. The techniques and mind-sets were developed for leading in calmer, predictable conditions. The problems we faced lent themselves to single, linear analysis and a command and control management style. However, these same approaches are inadequate in today’s complex environment. The hub of the wheel has gradually eroded. Hierarchical organizations have become more flat. Preexisting defined boundaries have collapsed. In the new social fabric, all aspects of society are directly linked. This shift of context from the wheel of stability to the web of change creates a struggle and search for new ways that work more effectively to allow us to make sense of events in times of rapid change.

Forces of Change

Many societal trends drive the acceleration of change, such as information, technology, globalization, demographics, environment and quality of life. The following examples in the areas of information, technology and globalization are illustrative of our rapidly changing world context.

Information – Information has had a profound effect on our day-to-day lives. The sheer amount of information increases daily. For example, from 1980 to 1987, we accumulated more information than we had in the previous 2,000 years. It is staggering to realize that a weekly edition of the New York Times contains more information than the average person in 17th century England would read in his/her lifetime.

In contrast, surfing the World Wide Web, we see more information then we could ever possibly have the time to sit down and read, let alone digest. The information on the Web is updated regularly and allows us to view worldwide events and access resources at the click of a computer mouse. Sometimes we may feel as if we are suffering from information overload; Wurman (1979) calls this information anxiety. Both the business world and the educational world are facing the reality that information technology is essential, and not a choice. Without up-to-date information we can fall behind quickly. “Information technology is a necessity, not a luxury for colleges and universities, yet it requires significant continuing investments in hardware, software, and training... Most institutions throughout the world are just beginning to develop strategies for acquiring hardware, training faculty and staff members, rethinking traditional ways of delivering instruction, and incorporating those plans into their regular budgeting process” (Green, December, 1997, p. B6). Today, colleges and universities are challenged to think differently about how students learn and how to use technology to enhance the learning process.

Information overload also has direct and profound effects on the stock market. Due to growing technology, the speed of stock market transactions is felt worldwide and occurs almost instantaneously. The stock market is affected not just by how U.S. companies are performing, but by world markets and stock exchanges. The recent U.S. stock market plunge of October 1997 was directly attributed to Hong Kong’s Hang Sang Market. Nearly every Asian market and currency was dragged down. Even when markets in the United States were closed, we could see the worldwide ripple effect as markets in other time zones were opened.

Through multiple media sources we can obtain information – radio, television, internet, fax, email, telephone, etc. This access to information, so quickly and through so many different sources, was unheard of decades ago.

Technology – This generation of college students is the first to have been raised as largely computer literate. Most students have computers and interactive computer networking available to them at school, and in addition, many students own computers at home. Because information is now accessible so quickly and easily to everyone via the World Wide Web, the places we look for information has vastly expanded. For example, prospective college students can now do college searches via the Web. Course offerings, catalogs, and admissions applications can all be accessed electronically. Information about specific offices on campus and their
descriptions being available on the Web save a great deal of time and energy spent on long distance telephone calls. Just recently a colleague whose department administers placement tests closed down for a week over the Christmas holidays. However, students were assured that they could receive all the information they needed about upcoming exams by going to the Testing Bureau's web site.

New technologies are changing and dissolving scientific boundaries, while shaping the information and knowledge we presently use in higher education. Many books and journals are now available online. The future of libraries is increasingly high tech. Our exploration in space has taken quantum leaps in technology, science and information. For example, the Hubbell telescope gathers more information in 36 hours than had been gathered in the previous 30 years. Scientists are now struggling with how to organize, store and analyze this vast amount of information.

High tech higher education institutions are also booming. For many nations, distance learning is a key to increasing access while containing costs. Millions of students around the world now are enrolled in distance-learning programs, including some three million students enrolled in 11 'mega-universities' devoted to distance learning. In China and in Turkey more than half a million students are enrolled (Green, 1997).

At the University of Phoenix, there are no dormitories, no library stacks, no cafeteria, no labs, no gym. The hundreds of students who stream into dozens of spartan meeting rooms each weekday evening for four-hour classes range in age from 23 to 60. Phoenix thrives so conspicuously because it acknowledges a profoundly changed higher-education market. It and the other new venues stand to win a big share of the surge in college enrollment expected over the next decade as Echo Boomers emerge from high school and as more adults seek continuing education. Colleges and universities must confront this new competition – and the changing demographics, economics, and technology behind it (Hammonds et al., 1997, p. 96).

This shift in technology makes some work practices obsolete. For example, faculty tell their engineering students that fifty percent of the information they learn today will be obsolete in five years. Technology is also changing the information and the knowledge that we know. The Genome project, a project dedicated to constructing a map of the 100,000 genes that make up our DNA code, will give us the capacity to create genetic profiles of newborns. The cloning of Dolly the sheep in 1997 is yet another result of accelerated change.

**Globalization** – We are fast becoming a global society. Our perspective in doing business and educating students is now national and international; transnationalization has blurred the boundaries. The globalization of the economy has created interrelationships that link countries, peoples, businesses, higher education and environments. A high percentage of jobs in Los Angeles are supported by foreign trade.

United States consumer goods are manufactured for both domestic and international use. The manufacturing, marketing, and competition for these goods has created multi-national organizations designed to compete in a global economy. The economic conditions of our export countries directly affect the global economy, the supply and demand of trade, and the stock market.

The globalization of the economy has direct implications for education. Research, fundraising, alumni development and international student development are but a few examples of the outreach that colleges must do in a global society. Of paramount importance is the need to educate students for a global society. “Most countries agree that their curricula must transcend national boundaries if they are to give students adequate background to succeed in an increasingly competitive economy. But applying that concept in the classroom and creating ways to overcome the structural obstacles to collaboration and exchange are no simple tasks” (Green, 1997). Global education is indeed not a simple task. And yet, learning how to collaborate across national boundaries is critical in this time of an interdependent world economy.

Since information, technology and globalization are complex systems, the interactive effects of these trends require a shift in order to understand our changing world. Science, technology, and the media have now touched our values, religion, family systems and education. Boundaries become blurred and create a series of interactive effects causing each sub-system to create an instantaneous ripple effect. Events occurring around the world appear instantaneously in your living room.

The rapidity of change is not going to slow down. In fact, it will continue to speed up. Business and education are both struggling to find ways to work and live successfully in this turbulent and fast-paced world.

**What Does This Mean for Leadership?**

A world of increasing change, diversity, complexity and interdependency requires new ways of understanding leadership and building leadership capacity. Leadership for the next millennium will be called upon to deal effectively with internationalism and multiculturalism in universities, the workplace, and society. Developing leadership for a global society must take into consideration the shift from a dominant paradigm, based on hierarchy and predictability, to an emerging paradigm based on such principles as heterarchy, complexity and unpredictability.

As the world undergoes major change, a new framework for understanding this change emerges, shifting us from an old to a new paradigm. “Paradigms are the mental maps
which shape and define our view of the world” (Allen and Cherrey, 1994). Kuhn (1970) defines a paradigm as a rudimentary way of perceiving, thinking, valuing, and doing associated with a certain vision of reality.

The new paradigm offered here emphasizes interconnectedness. It puts people, employees and customers at the center of an organization and disperses leaders throughout the organization. Hence hierarchical organizations are now more heterarchical. Command and control of the past is now leadership for the common good. Diversity has led to inclusiveness. There is not one best way in most organizations. The new paradigm can be compared to a rugby team; rugby looks like a chaotic sport, but it requires tremendous communication, continuous adjustment to an uncertain environment, and problem solving in a non-hierarchical structure. (see box at right)

Leadership in the next century may buck many of the trends from the 20th century. Peter Drucker tells an interesting example. “I met with a very big company not long ago – around 80 or so on the Fortune 500 list. They expect to be 5 on that list in 10 years, and I shocked them by saying I don’t think that list will exist, so the goal is meaningless. That list basically assumes that everything you do is under your roof and is owned by you and run by you. But already in many companies, most work is done through alliances, joint ventures, minority participation, and very informal agreements which no lawyer could handle” (1996, p. 15). This exemplifies the shift from an orderly predictable world to our present unpredictable and interconnected world.

Leadership is a complex phenomenon; therefore, it must be approached from a multidimensional framework. Developing student leadership potential for this changing world will require us to expand on our present leadership programs, and in many ways to rethink universities’ approaches to student leadership development.

Leadership in this new world requires us to understand the complexities of an interrelated system, to continually reflect on our personal and organizational learning, the need to value differences and embrace inclusiveness, and to practice collaborative leadership. We would suggest that as scholars and practitioners we need to find ways to develop student leadership programs that have interwoven throughout the program the following:

- Understanding the complexity of an interrelated system
- Continual reflection and learning with a commitment to the greater good
- Valuing differences and embracing inclusiveness
- Practicing collaborative leadership

Understanding the Complexity of an Interrelated System

Interdependence is said to exist in an organization when the movement of one part of the system affects all other parts (Eong, 1993). As in the example of the wagon wheel described earlier, individual components are influenced by other components in the system. In this connective world, there is a ripple effect throughout the system.

The leaders of the next millennium need to have a greater understanding of our interdependent world. It no longer suffices to educate future leaders in hierarchical structures. In this genre of leadership, hierarchies are being flattened and workers are being empowered. This shift will require leadership to design and support more durable and flexible organizations. It also requires a systemic perspective in order to respond to this rapidly changing world. In general, a systems thinker is someone who sees the whole picture; pays attention to balancing short-term and long-term perspectives; uses peripheral vision (“goes wide”) to see complex cause and effect relation-ships; recognizes the complex, dynamic and interdependent nature of systems; and remembers that we all influence and are influenced by the systems in which we function.

Leaders are constantly challenged to work in an unpredictable and turbulent world. Leadership also requires flexibility and durability to respond positively to a changing context. Flexibility is key to dealing with increased demands and less time to respond to change. Leadership will need to design, support and nurture organizations that are flexible enough to deal with systemic global changes.

As colleges and universities attract faculty with international expertise and students from around the world, an understanding of global importance is critical because it affects the way programs and services are offered at a university. Leadership education must be conducted in the context of global, cross-cultural awareness, and the ways in which information technology is bringing people together as never before.

One college that takes a unique approach to the development of student leadership is the College of St. Benedict. This institution specifically focuses on a holistic, inter-disciplinary approach to leadership with an

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present View</th>
<th>Emerging View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Heterarchical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders and Followers</td>
<td>Collaborative Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmented / Parts Mentality</td>
<td>Holistic / Interconnectedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Accomplishment</td>
<td>Continual Reflection and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivate Others to Accomplish Tasks</td>
<td>Maximize the Gifts of All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command &amp; Control</td>
<td>Common Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal and Policy Driven</td>
<td>Shared Values and Sense of Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Best Way</td>
<td>Embrace Inclusiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneous</td>
<td>Value and Search Out Diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
additional emphasis on gender-related issues and social ethics.

The University of Southern California provides another unique perspective of leadership that recognizes the interdependence of individuals and organizations throughout the university and community. At USC, individual students are expected to engage in leadership on four levels: 1) at the individual level, where students bring their unique backgrounds that shape their values; 2) within formal and informal groups, in which students learn to work in teams towards common goals; 3) within the university, where students incorporate their academic and co-curricular activities into a holistic experience, and where they have the opportunity to engage in leadership in a large private, university in an urban, multi-ethnic neighborhood; and 4) at the global level, where leadership development goes beyond the collegiate experience. A group of faculty, staff and students committed to the development of leadership, called the Leadership Collaborative, are pooling resources and strategies to enhance leadership development for all students at the university.

In this view of leadership, a greater awareness and understanding of an organization as a web of relationships is important. “We live today in an interconnected world. If you’re good at networking, you’ve got an advantage…. To position yourself for maximum growth, you need to excel at relationship management” (Pritchett, 1987, p. 41). To expand this awareness we need to develop the leadership capacity to see the connections and interdependencies and to become conduits of connections that develop new relationships.

**Continual Reflection and Learning With a Commitment to the Greater Good**

In order to have a continual understanding of who we are, and how we influence and are influenced by others, a commitment to self-development must exist simultaneously with the belief in the importance of influencing positive change for the betterment of others, the community and our society. Leaders should have a passion for making a difference.

Leadership as a collective effort for the greater good requires a core set of values and a sense of purpose. A shared purpose serves as a compass to guide the group or organization. DePree (1992) compares leadership to performing Mozart: “The music exists and it doesn’t. It is written on the page, but it means nothing until performed and heard. Much of its effect depends on the performer and the listener. The best leaders, like the best music, inspire us to see new possibilities” (p. 49). In collective leadership, it takes all of us, inspired by the vision, to create something new and exciting.

In leadership, the growth of others is facilitated. Leaders must optimize the gifts of others. In our leadership programs, we should teach and model relational development. Our programs must be based on values that reinforce trust, respect for each other, and on realizing the leadership potential of each and every one of our students.

Astin’s (1996) “A Social Change Model of Leadership Development” is a model that can be used to develop leadership programs on college campuses. It is based on seven values at the individual, group and societal level. One campus that has developed a value based student leadership program is the Miami University of Ohio.

Inspiring a shared purpose and optimizing the gifts of others can only materialize if a continual understanding and commitment to self-growth exists. We need to understand who we are and live our belief system. “All the techniques and all the tools that fill the pages of all the management and leadership books are not substitutes for who and what you are…. Leadership is about connecting voice and touch. It is about doing what you say you will do” (Kouzes, 1996, pg. 10). In this world of constant change, we need to develop in our students and ourselves the desire to continually learn and focus on personal growth and finding our voice. In summary, development of self and others and a passion for making a difference requires continual reflection and ongoing learning. In this ever-changing environment, we must continually learn.

**Valuing Differences and Embracing Inclusiveness**

The days of the homogeneous workforce have disappeared. New thinking in leadership must take advantage of the opportunities that diversity offers us. Encouraging diversity has become a common theme for many organizations. Often it is accepted without a real understanding of its importance. Why should we value diversity? The primary implication is that each of us has a unique perspective. There is overlap in our worlds, which allows us to understand and interact with each other, but our uniqueness is a defining characteristic of who we are as individuals. Multiple viewpoints allow us to see new possibilities and innovations that may otherwise not
surface. A diverse workforce offers multiple ways to approach problem solving.  

In order for respect and trust to occur, acceptance and a value of individual differences are necessary. “Fostering authentic diversity can be accomplished by respecting different perspectives, fostering open-mindedness, practicing dialogue, and listening with attention and empathy” (Allen et al., 1997, p. 10). Our leadership programs should assist our students in seeing different perspectives and teaching effective listening and dialogue skills.

Leadership education must teach an appreciation and willingness to value differences and embrace inclusiveness. The James MacGregor Burns Academy of Leadership at the University of Maryland was established to foster future generations of political leaders through education, training, service, and research. One of their programs was founded to encourage political participation among under-represented groups; it is the first such program in the country. Featured programs include a National Resource Center for Public Leadership. This Center links individuals, businesses, communities and movements with the resources for a new century of civic activism and transforming leadership (Academy of Leadership, 1997).

The University of Michigan’s leadership program focuses on preparing students to serve as contributing members of a multicultural society and an interdependent world. “U. of Michigan recognizes and values the interconnectedness of curricular and co-curricular arenas…. Through the integration of academic course work, practical and life experiences, combined with support and mentorship, a more holistic approach to student learning and student development is achieved” (University of Michigan, 1996).

Diversity can be a strength if leaders listen to the members of the organization. If we want to succeed in a global society, we need to take advantage of this opportunity to embrace diversity and learn from each other.

**Practicing Collaborative Leadership**

Collaboration is critical in today’s interconnected world. For leadership education, it means collective leadership where there is no one identified leader. “Every organization must have not one but many leaders. Some speak of ‘empowerment,’ others of ‘sharing the tasks of leadership.’ I think of it as dispersing leadership with leaders developed and performing across every level of the organization. Leadership is a responsibility shared by all members of the organization” (Hesselbein, 1997, p. 7). Even the expectations of leaders at the top of the organization are changing. These leaders are also expected to be facilitators, stewards, coaches, designers and teachers. (Senge, 1990). Effective leaders will also try to extract the best leadership qualities from each member of the organization.

Collaborative leadership implies that no one person has the solutions to the multifaceted problems that a group or organization must address. Collaborative leadership in this context requires a set of standards that encourages all members to act, allowing the collective wisdom to surface. Matusak (1996) uses the term leadership for the moment, to explain that “all of us aren’t leaders all the time” (p. 4). She suggests support and encouragement when somebody else’s specific strengths are necessary. We need to use collective action based on shared purpose and a core set of values in order to respond to this changing world. Using a music metaphor, “As leaders we play a crucial role in selecting the melody, setting the tempo, establishing the key, and inviting the players. But this is all we can do. The music comes from something we cannot direct…. In the end, when it works we sit back amazed and grateful” (Wheatley, 1992, p. 44). No one person holds the key to leadership. In this fluid, ever-changing environment members of an organization contribute to the greater good; thus, we need to create a supportive, open environment that allows and encourages all members to contribute.

**Our Roles: Leadership and Learning Focused**

We have described four important areas for leadership development in today’s world, and given examples of some college leadership programs that are looking at leadership differently. As practitioners and scholars in the study and development of student leadership on our college campuses, our role is to be leadership and learning focused. More specifically, it is to develop leadership from a systemic perspective on our college campuses and to create an integrated learning environment for the emerging leadership in our students and each other.

We need to be leadership focused, not leader focused. Leadership is a process, not a position. “Don’t confuse leadership with position and place” (Kouzes, 1996, p. 11). In the new way of thinking, we need to look not only at the individual student’s development, but also the entire organization, the surrounding environment, and beyond. “Our traditional views of leaders – as special people who set the direction, make the key decisions and energize the troops – are deeply rooted in an individualistic and nonsystematic world view” (Senge, 1990, p. 340). We shouldn’t look at each component separately, but rather as an integrative and interrelated system.

Considering an integrative system, Capra (1992) says, “In the old way of thinking, it was believed that in any complex system, the dynamics of the whole can be understood from the perspective of the parts. In the new way of thinking, we try to understand the parts from the dynamics of the whole” (p. 8). Past leadership research often used a parts mentality for understanding leadership. The Great Man theory, social exchange theory, situational theory are but a few examples. If instead we used a systemic perspective to view leadership, we would be focusing on the process of leadership in a much deeper way. For example, rather than approaching a leadership program from how a leader motivates others,
or how the leader gets others to buy into his/her vision; a systemic approach would focus on how communities coalesce around core values and are inspired by a common vision that is created by many.

For the sake of our students, we need to embrace a systemic perspective to leadership development rather than our present practice of parts mentality. Leadership is holistic. Leadership development on our campuses must include the individual student’s learning, the organization’s learning, the curricular and co-curricular experiences, the entire organization beyond the campus wall, society at large, our own leadership development, and how we model our leadership to others. We cannot look at these items as separate entities, but rather as an integrated, holistic system.

As leadership educators and designers, we need to keep sight of our role in the educational process. Senge (1990) illustrates this idea by comparing organizations to ocean liners. He asks the leaders “What is your role?” and most see themselves as the captain or the navigator. Yet Senge would argue that the most important role is that of designer – the person who has engineered a powerful, flexible ship that can travel long distances and move in multiple directions. That is our role in leadership development on our campuses – one of designer.

We need to create the structure and environment from which the building of leadership capacity can occur.

**In Conclusion**

Higher education plays a critical role in educating the leaders of the present and future. Developing student leadership potential for this changing world will require us to expand our present leadership programs, and in many ways to rethink universities’ approaches to student leadership development.

The Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) adopted shared standards and guidelines for student leadership programs in November, 1996 (see Concepts & Connections, vol 5 # 2). The purpose of these standards is to unify and focus college programs designed to develop the leadership potential of students (Roberts, 1997). The CAS standards give student leadership programs a foundation. The spirit of the program should come from the designers of the program, the culture of the university, and how leadership is modeled on that campus. We would encourage all leadership scholars and practitioners to capture the essence of the program through the following: an understanding of the complexity of an interrelated system; continual reflection and learning with a commitment to the greater good; valuing differences and embracing inclusiveness; and practicing collaborative leadership. The future requires us to develop leadership from a systemic perspective and to create an integrated, holistic, learning environment. We need to design student leadership programs that are not leader focused, but rather focused on the process of leadership.
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several individuals who are interdependent and generally interact on a face-to-face basis. I say “generally” because in modern organizations various members of a work group may actually be widely dispersed but linked via various technologies (e.g., computers, fax machines, teleconference equipment).

In organizations, however, a work group or team can often be identified as those who report to a common, immediate superior. This notion of group is rather broad based, allowing for traditional work groups and more contemporary project teams where various group dynamics and leader-group interactions are played out. The focus here is on three- or more-person groups or teams or on groups and teams comprised of multiple dyads. Various social, non-work groups and teams are also relevant.

Fourth L: Collectives

Individuals can be viewed as collectives or groups of groups (individuals) who are interdependent based on a set of shared expectations. These collectives are typically held together by echelons or hierarchies and identified by various “titles” or names.

For example, saying you are a member of the “production department,” or the “XYZ Corporation,” or the “ABC Social Movement,” conjures up images and expectations that you hold in common with other members of that collective, even if you do not know the other members personally or interact with them directly. Nevertheless, you typically share a common heritage, work on related tasks, and follow similar procedures.

Collectives are a higher level of analysis than groups and may be systems (e.g., production, support, managerial) or subsystems (e.g., functional areas, departments) of the organization, the entire organization, a part of a society, or the society itself. Various leader-organization, leader-system, and leader-subsystem connections exist for accomplishing organizational and social or societal goals.

The Leadership Matrix

By combining the four L’s of leadership with the four L’s (levels of analysis), it is possible to describe a four by four leadership matrix for understanding leadership in organizations and society. By also considering the time, process, and how leadership may change over time in terms of the I’s and the L’s, a more complete matrix can be created with “Time” as a third dimension. Leadership, like other things, exists in a “space-time continuum.”

Crossing four metaviews of leadership with four general levels of analysis of leadership results in a 16 cell “by L” leadership matrix. In other words, instrumental, inspirational, informal, and illusional leadership can be conceived as operating via persons, dyads, groups, and collectives.

For example, the chief executive setting the vision for the organization that all groups buy into can be viewed as collective-level inspirational leadership. Team leaders enforcing safety regulations across all team members to generate adequate and safe performance is an example of group-level instrumental leadership. The computer expert on a project team who has no official title, yet goes out of his/her...
way to help each individual on the team, one on one, is displaying dyad-level informal leadership. Individuals, whether leaders or followers, who accomplish things based on their individual talents without direction or guidance is an example of person-level illusional leadership. As outsiders, we may think or perceive the results to be due to leadership when in fact they are due to individuals’ differential skills and abilities, regardless of leadership.

Over time, different types of leadership may manifest themselves in organizations and society. Even when the same people (leaders and followers) are involved, the style (four I’s) and levels of analysis (four L’s) of leadership can change. Because individuals shift in and out of entities (e.g., dyads and groups) over time, interesting questions arise: when is a dyad a dyad, a group a group, or a collective a collective?

Over time, different levels of analysis of leadership (L’s) may better explain the nature of leader-follower relationships and the behaviors involved. For example, relationships may start out at a group level. Stronger relationships develop with some but not all followers and these relationships are managed by the leader.

Relationships may then develop, after another period of time, to the point where they are independent of the group and in dyads. Leaders and followers link independently of the groups, there is sharing and mutual control, and they reach agreement or consensus on each of these one-to-one relationships (dyads); some relationships are “rich” while others are “poor.” These dyadic relationships could then serve as the basis for integrating entire groups, teams, or collectives. Clearly, there are other possible scenarios.

Different theories and models of leadership (I’s) may better explain behavior at various points in the leadership development process. Over time, perhaps individuals’ (leaders and followers’) behaviors may first be explained by informal theories of leadership. As their relationships develop, they may be better accounted for by more formal instrumental explanations. Subsequently, when their behaviors move to yet another realm, inspirational theories of leadership may permit greater understanding of the actions. In other words, over time, shifting behaviors and the changing nature of relationships in leadership development are explained by informal, instrumental, and inspirational theories.

Likewise, at any one point in time, a mix of instrumental and inspirational behaviors may occur. At another point in time, however, the mix may shift. Obviously, other scenarios are plausible including those involving illusional leadership.

**“Hot Topics”**

Hopefully, the I by L by Time leadership matrix is a useful heuristic device for classifying past and current leadership research and for identifying future leadership studies. This extended matrix may also be useful for practicing managers, professionals, and educators as they try to understand leadership and its implications.

Toward that end, permit me to briefly describe, in no particular order, some current and future “hot topics” for leadership studies (if not “hot” already, they should be “hot” of necessity):

- Individual differences in leadership that focus on personality, abilities, skills, motivation, and values – We need to understand better the individual differences of leaders and followers which are the precursors and consequences of leadership.
- Neo-Inspirational leadership – These are approaches, primarily based in sociology, that follow from the work of Max Weber on the role of leadership in social structures, systems, and institutions.
- Leadership for environmental and social change – The “greening” phenomenon is also important for future leadership research, as is the leadership of social movements.
- Multiple-level approaches to leadership – We need to know more about the four L’s of leadership and how these combine to explain behavior, perceptions, and actions across levels of analysis.
- Leadership and diversity – Much additional research on the role of women and minorities in leadership positions is required.
- Leadership training, development, and education – We need to translate leadership theories and research into managerial practice and education and training programs.
• Qualitative and quantitative measures and methods of leadership – Research needs to move beyond one-source survey measures of leadership to include multiple sources and types of measures.

• International and cross-cultural leadership – We need to discover whether theories of leadership are universal or culturally specific, or geographically regional in nature.

• Political leadership – The changes in today’s world require new theories of political leadership for nations, world regions, and economic alliances.

• 360-Degree feedback for leadership development – Research is needed on the agreement/disagreement of different sources (subordinates, superiors, peers, customers) of feedback to leaders.

• Executive leadership – “Leadership at the top” or leadership of organizations is still an under-researched topic in leadership.

• Taxonomies of leadership and leader behaviors – We need to do a better job of categorizing and describing various types of leader behaviors in organizations and society.

• Meta-analyses of leadership and leader behaviors – Studies which empirically accumulate the results of numerous other empirical studies will help us understand leadership better.

• Interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches to leadership – Leadership is not limited to one discipline or arena, so studies which cut across multiple disciplines and arenas are needed.

• Longitudinal (over time) studies of leadership – Most research on leadership to date is cross-sectional at one point in time, so our understanding of the over time dynamics of leadership is limited.

• Leadership-team interfaces – Even in an era of “self-managed teams”, we need a better understanding of leadership in a team environment.

• “Back to the roots” research that revisits the classic works in leadership and their relevance for today and tomorrow – Much classical and traditional work on leadership from the early part of this century can be revisited and applied in today’s world for understanding tomorrow’s leaders.

In closing, I remind readers of Concepts & Connections that the leadership matrix I described above overlays these and other topics for future research. In short, whether instrumental, inspirational, informal or illusional; whether based on persons, dyads, groups, or collectives; leadership is the key for managerial, professional, and educational success and effectiveness. Our future leadership studies should have this end as a focus.

Now, if only I could get back my crystal ball….
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Leadership and the Future: Studying Change

By Susan R. Komives

Nearly every leadership book, article, or speech emphasizes the rapid pace of change. Authors who help us make meaning of this pace envision an emerging future that calls for a view of leadership beyond more conventional command-and-control models, to those that are empowering, inclusive, collaborative, and participatory. Futurist Alvin Toffler encourages us to see that change is now a way of life; indeed, change is the way the future invades our lives. I think we must shift this equation to say leadership is the way we invade the future.


One organization that regularly teaches us how to study the future is the Worlds Future Society (<www.wfs.org>; 800/989-8274) which has some thoughtful materials in The Futurist magazine, the Futures Research Quarterly journal, and Futures Outlook (regular analysis). Recent articles in the Futures Research Quarterly include such titles as “Training Workers for Interdisciplinary Work” (R. Shaffer, 13 (3), 1997) and “From Organizations to Relationships: New Ways of Working and Their Implications for Learning” (A. L. Manasse, 13 (3), 1997). Their futurist bookstore carries publications from diverse publishers about futures issues. These materials are useful for tracking trends, providing issues-related readings for classes, and keeping you up-to-date.

Another publication filled with interesting trends is American Demographics (<www.demographics.com>). Targeted as consumer trends for business leaders, it features trends in all aspects of American life for which leadership could be directed. Bookstores abound with trend analysis materials, and I recommend you re-read several classics like Megatrends 2000 (Naisbitt & Aburdene, William Morrow, 1990) and the United Way Strategic Institute’s “Nine forces reshaping America” (in The Futurist, 24 (4), pp. 9-16), forces of change which clearly show the vision that trend-watchers offer.

Imagining a future of rapid change and diverse voices, Nance Lucas, Tim McMahon and I (1998) intentionally brought a strong message of the importance of relationships to leadership for students. We imagine these key elements for relational leadership to include the capacity to be inclusive, empowering, purposeful, ethical, and process oriented. These elements and many like them are repeatedly found in many writings, projecting a highly interconnected future with web-like relationships and structures. James (1996) notes “Leadership in the twenty-first century will also require a heightened awareness of what the poet Mary Oliver calls the family of things, a context for what otherwise is an overwhelming kaleidoscope of change” (p. 228).

While it is tempting to write more about change and the various futures of leadership, I would like to redirect readers to the future of students and the changing nature of the student experience. Influencing the future has to be a careful integration of what we know about students with what we know about the changing demands of the world. The National Center for Educational Statistics regularly published compilations of national surveys of high school youth. Their recent “Youth indicators 1996: Trends in the well-being of American youth” provides useful information on today’s high school students. (You can order an individual free copy of this publication from <www.ed.gov/NCES/pubs>.) Arthur Levine and Jeanette Cureton’s research (1998) provides a useful overview of today’s current college students. They conclude with advice that we focus on four attributes to help bring these students to self-agency (hope, responsibility, appreciation of differences, and efficacy). As educators, they challenge us to see we need to design leadership experiences (e.g. “a curriculum for living,” p. 165) that emphasize transition skills students will need to adjust and adapt as continuous learners, conscious of their human heritage, their environmental context, their individual roles, and the importance of values and values-based thinking.

Student leadership experiences are developmentally powerful opportunities for students to learn to engage in healthy relationships with others toward socially responsible change. We must help students expand their capacity to work with others to make a difference in all that they do.
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In what is arguably the most famous review of any rock musician, Jon Landau wrote, “I saw rock & roll future and it’s name is Bruce Springsteen” (Puterbaugh, 1996, p. 11). The authors of this piece have been asked to see leadership future. If only it were as readily observable as what Landau saw at this 1974 concert in Boston.

To be asked to write a few words on “the future of leadership” is a joy and privilege – and a daunting task. As we approach the new millennium the very idea of “the future” seems to be showing up everywhere. Hotels in New York City are already booked for the night of December 31, 1999 (but doesn’t the “true” millennium begin on January 1, 2001?). Go to any bookstore and scan the titles in the business section. The word “future” is visible in numerous titles. The Drucker Foundation has just published the third in its “of the future” series — The Leader of the Future, The Organization of the Future, and most recently, The Community of the Future (Hesselbein, et. al., 1996, 1997 respectively). The one thing that people seem to be certain of is that the future will be a time of uncertainty. “We’ve got to learn to live with chaos and uncertainty, to try to be comfortable with it and not to look for certainty where we won’t get it” (Handy, 1997, p. 23).

As a starting point for our discussion, we would suggest that the two concepts which will greatly impact our lives in the future will be science and spirit. By science we mean the “new science” of chaos theory and quantum physics described by Wheatley (1992), but also greater awareness of what can be learned by studying the biological systems that exist in nature (Capra, 1996; Kelly, 1994). By spirit we mean our nonbody selves that helps us explore the “big” questions of life – “What is it all about? What is my purpose here (at work, in life)? Who am I?” (Hawley, 1993, p. 15).

This duality is similar to the idea of “high tech/high touch” – one of the basic principles of Megatrends (Naisbitt, 1982). In this book, Naisbitt described a world that was becoming increasingly technical, resulting in a corresponding need for more human contact. For this discussion, imagine a double helix, with science impacting spirit, spirit impacting science, and both influencing leadership.

The Impact of Science

In Future Perfect, Stanley Davis (1987) describes how the universe and science impact the management of organizations.

A basic progression governs the evolution of management in all market economics: fundamental properties of the universe are transformed into scientific understanding, then developed in new technologies, which are applied to products and services for business, which then ultimately define our models of organization.

**UNIVERSE ➔ SCIENCE ➔ TECHNOLOGY ➔ BUSINESS ➔ ORGANIZATION**  (P. 5)

We are seeing this impact already. Our knowledge of leadership and organizational life is being impacted by chaos and complexity theory (Blank, 1995; Kiel, 1996; Stacey, 1992 & 1996; Wheatley, 1992) and biological systems (Kelly, 1994). Organizations are being reconceptualized from machines and hierarchies to systems and webs (Helgesen, 1995). As Rowan Gibson (1997) notes, any new model of organizations...will have to have the nature of a biological organism, not a machine. It will be a distributed network of minds, of people working together and learning together, some inside the organization and some outside. It will be intelligent. It will be driven by the human imagination. (p. 8)

In designing innovations for the future, Janine Benyus (1997) uses lessons gained from nature to offer several questions that must be answered in the affirmative if what is being developed is to be long-lasting. While all the questions may or may not apply, it is interesting to consider what would happen if questions like this were asked of organizations.

- Does it run on sunlight?
- Does it use only the energy it needs?
- Does it fit form to function?
- Does it recycle everything?
- Does it bank on diversity?
- Does it utilize local expertise?
- Does it reward cooperation?
- Does it curb excess from within?
- Does it tap the power of limits?
- Is it beautiful?

(Benyus, 1997, pp. 291-292)

Similarly, Kevin Kelly (1994) describes “Nine Laws of God” – “the organizing principles that can be found operating in systems as diverse as biological evolution and SimCity” (p. 468). These laws for making “somethings from nothing” do much to describe groups in nature. They also offer interesting possibilities for organizations.
Distribute being
Control from the bottom up
Cultivate increasing returns
Grow by chunking
Maximize the fringes
Honor your errors
Pursue no optima; have multiple goals
Seek persistent disequilibrium
Change changes itself.
(Kelly, 1994, p. 468)

The Impact of Spirit

As South African writer J. M. Coetzee noted in *Age of Iron*, "I am trying to keep my soul alive in times not hospitable to soul" (as cited in Brussat & Brussat, 1994, p. xi). We are already seeing the early rumbles of the impact that questions of spirit are having on our lives. Margaret Wheatley (1998) notes,

For those who have focused on organizations, I find it delightful to note that W. Edwards

100 Ways to Keep Your Soul Alive (Brussat & Brussat, 1994), *Handbook for the Soul* (Carlson & Shield, 1995), *Care of the Soul* (Moore, 1992), *Wisdom Distilled from the Daily* (Chittister, 1990), and countless other books aimed at a general audience have recently been published. Issues of spirit are also being addressed in our work lives with the publication of works such as *Leading with Soul* (Bolman & Deal, 1995), *The Stirring of Soul in the Workplace* (Briskin, 1997), *Rediscovering the Soul of Business* (DeFoore & Renesch, 1995), and *Reawakening the Spirit in Work* (Hawley, 1993).

Jack Hawley (1993) captures this idea well, "The key question for today’s managers and leaders are no longer issues of task and structure but are questions of spirit" (p. 1). As Bolman and Deal (1995) note: The signs point toward spirit and soul as the essence of leadership. There is growing consensus that we need a new paradigm to move beyond the traps of conventional thinking. In truth, we may need to rediscover and renew an old paradigm, one deeply embedded in traditional wisdom. (p. 39)

Leadership in a Post-Industrial World

In an often used definition, Joseph Rost (1993) describes leadership in the post-industrial world as “an influence relationship among leaders and their collaborators who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes” (p. 99). Let’s explore this statement further:

Additional Readings Suggested by the Authors


“Leadership is an influence relationship”

In the quantum world relationships are everything (Wheatley, 1992). In the natural world, connectivity is evident everywhere (Kelly, 1994). In the chaotic world of science, systems are influenced by “strange attractors.” Spirit becomes involved when the type of influence examined is based on the greater good, as in servant leadership or stewardship.

Leadership is always dependent on the context, but the context is established by the relationships we value. We cannot hope to influence any situation without respect for the complex network of people who contribute to our organizations. Is this a fad? Or is it the web of the universe becoming felt in our work lives? (Wheatley, 1992, pp. 144-145)

We need a sense of connection. We have to feel that it matters to other people that we are there. Because it makes no difference whether you’re there or not, then you really begin to feel like a meaningless person. If you have not connection to anybody, you have no responsibility and therefore no purpose. (Handy 1997, p. 23)

We have to develop a sense of connectedness, a sense of working together as part of a system, where each part of the system is affecting and being affected by the others, and where the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. (Senge 1997, p. 129)

“among leaders”

Our very idea of what it means to be a leader is already changing. This can be very unsettling for everyone.

Society, therefore, is out of control because we are systematically destroying all of the authority and all of the control that our institutions once had. We are giving society a mind of its own . . . On the one hand that’s very exciting because it may lead to a new renaissance in the twenty-first century. We will see a lot of creativity bubbling up everywhere, just as we did back in the fifteenth century. But at the same time it’s very frightening, because people aren’t used to having no authority around. (Handy 1997, pp 26-27)

“and their collaborators”

Leaders and collaborators will be connected in self-organizing systems revolving around a common purpose, and this purpose will contain an element of spirit. As Wheatley (1998) notes, “Life needs to link with other life, to form systems of relationships where all individuals are better supported by the system they have created. It is impossible to look into the natural world and find an individual” (p. 346). Furthermore, Self-organizing systems have the capacity to create for themselves the aspects of organization that we thought we, as leaders, had to provide. Self-organizing systems create structures and pathways, networks of communication, values and meaning, behaviors and norms. In essence, they do for themselves most of what we believed we had to do for them.

Rather than thinking of organization as an imposed structure, plan, design, or role, it is clear that in life, organization arises from the interactions and needs of individuals who have decided to come together. (Wheatley, 1998, p. 347)

Once we observe the self-creation process from a coevolutionary perspective we see that we simultaneously mold our individual identity and create a contribution to a greater whole. What we create has value only if others find meaning in us. We may be intently focused on our self and the life we are making for ourselves. We may believe we can succeed in isolation. But if our system rejects the self we have created, we are truly valueless. A self that fails to create itself as a contribution to others is irrelevant in a systems-seeking world. It will go unnoticed or rejected, lacking the sheltering stability and support that a system offers to its members. If our self-expression is not meaningful to others, we will not survive. (Wheatley & Kellner-Rogers, 1996, p. 52)

“who intend real changes”

Continuos change is a natural part of the world of the “new science.” As Kelly (1994) notes, “Change...is eternal” (p. 96). Change connected to the “greater good” continuously asks the question “leadership for what purpose?” That’s what I mean when I write about the ‘edge of chaos.’ This is a term scientists use to describe times of great turbulence when new life is born out of the decaying of the old. When complexity and confusion get into some kind of new order. And when you are at that place at the ‘edge of chaos’ there is this great potential for creativity, but it’s also by definition a very troubled, very difficult time and place. I believe that is where we find ourselves today. (Handy, 1997, pp. 26-27)

“that reflect their mutual purposes.”

Leaders and collaborators are continuously “co-creating” their groups, organizations, and communities based on their reasons for existence. As Handy (1997) notes, “The great and most satisfying thing in life, I think, is a sense of purpose beyond oneself. If the purpose is only for yourself, it rapidly dissipates” (p. 32). Bolman and Deal (1995) support Handy’s statement: “When we succumb to greed, focus only on the bottom line, and worship exclusively at the altar of rationality, we undermine our search for meaning, passion, and a sense of life’s deeper, spiritual purpose” (p. 164).
Conclusion

We believe that the future of leadership will be shaped by the human spirit of both leaders and collaborators. Heart, hope, and faith, rooted in soul and spirit, are necessary for today’s managers to become tomorrow’s leaders, for today’s sterile bureaucracies to become tomorrow’s communities of meaning, and for our society to rediscover its ethical and spiritual center. Leading with soul requires giving gifts from the heart that breathe spirit and passion into your life and organization. (Bolman & Deal, 1995, p. 12)

There may be no better description of the journey we will all be taking tomorrow’s leaders, for today’s managers to become tomorrow’s leaders, for today’s sterile bureaucracies to become tomorrow’s communities of meaning, and for our society to rediscover its ethical and spiritual center. Leading with soul requires giving gifts from the heart that breathe spirit and passion into your life and organization. (Bolman & Deal, 1995, p. 12)

The future of leadership will also be shaped by science. Margaret Wheatley (1992) describes her leadership journey into the world of the “new science” in the following way. There may be no better description of the journey we will all be taking soon.

I felt as Heisenberg must have, when he walked those streets at dawn, begging for new insights into the universe. I, too, can feel the ground shaking. I hear its deep rumblings. Any moment now, the earth will crack open and I will stare into its dark center. Into that smoking caldera, I will throw most of what I have treasured, most of the techniques and tools that have made me feel competent. I cannot do that yet; I cannot just heave everything I know into the abyss. But I know it is coming. And when it comes, when I have made my sacrificial offerings to the gods of understanding, then the ruptures will cease. Healing waters will cover the land, giving birth to new life, burying forever the ancient, rusting machines of our past understandings. And on these new waters I will set sail to places I only now imagine. There I will be blessed with new visions and new magic. I will feel once again like a creative contributor to this mysterious world. But for now, I wait. An act of faith. Land ho. (pp. 44-45)
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