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Some authors report that after an initial inspiration, the 'book wrote itself'. That has not been our experience. In fact, we lived this book long before we wrote it. As academic administrators, with our identities still firmly in faculty roles, it didn't take long before the question of 'larger purpose' intruded itself into the administrative routine. In most institutions, there is little time, and perhaps little inclination, to reflect on purpose. Fortunately for us, the Governor of New Jersey in the late 1980s, Thomas Kean, understood the importance of institutional identity and purpose to achieving successful educational outcomes. The Governor offered large grants to colleges and universities throughout the state in order to help them clarify their own distinctiveness, challenging them to 'be bold' and 'innovative' and to rethink institutional mission before the term 'reinventing' was applied to organizations.

The earliest version of Education for Leadership and Social Responsibility was born out of an extensive planning process and was awarded $1.8 million for program implementation in 1989. Two years later, due to the vision of Program Officer Bobby Austin, the Kellogg Foundation awarded the comprehensive plan $926,000. We realize that we were very fortunate to have been able to begin this exploration of an educational design with such abundant resources, and that most institutions cannot expect that kind of a start. One of the reasons for writing this book — while acknowledging that early support — is to share the things we have learned so others may not have to spend lots of money finding out for themselves.

Early ideas were tested with colleagues over the course of nine years in presentations at professional meetings throughout the country. Some of the most important feedback we received came from exchanges at meetings of the Association for General and Liberal Studies, the Society for College and University Planning, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, The Washington Center for Internships, the National Association of Independent Schools, the International
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Society for Exploring Teaching Alternatives and at our own conference on New Ways of Learning and Leading held at Wells College. Although the students might not have realized it, we learned a lot from them in our experimental team taught class in 1990.

A serendipitous contact with Max DePree, author of *Leadership is an Art* and *Leadership Jazz* and former President and CEO of Herman Miller Corporation in Michigan, provided an important validation to our emerging concept of inclusive leadership. After a meeting with Max, a network of people in diverse corporate and not-for-profit organizations was established to help promote people-centered approaches to leadership. The Collegial Network still functions as an important source of professional and personal support for us.

Our ideas were nourished as well by several prominent educators who took the time to understand the comprehensive model that we were evolving. Before we had all of the pieces in place (and they are still shifting), words of encouragement and advice from David McLaughlin, then President of the Aspen Institute; from Ted Marchese, Vice-President at the American Association for Higher Education; from Terrell Jones, Deputy Provost at Penn State University; from David Brown, Provost at Wake Forest University and from consultant Gail Chambers were extremely important in keeping us on task. Special gratitude is extended to Bill Toombs, former director of the Penn State Center for the Study of Higher Education.

For the past three years we have been fortunate to have been associated with an experiment at Wells College, building programs and networks to increase understanding of inclusive leadership and to promote leadership opportunities for women. Through these programs, we were able to take what began as a focus on undergraduate education and extend it to non-traditional audiences, including young children and teenagers; corporate women and men; community volunteers; alumnae; entrepreneurs and business people. Although this book continues the focus on the undergraduate experience, much of what we learned at Wells is applicable to the community collaborations that are a necessary part of that experience. We were most fortunate to have the support and colleagueship of Lisa Ryerson, President of Wells College, for the research reported in the book and for the writing of the book. Our staff at Wells — our friends, Karen Kirkpatrick and Meg Rogers — provided the right work environment, and Karen contributed much of her time to the preparation of the manuscript.

We are indebted to the children who inform us in Chapter 2, to their parents for allowing them to participate and granting us permis-
sion to use their pictures and to their teachers and principals for letting
the 'leadership people' disrupt their schedules. To the artists who in­
vited us into their studios and living rooms for extended periods of time
when they might have been working, and spoke to us with great inten­
sity and candor, we offer our admiration and appreciation for what they
were able and willing to share. Finally, we are grateful for the support
and responsible sociability of our families — Pamela, Christina, Jose
Luis, Nicholas, Ian, Carey, Maria and Lee.

The book is divided into two sections. In the first, we explore
some theoretical dimensions that have influenced the construction of
an education for leadership and social responsibility, including an in­
troduction to the need for inclusive leadership. Findings from research
on children, artists and from Fortune magazine are used to support a
model of higher education that uses the theme of inclusive leadership,
the modes of analysis of systems thinking and common good thinking,
and collaboration as the dominant working relationship in and out of
the classroom.

The second half of the book deals with the practical application of
the model to a campus. How does a campus approach the design and
implementation of an education for leadership and social responsibil­
ity? The focus in all of the chapters is on process and programs. Begin­
ing with the processes of planning and implementation, we move
to discussion of programs for faculty development called teachers as
leaders/teaching for leadership, the development of an integrated cur­
riculum and co-curriculum, and a consideration of how an education
for leadership and social responsibility is to be assessed. In the final
chapter, older forms of campus community are rejected in favor of
collaborative community, which echoes the themes of an education for
leadership and social responsibility.

Though we focus on the framework of an education for leader­
ship and social responsibility to integrate the undergraduate experience
and produce desirable educational outcomes, the reader should bear
in mind that the details of that particular model are not what is most
important. Each institution needs to wrestle with similar questions re­
garding the purpose, content and process of the education they are
delivering. A successful exploration may result in an entirely different
subject focus than leadership, although we suspect the social respons­
ibility component will find more endurance. We hope there are valu­
able insights in this book even for those institutions that will never
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mention the word leadership but will strive to give their students an education for our collective survival and happiness in the twenty-first century.

Gloria Nemerowicz
Eugene Rosi

Pine Manor College
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts

August 1996
Part One

Theoretical Dimensions
Chapter 1

Introduction to Inclusive Leadership

We are still a little surprised that we have written a book about leadership. Earlier in our careers, we had both independently—in different institutions and disciplines—rejected the field of leadership studies as inherently flawed. Leader connoted exclusivity and hierarchy, and leadership studies focused either on personality traits associated with those who are leaders or on positions defined by power. A leader was something few could be, but many should aspire to be. Like heroes, leaders were supposed to be cultural role models. Because they so often fell short, leaders could be dissected for flaws and criticized for failing to provide the necessary leadership to improve conditions.

But much has changed in the world and in the field of leadership studies during the past decade. We now feel part of a movement that seeks to reclaim leadership as a human (not superhuman) process, one that we all have access to and responsibility for. With many others, we have moved from dismissing the study of leadership as a narrow, often elitist, endeavor, to an understanding of the concept's power to promote quality and provide the opportunity for people to define their common good.

Leadership is not and never has been an innocuous concept. Cultural beliefs about leadership have contributed to the explanation and maintenance of inequality in Western society. To the extent that we believe leadership is based on qualities in particular people that are either inborn or are rare and difficult to cultivate, inequalities between those who are or would-be leaders and the rest of us are expected and accepted. If we believe people are born leaders, it is futile to educate for leadership and social responsibility.

The Need for Education for Leadership and Social Responsibility

In this book we are proposing both the need and a method for approaching such an education for leadership and social responsibility. There are two reasons for the urgency we feel to get on with the job.
The first is the need to promote quality in individual lives, in relationships, in institutions, and in the goods and services we produce. The resurgence of interest in leadership in the past ten years is partly connected to the quality movement in the American workplace and to the parallel interest in spirituality and values in corporate life and in other institutions (Deming, 1986; Chappell, 1993). Many have concluded that product or service quality is important both for economic and competitive advantage and for a sense of ‘the good life’. Thus we speak of quality of life issues and we search for leadership that will foster higher quality in people and in products.

If we are to make qualitative improvements in our businesses, communities and relationships, our understanding of leadership must change. A culture’s assumptions about leadership have much to do with the health of the organizations that heavily influence the lives of individuals. We measure organizational health (Rosen, 1991) by the organization’s ability to enhance its members and constituencies and, as a result, produce goods and services that are of high quality. Peter Senge (1990) refers to the creation of the ‘learning organization’ as the embodiment of this kind of vitality.

A second critical reason to educate for leadership and social responsibility is the need to forge the common good within diversity. Democratic forms of organization depend on the ability to value and utilize individuality while being able to articulate a common good. This is as true of a small work group as it is at the level of national identity. Further, democracies depend on an understanding of the necessity of participation in the process of leadership. When the majority of the population does not vote, democracy is threatened. When the majority of an organization’s members and constituencies do not participate in active ways in organizational decisions, the organization (family, club, school, corporation) is weakened (Bellah et al., 1985).

Is the current attention being paid to leadership just another fad? Dozens of popular books signal a general despair about the lack of leadership that we need to see us through our problems. The discussion signals a dissatisfaction with some key aspects of public and private life. Why can’t we do better at coming up with solutions to complex political and social problems? Why are interpersonal relationships so fragile and too often destructive? Why do institutions designed to satisfy basic human needs fall short for so many people? How is it possible that American economic pre-eminence is threatened in a global marketplace?

These felt dissatisfactions, and the fears associated with them, have prompted an interest in finding new ways to improve leadership. The
search for leadership is a search to help guide us through rapid and radical social, organizational and technological changes. It is the response of a people accustomed to looking for heroes and supermen to chart the course that we then choose to follow. Of prospective leaders we want to know: 'What's your plan?'; 'How will you change/fix things?'

Many books have been written on the elements of leadership that can help people solve their own or their organization's problems. *Charismatic Leadership* (Conger and Kanungo, 1988), *The New Leaders* (Morrison, 1992), *Visionary Leadership* (Nanus, 1992), *Stewardship* (Block, 1993), *The West Point Way of Leadership* (Donnithorne, 1993), *The Working Leader* (Sayles, 1993), *Authentic Leadership* (Terry, 1993), and *The Courageous Follower* (Chaleff, 1995) are some that have made important contributions to the discussion. Each of these authors sets out to refine and help build a model of leadership that relies on humanistic values and ethical behavior. Several have introduced the idea of leadership as process (Burns, 1978; Senge, 1990; Rost, 1991); a perspective that we seek to carry forward in this book.

The process of leadership propels people to find and solve problems, to identify their common good, to seek more information — to learn. The process is social and interactive, by definition. Therefore, the traditional, impenetrable boundary between leaders and followers is of little use. All are engaged in a leadership process.

This book goes beyond the current literature in the belief that we can and must ready people for the process of leadership earlier in their lives and in a way that is integrated with the rest of their development. Although there are some corporate and community attempts to develop leadership, they cost billions of dollars in consumer and taxpayer money, they are selective in who is able to receive the development, and they are probably less effective than early learning. As Conger has suggested (1992), such leadership training is often an alternative to true change from within an organization, change that would take longer than a five-day training week and might result in the cultivation of broad-based leadership at many levels within the organization. Skill building doesn't often change world views, a necessary component for true organizational or personal change (Sayles, 1993).

People need to be prepared to enter the community and the workplace with expectations for their roles in the process of leadership. We are not interested in producing 200 or 2000 more leaders. We are interested in producing people who understand the principles that underlie what we call 'inclusive leadership' — understand it to be a process that they have a right to, and will expect to, participate in. Education for leadership and social responsibility is not the domain of
the corporate, religious, military or academic elite — the traditional training grounds. It belongs embedded in the schools, public and private, elementary and secondary, and in higher education.

The Current State of Education for Leadership

One of the things that has struck us in our work with secondary and primary schools is how little conscious attention is paid to teaching for leadership. One might assume that in a democracy, 'where people get the leaders they deserve', there would be more than a historical, 'great man' approach to leadership which relates the stories that have shaped our view of leadership. (See Gardner, 1995, for the importance of stories in framing issues.) Leadership is avoided as a curriculum and outcome goal for several reasons.

There is still much confusion and debate about the meaning of leadership. How can one teach about a concept without some agreement on its components? There are those who believe that leadership can’t be taught, either because it is an inborn trait or an ability developed through breeding, not the domain of the public schools. Some educators argue that leadership is knowledge-based and a good liberal education is all that is necessary to produce leaders. Others see leadership development as the province of non-teaching personnel: in colleges it would reside with student life staff; in secondary schools, with extra-curricular activities such as clubs, scouting, church groups and sports.

Although many college catalogues include ‘preparation for leadership’ among the goals of the education at that particular institution, few explicitly address the issue of leadership in a systematic, integrated and comprehensive way. Instead it is assumed that if one participates in the life of the college, perhaps taking a course or two about leadership when available, the capacity and the desire for leadership will result.

In 1987, 94 institutions of higher education were included in the Leadership Education Source Book (Clark, Freeman and Britt, 1987). At that time, most campus leadership development efforts fell into one of two categories. Most prevalent were those within the area of student life that were designed to develop personal attributes and skills assumed to be associated with good leadership. Academic courses were far more rare and were disparate and typically career-oriented. Most courses, directed at would-be managers, included an examination of leadership styles and business decision-making. Significant exceptions were single courses exploring the psychology and politics of leadership.
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By the early 1990s, about 200 universities (of the more than 3000 two- and four-year institutions in the US) were described as offering courses in leadership, joined by a number of new programs (Clark and Freeman, 1990; Freeman and King, 1992). Most notable was the founding, at the University of Richmond, of the first and only undergraduate degree program in leadership studies. In addition, five small to mid-sized, private institutions reported college-wide approaches to educating for leadership. Also at this time (1993), the Journal of Leadership Studies was established to 'serve as a forum for the expression of current thought, technique, theory, ideas, issues, trends, and innovations in the field.' From 1993 to 1996, 17 articles — about 14 per cent of the total published in the journal — addressed curriculum and teaching about leadership.

With some notable and encouraging exceptions, the typical college approach to leadership is still through the division of Student Life, which on most American campuses is not well-integrated with Academic Affairs, is considered extra-curricular, is targeted to small numbers of students, namely those who are in leadership positions on campus, and is focused on management issues, i.e., how to run a meeting, manage your time, or give a speech.

Although we are seeing more attention paid to leadership at the college level, the successful integration of leadership into the educational experience has not been accomplished. Furthermore, though many institutions may agree that leadership is a desirable outcome, there is considerable variation in the conception of leadership. We believe that most people complete their formal education with little sense of personal identification with the concept of leadership, little sense of their responsibility to participate in leadership, and no appreciation that it is their responsibility to cultivate leadership within their organizations.

The Context for Leadership in the Twenty-first Century

An essential part of any effort to educate for leadership and social responsibility is an attempt to inventory the realities of the twenty-first century, when the leadership will be applied. Clearly the desired characteristics of leadership will be shaped by perceptions of the anticipated challenges in communities, politics, families and work. Constructing an inventory of twenty-first century realities is a valuable exercise for educators, as it stimulates an examination of beliefs and understandings about the new millennium and, consequently, reveals assumptions about how students need to be prepared for it.
What follows is a list of realities, already part of our everyday existence, that will become more pronounced in the next millennium. They derive from the profound concerns that have been raised about the prospects in the future for: the physical viability of our planet; the destructive as well as constructive potentials of our known and future technologies; persistent intergroup tensions and inequalities; and the inability of public and private institutions to serve human needs. While the realities we discuss below do not exhaust the possibilities, we assume their importance must be acknowledged as we shape an understanding of leadership education.

1 Organizational, community, and global pluralism is an accepted and increasingly valued reality of life. The objective of discovering and valuing diversity in people, cultures and ideas occupies a significant portion of community, academic and corporate attention. Further, for the healthy individual there is a need to be aware of and be comfortable with one's own cultural and gender identity in order to appreciate the diversity that others offer.

2 The troublesome side of pluralism is the reality that difference is often the basis for structured inequality. Inequalities are created and maintained by the economies and the ideologies of nations, organizations and communities. They are at the heart of conflict in organizational and global arenas. Economic scarcity, and its manifestation in un- and under-employment, malnutrition and war, is a reality that impacts the lives of individuals and whole countries. The inability to provide economic participation to all members of our communities has devastating consequences for the survival of democratic organizations and for the growth of healthy leadership.

3 Organizing diverse people into groups that live, grow, explore, produce, reproduce and solve problems is increasingly likely to be done using more horizontal, flatter forms of organization. In addition, these groups are linked in networked relations with one another in forms that are still emerging. As it grows horizontally, the networked organization creates webs of interdependencies among its members.

Traditional, pyramidal, bureaucratic structures that rely on hierarchy for order and conformity are becoming obsolete (Miles and Snow, 1986). The rational model of human behavior, especially rational decision-making — upon which this organizational model is based, is being questioned (Sayles, 1993).
Hierarchy can no longer control the flow of communication, the chain of command is often difficult to identify, and the effectiveness of top-down, command and control leadership is questionable.

Horizontal organizations assume a more holistic approach to their members and to the work of the organization, rather than the more narrow, role-specific approach of the bureaucratic system. Instead of conformity to a status quo, people in these new organizations expect that creativity and change will occur as a result of interaction among members. Creativity and improvisation from all parts of the organization are encouraged. Participants are defined as capable of understanding the system and are entitled to information.

Within these new structures, team-based decision-making, production, and accountability are replacing reliance on the individual. Collaboration and cooperation are replacing competition as the primary relation within and among organizations and communities. There is increasing need for awareness of interdependence, the limits of unilateral solutions, and the value of win-win strategies. Clearly, in order for these new forms to be successful there must be open opportunity for members to participate.

New organizations, new relationships, and the value of pluralism are all related to the reality of accelerating, complex technologies. The gap between basic scientific discovery and its application continues to narrow, making the consequences of choice more momentous. Today's technology can contribute to both a sense of individual powerlessness as well as a tremendous increase in the availability of resources at one's fingertips.

The perception of technology as a quick fix for our pressing social problems allows a false sense of security to mask the reality of technology itself as a problem involving the need for human choice. Many still perceive technological development as a gradual, controllable process that provides time for experts to make the 'right' choices. Actually, the development is often exponential, with decision-making impaired by the lag in understanding implications for basic systems and time-honored values.

Democratic values are increasingly pushing for expression in the twenty-first century. As America continues the experiment to govern a pluralistic population democratically, democratic processes have found a place in Eastern Europe, in the republics
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of the former Soviet Union and, in the face of great resistance, in China. While there is no guarantee that democracy abroad will prevail and while the euphoria of 1989–90 has vanished, democratic values and processes continue to provide a powerful benchmark. The values include: equal opportunity for participation in the life of the organization or society by all members; honoring the dignity of individual human life; freedom of expression of opinions and access to information; and the application of the principles of justice. In American workplaces, schools, communities and families, the strain to fulfill the promise of democracy is evident (Bellah et al., 1991; Barber, 1992).

Decentralization and the Common Good

Whether or not one values these six realities, they are with us in both public and private ways, through every aspect of our lives. Our families, schools, governments, religions, communities and businesses feel the impact of pluralism and the potential for inequality and conflict. Our institutions are likely to be experimenting with flatter organizational forms to get their jobs accomplished, and, in the context of pluralism and potential conflict, they will be relying on collaboration and team-based decision-making. Increasingly, people will expect to be a part of many teams, will expect to be heard and be required to listen, and expect to never stop learning, teaching and taking risks. Hopefully, much of this will be supported with reference to democratic values, rights and responsibilities.

Each of these realities — in our personal, political and organizational life — supports a tendency toward decentralization, autonomy and heterogeneity. From the break up of the Soviet Union to the successful General Motors Saturn plants, from the modern American family, to educational compacts and charter schools, there is increasing stress on independent definition of outcomes, local decision-making and control of the process, the valuing of difference and distinctiveness, and a reliance on increasingly sophisticated technologies to get the job done.

The first reality, pluralism, is a value-neutral concept that seeks to describe ‘the many.’ When it is applied to human groupings, the basis of classification is some social category with meaning to the history and identity of people. But, of course, human identity has never been value-neutral. Although this country was founded on the principles of
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democracy and pluralism, the struggle to value and utilize differences productively continues. Tendencies toward ethnocentrism — seeing one’s own group as ‘the best’ — are as true in modern corporate America as they are in high schools. We know that group pride, patriotism and loyalty are positive emotions for the preservation of groups. The same elements that hold smaller groups together, however, lead to ‘in-group/out-group’ thinking associated with prejudice, competition, rivalry, hoarding, domination and overt conflict. How do we preserve and honor group differences while drawing larger circles of inclusion?

The second reality — flatter organizations — also encourages decentralization. As opposed to the newer, flat organizational model, the traditional hierarchy that we have become accustomed to appears very neat. It is part of a rational model of behavior whose organizational component, the bureaucracy, is highly centralized. The classic work of Max Weber (1947) outlines the dimensions of bureaucratic organization and links the development of bureaucratic forms to the dominance of rationality as the desired and actual model of human behavior. Weber points out the need for rationality in social systems which have converted from small, intimate communities to large, differentiated urban centers. Given the high degree of specialization within bureaucracies, people enter their roles credentialed and are differentially rewarded based on the scarcity of their credential or talent as well as the responsibility of their position. Emphasis is on position, not people.

Bureaucracy promotes predictability, impersonality and control of information, thus bringing order to what might be the chaotic mix of masses of different people. In some ways, living and working and relating within bureaucratic structures relieves people and their leaders of the need to define a common good. The structure does that for them. The common good is managing the bureaucratic system, letting the rules of the system work, and, at the bottom line, keeping the system going. Such a common good does not deal with human purpose beyond the reason for which the bureaucracy was created.

Flatter structures push responsibilities farther into the organization, to the people who actually do the work. There is less traditional managing of subordinates by superiors and therefore more leadership opportunity. Individual work groups, teams, learning groups, coordinating groups are given more autonomy to define the job and how it will be done; to locate resources and organize to do the job; and ultimately to evaluate the results.

Flatter structures eliminate close supervision and often create autonomous cells within the larger structure. While many applaud the
increasing reliance on teams — in the workplace, in classrooms, as a model of family life, and for communities — for the spirit of equality and collaboration that they engender, we need to be cautious of the tendency of teams to lose sight of an overarching common good of which they are a part. The same forces at work in the arena of pluralism are at work whenever groups are created with identity and special purpose. The challenge for leadership, at all levels of organizations, in families, corporations and nations, is to create the conditions for inclusion of these autonomous units into a larger enterprise.

The influence on decentralization of technology has interested social scientists since the mass production of the automobile. We are accustomed to people being physically decentralized from their families, their communities and their workplaces. Can families hold together and serve the needs of their members for identity, emotional and economic support and Thanksgiving dinner when they may live and/or work thousands of miles apart? Can work organizations thrive in the age of the ‘virtual office’? Can communities educate the children of families whose members are physically absent from the community either permanently or for long periods of time?

Through the information revolution, people are at once able to communicate with millions of people they have never met; to decentralize their engagement with others to very specific topics; and to work, play and shop quite alone with their computer keyboards. The possibilities presented by technology have altered public discourse. There is little room to decide if something should exist in the realm of possibilities. Rather, if it is technologically possible, it will exist and the discussion, if any, will have to do with the choice of application. While technology clearly offers tremendous advantages for the quality of human life, people are disconnected from the production of technological devices, which is left to technical experts, and often from the decisions about application, which are left to moral or legal experts.

Democratic values continue to undergird the rights and responsibilities of the individual in relationship to government and to other citizens. They honor the individual as ‘endowed with unalienable rights’. While they put emphasis on individual rights, in the best democratic systems they do so in the context of the collective and with the purpose of making the collective enterprise work. Individual rights are balanced with group level responsibilities. Often, democratic rights and responsibilities sit uncomfortably with other organizational goals and centralized control emerges. We have often heard ‘this is not a democracy’ from classroom teachers, parents and bosses, in response to complaints by participants. Democratic values are often overridden by organizational
values that call on certain leadership positions to give direction, to impose order and meaning: i.e., the teacher, parent, boss 'knows best,' or he or she may not always be right but is the teacher, parent or boss 'so you better do as you are told'. Agreement on democratic values that honor the individual and at the same time require participation in a larger enterprise is the best foundation we have for locating the common good.

At the turn of the last century, sociologists and others were concerned with the impact of the Industrial Revolution and urbanization on our social institutions. How, they asked, would a society characterized by an increasingly specialized division of labor and by differences in ethnicity, religion and social class, be held together to function as a whole? Most influential was Emile Durkheim's analysis (1933) that 'interdependence of unlike parts' was to be the social glue in heterogeneous societies, replacing the glue of familiarity that characterized more traditional, homogeneous societies. Interdependence implies an equality of dependency that is rarely apparent. It implies an equality of value in the eyes of the other. One does not have to look far to see evidence that some people — those living in cardboard boxes, those without medical insurance, those working at minimum wage or not working at all, those who do not fit cultural standards of mental and physical appropriateness — are more dependent than others. Interconnectedness conceals levels of (inter)dependence.

The division of labor and the revolution in production that transformed our lives at the beginning of this century understandably led to concern for the integration of society and for the ability of social systems to hold together in the future. The post-industrial future has been upon us for at least the last 30 years. The most important challenge facing leadership today — at all levels within organizations, communities, and families — is creating conditions that allow the members to manifest their individual and group level differences while at once defining their common good and finding ways to pursue it.

The Common Good and Inclusive Leadership

The preceding discussion makes clear the need for links among smaller groups of people within a larger common enterprise. The smaller group may be the children in the family, a particular nation, an interest group within a community, an ethnic group within a nation or a work team in a company. We have said that it is the job of leadership to help
diverse people define their own common good and find means to pursue it. In subsequent chapters we will learn more about the kind of leadership that can do this. Before we turn to some new sources for more insight into leadership, let us review the assumptions we are making.

The traditional concept and practice of leadership is not well suited to deliver what is needed. Because it is defined by position in a hierarchy, traditional leadership is achieved through possession of credentials which provide access to the position. In addition, the position demands, and others expect, that the leader will do the defining of purpose and will solve the problems at hand. If he/she cannot, a new leader will be found. The traditional relationship between leaders and followers is one of inequality. Distinct differences in character, breeding, personality, intellect or other traits separate the few leaders and the many followers. Most followers are assumed to be basically lazy and motivated by narrow self-interest. The few good leaders that are necessary are produced primarily by select institutions.

It is unimaginable that traditional leaders would engage in the processes that would result in inclusivity and common good thinking. Communication between leaders and followers is formal, prescribed by hierarchical rules of command and custom. Communication is not spontaneous, nor is it two-way; control of information is a base of power. Since information can be dangerous in the wrong hands, it is shared selectively. Consultation occurs only among certain positions; too much consultation will be interpreted as a sign of the leader's inability to make decisions and lead. Ethics, which can unite groups of people around principles, are often seen as incompatible with strong leadership, which sometimes relies on secrecy, deception and favoritism to accomplish goals.

In contrast, a new model of leadership has emerged to offer alternative conceptualizations and assumptions that will influence leadership. Many are working to craft the new model, and the language we have to describe it is still in flux (see citations, pp. 4–5). We call the new model inclusive leadership.

This kind of leadership is not dependent on position; it is expected to be manifest throughout an organization in relationships among people. Leadership is evaluated qualitatively by how people are working together to define and pursue their common good. Leaders and followers mentor, coach and learn together. Followers are active participants in the process, shaping and drawing out leadership when it is needed. In this model, leadership derives from basic human characteristics that are cultivatable in people. Among the characteristics are creativity,
curiosity, empathy and cooperation. Nearly everyone can acquire the propensity for each of these behaviors, which are not inborn.

In systems characterized by inclusive leadership, information is systematically sought and freely shared. Two-way communication is critical, with an emphasis on the skill of listening. Value is placed on democratic processes, on honesty and fairness, respect for the individual, and responsibility and accountability. Inclusive leadership is socially responsible leadership, inclusive of many diverse people united by the search to define and act on common good goals. The absence of stark differences between leaders and followers in terms of any social characteristics or preconceived qualifications promotes a sense of familiarity, reciprocity and equality between leaders and followers. Leadership is not a mystery.

These broad brush strokes illustrate that by definition inclusive leadership must involve people in creating their own futures and in solving problems in order to increase well-being and assure our collective future. Sound like a tall order? It is. But it is precisely the order given to liberal education.

**Listening to the Voices of Children, Business and Artists**

Clearly, we need to know more about this powerful concept before we begin crafting the education that will help people create and use it. In order to provide more clarity to our thinking about inclusive leadership, we turn to three voices with very different experiences but, perhaps surprisingly, with similar perspectives when it comes to leadership.

First we will speak with those who are learning the cultural rules and expectations about leadership — children. We turn to children to better understand the messages we adults transmit about leadership and thus to better understand our own thinking. We also turn to them as consultants about how leadership might be done better, to achieve more cooperation and better results. The importance of listening to the ideas of children has been convincingly argued by Howard Gardner: ‘Education that takes seriously the ideas and intuitions of the young child is far more likely to achieve success than education that ignores these views, either considering them to be unimportant or assuming they will disappear on their own’ (Gardner, 1991:248).

Next, the voice of the business community will be heard through an analysis of *Fortune* magazine. Is inclusive leadership relevant to the contemporary workplace? When educating for leadership and social responsibility, are we also educating for the real world of work?
Table 1.1: Comparing traditional leadership with inclusive leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Leadership</th>
<th>Inclusive Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identified by position in a hierarchical structure.</td>
<td>A quality of the interaction of people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relies on rational model of human behavior: depersonalized relationships, predictability, and efficiency.</td>
<td>Not dependent on position — expectation that it will come throughout organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership is evaluated by how leader is doing at solving problems.</td>
<td>Leadership is evaluated by how people are working together to define and improve their common good, solve problem, etc. Leader as mentor, guide, empowering others, learner and teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders provide solutions and answers.</td>
<td>Leaders and followers have an interdependent relationship. Follows are active participants in the process of leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinct differences between leaders and followers: character, personality, and breeding.</td>
<td>Based on human characteristics that are teachable/learnable: empathy, creativity, cooperation and curiosity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followers are assumed to be motivated solely by self-interest and are lazy.</td>
<td>Information is systematically sought and and freely shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The province of a few (good men).</td>
<td>Communication is critical, with a stress on listening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produced by select institutions.</td>
<td>Values democratic processes, honesty and shared ethics. Seeks a common good within diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication between leaders and followers is infrequent and formal. Little consultation necessary or desirable. Information is controlled and retained as source of power.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics often incompatible with strong leadership which often must rely on secrecy, deception and payoffs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, we will hear from those who engage regularly and creatively in processes of problem finding and solving, and in perfecting the quality of their work. They work collaboratively as well as independently to seek new ways to express the common human condition. These leaders, rarely viewed as such, are called artists. We believe their knowledge of the process of creativity will help clarify the process of leadership.

The perspectives of these groups will help us refine the necessary approach and elements of an education for leadership and social responsibility which we will examine in the second part of this book.
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