Organizational Consultation XXX: Leadership and the Appreciative Perspective

William Bergquist, Ph.D.

We have now completed our journey around the Appreciative Triangle. We have ventured into the domains of *information*, *intentions* and *ideas*, and have delved into three appreciative strategies that relate to each of these domains: *assessment* (information), *chartering* (intentions) and *empowerment* (ideas). We have explored three strategies along the way that bridge these three domains: *benchmarking* (information and intentions), *development* (intentions and ideas) and *feedback* (ideas and information).

One key ingredient is missing. It is *leadership*. The time has come in this final set of essays to directly address the issue of appreciative leadership. Specifically, the time has come to focus on an important proposition: *if a leader is appreciative in her own engagement with other members of the organization, then the task of implementing appreciative strategies is much less formidable.*

In examining this proposition, I turn first to an obvious question. How should a leader engage the six appreciative strategies that are described in this series of essays? I then turn to subtler issues regarding both traditional and newly emerging models of leadership that are themselves inherently appreciative. I specifically examine *contextual models of leader* and introduce a model of leadership that derives from traditional metaphors: *lover*, *partner*, and *servant*.

I then shift to a model of leadership that is based on decidedly nontraditional metaphors: *conductor, jerk*, and *rogue*. Finally, I turn to a conception of leadership that integrates the old and new, while bringing distinct clarity to the notion of appreciative leadership. At various points throughout this essay, I rely heavily on the appreciative wisdom offered by the remarkable 20th Century philosopher and scientist, Teilhard de Chardin. I turn to him specifically in presenting the final, integrating model of leadership.

Leadership, Organizational Culture

And The Appreciative Triangle

The Appreciative Triangle has no obviously starting point, nor is any one of the six strategies more important than the other five strategies. However, leaders of some organizations tend to dwell in one or two of the domains and lean heavily on one or two strategies.

There are many reasons for making primary use of a specific strategy or for focusing specifically on the domain of information, intentions or ideas. Leaders of an organization that is in the business of mass production, for instance, will be inclined to dwell in the domains of information and ideas. They want to know what is happening in their production facility. They are consistently searching for new ideas to reduce production costs or increase sales.

By contrast, it is quite understandable that leaders of a human service agency dwell in the domain of intentions and focus on chartering and development strategies. Volunteers who work with this agency want to know what social purposes are being served by the agency. Furthermore, the paid staff of the agency must be frequently engaged in their own professional development to keep up with the shifting needs of their clientele. There are many obvious reasons for concentrating in this agency on chartering and development.

Most successful leaders will accommodate their own personal preferences to the immediate needs of their organization, whether their organization is manufacturing chips or advocating for homeless youth. They will ask an appreciative question: what is important in this organization? They will then adjust their own preferences to these realistic needs and concerns.

Organizational Culture

There is another overriding reason for the concentration of leaders on a specific domain or strategy. This overriding reason concerns *organizational culture*. It is a less rational reason and often harder to justify. However, it is just as compelling as tangible demands of the task being performed by the organization. Culture tells an organization what *should be* important, even if this imperative defies all reason and tangible evidence.

Just as each member of the organization has her own distinctive personality that is exhibited in predictable patterns of behavior in various settings and over time, so an organization has a distinctive culture that is exhibited in predictable patterns of organizational behavior. The culture of an organization, like personality, tends to be immune to time or space. It remains unchanged or it slowly changes. Despite shifts in the membership of an organization, the culture endures. Despite new product lines or services being rendered by the organization, the culture of an organization remains fundamental and immutable.

Despite shifts in leadership and leadership personalities, the culture of an organization is sustained. When leadership and organizational culture are in conflict, the culture is likely to win. Successful leaders will shift their personality or, more often, engage a latent aspect of their enduring personality, to accommodate the culture. Just as they accommodate to task demands and employee needs, successful leaders accommodate culture. Unsuccessful leaders don't accommodate and become alienated from the organization in which they supposedly have great influence.

There is considerable confusion regarding the ability of leaders to change organizational culture. Many projects are underway in 21st Century organizations that are seeking to improve culture, change culture, or embrace a new culture. They are unlikely to be successful if they are really intended as vehicles for shifting culture. Linguistic confusion often attends these ill-fated attempts to change culture. This confusion concerns the use or misuse of two terms: *organizational climate* and *organizational culture*.

Organizational climate refers to a temporary state, or quality of thought and feeling, within an organization. How do our employees feel about working in this organization right now? What are the primary concerns of leaders in this organization this month? Are the employees in this division likely to be pleased about this reorganization? How are we doing with regard to employee morale? These are organizational climate issues. Organizational climate does change, and leaders certainly can influence climate through their decisions and actions.

Organizational culture refers to an enduring trait, or reinforced pattern of behaviors, within an organization. What are the enduring stories, values, informal rewards and ways in which employees treat one another? These are organizational culture issues. While organizational culture tends to be very stable and endures many changes within an organization, organizational climate is often cyclical. Organizations go through cycles, especially if they are involved in seasonal changes. Department stores, accounting firms, agricultural businesses—and sports teams—all go through seasonal changes.

The climate of these organizations will inevitably change. However, the organizational culture does not change. We find that organizational climate will shift with a major organizational success or failure, with a major reorganization in the organization, or with the introduction of a new compensation system or training program. The organizational culture typically is not influenced in an immediate, noticeable way by any of these events.

Organizational culture, like personality, is formed early in an organization's life. It continues to exert profound influence throughout the life of the organization. Organizational culture plays a particularly important role in the definition and maintenance of effective leadership.[i] An appreciative perspective on organizational life and leadership begins with recognition that organizational culture is powerful, pervasive and not easily changed. An effective and appreciative leader will recognize and understand the complex dynamics of the organization where she works. She will seek to take full advantage of strengths that are inherent in this culture rather than seeking to change the culture.

Personalities can be changed through the use of drugs, physical invasion of the brain or profound brainwashing techniques. None of these techniques are recommended or ethical, except under extreme conditions. Similarly, organizational cultures can be changed, but the cost is great. Insensitive mergers, decimation of work forces, and organization-wide threats can change culture. However, those who remain in the organization are demoralized, fearful and certainly marginally committed, at best, to the organization's welfare.

Organizational culture will often shift with massive upturns or downturns in business, or rapid growth or decline in the size of an organization. These changes, however, will often leave the organization with little capacity to cope with future changes. All of this speaks to a simple, but often ignored, truth: *organizational cultures are to be appreciated, not changed.*

The Four Organizational Cultures

Given this brief introduction to the nature and dynamics of organizational culture, I turn specifically to the relationship between organizational culture and preferences of leaders for one or more of the specific domains and one or more of the appreciative strategies described in this set of essays. There are three kinds of organizational culture that relate directly to the three domains I have identified. These are the *culture of information,* the *culture of intentions*, and the *culture of ideas*.

The first of these three organizational cultures encourages the generation and sharing of information. This information-rich culture helps keep leaders in touch with constantly shifting realities. The second organizational culture is filled with conversations about and expressions of the intentions that serve as a foundation for the organization. This intention-rich culture encourages clarity of mission and values, and ongoing dialogue regarding organizational vision and purposes. The third organizational culture encourages and sustains the generation of ideas. This idea-rich culture promotes risk-taking and learning from experience. Emphasis is placed on movement in the organization from reflection to action.

Twenty First Century leaders will be successful in creating an appreciative organization to the extent that they fully understand and embrace all three of these cultures. Successful and appreciative leaders will support the production and use of information, the clarification and monitoring of intentions, and the generation and enactment of ideas. The challenge for many leaders is to find a way to feel comfortable in and recognize the important role played by each of these three cultures. I will briefly describe each culture and suggest ways in which leaders working within each can most effectively engage the six strategies of the Appreciative Triangle. I then turn to a fourth culture that incorporates all three domains.

Culture of Information

I have consulted to many organizations that I would describe as *left leaning*. This doesn't mean that these organizations are liberal in political ideology. Rather it means that the leaders of these organizations tend to dwell in the domain of information and readily embrace appreciative strategies associated with this domain: assessment, benchmarking and feedback. These strategies are all located in the lower left-hand corner of the Appreciative Triangle—hence, the term left leaning.

The leaders of left leaning, information-rich cultures love data and lengthy, in-depth analyses. They are inclined to be very cautious and may emphasize autonomy and individual responsibility. These men and women tend to live in and help create a culture that is information rich. Abundant data are generated and shared among members of the organization. This information animates the organization and clarifies intentions. When it is operating effectively, this information-rich culture is conducive to reflections about the functioning of a work team and about the relative success of the overall operation of this team. Feedback regarding performance is welcomed. Mistakes are acknowledged and learning from mistakes is encouraged.

Successful and respected members in a left leaning organization tend to be flexible in their response to problems and creative in identifying or generating alternative

solutions. This culture rewards analytic competence. Successful members tend to be skillful in designing and managing the *methods* being used in the group. Members of these organizations tend to support procedures, policies and practices that help to create and maintain a productive and safe environment in the group.

Thoughtful leaders thrive in this culture. These leaders compliment the focus on information with their commitment to careful analysis and reflection. Frequently, an information-rich culture produces an excess of information. This information may be valid, but it is not very useful. The thoughtful leader encourages careful research and the formulation of questions that produce useful information. In an information-rich culture, the thoughtful leader will usually find enthusiastic support for rational discourse and the ongoing technical training and conceptual education of all employees.

Culture of Intentions

The domain of intentions is particularly important in some organizations with which I have consulted. I find that these organizations readily embrace my recommendations regarding the use of appreciative strategies that reside at the top of the Appreciative Triangle: chartering, benchmarking and development. These organizations are *upward focused* because of this emphasis on strategies at the top of the Triangle. The energies of these organizations are focused upward, metaphorically and topographically, with regard to the Appreciative Triangle. The leaders of these organizations thrive when attention turns to discussions about organizational charter and to an exploration of the mission, vision, values and purposes that form a foundation for this charter.

The intention-rich culture is characterized by settings in which members of the organization focus on *relationships* rather than methods (as in the case with information-rich organizations). Members of upward focused organizations are sensitive to and fully appreciative of diversity in the experiences, ideas, values and aspirations that exist among organizational members.

Differences among members with regard to gender, race, ethnicity, nationality and disabilities are viewed as strengths and valuable resources. Successful participants in this culture tend to be aware and supportive of the traditions and history of their group and organization. They frequently honor the contributions of past and current members. They enjoy celebrating the distinctive features and accomplishments of their group and organization.

The intentions-rich culture tends to be particularly supportive of employees who are skillful in providing personal assistance to other members of the group when requested. Furthermore, competent members of this culture provide assistance in a manner that is responsive to the other person's needs and that respects the other person's autonomy and sense of self-worth. Personal risk-taking and interpersonal learning among all group members is encouraged in this culture. Inspiring leaders thrive in this organizational culture. These leaders focus on values and the vision, purposes and personal aspirations that are derived from these values. The inspiring leader in this culture will find enthusiastic support for her concerns about the welfare of employees and the building of community and commitment.

Culture of Ideas

The leaders of some organizations with which I have worked tend to dwell on the domain of ideas. They readily embrace the strategies of empowerment, development and feedback. These leaders and their organization thrive on decisive action. In terms of the Appreciative Triangle, the idea-rich leaders and organizations tend to be *right leaning*. Once again, this doesn't refer to political ideology, but rather to the tendency of these leaders and organizations to dwell in the right-hand domain (ideas) and employ the appreciative strategies located in the lower right-hand corner of the triangle.

In this series of essays, there is a strong emphasis on the task of the group. Group methods and relationships among members of the group are secondary. Members of a right leaning group will take risks in order to be successful performers. They will try

anything once—provided it enables them to successfully complete the task. When this culture is working effectively, employees are inclined to work very hard in accomplishing the convening task. They pitch in to assist others who are faced with heavy workloads and are fully satisfied with their own work only when it yields an exceptional product or service. Quality improvement programs are readily accepted in this type of organizational culture.

The idea-rich culture tends to honor and encourage people who are very skillful and knowledgeable in specific areas of expertise. Task-related competence is critical in this culture—as it is in the information-rich culture. This culture supports those people who possess and make effective use of the technical competencies that are needed to perform their appointed functions. When this culture is successful, employees want to be effectively supervised by the formal management of their group. Managers are formally designated and they, in turn, delegate appropriate responsibility, with a comparable amount of authority, to members of their work group.

With regard to commitment and priorities, people working in a culture of ideas want to be clear about the goals, purposes and aspirations that have been assigned to their group. They want to be compensated fairly and appropriately for their accomplishments of assigned tasks. Ideally, timely rewards and promotions are given for both individual and group achievements. In general, the culture of ideas is most closely aligned with an assertive style of leadership. The assertive leader encourages risk-taking and the generation of innovation practices. When trusted, the assertive leader provides a safe environment that encourages the generation and enactment of new ideas.

Culture of Diversity

In addition to the three distinctive cultures just identified, there is a fourth culture that blends all three domains. This is the *culture of diversity*. All three perspectives are honored in an organization where this diversity-rich culture thrives. Information flows

throughout the organization, intentions are given serious and ongoing consideration. Ideas are generated and actions are taken at all levels of the organization.

Contextual leadership is clearly needed if a culture of diversity is to flourish, for diversity inherently requires the emergence of leadership at all organizational levels. Furthermore, diversity requires flexibility in the use of differing styles of leadership at each level of the organization and in specific situations. This fourth culture of diversity is more closely aligned with appreciation than are any of the other three cultures. The contextual leader who operates effectively in the culture of diversity is flexible and sensitive to the varying styles of leadership that are needed in complex organizational settings.

What exactly is contextual leadership? We find wide-spread support for and extensive descriptions of this leadership model in many books of the past half century about leadership that emphasize the critical role played by organizational context in determining the effectiveness of specific leadership styles. The contextual approach to leadership is exemplified in the work of Hershey and Blanchard.[ii] It is exemplified in several even more insightful (but less popular) books written by Fiedler, Vroom and Yetton, and Woodward.[iii] Each of these leadership models emphasizes the relativity of leadership. By contrast, traditional leadership and management theory is typically more entrenched regarding effective practices.

As exemplified in the classic work of Blake and Mouton,[iv] these normative models emphasize the acquisition of specific skills and attitudes that are appropriate to one, correct mode of leadership. In the case of Blake and Mouton, this one correct mode is the so-called consensus-building style of leadership. Contextual models suggest that effective leaders use differing styles of leadership in particular settings and in doing specific tasks. No one style is always effective. Rather leaders must learn when to use a specific style and how to use this style. In the case of normative models, leaders must learn a specific style and apply it in all instances, whether this style is one of openness to other people, clarity

regarding mission and goals, fairness and acceptance of diversity, or the ability to act in a decisive and strategically sound manner.

Organizational Context and 21st Century Leadership

The contextual model of leadership and the culture of diversity move us closer to appreciative leadership than do any of the other three cultures or styles of leadership associated with these three cultures. However, even the contextual leadership theorists provide an inadequate model when we consider the complex, unpredictable and turbulent organizational environments that I have identified in this series of essays. We can't even find consistency regarding contexts within which a specific leadership style does or doesn't work. At certain times, a particular kind of leader will make a difference, provided she is in the right place and time. At other times, this same leader will be ineffective, even if the situation very closely resembles that which existed at the point of effectiveness. Sometimes Leader X is influential. At other times she is not.

An old Zen saying suggests that we can never step into the same river, for the water that was there when we first entered the river (and the pattern of water flow in the river) is not the same the second or third time we enter the river. Flexibility in style, therefore, must be supplemented by a commitment to learning.

As Argyris, Schon and Senge have observed, we are effective leaders not because we avoid making mistakes, but because we learn from our mistakes.[v] Yet, if appreciative leadership is to be effective, something more is needed. An appreciative model of leadership must be based, in addition, on the assumption that history is the unfolding of simultaneous or sequential elements of both reason and irrationality.

Organizational Order and Chaos

Organizations are all about the interplay between reason and irrationality, order and chaos.[vi] At one level, there is orderliness in the enactment of effective leadership. The contextual leadership theorists, such as Hershey and Blanchard, define specific criteria

regarding group and individual maturation of subordinates or the nature of tasks being performed when determining appropriate leadership styles. At another level, there is nothing but chaos and unpredictability.

Appropriate styles of leadership and, more importantly, the effectiveness of a specific leader can neither be predicted nor fully understood after the fact. The characterization of any phenomenon in an organization, such as worker morale, is often influenced more by the nature of the measuring procedure or tool being used than by the phenomenon itself.[vii]

Similarly, in the assessment of leadership effectiveness, the relative success of a leader is often determined less by the leader being studied than by the level at which the analysis of leadership is being conducted and by the nature of the effectiveness criteria being used. Certain criteria and certain levels of analysis produce clear conclusions about the nature of effective leadership; other criteria and levels of analysis produce either contradictory conclusions or a muddle of images and impressions about effective leadership.

At one level, the behavior of virtually any leader is understandable and even predictable. At another level, the behavior of this same leader is inexplicable and unpredictable. At the global level, for example, we can examine the behavior of one of our past archenemies, Saddam Hussein. Saddam is described, understandably, as a mad man, who is willing to sacrifice his people and his country for a vision of regional domination that is neither appropriate nor achievable. His behavior exemplifies chaotic, irrational leadership.

Furthermore, American vigilance and weaponry make considerable sense. Yet, as one examines the life of Saddam and the history of his country and region, many of his dreams begin to make some sense. Conversely, the strategies that are formulated and actions that are taken by the American government begin to seem more chaotic and inappropriate. It is not unusual for one part or level of a system to begin to look increasingly chaotic or arbitrary precisely at the point when another part or level of the system becomes clearer and more purposeful.

Leading In Order and Chaos

We can look at the behavior of almost any corporate or governmental executive to discover both chaos and order in 21st Century leadership. The manager of a large Western city government, for instance, recently prepared a plan for decentralization and a performance management system that encourages broad-based participation and consensus-based decision-making.

The men and women who work under this city manager were encouraged to introduce this new plan and system to their subordinates in a timely manner. These efforts are certainly consistent with the appreciative trend toward collaboration and teamwork. They exemplify a thoughtful and orderly process of change. Yet, according to one of this city manager's subordinates, the process, as actually enacted, was chaotic and counterproductive:

> The idea was a good idea, on paper. It was a change strategy encouraging less authority from the boss and more delegated accountability/participation within the lower rank management team. Consistent reporting loops would keep top management informed but not involved with every minute decision. It was breaking down the number of people (to smaller size) involved in making the decision. The system was attempting to be [appreciative]. The problem with the system became apparent when managers, top to bottom, did not trust each other to model, report, and consequently carry out the service to the citizen. They did not know how and the frustration became *modus operandi* for staff.

In the process of bringing about more orderly and creditable city services, the city manager temporarily created a system that was less ordered and less creditable (at least among employees):

> . . . communication became strained and fragmented to manifest as "turfing" or a type of "them versus us" phenomenon. This was most apparent within the top Executive

> Management team's ineptness in honest, direct discussions across function. Effective, productive communication simply did not exist. . . Managers were afraid to talk candidly with certain others due to some "fear of consequence." . . . Departments blamed other departments for their inefficiency to deliver service on time. . . .Some departments . . . felt like and acted as if they were in a war zone. Cliques whispered about their manager and made other cliques their enemy. In addition, lots of complaining occurred revolving around the so-called "imposed changes" they were forced to undergo. Fragmentation in allegiance to the boss and to client service was quite evident.

This isn't the whole story. The city manager was very effective in creating a public image of the new changes as being responsive to public needs. He had gained the full support of the mayor and the media in his efforts to decentralize the operations of the city. He offered a portrait of order to the public. Thus, at one level and from one perspective there is order. At another level and from another perspective there is chaos. A similar story can be told in many public and private organizations.

The Appreciative Leader: From A Traditional Perspective

How does one address this interplay between order and chaos? How does one move beyond the contextual model of leadership to a more fully appreciative model? I propose that contemporary leaders must not only embrace multiple roles and functions in their organization. They must embrace a multitude of roles that come from different eras in our society and that represent a complex interweaving of order and chaos.

Some of these roles and functions are decidedly traditional in nature and build on a sense of community. These roles tend to be effective in addressing the challenges of order. Other roles and functions are appreciative and reflect shifting notions about organizational life in contemporary society. These roles and functions tend to be aligned with the dynamic chaos in contemporary organizations. I turn first, in this essay, to traditional roles to be played by leaders.

In looking at traditional concepts of leadership that might be of value to contemporary leaders, I turn to an unusual source, Teilhard de Chardin. Teilhard was a renegade priest, scientist and philosopher who wrote during the first half of the 20th Century. His vision and analysis is remarkably relevant to 21st Century realities—especially with regard to appreciative leadership.

Teilhard's notion of leadership takes the form not of directing or even managing; rather, Teilhard believes that effective leadership builds on a process of synthesis: the synthesis of ideas and the synthesis or uniting of people. This appreciative and holistic emphasis on synthesis contrasts sharply with the emphasis in modern society on deficit and analysis. In modern management theory we break things down into their constituent parts and identify problems that justify dominating control of discrete entities. In Teilhard's world we put things together and grow to appreciate them.

Leader As Lover

Love is a key word for Teilhard in examining this synthesizing relationship between the individual and collective: "considered in its full biological reality, love—that is to say, the affinity of being with being—is not peculiar to man. It is a general property of all life and as such it embraces, in its varieties and degrees, all the forms successively adopted by organized matter."[viii] In emphasizing the role of *leader as lover*, Teilhard states that:[ix]

> . . . love alone is capable of uniting living beings in such a way as to complete and fulfill them, for it alone takes them and joins them by what is deepest in themselves. This is a fact of daily experience. At what moment do lovers come into the most complete possession of themselves if not when they say they are lost in each other? In truth, does not love every instant achieve all around us, in the couple or the team, the magic feat, the feat reputed to be contradictory, of 'personalising' by totalising? And if that is what it can achieve daily on a small scale, why should it not repeat this one day on world-wide dimensions?

Leader as Partner

Riane Eisler offers an appreciative emphasis on relationship and *leader as partner* that aligns with that offered by Teilhard.[x] Eisler proposes that seeds have already been sown for the movement of our society from a highly individualistic and competitive dominator model to a collaborative and more feminine model of partnership.[xi] She comments extensively on the reexamination of cultural history that is now occurring. This history, according to Eisler, shows that our world has known many eras when highly advanced civilizations have existed successfully with partnerships rather than domination. Eisler dramatically documents the destructive consequences of a world that fails to value the feminine characteristics of collaboration and colleagueship.

War, poverty, and ecological dislocation arises from an indiscriminate valuing and rewarding of more masculine characteristics: hierarchy and the use of force to establish status:[xii]

> Drawing upon a wide range of relatively neglected old as well as recent social scientific studies—in particular, recent and potentially revolutionary findings by archaeologists in Anatolia, Crete, and Old Europe . . . Eisler proposes two primary models of social organization characterized by widely differing social guidance or values systems. The first, designated the partnership or gylanic model . . . is characterized by "soft" or stereotypically feminine values such as mutual accommodation, cooperation, and nonviolence. The second model is the dominator or androcratic model . . . with a characterizing value and social guidance system idealizing "hard" or so-called masculine values such as conquest, mastery, and force.

Teilhard and Eisler offer us rich, provocative food for thought, especially when their ideas are linked with processes of appreciation. The notion of appreciative leadership as synthesis and partnership is truly radical. Yet the seeds for an appreciative model of leadership have already been sown in the mundane and daily experiences of many contemporary leaders.

A man I know who heads a successful gourmet coffee company talks about sitting in his office and knowing exactly what is happening throughout his company as a function of the sounds he hears through the wall and the smell of the coffee being produced. He doesn't know exactly how he is able to gain this appreciative sense of the company's overall health at any one point in time, but firmly believes that this unifying sense of his company is essential to his leadership role in this organization.

Another leader suggests that she appreciates the overall, coherent intentions and dynamics of the school she heads when she serves in the role of teacher. To be a leader she needs to get out of her office and head into a classroom. Like the coffee maker, she can sense and fully appreciative the quality of education in her school only by participating directly in this educational process as a teacher and co-learner. When she is not teaching, the school often seems to lose its unity for her and she feels out of touch with its essential properties.

Conclusions

We find a parallel analysis to Teilhard's and Eisler's notions of leader as lover and partner in Robert Greenleaf's description of *leader as servant*:[xiii]

> A fresh critical look is being taken at the issues of power and authority, and people are beginning to learn, however haltingly, to relate to one another in less coercive and more creatively supporting ways. A new moral principle is emerging which holds that the only authority deserving one's allegiance is that which is freely and knowingly granted by the led to the leader in response to, and in proportion to, the clearly evident servant stature of the leader. Those who choose to follow this principle will not casually accept the authority of existing institutions. RATHER, THEY WILL FREELY RESPOND ONLY TO INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE CHOSEN AS LEADERS BECAUSE THEY ARE PROVEN AND TRUSTED AS SERVANTS. To the extent that this principle prevails in the future, the only truly viable institutions will be those that are predominantly servant-led.

Teilhard, Eisler and Greenleaf all offer encouraging and inspiring models of leadership. One may be inclined, however, to dismiss these portrayals as hopelessly out of date or out of touch with reality. A similar critique is often drawn with regard to many of the other appreciative approaches to organizational life. Yet all three visionaries, Teilhard, Eisler and Greenleaf, speak to the necessity for making this shift in leadership, given the critical condition of many 21st Century organizations.

Furthermore, there is ample evidence all around us in our natural world that suggest the abundance of love, partnership and servanthood. According to Teilhard: ". . .[if] a universal love is impossible, how can we account for the irresistible instinct in our hearts which leads us towards unity whenever and in whatever direction our passions are stirred: A sense of the universe, a sense of the All, the nostalgia which seizes us when confronted by nature, beauty, music—these seem to be an expectation and awareness of a Great Presence."[xiv]

---

[i] Edgar Schein, *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.
[ii]Paul Hershey and Kenneth Blanchard. *The Management of Organizational Behavior*. (3rd ed.) Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
[iii]Fred Fiedler. *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967; V. H. Vroom and P. W. Yetton. *Leadership and Decision Making*. Pittsburgh, Pa: University of Pittsburg Press, 1973; and Jane Woodward. *Management and Technology*. London: HMSO, 1958.
[iv] Robert Blake and Jane Mouton. *Managerial Grid III* (3rd ed.). Houston, Tex.: Gulf, 1985.
[v] Chris Argyris and Donald Schon, *Organizational Learning*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1978; Peter Senge. *The Fifth Discipline*. New York: Doubleday, 1990.
[vi] Margaret Wheatley. *Leadership and The New Science*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 1999; William Bergquist, *The Postmodern Organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994; Ralph Stacey. *Complexity and Creativity in Organizations*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 1996.
[vii] James Gleick. *Chaos*. New York: Viking Penguin,1987; William Bergquist. *The Postmodern Organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994.
[viii] Teilhard de Chardin. *The Phenomenon of Man.* New York: HarperCollins, 1953, p. 264.
[ix] Teilhard de Chardin. *The Phenomenon of Man.* New York: HarperCollins, 1955, p. 265.
[x] Riane Eisler. *The Chalice and The Blade*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1987.
[xi]Riane Eisler. *The Chalice and The Blade*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1987.
[xii] David Loye and RianeEisler. "Chaos and Transformation: Implications of Nonequilibrium Theory for Social Science and Society," Behavioral Science, 1987, 32, p. 63.
[xiii] Robert Greenleaf. *Leader as Servant.* Peterborough, New Hampshire: Windy Row Press, 1970, pp. 3-4.
[xiv] Teilhard de Chardin. *The Phenomenon of Man.* New York: HarperCollins, 1955, p. 266.