EMERGING LEADERSHIP MODELS: IMPLICATIONS FOR PUBLIC POLICY EDUCATION

Judy Lawrence Rogers
Miami University

"It's all a question of story. We are in trouble just now because we do not have a good story. We are in-between stories. The Old Story — the account of how the world came to be and how we fit into it — is not functioning properly, and we have not learned the New Story. The Old Story sustained us for long periods of time. It shaped our emotional attitudes, provided us with life purpose, energized action. It consecrated suffering, integrated knowledge, guided education. We awoke in the morning and knew where we were. We could answer the questions of our children. We could identify crime, punish criminals. Everything was taken care of because the story was there. It did not make men good, it did not take away the pains and stupidities of life, or make for unfailing warmth in human association. But it did provide a context in which life could function in a meaningful manner."

(Thomas Berry in Schwartz & Ogilvy, p. v)

Thomas Berry states it very eloquently — Western culture is in the midst of a revolution. It is a revolution of major import because what is in flux is our definition of reality, our understanding of how the world operates. My objectives are to examine the paradigm shift and the changes in our beliefs and assumptions about how things are; to demonstrate how the paradigm shift has influenced the conceptualization of effective leadership; and to draw implications for public policy education from both the paradigm shift and the new definitions of leadership.

Characteristics of the Emergent Paradigm

Assumptions that have dominated our culture for several hundred years are losing credence. Capra states these assumptions as "the belief in the scientific method as the only valid approach to knowledge; the view of the universe as a mechanical system composed of elementary material building blocks; the view of life in society as a competitive struggle for existence; and the belief in unlimited progress to be achieved through economic and technological growth" (Capra, p. 31). In the last

decades, in research conducted in many disciplines, these basic assumptions or paradigms of Western society have been found wanting in their ability to respond to the complex problems of our times (Toffler).

Schwartz and Ogilvy have given further definition to the paradigm shift by identifying seven transitions in the way the world is perceived to operate by Western culture. Table 1 names and defines these shifts.

Table 1. Comparison of Conventional Paradigm and Emergent Paradigm Qualities

Conventional Paradigm	Emergent Paradigm
Objective	**Perspectival**
Events can be studied from the "outside" with value-neutral instruments and mental processes.	Events are necessarily viewed in light of the viewer's experience, values, and expectations; "believing is seeing."
Simple and reductionistic	**Complex and diverse**
Events can be explained, controlled, and predicted by reducing them to their simplest components; complexity requires simplification	Understanding events requires increasingly complex views of their processes and structures; the whole transcends the parts.
Hierarchic	**Heterarchic**
Systems are ordered vertically and control, authority, responsibility, knowledge flow from the top downward.	Order in a system is created by networks of mutual influence and constraints.
Mechanical	**Holonomic**
Events are calculable and sequential; actions result in quick and predictable reactions.	Events are dynamic processes of interaction and differentiation in which information about the whole is present in each of the parts.
Determinate	**Indeterminate**
Future states follow from present in rational, predictable ways.	Future events are unknowable; ambiguity and disorder are to be expected, valued and exploited.
Linearly Causal	**Mutally Shaping**
Events have finite, indentifiable causes.	Events are generated by complex reciprocal processes that blur distinctions between cause and effect.
Assembled	**Morphogenetic**
Change is planned implementation of prescribed processes that create predictable results.	Change is evolutionary and spontaneous; diverse elements interact with each other and the environment to create new, unanticipated outcomes.

Source: Kuh, George, E. Whitt, and J. Shedd.

Schwartz and Ogilvy recognize that some of the qualities of the paradigm shift, as they have identified them, overlap. They also realize that as the paradigm shift progresses some of these qualities may be refined and replaced with other conceptualizations that more appropriately capture the new view of the world. However the themes that

emerge from these seven qualities are at the heart of the cultural transition. The themes represent a shift from the mechanistic world view in which objectivity, control and linear causality are supreme, to a world view marked by a more contextual, complex and relational paradigm. They also portend the decline of the values of the patriarchical world and the end of the dominance of its values of objectivity, independence and rationality (Kuh, Whitt and Shedd).

> The total pattern of change is somewhat like a change in metaphor, from reality as a machine toward reality as a conscious organism. Machines are mechanical and relatively simple. They are organized hierarchically from components and they function linearly and predictably. We can stand outside them and study them. A conscious being — say, a human being — is very complex and unpredictable . . . They are internally interconnected, consisting of many complex subsystems. They are externally interconnected with other people and the world around them . . . Because of this complexity of interaction, people don't always see the same things; they have unique perspectives. In the same way, the emergent paradigm of the actual world is complex, holographic, heterarchical, indeterminate, mutually causal, morphogenetic and perspectival. The shift in metaphor is from the machine to the human being. We are like the world we see. (Schwartz and Ogilvy, p. 15).

Paradigm shifts, such as the one we are now experiencing, have occurred at various times in the history of Western civilization. Sociologist Pitirim Sorokin posits that these cultural evolutions are part of a "strikingly regular fluctation" of value systems and beliefs that have occurred throughout the history of humankind. However, Sorokin states very strongly that "the crisis we are facing today is no ordinary crisis but among one of the great transition phases that have occurred in all previous cycles of human history" (Capra, p. 32). The transition that we are in calls for a deep reevaluation of the beliefs that we have used to make meaning in our lives. It calls for far-reaching changes in most social relationships and forms of organization and a recognition that the premises upon which many of these relationships were built are now outdated. It is no less than a complete cultural transformation.

Old paradigms die hard. The true believers may never give up their perspective but simply become the minority as the numbers of evangelists for the new paradigm reach a critical mass and the values of the new paradigm become dominant. Capra senses that before the twentieth century is out, the emergent paradigm will have reached that critical mass. It will replace the conventional paradigm as the accepted view of reality. His prediction would seem to hold true for the conceptualization of leadership.

Conventional Leadership

The new definitions and conceptualizations of effective leadership which have proliferated over the past twelve years evidence the paradigm shift. Kuhn tells us that paradigms influence not only what

we see, but what we don't see. In the conventional paradigm, organizations are seen as machines and people as irrational beings who must be molded and shaped into interchangeable parts for the smooth functioning of the works. Through this mechanistic lens, the leader is perceived to operate in a stable organizational environment. The leader's role is to plan, organize, control and make decisions commensurate with his/her position in the hierarchy. The leader sets goals for the organization and his/her subordinates based on data and a rational process of identifying future directions and priorities. Organizations are seen to function in logical predictable ways and the leader's job is to control outcomes. Military metaphors are used to conjure up the tough-minded, decisive, efficient, hard-nosed leader. The leader/subordinate relationship is based on a transaction, an exchange of wants between leader and follower. The leader recognizes what the subordinates want from work and sees they get it if their performance warrants reward. The leader uses power to control other's actions. Vision, the leader's vision, is used to motivate subordinates to accomplish organizational goals. Leadership is viewed as a property of the individual.

The shift to the new paradigm describes a world that is more complex, diverse, ambiguous, constantly changing and unpredictable than the conventional view of a stable, orderly universe. Scholars have begun to explore the implications for leadership and management of operating in a world of "permanent white water" (Vaill, p. 2). Vaill identifies a system of "myths" in the practice of leadership and management, emanating from a conventional view of the world, that have a powerful control over our consciousness and stifle our ability to adapt to constant change. The first is the myth of a single person called "the leader." It is a myth that obscures the reality that all kinds of people, whether or not they have the title or authorized power, have opportunities for leadership in modern organizations.

A second myth is that there is a single, freestanding organization in which the leader or manager carries out his/her role. In a world of "permanent white water," the boundaries between an organization and its increasingly turbulent environment have blurred. "Furthermore, the thorough reification of the idea of 'organization' dulls our sensitivity to all the different ways the organization can appear, depending on the point of view of the observer" (Vaill, p. 12).

A third myth is that of control through a pyramidal chain of command. Hierarchy is deeply embedded in our cultural psyche. We aren't organized unless someone is "in charge" (Peters). Yet modern organizations are composed of networks, cross-functional task groups, matrix structures and numerous informal collectivities that have arisen because of the unworkable notion of the single chain of command.

Another myth is that of the organization as pure instrument for the attainment of official objectives. Even though the human relations school in the 1930s and '40s introduced the existence of the informal organization with its many "unofficial" goals (Roethlisberger and

Dickson), we cling to the idea that organizations are rational instruments designed for specific, agreed upon and identifiable purposes.

Finally, there is the myth of rational analysis as the chief means of understanding and directing the organization. Since the time of the industrial revolution, rationality has been the dominant model. Effectiveness consists of rationally deciding what needs to be done and then rationally doing it (Vaill). However in a world of permanent white water, in complex and diverse systems that interconnect with other complex and diverse systems in unpredictable ways, intuitive wisdom will be needed as much, if not, at times, more, than rational analysis.

What the conventional view of organizations and leadership does not "see" is the turbulence and ambiguity endemic to most organizational processes, the multiple perspectives present regarding organizational goals and purposes and the interconnection and mutual shaping that constrains and influences the relationship between leader and follower. The new research on leadership takes these emergent paradigm assumptions as its premises.

Emergent Leadership

Since 1978, when Burns introduced the concept of transformative leadership, growing numbers of scholars and practitioners have embraced a view of leadership that is less hierarchical, more relational and focuses on making meaning rather than making rules. In contrast to the notion of leadership as transaction, Burns views leadership as transformational. Instead of an exchange of wants, leadership is recognized as a symbiotic relationship between leaders and followers in which the needs, desires and values of both mesh and create meaning in the context of the organization. Transformational leadership is not power "over" but power "to." Transformative leaders empower followers by enlisting them in creating a vision for their lives and for the organization that elevates both followers and leaders to higher levels of productivity, self-actualization and social responsibility. What Burns recognizes in his conceptualization of leadership is that it is not practiced from the "helm" of the ship or from the "top" of the heap, but in context and in collaboration with others. Leadership is a shared act practiced at times by every member of the community.

Taking off from Burns' work, other scholars have focused on the cultural, symbolic and artistic aspects of leadership, issues considered "soft" and "poetic" in the conventional view (Bennis and Nanus). Sergiovanni refers to leadership as "cultural expression." What is important is what the leader stands for, who he or she is. Tactical skills such as conflict management, decision-making, using situational leadership theories, etc., the heart of conventional views of leadership, are considered basic competencies by Sergiovanni. But to go beyond routine competence the leader must make meaning. "Meaning suggests that people believe in what they are doing and appreciate its importance to the organization, to society and to themselves" (Sergiovanni, p. 109).

The leader must first of all recognize the distinction between basic competencies and symbolic leadership. They must stand for certain principles that become the foundation of their actions; they must be able to articulate their principles into an operational framework; they must then persist in these principles and help people interpret contributions and successes in light of the organization's purposes; they must recognize that little can be accomplished without the support and good will of others. With the emphasis on meanings rather than skills, Sergiovanni proffers that "we come to see leadership as less a behavioral style or management technique and as more a cultural expression ... a set of norms, beliefs and principles emerge to which organizational members give allegiance (p. 111).

Several other scholars have amplified the relational and cultural aspects of new paradigm leadership. Kouzes and Posner, in a study of managers and leaders, uncovered five fundamental practices of exceptional leaders. First, exceptional leaders challenge the status quo by looking for opportunities and taking risks; second, they inspire a shared vision through their ability to envision the future and through their commitment to enlist others in creating the vision; third, they enable others to act by fostering collaboration and by strengthening others; fourth, exceptional leaders model the way by setting an example and by making accomplishments feasible; and fifth, they encourage the heart by recognizing individual contributions and celebrating accomplishments. Similarly, in a study of charismatic leaders, Conger found several behaviors that were common among them. Charismatic leaders have skills in visioning, in communication, in trust-building and in empowerment.

John Gardner examined the tasks performed by leaders and identified what he considered to be the most important functions of leadership. Among those functions were envisioning goals, affirming values, motivating, achieving workable unity through trust, serving as a symbol and renewing — all of which he saw subsuming the leadership tasks of enabling and empowering. Taken together these studies demonstrate that while the conventional paradigm emphasizes the instrumental and behavioral aspects of leadership, the emergent paradigm recognizes the more informal, subtle and symbolic aspect of leadership.

The themes that run through the recent literature on leadership emphasize empowerment, vision, culture, collaboration, complexity, diversity, dynamic environments, nonlinear thinking and an ability to ride the waves of change. Table 2 depicts the leadership models that emerge from a conventional versus an emergent view of the world.

For some, the new image of leadership that has evolved over the past decade suggests that the conventional model has outlived its usefulness and now must be replaced with the emergent view. "The old approach is purposive, static and entropic, while the new one is holistic, dynamic and generative" (Quinn, p. xv). However, Quinn suggests that rather than look at the two perspectives (which he labels as purposive and

Table 2. Models of Conventional and Emergent Leadership

	Conventional Leadership Model	Emergent Leadership Model
Operating Style:	Competitive	Cooperative
Organizational Structure:	Hierarchy	Team (Leadership with, not over)
Basic Objective:	Winning	Quality Output
Problem-Solving Style:	Rational	Intuitive/Rational
Key Characteristics:	High Control, Analytical, Unemotional, Organized, Tactical, Manages Resources, Individual Focus, Reductionistic	Lower Control, Empathic, Empowering, High Performance Standards, Collaborative, Multi-perspectives, Makes Meaning, Focus on the Common Good, Holistic

Adapted from: Loden, Marilyn.

holistic) as an either/or dichotomy (an act which itself is based in the logic of the mechanistic paradigm) we consider the holistic view as *inclusive* of the purposive view. He proposes that exceptional leaders do not achieve excellence in their organizations through using one or the other philosophies but by using both. Exceptional leaders recognize that their environment is turbulent, unpredictable and complex and employ a variety of perspectives in order to cope effectively with it. "As one set of conditions arises, they focus on certain cues that lead them to apply a very analytic and structured approach. As these cues fade, they focus on new cues of emerging importance and apply another frame, perhaps this time an intuitive and flexible one" (Quinn, p. 3-4).

According to Quinn it is this ability to view the world from different perspectives, the ability to frame and reframe a problem or question using different assumptions that is the requirement for exceptional leadership in our modern world. Quinn labels these leaders as strategists and states, "They are not totally focused on goals. They develop a capacity to generate new orders and organizations. In particular, the strategist realizes that all frames through which the world is seen are relative . . . This discovery particulary qualifies the strategist to understand the uniqueness of each individual and situation" (p. 7). It is this kind of thought pattern, this "Janusian thinking" (Quinn, p. 20), that has precipitated the most profound scientific breakthroughs in Western society.

Quinn concludes that moving beyond rational management does not mean moving from the purposive to the holistic frame — it means using both frames. This entails moving through three stages. "The first step is recognizing polarities. The second step is seeing the strength and the weaknesses in each of the polar perspectives. The third, and most challenging, step is not to affix to one or the other but to move to a metalevel that allows one to see the interpenetrations and the in-

29

separability of the two polarities. The third step takes us to a transformational logic. It allows for simultaneous integration and differentiation. The new vision integrates the previously contradictory elements and results in synergy. It is here that excellence occurs" (p. 164-165).

Quinn's ideas are at the leading edge of the current research on leadership. Effective leaders move beyond rationality and the machine metaphor to a more multiperspective and holistic frame — a frame that is inclusive of both views. If one compares the holistic leadership model with the role of the public policy educator, similar values, beliefs and behaviors are quickly apparent. The final objective of this paper is to examine the implications of the paradigm shift and the new definitions of leadership for public policy education.

Implications of Emergent Leadership for Public Policy Education

It seems clear that the public policy process itself can be described as perspectival, indeterminant, complex, diverse, dynamic and morphogenetic. The act of creating public policy is more aptly captured in a dynamic rather than a mechanistic view of the world. Leadership models that emanate from emergent paradigm assumptions seem to resonate with the objectives of public policy education. The themes that weave through the recent scholarship on leadership, namely, a shared vision, empowerment, shaping a collaborative culture, employing multiple frames and recognizing an environment of continual, complex change are themes also found in the literature on policy education and cooperative extension. I would like to examine some of these parallels more closely.

Hahn identifies the objectives of public policy education as "1) to increase people's understanding of public issues and policy-making processes and improve their ability to participate effectively and 2) to contribute to the resolution of important public issues by helping people and communities move through the policy making process" (p. 1). A value embedded in these objectives is a commitment to focusing on concerns determined by the people themselves. This is also a value inherent in the leadership act of creating a shared vision. In both cases, the question for the leader or the public policy educator is, "Whose vision is it?" Is the vision espoused by the leader representative of only an elite few, or of the total membership of the organization? Are the issues on the public agenda representative of the concerns of a narrow interest group or inclusive of the concerns of most importance to the entire citizenry? Ideally, both leaders and public policy educators recognize that the active involvement and commitment of the members of the community in creating the kind of environment in which they will work and play is, in the long run, better for everyone. A "citizen-generated agenda" is grounded in valuing multiple perspectives and heterarchy. It is a shared act of creating a chosen future.

Empowerment is another theme common to the recent literature on leadership as well as to literature on public policy education. In both

contexts it means helping people recognize the assumptions that render them powerless and then taking action which brings their concerns to the organizational or community agenda. Hahn sees the role of public policy educators as "helping to equalize the ability [of citizens] to participate effectively" (p. 5). He emphasizes that "Helping people cope or adapt is not enough. To have control over their lives, people must be able to understand and participate in decision making at the organizational and governmental levels" (p. 3). The result of empowerment is an organizational or community culture that generates a sense of meaning in people's lives and challenges them to higher levels of self-actualization and social responsibility. It is also an environment in which leadership is dispersed. Public policy education is grounded in democratic principles (Hahn). Empowerment is a means to enact these principles and is based on valuing a heterarchically ordered world.

Empowerment also implies an organizational culture that is collaborative, a third common theme in the literature on leadership and public policy education. The role of Cooperative Extension throughout its history has been to cosponsor activities and cooperate and collaborate with its various constituencies. Its name and its heritage are based on these values. The objectives of enhancing citizen participation in policy making and bringing about greater collaboration between all parties in the policy process operationalizes these values. These attitudes are further manifested in extension's role in community leadership development. For example, at the Institute for Community Leadership and Development (ICLAD) in Orono, Maine, team leadership with its emphasis on collaboration, cooperation and inclusion is central to the leadership education it provides. Additionally, the ICLAD Board "has made a serious commitment to modeling this leadership in its day-to-day operations . . . emphasizing trust, open communication and honest discussion of differences in addition to overseeing the programmatic efforts in its charge" (Kilacky, p. 4).

The policy education model set forth by Hahn also puts an emphasis on process as well as content. Citizens must not only have information about the issues, but they must be able to communicate, form coalitions, lead others, facilitate group actions, network and collaborate, manage conflict and motivate. The focus on process, on working with groups, on teamwork and on teaching these skills to citizens has long been a value of extension education as put forth in *The Ten Guiding Values of Extension Education* (Sanderson). The world of the new paradigm which is marked by continual, complex change and dynamic, interdependent systems requires leadership that emphasizes relationships, groups, networking, process, intuition, perceptions and collaboration. Extension educators, already skilled themselves in these area, can play an important role in helping develop the capacity of the citizenry to survive and thrive in a world of constant, complex change.

The final theme which is common to both new paradigm leadership and public policy education is the use of multiple frames to examine issues of import to a community. Hahn advocates the "alternatives and

consequences" model as the way to explore policy options. A list of alternatives, including existing and new solutions, for resolving an issue are generated. The alternatives allow one to explore an issue as it might be seen by different professions and disciplines and include the resolutions favored by people on all sides of an issue. The pros and cons of each alternative are identified. Quinn describes this act of framing and reframing as ideally leading to a different kind of comprehension. "The reframing process results in a synergistic integration . . . the integrated functioning of antithetical elements" (Quinn, p. 20-21). Public policy educators who can achieve metalevel analysis, using both the purposive and holistic frames to examine issues and to carry out the process of public policy education will have risen, in Quinn's view, to a "transformational logic . . . a simultaneous integration and differentiation in which two contrasting domains are understood and woven together" (p. 165). Using and teaching this perspective in the public policy process would be a significant contribution to our society.

Finally, it would seem that extension educators, by embracing public policy education as put forth by Hahn, are on the cutting edge in recognizing, applying and teaching the assumptions of the emergent paradigm and the heterarchical world order it represents. Through modeling the new leadership style as well as teaching it, through striving to create a culture of participation and empowerment, through focusing on process as well as content, through demonstrating the worth of collaboration as a means to achieve common purposes and through understanding and using multiple frames to help unify polarities in the policy making process, extension educators will themselves be transformational leaders. They will help raise the citizenry to new levels of self-actualization and social responsiblity. Their work also has the potential for helping members of our society come to terms with, and eventually embrace, the radical shifts in individual values and societal conditions that transition to the new world view portends. Public policy education as put forth in this paper brings extension ever closer to achieving the vision of founding father Seaman Knapp "to make a great common people and thus readjust the map of the world" (Sanderson, p. 21).

REFERENCES

Bennis, Warren, and Burt Nanus. *Leaders.* New York NY: Harper & Row, 1985.

Burns, James M. *Leadership.* New York NY: Harper & Row, 1978

Capra, Fritjof. *The Turning Point.* New York NY: Simon & Schuster, 1982.

Conger, Jay. *The Charismatic Leader.* San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass, 1989.

Gardner, John. *On Leadership.* New York NY: The Free Press, 1990.

Hahn, Alan. *Resolving Public Issues and Concerns through Policy Education.* Cornell Cooperative Extension Info. Bull. 214, Cornell University, 1988.

Kilacky, James, ed. *In Transition.* University of Maine Cooperative Extension Newsletter, Oct. 1989.

Kouzes, James, and Barry Posner. *The Leadership Challenge.* San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Kuh, George, E. Whitt and J. Shedd. *Student Affairs Work 2001: A Paradigmatic Odyssey.* Alexandria VA: American College Personnel Association, 1987.

Kuhn, Thomas. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions,* 2nd ed. Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Loden, Marilyn. *Feminine Leadership or How to Succeed in Business Without Being One of the Boys.* New York NY: Times Books, 1985.

Peters, Thomas. *Thriving on Chaos: Handbook for a Managerial Revolution.* New York NY: Knopf, 1987.

Quinn, Robert. *Beyond Rational Management.* San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass, 1988.

Roethlisberger, Fritz, and William Dickson. *Management and the Worker*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1939.

Sanderson, David. *Sourcebook, Module 1: Understanding Cooperative Extension: Our Origins, Our Opportunities*. Raleigh NC: North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service and the Department of Adult and Community College Education, North Carolina State University, 1988.

Schwartz, Peter, and James Ogilvy. *The Emergent Paradigm: Changing Patterns of Thought and Belief*. Analytical Rep. 7, Values and Lifestyles Program. Menlo Park CA: SRI International, 1979.

Sergiovanni, Thomas. "Leadership as Cultural Expression." *Leadership and Organizational Culture: New Perspectives on Administrative Theory and Practice*, ed. T.J. Sergiovanni and J. Corbally, pp. 105-114. Urbana IL: University of Illinois Press, 1984.

Toffler, Alvin. "Forward: Science and Change." *Order Out of Chaos*, pp. xi-xxvi. New York NY: Bantam, 1984.

Vaill, Peter. *Managing as a Performing Art*. San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass, 1989.