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This research suggests a new approach to leadership. Using a Glaserian grounded theory methodology, a new process theory of leadership was developed based on the data. These data included 26 interviews and numerous observations of individuals and situations. The result is described as the Theory of Transpersonal Leadership. This theory delves into the internal process that takes place within individuals as they make decisions regarding leadership within their own lives. The theory also includes the explanation of discovered concepts from this research. These concepts include: the Catalytic Confluence, Demand Morphism, and Symbolic Mutualism, which explain the major points within the process that ultimately culminate in the leadership experience.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement

Traditionally leadership research has incorporated a wide range of research methodologies to provide a vast array of theories regarding leaders and leadership for our world. None of these theories can be considered without respect to those that have come before or after, as these theories represent an ongoing evolution in the chain of a dynamic process. There have been a quite astounding array of theoretical approaches that address the external factors that influence leadership such as situational theory, contingency theory, and the rational-deductive approach. Despite these, no one theory has provided an thorough and internally based explanation of the phenomenon of leadership from the leader’s individualized and personal perspective on leading. An exploration of this internal process informs our understanding of leadership from a new perspective and provides critical insight into yet another dimension of the formative processes that lend to a conceptual understanding of contemporary leadership. Such insights are most relevant, especially as events challenge timeless notions of leadership and question the ethics of decisions made by some of contemporary society’s leaders.
Significance of the Study

This study provides a conceptual view of leadership using a Glaserian grounded theory approach. The reason for this approach is that "concepts are timeless in their applicability" (Glaser, 2001, p. 15). Max Weber suggested that the creation of clear concepts is the essence of good social theory. In fact Weber's concepts of charisma and division of labor are evidence of the endurance of conceptualizing (Glaser, 2001). Through the use of this approach, it is possible to uncover some piece of the puzzle regarding leadership that pertains to all people regardless of background, ethnicity, or time in history. The development of an emergent theory allows for generalizability and modifiability and provides an element that enhances the cohesiveness to our understanding of current theories. This research offers a contribution to the current level of knowledge on leaders and to the literature. It also creates an opportunity to enter into academic conversations by positing a significant contribution to the ongoing dialogue on leaders.

Ex-post Facto Research Question

How will Glaserian grounded theory inform the conceptual understanding of leaders in contemporary Western society in a manner that differs from traditional perspectives of leadership and lends to the creation of a new theory of leadership?
Literature Review

The literature review for this dissertation has been divided into three parts. First, it explores the use of grounded theory in a wide range of disciplines. Second, it examines traditional theories of leadership to provide a perspective and fit for any new emergent theory. Finally, it provides a review of other grounded theory studies in leadership that are available and have contributed to the application of this theoretical frame as it informs our understanding and appreciation of the complexities of leadership.

Interdisciplinary Use of Grounded Theory

Grounded theory is a well-established methodology (Glaser, 2001). Originally, grounded theory was primarily used in sociological research and was created in a seminal study of the phenomena of death and dying by Anselm Strauss and Barney Glaser. From this application it quickly spread to the discipline of nursing. From there it began to achieve worldwide acceptance in a wide range of fields and has been employed in diverse disciplines. This portion of the literature review provides an overview of these disciplines and examines some of the important research that has been produced through the application of this theoretical approach.

Traditional Theories of Leadership

Leadership theory has not developed in a vacuum (Burns, 2000). In fact, as theories of leadership have developed through time they have incorporated pieces of
the theories that have come before. By reviewing the development of leadership theory from an historical perspective, it is possible to understand the enormous complexity of the evolution of leadership theory. By examining the details of leadership in ancient history and progressing to present-day popular theories, the goal is to expose areas where a new theory fills gaps left unexplored or unexplained by others. Such a review aids in establishing the need for developing a new and emergent theory.

**Other Grounded Theory Studies of Leadership**

Finally, this literature review explores the use of grounded theory to capture other leadership theories. This undoubtedly posits the value of the application of grounded theory and suggests the need for the use of the grounded theory method to inform this research or confirm its use and acceptance by others in the field.

**Methodology**

The grounded theory approach emphasizes that “generating a theory from data means that most hypotheses and concepts not only come from the data but are systematically worked out in relation to the data during the course of research” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 6). The core process of grounded theory is conceptualization. It is from this conceptualizing of patterns that categories are developed which eventually become core concepts. Core concepts in turn develop pieces that evolve into theory. There are five main components to the grounded theory process: theoretical sensitivity, theoretical sampling, coding, theoretical memoing, and
sorting. "The detailed, conceptual route from data collection to a finished writing process is a process composed of a set of double-back steps" (Glaser, 1978, p.16).

Essentially one begins collecting data and codes the data as soon as possible with memos that eventually lead to categories. These categories eventually are saturated and are translated to codes. Eventually the codes are reduced to core concepts as the theory emerges. This is not a linear process. One must constantly go back to data collection based on the direction of the data and collect more data until the researcher is satisfied and the categories saturated. The detailed overview of methodology provides further historical and developmental background as well as justification for pursuing the Glaserian approach.

Results and Analysis

This portion informs the process of the research and the resulting concepts that emerged in the field. Each of the concepts is described and expanded in detail in a lexicon. In addition, these descriptions will also inform the manner in which the concepts have contributed to the development of the overall theory. The Theory of Transpersonal Leadership is revealed, detailing its place in the evolution of leadership theory as well as its pragmatic nature. Essentially, in order to understand more clearly the notion of transpersonal leadership, it is necessary to consider the practicality of its nature in our lives (James, 1907). This direction literally breathes action and power into the theory. With this in mind, the new theory suggests its uses in present day
leadership training, education, and individual practice, as well as some direction for future research.

Summary

Throughout the five distinct chapters of this dissertation, connections are drawn to other theoretical orientations, disciplines, and ideas that show the intrinsic interconnection of the leader to the world. This underlying thread suggests that this new theory must stand within a pantheon of predecessors, and helps to clarify our thoughts about leaders and leadership. Leaders exist in a complex world that is constantly changing and adapting. It only follows that the creation of new theories of leadership using timeless concepts are necessary and that they evolve as part of a response to the complexities of contemporary life. The Theory of Transpersonal Leadership provides us with new ways of exploring and understanding the dynamic process of leadership.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Despite its placement in this research, it is important to note that unlike other research methodologies, the literature review in grounded theory comes after the research. This is in keeping with the precepts of Glaserian Grounded Theory to prevent as many preconceived notions as possible. In reading the literature review one must keep in mind that the direction of the review came as a result of the data collected in the field. It did not direct the collection; it did, however, enhance it.

As the Theory of Transpersonal Leadership emerged, it became apparent there was not one all-encompassing present day theory that contained the concepts that had developed as part of this research. Yet, in some ways the new theory contained the specter of other theories. It was for that reason that reviewing a historical chronology of leadership theories seemed appropriate. By reviewing the development of leadership theory from an historical perspective, it is possible to understand how this new theory has not emerged in a vacuum. In fact, it picked up pieces of the past along the way to becoming something new. Beginning with the origins of leadership in ancient history and progressing through present-day popular theories, one can expose how this new theory fills the holes that had been left by others and yet clearly built a new approach to what has already been discovered regarding leadership.
This literature review also touches upon the use of grounded theory in various academic disciplines as well as its use in the study of leadership. The result of this review could not be exhaustive. There are simply so many studies and articles published using grounded theory that the result would have best been presented as an annotated bibliography. However, an overview of literature related to grounded theory further established its historical legitimacy.

Use of Grounded Theory in Various Disciplines

As sociologists working in the field, Glaser and Strauss were on the brink of discovering of something that went well beyond the original intention of their research studying dying patients in the hospital setting. They unintentionally discovered a new method of research that would become a force in the field of qualitative methodologies (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This method was easily assimilated into sociology, a field that studies human relations and organizations as science. It did not take too long before this methodological approach was applied to other fields. In nursing, grounded theory is one of the most published qualitative methodologies. Seminars held by the Grounded Theory Institute, such as that held in Paris in May 2002, are filled with nursing students working on their master’s and doctoral research from all over the world. A bibliographic search for grounded theory produced hundreds of articles in at least one dozen nursing journals with grounded theory based studies (Beralas, 2003).
The transition to other disciplines occurred gradually. Today, there are many disciplines that have employed grounded theory. Examples of such disciplines include philosophy, psychology, public health, medicine, dentistry, and nursing. Specifically the range of research can be seen in this brief review of doctoral dissertation titles. Equally there are numerous international institutions of higher learning that can boast the use of grounded theory for dissertations, theses, and published research. Glaser (2001) provides many such examples. From the University of Strathclyde in Scotland, C. Andriopoulos’ research is presented in *Mind Stretching: A Grounded Theory for Enhancing Creativity*. From the University of Texas at Austin, A. Calvin presented *Hemodialysis Patients and End-of-Life Medical Treatment Decisions*. B. Gibson’s research for Queens University of Belfast suggested a theory of *Dangerous Dentaling: A Grounded Theory of HIV and Dentistry*. In New Zealand, B. Yee’s research studied *Images, Role Plans and Stereotypes* (Glaser, 2001, p. 232). These examples present a brief but impressive group of researchers that have employed grounded theory methodology. They also present an illustration of the adaptability of grounded theory to various fields and the acceptability of this methodology by a variety of institutions and universities.

**Traditional Theories of Leadership**

Dr. Jack Burns, a professor teaching leadership theory at Whitworth College, found it challenging to present the evolution of leadership theory in a way that made it easy for his students to understand. There have been many elements from a variety of
disciplines that have influenced and created schools of thought that have produced theories of leadership. These elements originate from the philosophical, social, psychological, and political fields, to name only a few. In his attempt to try to present a comprehensive picture of leadership theories, he tried to first teach from a traditional school of thought. He then attempted a timeline or historical approach. The difficulty with a timeline approach is that "it was rather confusing, and a timeline makes it difficult to demonstrate the continuous influence of many of these schools" (Burns, 2000, p. 43). Together these two approaches caused students to think in terms of discrete development and not understand the former schools of thought as providing a continuing thread that persists as new ideas or theories were developed. For these reasons, he produced a metaphor that suggested the chaotic development of leadership theory. His example used the idea of a river to suggest the historical development of leadership theory (Burns, 2000). The river metaphor made sense because it gave "length, depth, and breadth" (p. 43) to our thinking about the historical development of leadership theory (Figure 1).

It is important to consider this metaphor as the literature review unfolds.

The first thing we notice is that unlike most rivers that trace their headwaters to tiny springs or snowcapped peaks where an ever flowing trickle races down steep drainages into deep valleys that feed and grow the river gradually, the Leadership River has different beginnings. (Burns, 2000, p. 44)

The river splits and forks, divides and includes rock, falls, and rapids. It is chaotic at best. The ability to try to place these schools of thought in some sort of logical timeline is a challenge. Nevertheless, a historical representation has been attempted. It is helpful to remember that like a river, the evolved theory always carries parts from
Figure 1. The Leadership River System (Burns, 2000). Used by permission.
the prior source. One cannot distinguish the water in the falls from the water in the rapids. Once these waters co-mingle and reach the sea, it is impossible to gauge where they originated. In this same way, there may be some disagreement regarding where these theories actually began and who should have the credit for their origination. This specific chronology presented in this research is based on a course taught at Mercer University and interspersed with timelines from Burns and Bass (Mercer University, 2003).

Chronology

Principles of leadership can be dated as far back as ancient Egypt. Hieroglyphics for leadership (seshemet), leader (seshemu), and follower (shemsu) began over 5,000 years ago (Bass, 1990, p. 3). In early times, words like “head of state, military commander, princeps, proconcul, chief or king were used by society to separate the ruler from the rest of those in society” (p. 11). However, the word leader is a modern convention and can be traced back to about 1300 A.D. The concept of leadership does not emerge until the 1800s (Mercer University, 2003). In discussing the origins of the division of labor, Adam Smith states, “We obtain from one another the greater part of those mutual good offices which we stand in need of” (Cannan, 1937, p. 15). Smith was talking about the division of labor and never specifically mentions the relationship between leader and follower. Still, he maintains that there must be some mutual benefit; a follower will follow as long as there is a benefit in return. Hegel’s Phenomenology of Spirit, first published in 1807, is often
credited as the first major book about leadership as it relates to the political process (Hegel, 1994). In 1845–1847 a Scottish philosopher, Thomas Carlyle, suggested his *Great Man Theory*. In his view, the hero, prophet, and poet are other words for the *Great Man*. His thoughts started the idea that leaders are born, although Carlyle goes on to say, “I have no notion of a truly great man that could not be all [sic] sorts of men” (Benham, 1928, p. 167). This suggests an oxymoron of sorts. How could the leader be only a *great man* and yet all *sorts of men* at the same time? Perhaps Carlyle was simply pointing out the hole in his own theory or a direction for new theory building in the future.

**Trait Theory**

Today, the Trait Theory of leadership appears to be overly simplistic. To theorize that the differences between those who lead and those who follow could be reduced to a set of specific traits or features that separated the leader and follower as easily as the wheat from the chaff, appears naive. In keeping with the thoughts of the early origins about leadership, the idea that leaders are born different from followers and are *great men*, it follows that there must be some superior qualities in these individuals that differentiated them from others. Enter the scientific approach and attempts to begin to quantify what made good leaders. The researchers of this time set about to identify the specific traits or characteristics of leadership. Studies, especially early personality testing on individuals identified as leaders and followers, were performed and then compared to test for significant differences. Measures of
dominance, social sensitivity, moodiness, masculinity, and physical appearance as well as others were evaluated (Kellerman, 1984, p. 94).

Early trait theory is compiled in the *Handbook of Leadership* by Bernard Bass. In this book he outlines the hypotheses of researchers like Kohs and Irle, L. L. Bernard, Bingham, Tead and Kilbourne. All of these researchers explained leaders in terms of personality and character traits (Bass, 1990, p. 38). One of the well known studies of leadership was completed by W. O. Jenkins. He based his extensive analysis on the traits of military leaders by compiling the results of a large number of military studies that indicated traits required in a given situation (Bass, 1990, p. 564).

In an attempt to discern a reliable and coherent pattern of traits related to leaders, Ralph Stogdill conducted research in which he reviewed over 120 leadership trait studies. The results of his compilation produced a mass of inconsistent and contradictory results that led him to postulate that no such pattern of leadership traits exists (Bass, 1990). Based on his research, "Stogdill concluded that the leaders' traits must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics of the followers" (Bass, 1981, p. 29). This suggests similarities in the leader and the follower. Yet, at this point in theory development, the two positions, leader and follower, were considered separate and distinct characters. Instead of looking at the similarities of both roles, Stogdill moved in another direction by focusing on the situation of leaders and their followers. He believed that in order to analyze leadership one had to also consider the situation of leadership. This idea went on to influence most of the theory that followed (Bass, 1981). Stogdill then developed the Role Attainment Theory in which
he stated that "the leadership potential of any given member is defined by the extent to which he initiates and maintains structure in interaction and expectation" (Bass, 1981, p. 31).

Although sometimes placed under the more modern approach of transformational leadership, Max Weber's ideas regarding the charismatic leader are sometimes considered in this period. According to Weber, the direction of social actions is controlled by society's belief that a legitimate social order exists. He postulated there were three legitimate types of authority, which were:

1. Rational Authority, where patterns of normative rules, originally arising from the interaction of group members, attain legality, and obedience becomes owed to some established order within the limits of its scope, for example, educational establishments and the law;
2. Traditional Authority, where there is an historically established belief in the legitimate status of those in power and obedience is owed to the person of the chief, or leader, and where both parties are thus bound by obligations; and
3. Charismatic Authority, where some individual is followed and obeyed because of a special trust he induces, his peculiar powers and unique qualities. (Kellerman, 1984, p. 161)

Max Weber saw charismatic leadership as a collective concept. He described charismatic leadership as "a bureaucratic force that might divert the course of cultural rationalization toward the positive direction of deliberate formulation of ultimate values" (Portis, 1986, p.129). In Weber's mind, politics was "any sort of leadership in action" (Portis, 1986, p. 129). As an action word, it suggested nothing about followers; therefore, the idea of charisma as a quality of the individual was dramatically simplistic. As a collective concept, charisma is a "projected pattern rather than a description of real characteristics or some phenomenon" (Portis, 1986, p. 130).
It is interesting to note that Weber was suggesting ideas about leadership from a conceptual perspective. This is perhaps one of the reasons why as a concept *charismatic leader* has sustained to this day in a way that here today, gone tomorrow theories about leadership have not. Yet, if we consider Weber’s idea of the charismatic leader as conceptual, the idea may be inappropriately located under the ideas of trait theory.

Ralph Stogdill was an outspoken critic of Trait Theory. This aided in making this approach less prominent. A new direction of leadership theory began. Stogdill’s research led to theories regarding the situational demands of leadership; this direction shaped future ideas regarding leadership even to the present day (Bass, 1990).

**Situational Theory**

It seems natural that when the trait orientation of leadership did not seem to provide a comprehensive enough view of the leader that the next evolution beyond the character of the leader would involve situation in which the leader finds himself/herself. History, after all, provides many lively examples of situations where ordinary men seemed to rise to the occasion of leading. Abraham Lincoln, Adolf Hitler, and Winston Churchill are just a few examples. It was the situations these men found themselves in that may be the impetus for their leadership success, according to some theorists.

Situational leadership suggests that leadership is a matter of situational demands and the factors in a particular situation determine who will emerge as the
leader (Bass, 1990, p. 38). This idea has its roots in ancient times. In Plutarch's Parallel Lives, this ancient Greek paired a philosophical biography of a Greek leader with a Roman leader (McCutchen, 1998). His comparison was to examine the character of great men such as he suggested in the person of Alexander the Great and Caesar as they literally paralleled one another in totally different cultures. This presents a conflicted approach. To the great men theorists, this suggested that personality and personality development created the leader, and to the situationalists, just the opposite (Bass, 1990, p. 38).

According to situationalists like A. J. Murphy and J. Sneider, the leader emerged as a function of the occasion and the conflicts of the times (Bass, 1990, p. 39). Following this logic it follows; situation occurs–leader emerges. This may be short-sighted and offers room for new theory development. Metaphorically, one can recall the moral at the end of the movie, The Wizard of Oz (LeRoy, 1939). Dorothy, it seems, always had the power to go home; she merely had to make the choice to do so. Perhaps then it is merely an oversight to suggest anything less of leadership.

There are hybrid theories within the context of situation. These include Personal–Situational theory, which suggested a combination of personal and situational elements are necessary for leadership. William James, writing in 1880, points out the example of Ulysses S. Grant, who was a failure in his personal life and in his presidency, but one of the Union’s greatest military leaders of the Civil War (Bass, 1990, p. 39).
It is clear that neither a *trait approach* or the *situational approach* alone was comprehensive enough to explain the complexities of the role of leader. If these were sufficient, continued research on leadership would not have continued. A deeper and more encompassing approach was soon on the horizon that would delve into areas never considered previously to explain the leader role.

**Psychoanalytic Theory and Leadership**

One new area of the study to begin to take root dealt with the mind and the emotional and mental processes. A psychoanalytic perspective brought new ideas and approaches to the study of leadership. Many of the early psychoanalysts spent a great deal of research and writing on the topic of leadership. Among these include Sigmund Freud, Erik Erickson, Eric Fromm, and H. Levinson. Freud’s study of Moses is often cited as an example of the leader as father figure (Jones, 1955, p. 365). From a psychoanalytic perspective, leadership was explained through the analysis of an individual’s early childhood and family developments. This would explain the leader’s behavior and decisions. For Freud, the father as head of the family defined the psychological world of the leader. The father is everyone’s own private leader, who mediated the “‘transition . . . from inner to outer, from psychology to politics’” (Bass, 1990, p. 41). Psychoanalysis was a relatively new concept at the time. It began in or around 1895 with the publishing of a paper called *Studies on Hysteria* jointly written by Sigmund Freud and Josef Breuer (Jones, 1955, p. 240). As an emerging science, psychoanalysis provided a new insight into the understanding of the political leader.
based on his “childhood deprivations, cultural milieu and relationship with parental authority” (Bass, 1990, p. 41) and how they embarked on fulfilling the psychodynamic needs of followers. The perspective was notably negative. In terms of the leader-follower relationship, Freud believed “group members act like family siblings, in developing their ego-identifications. They form a common libidinal connection with their leader (father) by incorporating his image into their superegos” (Bass, 1990, p. 42). Freud was a physician and therefore his ideas were rooted in the medical model. This view works from the view of curing illness rather than the origins and maintenance health of an individual as primary focus. In keeping with this approach, Freud was looking for pathology or the dysfunctional origins of the leader or his decision-making and interaction with others. He was not working for a holistic, positive, health-originated viewpoint. If one chooses to see the glass as half-empty, it just that. It is only a change in perspective that allows one to see the glass as half-full.

**Humanistic Theory**

It is difficult to place the humanist movement in a specific place in this timeline. Partially, this is because it depends on who is given credit for this period in theoretical development. It is the opinion of some scholars that this movement should be credited to Mary Parker Follett. Her work as a business consultant worked to humanize the industrial and civic sectors; however, she was a woman and history often fails to give credit to women as groundbreakers. Usually credit for this movement is given to Elton Mayo, a Harvard scholar who published the findings of
the now infamous Hawthorne studies in the late 1920s. The Hawthorne studies were so important because they emphasized the importance of the worker and his/her treatment within the work environment (Burns, 2000).

Within the psychological realm, Humanistic Theory fits well as American styled psychotherapy. Carl Rogers is probably the best known spokesman for this movement in psychology that began in the 1960s. This approach was a dramatic move away from Freudian analysis. The humanistic approach challenged the basic assumption that the “counselor knows best” (Corey, 1991, p. 205). This approach went on to develop a wide scope of influence on “on how people obtain, possess, share, or surrender power and control over others and themselves [sic]” (p. 205) in their lives. This style eventually became known as the person-centered therapy. This approach sees the leaders function to modify the organization to allow individuals within it to realize their potential and in doing so contribute to the organization’s goals (Bass, 1990). This is humanistic in that Rogers’ primary theme emphasized that humans would develop in a “positive and constructive manner in the climate of respect and trust is established” (Corey, 1991, p. 207). Accordingly, if leaders worked from this perspective, they would be successful and so would their organizations. It is clear that management and leadership is being confused here. While one can be a leader who manages, one who manages does not necessarily lead.

The Humanistic Movement, like many of the other schools of thought in leadership theory, never really went away. This influence was reinvented and continues to influence to the present day. As this movement continued to emphasize
the importance of the individual and the worker as a person, it became evident that a new shift was developing. Leadership from this perspective was being considered as a managerial function.

As time went on, it became important in the industrialized world not only to understand great leaders of the past but to begin to identify the determinants of leadership for the future. This would enable individuals to be trained to be leaders. Training programs could be developed to allow individuals to learn skills that would allow their leadership potential to be refined. This assumed that leadership, like any other skill, could be taught and learned (Mercer University, 2003). Perhaps a deeper analysis would suggest that instead of working from clay and literally sculpting a leader, one could think like a carver who believes the form was contained within the wood all along; it is only necessary to strip away what does not belong to reveal the true form.

In 1960, Douglas McGregor, president of Antioch College, described what came to be known as Theory X and Theory Y. McGregor defined certain assumptions that he felt underscored the practices and direction of managers as it relates to their employees. What he was trying to convey was that “what managers said or exhibited in their behavior revealed their theories-in-use” (Jarvis, 2003). Unfortunately, this became known as the *one best way*. Bad stereotypic behavior was known as Theory X and good as Theory Y (Jarvis, 2003). McGregor based much of his theory on Abraham Maslow’s needs satisfaction model of motivation. Reviewing a summary of this theory provides additional insight into how leaders are motivated to lead.
Maslow's theory of human motivation presents a hierarchy of needs. These needs can be thought of as a pyramid in which the basic needs must be satisfied before one can ascend to the next level. An overview of these needs are presented below:

**Physiological needs:** These basic needs, which are physiological in nature, are in regards to the drive for hunger, thirst, and breathable air. These needs must satisfied before a person can move upward in the pyramid.

**Safety needs:** Once the physiological needs are met we move on to a new set of needs that are known as safety needs. This is the need to not feel threatened. When society is running smoothly and is peaceful there is little need for individuals to fear and safety is no longer a primary motivator. Maslow believed neurosis in adults was primarily due to a lack of safety in childhood.

**Love needs:** The next level of motivator is love needs. When one is satisfied on the other two levels the need for love and affection and belongingness. The lack of meeting of these needs led to maladjustment and can become more severe psychopathology.

**Esteem needs:** This refers to the need to know oneself and one's relevance to the outer world as expected by others. Maslow divided this area into two subsets, first the need for strength, achievement, adequacy, and confidence. When facing the world, the need for independence and freedom is required. Secondly, the desire for reputation or prestige, recognition, attention and appreciation is necessary.

**The desires to know and to understand:** This is a prerequisite for self-actualization. It is about a deeper understanding of the world and the self.

**The need for self-actualization:** According to Maslow, even when all of the above needs are satisfied we can expect a discontent and restlessness to develop. This creates the need to fulfill one's ultimate potential. To become all one is capable of becoming (Verhulst, 2003).

Looking at an overview of Maslow's theory one can see how easy it is to apply these concepts to leadership. Based on the evolution of leadership theory, one could tend to believe that leaders had different motivations than followers and had long ago satisfied the basic needs. With this line of thinking, leaders are believed to have actually attained a higher level of motivation. Maslow also identified leaders he felt had attained self-actualization. Among those on his list included: Thomas
Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, Albert Einstein, Pierre Renoir, Eleanor Roosevelt, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and Albert Schweitzer (Performance Unlimited, 1998). In 1965, Maslow created a theory of eupyschian management which was created through observation of people at work in industry. "Eupyschian management distinguishes between the person who is trying to be a democratic superior and one who is spontaneously democratic" (Bass, 1990, p. 44). He felt it was important for managers to develop the self-esteem of subordinates. In doing so, everyone would have an opportunity to reach self-actualization or the capacity to reach his or her ultimate potential. One must consider that, like other choices in life, an individual must choose the path to self-actualization. Otherwise, all the good intentions of superiors will fall on deaf ears.

Path-Goal Theory

It follows that path-goal theory would be one of the next major theories of leadership to take center stage. In many ways, path-goal theory is reminiscent of behavior modification. According to House,

The leader clarifies the goals of the followers as well as the path to those goals. This clarification enhances the psychological state of the followers and arouses them to increase their efforts to perform well. Thus, the followers achieve satisfaction from the job to be done. The leaders may enhance satisfaction with the work itself as well as provide valued extrinsic rewards . . . . (Bass, 1990, p. 46)

Despite the sophistication of these ideas, it still sounds a lot like ringing a bell to evoke salivation. Contemporary followers rarely appear so sheep-like.
Contingency Theory

The 1970s was dominated by the introduction and application of Contingency Theory. The point of this theory was to hypothesize regarding leadership effectiveness. Fiedler himself describes the complexity of this theory as a “pretzel-shaped hypothesis” for a “pretzel-shaped universe” (Fiedler, 1967, p. 14). This theory postulates that the effectiveness of a group is contingent upon the relationship between leadership style and the degree to which the group situation enables the leader to exert influence” (Fiedler, 1967, p. 15). Fiedler performed quantitative research using a tool that measured Assumed Similarity Between Opposites or ASo and another tool that looked at Least-preferred Coworker or LPC. Fiedler then went on to study a wide range of groups to look and evaluate the scores from these scales to hypothesize about the effectiveness of leadership. Part of his conclusions were:

under normal conditions the leaders who is liked and accepted by his group (or feels liked and accepted), who has high position power, and who has a clear-cut task, has everything in his favor. His group members will be glad to follow him; those who are not compliant can be given specific directions and, if necessary, they can be coerced to perform the structured task situations. (Fiedler, 1967, p. 143)

In short, popularity and likability helps to aid effectiveness for the leader. However, if leaders assumes they are well-liked, is this the same as being well-liked? If the ability to lead is based on popularity, are leaders more likely to make decisions based on how they will be perceived by followers than what is really in the best interest of the organization? The motivation for popularity does not always produce good decisions. Does it instead produce Enron and Tyco styled leaders who make choices that
produce profits but destroy morality? Ultimately, this theory suggests a shallowness on the part of followers who are characterized as easily manipulated and motivated. The answer is hardly so simplistic.

**Situational Leadership Model**

The next wave of leadership theory hypothesized that what worked in a given situation could be generalized to another similar situation. The model provided detailed descriptions of these situations. This is an expansion of the ideas of situational leadership first developed by Hersey and Blanchard. The main premise of Situational Leadership is that there is no best way to influence people.

Situational leadership is based on the interplay among:
1. the amount of guidance and direction (task behavior) a leader gives;
2. the amount of socioemotional support (relationship behavior) a leader provides; and
3. the readiness level that followers exhibit in performing a specific task, function or objective. (Hersey & Blanchard, 1993, p. 184)

Paul Hersey was a retired telephone pioneer for Bell Laboratories who developed ground-breaking phone technology and patents. His cohort, Rear Admiral Theodore Blanchard of the United States Naval Reserve (USNR), was a naval officer decorated for his courageous leadership during World War II. Together they pioneered a new approach to management and the influence of people through leadership. This focus approached leadership from an observed behavior perspective. This theory did not rely on some inborn traits or acquired abilities but instead emphasized the behavior and environment in which leaders found themselves.
This perspective was very important because it emphasized that leadership skills could be learned. Hersey and Blanchard were practical men providing practical applications of theory. If their premise was true, then individuals could increase their effectiveness as leaders through education and training (Hersey & Blanchard, 1993, p. 116). Their technique to develop this theory was to observe the frequency or infrequency of certain leader behaviors in numerous types of situations. This allowed for the development of models to predict the appropriate leadership behavior for the situation in which the leaders would find themselves.

These ideas were supported by Victor Vroom, another leadership theorist who stated:

I do not see any form of leadership as optimal for all situations. The contribution of a leader’s actions to the effectiveness of his organization cannot be determined without considering the nature of the situation in which that behavior is displayed (Hersey & Blanchard, 1993, p. 117)

This worked well with Hersey and Blanchard’s identification of the three main components of the leadership process, which are identified as the leader, the follower, and the situation (p. 117). It appeared a pragmatic response to create situation descriptions, observe successful behavior used by a leader in that situation, and suggest that if others could learn these skills and style, the same result would follow. This kind of response to the problems of leadership provided a measurable technique and an approach that schools of business and management could teach their disciples. The first problem with this approach is the unpredictability of human beings. One cannot be assured that everyone will react the same way in the same type of situation. It would be nice to be able to quantify behavior and situations so easily, but the truth
is that situations and the interactions of people cannot be so easily categorized that we can predict the outcome each time there is interaction.

**Expectancy Theory**

The theory by Victor Vroom and Phillip Yetton is often called different things in the literature. In some cases it is called the Leader-Participation Model, sometimes the Rational-Deductive Approach, and in still others, the Expectancy Theory. For the purposes of this literature review, Expectancy Theory has been chosen as the preferred terminology. Yet, it is easy to understand the confusion. The Expectancy Theory has aspects of all these ideas within it.

Expectancy Theory linked some accepted facts about leadership into a prescription of the kind of leadership style that is most likely to succeed. They posed ten questions that leaders should ask themselves in deciding whether to be directive or participative in decision making with their subordinates and whether to do so primarily with individual subordinates or with the group as a whole. (Bass, 1990, p. 52)

Vroom and Yetten constructed a decision-making model that applied to these questions. If the response to a question was *yes*, one followed one line; if *no*, one followed another along a decision tree. This explains the term *rational-deductive*. Since the majority of solutions involved a management style that was inclusion of followers, this theory can easily be coined *leader-participation*. However, Expectancy Theory makes the most sense. It is literally a theory that does its best to create a line of logical thinking so that the manager or leader can *expect* a certain response. Expectancy Theory was considered very important in the evolution of
leadership theory for three reasons. It suggested that leaders had the ability to adapt their styles to particular situations, thus giving credence to the situationalists. Further, this theory was widely accepted among other leadership researchers as legitimate, and finally, because it reinforced the idea that people’s leadership skills could be developed.

Although all of these leadership concepts have never been completely forgotten, a new breed of leadership theorists were on the horizon. Like social sciences and psychology, models that were behavioral in their approach were giving way to ideas that were procedurally driven. These were conceptualized as Process Theories.

**Process Theories**

There are a variety of theories that fit under the heading of Process Theories. They move ideas about leadership away from the individual or the situation to something more complex. It literally becomes a process as the result of interaction between a variety of things. One of these process theories is known as Transformational in nature. It is probably due to the humanistic movement’s research on moral development that the concept of transformational leadership developed at all. Transformational leadership emphasizes the leader’s teaching role in connection with followers.

The premise of this leadership is that, whatever the separate interest persons might hold, they are presently or potentially united in the pursuit of “higher” goals, the realization of which is tested by achievement of significant change.
that represents the collective or pooled interests of leaders and followers. (Burns, 1978, pp. 425–426)

It is the process of that interaction that creates leadership in action to transform the current situation. This assumes moral implications. For this reason, Adolf Hitler would not make James MacGregor Burns’ list of transformational leaders. For Burns, the transformational leader must be a positive force. Still, it is impossible to deny that Hitler transformed his country and the world in a dramatic way. Perhaps due to our inability to separate hero worship from the leader role, we cannot think of Hitler as a transformational leader. He was not a moral man; he did not provide moral leadership. For great and moral people that have worked to provide positive leadership, he represents a pariah on the face of good leaders everywhere. Yet, denying the fact does not make it true. It becomes necessary to simply make the distinction between moral and immoral leadership as categories of the phenomenon. Leadership is a value neutral term, good or moral leadership is not.

Burns defined leadership as a “reciprocal process of mobilizing, by persons with certain motives and values, various economic, political, and other resources, in a context of competition and conflict, in order to realize goals independently or mutually held by both leaders and followers” (Burns, 1978, p. 425). He went on to say that the nature of the goal is crucial, even when the goals are separate; they must still be related. One example of this kind of interaction is trading votes in a legislature. Burns described this as transactional leadership and made the point of differentiating this from the kind of leadership in which leaders alter, shape, and motivate followers through their role as teachers. This is described as transforming leadership. This type
of leadership suggests a moral element in which the leader aids the followers in the pursuit of higher goals (Burns, 1978, p. 425).

Unlike other theories of leadership which frequently saw the role handled only by those endowed with the special ability to lead, Burns understood that his transformational leadership was more widespread and even commonplace. He saw leadership occurring in the activities of parents, teachers, peers, preachers, and politicians. However, he drew the line on any act that involves manipulation, coercion, or selfish personal gains. This was not leadership in his mind. The test for transformational leadership must prove out in the positive contribution to change through collective and moral motives and values (Burns, 1978, p. 427). As Burns defined leadership,

It is a function of complex biological, social, cognitive and affective processes, that it is closely influenced by structures of opportunity and closure around it, that it may emerge at different stages in people's lives, that it manifests itself in a variety of processes and arenas—in short, we have seen that the usual generalizations are without foundation. (Burns, 1978, pp. 427-428)

Furthermore, he asserted that leadership can be generalized across time, culture, and politics. This is legitimized through the theory development in the field of moral development. According to the researchers in this field, moral development has a culturally universal component that is not simply a reflection of the particular society, culture norms, or parental ideology. Burns supported his conclusions on the work of human development pioneers such as Adler, Maslow, Piaget, Erikson, Rokeach, and Kohlberg (p. 428).
In 1985, Bernard Bass expanded this idea of transformational leadership by saying that it augmented the effects of transactional leadership on the efforts, satisfaction, and effectiveness of subordinates. Tichy and Devanna (1986) noted that transformational leadership was more than just charisma in action, that it actually was a behavioral process that could be learned and managed through a systematic approach (Bass, 1990, pp. 53–54).

Servant Leadership

Robert Greenleaf’s concept of the leader was first written in the 1970s; however, it seems to have never gone completely out of vogue. He gives full credit for the concept of the servant leader to his reading of Herman Hesse’s *Journey to the East*. In Hesse’s autobiographical story, the central figure Leo accompanies his party on a mythical journey as a servant performing menial and demeaning chores. Leo also sustains the spirit of the group with his extraordinary presence, spirit, and song. Once Leo disappears on the journey, the group falls into disarray and the journey is abandoned. Somehow this group is unable to complete its goal without the servant Leo. Some years later, when the narrator of the story finally finds the servant again, he discovers that Leo was actually the Head of the Order that sponsored the journey. The guiding spirit of the journey took the role of servant in order to lead (Greenleaf, 1977). Greenleaf’s thesis is that more servants should emerge as leaders, or should follow only servant-leaders” (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 10). He goes on to expand his idea:

Servant leader is leader first. . . . It begins with a natural feeling that one wants to serve, and to *serve* first. The conscious choice brings one to aspire to
lead. That person is sharply different from one who is leader first . . . the leader-first and the servant-first are two extreme types. (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 11)

This suggests the leader not only make a proactive choice but also one steeped in positive moral attitude. In Greenleaf's view, the servant-leader takes care of others' highest priority needs and supports their interpersonal growth as human beings. By doing, so he enhances his own leadership.

Such a theory suggests an unselfish, ethical, noble altruism that is difficult to justify for leaders of today's profit-driven corporations. It is doubtful that corporate executives at Enron were thinking about needs beyond their own drive for wealth or prosperity. Although this is just one example of leadership run amok, history can provide us with many others from Presidents to school board presidents. Leadership gone awry is a common theme. Servant leadership appears more appropriate for nonprofits and religious organizations than it does for governments and business. However, the idea that a leader uses intuition to feel for patterns and constantly reevaluates by listening, understanding, and aiding the achievement of the optimum for others has not been the call of most Master of Business Administration (M.B.A.) programs in this country. This theory suggests an Eastern bend on leadership philosophy that is not easily accepted by those raised on Western values. Noble and ethical as the theory of servant leadership appears to be, it is easily rebuffed by a society whose economy is driven by the value of the stock market.
Social Change Model of Leadership

The concept of servant leadership is expanded when you consider the Social Change Model of Leadership. In many ways, this theory contains some of the concepts of servant leadership but expands the leadership responsibility from an individual decision by making it a process. This model promotes the concepts of "equity, social justice, self-knowledge, personal empowerment, collaboration, citizenship and service" (Central Michigan University, 2003). Initially, this model was designed for professionals in the field of student affairs whose goal was to develop leadership potential in students. Later, it was expanded to include faculty and administrators with a desire to expand leadership developments within their own spheres. It suggests a greater self-knowledge and an exploration into one’s talents, values, and interests as they relate to leadership. This theory facilitates an expanded knowledge to mobilize the self and others to serve and work collaboratively. This leads to positive social change for a community or institution.

Relational Model of Leadership

In 1998, Susan Komives, Nance Lucas, and Timothy McMahon focused attention on the relational model of leadership as it related to college students exploring the nature of leadership within themselves. Their frame of references uses educational and psychological viewpoints to engage the student in the idea of understanding themselves and their relation to others and how this impacts their role as leaders in the world. This theory sees relationships as the key to leadership
effectiveness. According to this research, "the journey through the leadership process will make a difference in all aspects of your life" (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998, p. 4). Relational leadership has six foundational principles:

- Leadership is a concern to all of us.
- Leadership is viewed and valued differently by various disciplines and cultures.
- Conventional views of leadership are changing.
- Leadership can be exhibited in many ways.
- Leadership qualities and skills can be learned and developed.
- Leadership committed to ethical action is needed to encourage change and social responsibility. (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998, pp.4–5)

The relational leadership model suggests a perspective based on a relational process in which the goal is to have a common benefit to all involved. In this role, the leader must be “inclusive, empowering, purposeful, ethical and process oriented” (Dyer, 2001) in order to create a cohesive group that will put their combined efforts together to achieve the common good. Karen Dyer (2001) suggested in her article “Relational Leadership” that the concept might just be too simple to be effective. Quite frankly, if individuals were good at self-evaluation and insight, there would be more effective relationships at nearly every level of human involvement from parenting to Chief Executive Officer.

The Era of the Future Leader

There are many other theories of leadership that have become popular or a matter of focus for a period of time and hybrid theories that have been reinvented with old theories as the mainstay of their premise. One group that has focused their time, research, and energy on leadership is the well-known Drucker Foundation. In
the late 1990s, the Drucker Foundation published a book entitled *Leader of the Future* (Hesselbein, Goldsmith, & Beckhard, 1996). This book compiled essays about new visions, strategies, and practice for the next era of leadership. Many of the best-known leaders and thinkers of leadership provided material. In his foreword, Peter Drucker summarized his thoughts about leadership after nearly 50 years of work with every kind of leader imaginable. Drucker notes that all the effective leaders he has encountered had four simple things that they all knew:

- A leader is someone who has followers
- Popularity is not leadership. Results are.
- Leaders are highly visible, and they set examples.
- Leadership is not the rank, privilege, title or money, it is responsibility.

(Hesselbein et al., 1996, p. xii)

Drucker strongly asserts that although there may be leaders who are born, there are simply not enough of those to go around. In his mind, “Leadership must be learned and can be learned” (Hesselbein et al., 1996, p. xvii). The book itself goes on to present the future leader from nearly every conceivable angle.

One of the contributors to this book is Ken Blanchard, well known for his series of books that started with the *One Minute Manager*. In this essay, Blanchard focuses on turning the organizational pyramid upside down to provide more effective leadership. This, he insists, is the way for the future leader to implement new vision (Blanchard, 1996, p. 85).

Another contributor, Frances Hesselbein, famous for turning the Girl Scouts of America program from a failing institution to a revitalized organization, has been hailed as one of the leaders of excellence in our modern time. She forecasts the leader
of the future to be a person focused on the “how to be” (Hesselbein, 1996, p. 122) aspects of leadership, that is, an individual focused on “quality, character, mind-set, values, principle and courage” (Hesselbein, 1996, p. 123).

Steven Covey, founder of the Covey Leadership Center, is the author of The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People and Principle Centered Leadership. His essay stresses that the leader in the next millennium will be one whose organizational culture is based on principles. These principles exist within the leaders who are not afraid to have vision, courage, humility, and the capacity and energy to constantly learn and grow. In this way, they model good principles of living in harmony with values such as “fairness, service, equity, justice, integrity, honesty and trust” (Covey, 1996, p. 151). He emphasized that the future leader will be the same leader of the present, but one who has undergone an internal change, an “inside-out transformation” (p. 155).

Richard Leider, a nationally known leader in the field of career development, provides a summary chapter on self-leadership. He maintains that organizations of today and in the future require re-engineering to remain in the game. However, he sees the new re-engineering as something that will demand major self-leadership changes. These changes require leaders to make the choice to create self-change. Also required is listening to others with their heart and continually deciding to look within and decide what they wants, what they value, and what they are willing to be courageous about (Leider, 1996, p. 190).
Throughout this book there is a trend that underlines many of the essays about leadership. It has to do with the trend that involves the very nature of the individual that is leading. The internal workings of the individual, as varied as they may be, are vital to the success of the organizations they lead. Without a person with some sense of themselves as well as their organization, the organization fails to achieve its goals.

Attempting to create a comprehensive review of leadership theories is an overwhelming task. What this review has accomplished is to suggest an evolution of leadership theory and well as lay the groundwork for how and where the concepts that emerged from this research might fit in the scheme of leadership ideas. With this in mind, it is possible to see how previous leadership theories may be better served by creating a thread that could weave and bring together the beads that represent the ideas of many individuals. Ultimately this research did not produce some great new bead of wisdom; it created a strong thread to link others beads.

### Grounded Theory and Leadership Research

Grounded Theory is a methodology that has been used in a wide range of disciplines for the study of a plethora of subjects. In a book by Ken Parry of the Center for the Study of Leadership in New Zealand and James Meindl from the Center for International Leadership at the State University of New York at Buffalo, a collection of essays from researchers around the world using grounded theory to study leadership has been assembled. In *Grounded Leadership Theory and Research: Issues, Perspectives and Methods* (Parry & Meidl, 2002), 20 varied researchers from
colleges and universities throughout the world submitted research based on grounded theory and/or the principles that derive from the grounded theory method. In one essay entitled “Salient Biases in Discussion and Research on Leadership” by Micha Popper (2002), the concept of leadership as relationship is highlighted. This essay emphasizes the strength of the grounded theory method when one is considering the “leadership as relationship” paradigm (p. 15). The researcher goes on to say that the method is holistic and is “based on observing people in their natural territory, interacting with them in their own language and terms” (pp. 15-16). Further, where quantitative approaches allow generalization across frequencies, grounded theory emphasis is development of theory rather than the testing of it. This difference is important; generalization regarding leadership does not necessarily contribute to a deeper understanding of the phenomenon. According to this study, it is only by examining the details of leadership that clearer and stronger focus can be presented.

Lessey Sooklal and Dennis Hanlon of the Memorial University of Newfoundland used a grounded theory approach to a leadership theory with insights into entrepreneurship. Sooklal had previously used grounded theory to present a general theory of leadership in 1991, which was empirically tested by Hanlon in 1999. The two paired up to create this entrepreneurship theory using grounded theory (Sooklal & Hanlon, 2002).

*Grounded Leadership Theory and Research: Issues, Perspectives and Methods* (Parry & Meidl, 2002) ends with the authors extolling the benefits of grounded theory analysis as it relates to leadership research. For example, they stress
that this method of research allows for the opportunity to gain insight into the
"leadership as relationship" and reinforces the use of grounded theory to begin a "new
conceptual base" (p. 200). They maintain that grounded theory allows for a
framework for interpreting metaphorical data regarding leadership and therefore
insight into the social phenomena that surround leadership.

Summary

In most research studies, the role of the literature review is to provide a
comprehensive search of all the relevant research prior to beginning the new study.
The literature review literally defines in what direction the new research should move
and where the holes in theory exist that still need to be filled. In some cases, the role
of the literature review is to suggest prior theories or hypotheses that require
replication. However, this is not the case in grounded theory. The goal of the
grounded theory method is the "discovery of concepts and hypotheses, not the testing
or replicating them (Glaser, 1992, p. 32). This means that the role of the literature
review must also be different.

Since the timing of the literature review in grounded theory studies is also
different, it makes sense to apply this portion of the study in a different context. Once
the concepts and theory begin to emerge in the field, one begins looking at the
literature to help guide or reinforce what is or is not happening in the field. In the case
of this grounded theory study of leadership, it appeared important to have a better
understanding of the historical perspective of leadership and what other theorists felt
was of importance. Would the literature review reinforce what was emerging in the field, or would it suggest that this new data had moved in divergent direction? The truth is that the review suggested a little of both.

In his book on leadership, Bernard Bass (1990) makes the observation that

By now, it is fair to say that every procedure known to social science in general has been applied specifically to the study of leadership. These procedures have included autobiographical analysis; biographical analysis; case studies; evaluation of news records, memoranda and minutes of meetings; the analysis of speeches; biodata analysis; studies of communication patterns; autologs and observers’ logs of leaders’ activities; ratings by observers, superiors, peers, subordinates, and clients; judgments of verbal protocols; and individual interviews. (p. 55)

In his summary, Bass forgot one type of data collection that had yet to be fully recognized in relation to leadership studies. He forgot about grounded theory. Although the use of grounded theory for the study of leadership is hardly groundbreaking, the creation of new theory based on the research using this methodology allows for continued insight into leaders and leadership. Newly developed theory on leadership, like others that have come before, will undoubtedly build on previous foundations and contribute to the ongoing discussion regarding leadership.

Finally, one of the things that became most apparent in pursuit of this literature review was the importance of not having read these great theories and authors prior to the development of my own theory. The result would have been a lesser and less affirmed version of what ultimately became the Theory of Transpersonal Leadership. The timing of this literature review allowed for many hours of affirmation that this new theory was appropriate and well-timed, as well as
appropriately placed in the timeline of leadership theories. The literature review literally reinforced what emerged from the data and was ultimately affirmed by those that have gone before and can legitimately call themselves great writers and thinkers of the subject. What has also been impressive is the evolutionary necessity of leadership theory. As time moves forward, leadership theory must expand. Creating conceptual theory will aid in providing longevity to future theories of leadership. This new theory developed as a result of this research and is by no means the end to the development and expansion of theories of leadership. It is not supposed to be. The hope is that, by providing conceptual ideas about leadership and not detailed analysis of behavior, response, or situation, the value of old and new ideas can come together in a form that will have lasting effect and appeal.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Overview of Grounded Theory Methodology

Grounded theory is an inductively derived process first postulated by Glaser and Strauss in 1967 as a result of their seminal research studying dying patients in the hospital setting. In their book, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory* (1967), Glaser and Strauss suggested that generating theory is a "process of research" (p. 6). This approach emphasizes that "generating a theory from data means that most hypotheses and concepts not only come from the data, but are systematically worked out in relation to the data during the course of the research" (1967, p. 6). This is in direct contrast to a theory that is generated by logical and a priori assumptions.

In 1991, Anselm Strauss and Barney Glaser differentiated their approaches to grounded theory. Anselm Strauss, along with Julie Corbin, published the *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques* (1990), to which Dr. Glaser strongly objected. He believed this book suggested a completely new methodological approach that fractured and misconceived the grounded approach. The major differences are contrasted in Table 1.

Although the differences between these two approaches may appear subtle to the casual observer, there are obvious and divergent differences that inform the
Table 1

Glaser and Strauss Methodological Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glaser Approach to GT</th>
<th>Strauss Approach to GT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The researcher asks two formal but not preconceived questions of the data. &quot;What is this a study of?&quot; and &quot;What is actually happening in the data?&quot;</td>
<td>• Formal questions are not asked of the research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data are compared incident to incident and compared and analyzed.</td>
<td>• Emergence is interrupted by asking preconceived and substantive questions; this takes the research away from the true nature of the nature to what the researcher decides is at issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Categories and properties emerge which fit and are of relevance to the discovered problem.</td>
<td>• Suggests that variables such as sex, age, or conditions are relevant, despite what the data reveal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Variables such as age, sex, etc., are not relevant unless the data reveal that they are.</td>
<td>• Easier method to use, as description is acceptable and more familiar and comfortable to most researchers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The approach is difficult to learn as thinking in a conceptual manner diverges from what we have been traditionally taught in qualitative research.</td>
<td>• The resultant theory is conceptual description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The resultant theory is emergent and conceptual. It is not descriptive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Derived from Glaser, 1992, pp. 1–7)

research on an intrinsic level. Corbin and Strauss allow for a preconceived approach that is dramatically different from the Glaserian approach of sensitivity without bias and through formal questioning. With the Glaserian approach, one begins the research without knowing the answer. This is clearly not the same as Corbin and Strauss’s idea of using a hypothesis and working towards verification. These simple nuances change the method enough to suggest that this approach is indeed different from the original grounded theory method discovered in 1967. Since the goal of this dissertation was to
discover a new, emergent, and conceptually based theory, the Glaserian approach to grounded theory was chosen as the most appropriate.

The core process of Glaserian grounded theory is conceptualization. All grounded theory is the "generation of emergent conceptualized, integrated patterns which are denoted by categories and their properties" (Glaser, 2001, p. 9). In addition, there are five main components to the grounded theory process: theoretical sensitivity, theoretical sampling, coding, theoretical memoing, and sorting.

**Theoretical Sensitivity**

"Generating theory and doing social research are two parts of the same process" (Glaser, 1978, p. 2) within the context of grounded theory. Unlike other methodologies that seek to verify pre-existing ideas or preconceived hypotheses, this method's primary purpose is emergence of a theory that is generalizable and modifiable to those in the field of research and practice. There is an innate reliance on the psychology of the analyst for this method. In other words, the skill, fatigue, maturity, cycling of motivation, life cycle interest, insights into, and ideation from the data are vital and important and, unlike other methodologies, are not a presumed bias (Glaser, 1978). In order to gain theoretical sensitivity, one must enter the field with as few preconceived notions as possible or, more precisely, without a hypothesis. This prevents the hypothesis filter effect: not paying attention to some items because they do not fit the schema of the research. Sensitivity refers to the researcher's "knowledge, understanding and skill, which foster his generation of categories and
properties and increase his ability to relate them into hypotheses and to further integrate the hypotheses, according to emergent theoretical codes” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 27). In many ways, theoretical sensitivity can be paralleled with awareness that is general and open in nature. In other words, this suggests that there is more than one possible field, doctrine, or science that can offer explanation for the researcher’s findings. Literally, this allows for a myriad of potential intellectual perspectives from which one may choose. Openness is key.

**Theoretical Sampling**

Theoretical sampling is the weathervane of grounded theory. It literally points the direction for the researcher to move to collect new data. The researcher begins with what he/she believes to be good starting places to collect data and then move in the direction the data suggest. Data create memos, and the memos eventually create categories. As the researcher saturates a category, he or she moves forward.

The general procedure of theoretical sampling . . . is to elicit codes from raw data from the start of the data collection through the use of constant comparative analysis as the data pour in. Then the researcher used the codes to direct further data collection, from which the codes are further theoretically developed with respect to their various properties and their connection with other codes until saturated. Theoretical sampling on any code ceases when it is saturated, elaborated and integrated into the emerging theory. (Glaser, 1978, p. 36)

The process allows the researcher to shift the emphasis in the research early so that the data are reflecting what occurs in the field and not on the speculation of what is expected to be observed. This allows the researcher to uncover data in areas and ways that might not have been considered and thus overlooked in the data collection.
Coding

Theoretical coding is the basis of the primary relationship between the data and the theory. "Generating a theory by developing the hypothetical relationships between conceptual codes . . . which have been generated from the data as indicators, we 'discover' a grounded theory" (Glaser, 1978, p. 55). In coding, the researcher now becomes the analyst. Simply stated, the data are fractured by grouping them into codes, and these codes in turn build the theory. The theory explains what is happening in the data. Codes are an abstract, highly condensed version of the data and explain what is happening in what might otherwise appear disparate data. This is why variables such as age, sex, and race are neutralized. For example, by turning from descriptive thinking to conceptual thinking, we can theorize in terms of human beings, which is more abstract than in the terms men and women, which tend toward a description of a kind of human being.

Coding begins with open coding, where the analyst sets out as many categories that might fit. As many incidents as possible are placed in these categories. This coding allows for the researcher to note the direction the research should take (theoretical sampling) before a decision is made regarding focus for the study. Data are analyzed as a whole and then line by line, with the researcher coding each sentence. This creates a continual stimulus for more codes and provides an example of the zig-zag approach to this method. One ceases to open code and code only for a core variable or delimit the study when the "analyst sees that the prospects for a theory that does cope with the data entoto" (Glaser, 1978, p. 61).
At this point theoretical coding takes place. Theoretical coding conceptualizes how the substantive codes relate to one another and become hypotheses that are integrated into the theory. These codes become the thread that sews together the fractured pieces of data (codes) to become whole again.

**Theoretical Memos**

"Memos are the theorizing write-up of ideas about codes and their relationships as they strike the analyst while coding. Memos lead, naturally, to abstraction or ideation" (Glaser, 1978, p. 83). This process never ends. It begins with the initial coding of the first data and continues until the theory is finished. The goal is for the researcher to learn to stop and memo whenever a thought occurs—a more difficult process than it appears. When one is steeped in the research, ideas about it can abrupt at the most inopportune moments, such as at a concert or in a grocery store or at a movie. It is important to take the time to write these ideas down as soon as possible. Memos can be a word, a phrase, a paragraph, or more. The researcher should feel free to memo in any way that is comfortable and effective.

**Sorting**

Finally, one begins the process of sorting. This sorting is essential to the process of developing theory as it allows an opportunity for fractured data to be put back together. Usually the researcher will have a large pile of memos, but unless one sorts these memos, there is the likelihood of producing a thin, less integrated theory.
It is important to understand that this is a conceptual sort, not a data sort, and that the researcher must perform this step on his or her own. Only the researcher knows his/her data well enough to sort appropriately. Through sorting, the outline of the theory begins and subsequently is filled in. The intent of this process is to use the sorting of conceptual memos to produce a rich theory that is not descriptive but remains conceptual in its nature (Glaser, 1978, pp. 116–119).

Application of the Grounded Theory Method to This Leadership Study

Although it is important to have a basic understanding of this methodological approach from a general perspective, it is equally as important to understand the basic premise and practice of the method as it informed the research of this specific study of leadership. Translation of this method into practice has been detailed and described to aid in the understanding of process of research.

Theoretical Sensitivity

It is extremely difficult to judge our own sense of openness as we enter the research field. This methodology relies heavily upon the inner psychology of the researcher, and therefore it is important to have some personal insight and understanding as one undertakes this process. Fortunately, this is a vital characteristic of being an effective therapist. As a therapist who has had the privilege of working in private practice for the last eight years, it has been essential to gain knowledge of the self as part of the process of developing skills and abilities as a therapist. This is a
never-ending project. It is one of ongoing awareness that is constantly evolving. Yet, personal insight and evolution are not enough to gain or maintain theoretical sensitivity. Other endeavors aided in this process. Attending two grounded theory seminars and having the opportunity to present a paper in New York aided this researcher by adding to her knowledge base and providing an experienced group of supportive researchers to depend upon. This created an invaluable link that supported this researcher throughout the process.

Reading outside the field of study was also important. At least 27 other books were read in the course of the last year and one half that ultimately aided in adding to sensitivity. Examples of these books included The Alchemist, Dry, The Devil in the White City, Jung, Essential Dali, Bare, The Natural History of the Rich, The Four Agreements, portions of Le Morte d'Arthur, and The Two Towers, to name only a few. These titles were read in addition to books that ultimately added to the dissertation and literature review itself. In some cases, they unwittingly added to the dimension of the research by providing unsuspecting insights into leaders and leadership. All of this combined to aid in creating an opportunity for openness as data were collected.

**Theoretical Sampling**

Before one can begin to think in terms of theoretical sampling, one must begin with a place to collect data. Initial recruiting of a potential source of participants was derived initially through solicitation of referral phone numbers from some members of
the 1999 Western Michigan University Ph.D. cohort in Public Administration. This group was chosen because it provided several key components believed to be essential to this process. First, as a member of this cohort, the researcher had immediate access to a broad range of individuals. Second, the members came from a wide range of occupations and fields. Third, they were geographically located throughout the state. Additional participants would be located using snowball sampling. This is a process by which a researcher locates a few individuals in the population of interest and asks them to refer other individuals to the same group (Grinnell, 1997).

Theoretical sampling actually followed very naturally and logically. For example, in one interview someone suggested that one of the finest examples of leadership he knew existed in the director of a community foundation because this individual embodied a sense of giving back to the community that is essential to a good leadership, according to the interviewee. This person was accessed quite easily and interviewed. In one interview a spiritual leader suggested that good leadership was like good mothering. Several mothers who were considered to be good parents were interviewed. These illustrations are suggested to relay how theoretical sampling works during the process of the research. The researcher needs only to follow the lead of the participants to move along the sampling. Ultimately this allows the research to find its own data and move in the direction that is discovered instead of preconceived.
Coding

Coding is probably the most complex aspect of this research methodology. It is a difficult piece to explain and yet it is vital to the understanding and validation of the theory to be able to effectively illustrate this piece of the research. Interviews were considered immediately after they were complete. Many times notes were completed in the car following the interview. As soon as possible, the interview notes were typed into the computer. It was read as a whole first and then coded line by line. Interviews were printed and coded with colored pens additionally. Memos were written on index cards so that they could be sorted into various piles. As categories emerged, they were printed on large sheets of paper and/or written on a dry erase board. These also were noted on index cards. Incidents that related to these categories were also written. Eventually these narrowed the scope of the research (delimitation) as the core variables emerged. These core variables or concepts were again typed in large print and/or written on a dry erase board. At various intervals in the coding process more interviews would take place, thus providing more codes and memos. Several re-interviews were conducted. This was an especially important piece during the emergence of core variables. Finally, three main core concepts were delineated. Initially, it was extremely difficult to see how they related to one another. It appeared that three core variables had emerged and perhaps a decision would have to be made as to which variable should become the focus, thus delimiting the study further.
It was at this juncture that cognitive confusion occurred. Although the researcher never stopped thinking about the data, it had become a gray muddled mass that did not appear to make sense. This is the time of cognitive confusion in the grounded theory process that had been described by its users. It is a frustrating and yet poignant time ripe for the emergence of theory. The core variables were considered for several weeks on the walls of the office without apparent connection to one another. They had all come from the data, and they were connected in some way, but this researcher could not make sense of what appeared to be fragmented information. It was at this point that the process of literature review intensified. It was the combination of this review and continued interviewing and coding that eventually led to the understanding of the basic social process that underlines this theory. Once this emerged, the entire theory, its name, and the understanding of the three core variables fell into place to become the Theory of Transpersonal Leadership. The details of this emergence are revealed in the Results and Analysis portion of this document.

Sorting

The researcher began with a pile of index cards with various memos, categories, and codes. A process of shuffling these cards into conceptual code piles began to help make sense of what appeared to be fractured data. This procedure was repeated on several occasions and as new data were coded. This also aided in delimitation to three primary conceptual codes that were the basis for theory
development. Clarification of the conceptual codes through this process allowed for connections between them. This ultimately led to finding a name for the theory that expressed its nature to rise above the ordinary interpersonal development of the self which led to the concept of the transpersonal.

Summary

The proficient use of grounded theory occurs as part of the process of the research. It is a steep learning curve. This was the researcher's first attempt at learning and effectively employing this methodological approach. With further study and additional research, the method will become easier and more natural in its use. The breakdown of the method as it applied for this doctoral research study has been presented with the directives as dictated by the Glaserian method and the practical application as it applied in the field. It is the intent by doing so to present clear indication of the systematic nature of this study and the grounding of the discovered theory.
CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The data collected for this research were accomplished through a series of interviews and observations. During the course of this study, ideas emerged that were eventually delimited to three major concepts that became the core of the theory that was developed. These concepts are presented, not as they emerged in the research, but in a logical order from the basis of the progression of leadership within the individual. The three main concepts took varying amounts of time to both emerge and fully mature. The process of memoing and coding resulted in a large pile of notes that were eventually placed on index cards. These cards were sorted and resorted into piles on several occasions. This aided in delimiting the study and understanding whether each of these items is a separate concept or merely a part of a single, larger concept. Interviewing continued throughout this process until the three major concepts were saturated and no further new concepts had emerged. The direction of data collection moved according to the response and suggestion of the respondents and the original directions outlined initially in the research proposal. The study settled into three main concepts that appeared to be important and distinctive. How these concepts would eventually link together to create theory was initially confounding. Creating large notes regarding the concepts and displaying them in large print on memos across the walls aided in working the pieces together. At first there did not
appear to be a connection, yet all three concepts had emerged from this study of leadership. Re-interviewing several respondents and asking for clarification of ideas helped to create the necessary connections in the three concepts. This was suggested when one respondent noted the existence of some higher purpose that might be going on within the leader. The look within appeared to be introspective and intropersonal. It suggested psychology as a discipline to explore for clarification. This direction allowed an opportunity to discover a voice for this research that was explicit and conceptual. Ultimately, this led to the word, the concept, and the title of the theory.

In psychology, transpersonal suggests a relationship without boundaries. Transpersonal can also be defined as boundless, having no limits. Transpersonal psychology and psychiatry presented some similarities in their major underlying assumptions that appeared to have fit in the context of leadership. These assumptions were originally outlined by the Association for Transpersonal Psychology in the late 1960s and early 1970s. They can be summarized as:

- Impulses toward the ultimate state are continuous in every person although full awareness of these is not necessarily present at any given time.
- The realization of an ultimate state is essentially dependent on direct practice related to a “path” (course of action or conduct entered into for the purpose of realizing an ultimate state) and on conditions suitable for the individual concerned.
- Every individual has the right to freely choose his or her own path and to change from one personal path to another if or when he or she so desires.

(Boorstein, 1996, p. 10)

These assumptions are harmonious with the concepts and categories, catalytic confluence, symbiotic mutualism, and demand morphism that emerged through the
data collected in the research. They give depth to the emergent concepts and validity to their discovery by the rediscovery of their essence in another field.

Each and every individual interviewed suggested a driving force that moved them to a place in life where they could choose to lead or choose not to lead. For some individuals it was a defining moment that they recall as clearly as a traumatic event. For others it was a sequential process that evolved over time. In either case, it suggested some force that moved them to where they are at this moment (the moment of interview) in their life. The idea of some force moving an individual toward a moment of clarity suggests a sense of spirituality to the leadership decision. This is not to be confused with a religious perspective. Religious refers to the belief system of a specific group, where spiritual refers to the realm of the human spirit (Scotton, Chinen, & Battista, 1996, p. 4). The concept of transpersonal specifically suggests development beyond average; it also refers to something that is developed beyond conventional, personal, or individual levels (Scotton et al, 1996, p. 30). With this in mind, it is easy to see how the decision to lead is part of the process of self-actualization. The role of this higher need is to fulfill one's ultimate potential and become all one is capable of becoming. It is not a huge leap to see making a decision to lead as the culmination of one's potential or a step in that process.

Individuals interviewed also made it clear that they could decide not to take a particular path toward leadership, or that they could change directions once they started. It was also possible to make the decision to lead over and over again in one's
life. This created an affirmation that assured the individuals that they had continued to make the best decision for their life situation.

That moment of acute clarity and the point of decision making is referred to as the Catalytic Confluence. As a point of emphasis, this is the same type of experience described by those individuals who have overcome additive problems. It is described as "a sort of eye-opening, clarifying, different vision of the world and themselves" (Boorstein, 1996, p. 34). Even for those individuals who described their confluence as a set of sequential steps, there appeared to be a moment when everything came together.

The literature review for this research illustrated how theories of leadership began as specific and eventually became broader and more general. These theories began as explanation for the gifts of a few great men. Eventually these theories evolved to illustrate a set of skills that each of us could learn and use based on our perspective of a particular situation. Leadership that was once closed and selective was opened for all of us. This evolution seemed to show that each of us is capable of leading; we need only make the choice to move toward that direction.

Transpersonal leadership theory sees the individual as an integrated whole. In contrast with other leadership theories that looked at only one aspect of the individual, transpersonal leadership sees the individual in a leadership role not separate from who they are psychologically, physically, spiritually, and intellectually. These aspects of the individual are irrecoverably enmeshed, and all of these pieces together move the individuals toward their internal decision to chose leadership.
suggest that only the spiritual aspect of the person is leading in a religious institution, or that the intellectual aspect of the person is leading in an academic institution is absurd. It is equally absurd to separate who we are as leader from who we are as products of our genetics, our environment, our upbringing, and our experiences. It is the complex cocktail of life that creates the individual, and that individual brings all of this to the leadership experience. The process of leadership is much larger than the individual; it is the result of a web of interrelations that affects each and every decision we make in life and ultimately as leaders in the world.

Leadership by its nature affects others. In this way, transpersonal leadership understands that the decision to lead is much larger than the individual. Leadership must have followership, and the interaction of leader and follower affects individuals, organizations, institutions, governments, communities, churches, neighborhoods, schools, etc. Leadership suggest that the individual act according to “one’s best vision” (Boorstein, 1996, p. 140) in service to ___________. You may choose any of the above words to fill in that blank.

Just as breathing is a natural activity in our body, service is a natural activity of our Higher Self; and at a certain point of development, it becomes natural to the personality as well. Its precursor in the personality is the urge to make things better . . . We recognize that service in line with our transpersonal vision is the most effective way to make things better and, therefore, the best and most meaningful thing to do. (Boorstein, 1996, p. 140)

This is in line with Robert Greenleaf’s thoughts on servant leadership and with the concepts of the social change model. Both of these models continue to be popular approaches to leadership. The Theory of Transpersonal Leadership is another link in the line of process theories that have evolved regarding leadership. What makes it
dramatically different is that the process occurs within the individual and moves outward as the leader takes on his or her role and brings it to fruition. This is a subtle yet very important distinction. The process is internal and personal.

Catalytic Confluence

From the research, the idea that the decision to lead is a personal choice that each and every individual has the opportunity to make at some point in life was often reinforced. In fact, individuals may make this choice over and over again in their life.

If one is servant, either leader or follower, one is always searching, listening, expecting that a better wheel for these times is in the making. It may emerge any day. Any one of us may find it out from personal experience. (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 9)

At any given moment on a given day, each and every one of us are faced with a wide variety of situations, in which we have an opportunity to make a decision regarding our personal choice to lead. This decision has range and can appear to be a minor leading opportunity such as, “Would you like to teach the Sunday School class for fifth graders?” or it may appear to be a major opportunity: “Would you like to chair the finance committee for the board?” In either case, these present as opportunities for leadership. The choice then is internal and individually discerned. Despite pressure from external forces, an individual can make the decision not to take a leadership role. This does not suggest there is not the potential to lead or a current choice not to move in that direction. Various forces in an individual’s life create the internal drive toward decision. These forces include our experience as human beings in the world, our education, our upbringing, and our values. Internal forces finally
drive the individual to a point of decision. The concept that best encompassed this idea is referred to as the Catalytic Confluence. Following is an explanation regarding the choosing of these very particular words to create a concept that fit the data.

**Catalyst**

*Catalyst* is a term that originally comes from chemistry. In this science it refers to “a substance which changes the speed of a chemical reaction without itself suffering any permanent change” (Masterton & Slowinski, 1973, p. 384). Moving beyond chemistry, we can expand this term to relate it to a person that acts as the stimulus in bringing about or hastening an effect (Neufeldt & Guralnik, 1991). For the purposes of this theory it refers to the driving forces (stimulus) within each of our lives which come together at a given moment and force a decision (an effect) regarding leadership.

**Confluence**

This term usually pertains to water. Essentially it refers to the coming together of streams or a place where the streams join. If we extend this definition to its limits and understand that water is frequently used to symbolize the unconscious, it fits well to use the word *confluence* in this context. The moment (place) of the driving forces coming together is the confluence in the leadership decision-making process. This is based on an individual’s perception and is an internal process. In some ways it can be
seen as a moment of intersection between individuals’ perception of a situation, their experiences and values.

Together Catalytic Confluence creates a colorful metaphor for the process individuals undergo throughout life and their decision-making regarding leadership. Some may argue that not everyone goes through this process and that the catalytic confluence simply cannot be a universal human process. However, each of us is set upon a path in our lifetime that includes a variety of decisions. It would be virtually impossible to live without making decisions or having someone make them for us. The fact also that much of our decision making process is internal process is easily accepted. It is important to acknowledge that indecision is also decision and must be acknowledged as such. History is full of examples of those who chose not to make a decision and dealt with the consequences of that inaction. Inaction is not necessarily a negative. If Kennedy had not moved slowly with Castro and the Cuban missile crisis, our world might be vastly different than it is today. In the end, the lack of immediate reaction or choice was a positive one. Psychology, medicine, and history would show that individuals and the choices they make in life are a result of numerous influences and these influences come from our genetics, our environment, our learning, and our values. No two individuals can be considered identical in this realm. This can lend some explanation into why individuals faced with identical situations make different choices.
Theoretically, psychological need within the individual creates an "aroused tension state (a drive) that motivates an organism to satisfy the need" (Myers, 1998, G-4). Simply stated, these drives motivate the individual to respond. However, even in the naïve individual not all responses have the equal probability of occurrence. For each primary drive, there is an innately determined preferential order, which we have called the *innate hierarchy*. . . . Different strong stimuli have an innate tendency to elicit different responses. (Goldfried & Merbaum, 1973, p. 37)

This means that not all drives, beyond the primary driving forces for air, water, and food, are valued equally by all human beings or are processed in the same way. This can add further explanation to the choices individuals make regarding leadership in their own lives. If I do not value the same driving forces as my neighbor, I will likely not make the same decisions, even when faced with similar circumstances.

At some level the concept of Catalytic Confluence is existential in nature. Existentialism is an intellectual approach to life and the issues that surround life. From the existential perspective, we accept the premise that although our choices are restricted by external circumstances, we are the architects of our own lives and not merely the victims of it. In existential therapy, a client is challenged to find a range of alternatives from which to choose. According to Viktor Frankl, "The essence of being human lies in searching for meaning and purpose" (Corey, 1991, p. 172). In choosing for or against a leadership decision in one's life, one superimposes drives, life experience, and learning against that search for meaning and purpose. It is impossible to separate who we are and where we have come from, from our personal decision-
making process. It is equally impossible to avoid a leadership decision at some point in our lives.

Demand Morphism

The first concept that emerged from the data was Demand Morphism. Observation and interview suggested almost immediately the strong connection between leader and follower. However, it was stronger than just a connection. There appeared to be a role and responsibility the leader had in deference to the follower. Leader behavior, decision, and direction appeared to be in response to their followership. In response, the leader had to gain something positive from his/her perspective. If leaders did not gain some level of satisfaction or gratification from their role as leader they would likely not continue in their role or dramatically change courses. As the data flowed, it was clear that there was something deeper going on that was connected to the concept of Demand Morphism, yet it was not as easily or immediately defined. At some point much later in the research two other concepts emerged that were eventually merged into one more fully defined concept, which was defined as Symbiotic Mutualism. This concept is more clearly defined later in this chapter.

Demand Morphism is one-sided. It is the leader response in the leader/follower relationship. It explains the response of the leader to this constant shift from demand/need to need/demand between leader and follower. The leader is constantly gauging from his or her own internal perspective the level of need for the followers...
and the organization and the demands that are required as a result. At times, the need is secondary to the demands (which are less subtle and more forthright). These interactions are the essence of this process. Demand Morphism is the portion of this response from the leader's perspective. There must be some gain on the part of the leader or the leader will not morph to fill the need or demand of the follower. As the leader meets the demand of what is required by the followers in a given situation, and as the followers need change and create new demands, there must be the ability to ebb and flow with the state of flux. It requires flexibility on the part of the leader. This process on the part of the leader is Demand Morphism. It is literally the leader's adjustment mechanism. It is an internal process in the leader that is manifested externally by changes made to meet the needs of the follower and ultimately gain something positive from the leader's perspective. It is a constant reinforcing and ongoing process and it provides part of the motivation for the leader to continue his/her role.

There seemed to be some underlying connection to the basic laws of science with this concept. Something recalled from early days of science classes appeared to parallel this idea. It was with this in mind that some research into physics occurred and led to noting a parallel with Newton's Laws of Motion and this concept regarding leader behavior. Newton's Laws of Motion are defined as follows:
Law 1: “Every body persists in its state of rest or of uniform motion in a straight line unless it is compelled to change that state by forces impressed on it” (Halliday & Resnick, 1970, p. 63)

Law 2: Force = Mass X Acceleration — This formula represents Newton’s second law of motion. In this case,

\[ F = m \times a \]

\( F \) represents the sum of all forces acting on the body, \( m \) is the mass of the body and \( a \) is the acceleration. . . acceleration of the body is directly proportional to the resultant force acting on it and parallel in direction to this force and that acceleration, for a given force, is inversely proportional to the mass of the body. (Halliday & Resnick, 1970, p. 65)

Law 3: “To every action there is always opposed an equal reaction; or, the mutual actions of two bodies upon each other are always equal and directed to contrary parts” (Halliday & Resnick, 1970, p. 66).

It seemed curious that these ideas regarding intrinsic laws of motion “discovered” by Newton appeared to have a connection to the relationship of leader and follower. The result is a translation of Newton’s Laws of Motion to become the Laws of Demand Morphism as they relate to Transpersonal Leadership:

Law 1: Essentially the leader will make no changes and move in their own defined direction unless compelled by the followers to change direction or actions.

Law 2: The level of change and need to immediate change is directly proportional to the force of the follower’s need; low need requires gradual or small changes, large needs requires large or immediate change. Unlike Newton’s Law, time may be an element, because people are not merely objects and do not move at the same interpersonal rate as an object with force applied.
Law 3: The leader reacts with decision and movement, not stagnation or more need. Failure to act results in the usurpation of the leadership role or the death of the organization, which is an action of its own.

Time is an important element that needs to be considered with each of these suggested laws in order to have them make sense in regards to human beings and internal processes. Response is not always immediate when dealing with human beings as it is in physics. There can be a time element that is not considered in the same way as in science. A leader may not immediately respond to a force. Indecision needs to be added as a possible proportional response. As a point of clarification, using the word change in this metaphor might lead to some confusion with this illustration. Newton's Laws do not suggest that the thing that is in motion is in some way permanently changed. Instead the illustration is meant to be understood as the motion = change.

Another aspect of this process is the feeling of satisfaction or gratification that the leader must feel in order to meet the need or demands of his/her followers. If leading is a personally painful process or does not fit some ultimate need of the leader, he or she is likely to abandon this role. This gives some insight into the complexity to this process and how it is internally and personally driven.

David Boje (2000), in an article entitled "Theatrics of Leadership Theory," discusses the problem with present leadership theories—that they are one-dimensional. From a theatrics point of view in plays "we find highly complex characters who change their personality (traits) and actions (behavior strategy) from
one scene to the next (Boje, 2000). He goes on to explain that we can look at great playwrights like William Shakespeare to illustrate how often one-dimensional leaders fail to perform effectively. Examples of this can be found in such characters as King Lear, Richard II, or Mark Antony. Boje maintains that present day leadership theory expects its leaders to be heroes. These leadership theories then expect the heroes to engage in rational action. The problem with this is that if we “just focus on socially desirable, heroic qualities we end up telling fairly tales of leadership.” Boje understands the role to be much more complex.

He illustrates this with the play Tamara, (Boje, 1995), in which highly complex characters change personality and their actions from scene to scene. This is an illustration of how human beings adjust to changing demands and situations, in the same way leaders adjust their traits and behavior strategy to meet the need of the followers. This is a new way to think of leaders and their interactions: as highly complex and internally driven but externally developed processes.

Fiedler (1967) states that one of the few undisputed findings in leadership research is that effective leaders have the right qualities in the right place at the right time. In some ways this suggests that a situation occurs and along comes a leader that is perfect with all the qualities needed to be successful. Perhaps this is a simplistic perspective. Doesn’t it make better sense to suppose that a situation arises and an individual, perhaps already in some way connected, allows the skills and abilities he or she has to bloom in order to handle the problem? This allows for the complex nature of the human being to unfold. The same complex nature that reflects human nature
and allows all us to work effectively in a variety of situations can also take on a screenplay’s worth of roles. Simply stated, individuals morph to meet the demand based on the perception of the situation and what is needed. It is not unlike what each of us does in a given day in our dealings with other people and the world. In the same way, the leader must adapt to an ever-changing environment, body, and life. Failure to do so can mean the loss of valued things, or life. For the organization being led, it can be the difference between success and failure.

Machiavelli understood this thinking. In the _Prince_ he states:

A prince, therefore, being compelled knowingly to adopt the beast, ought to choose the fox and the lion; because the lion cannot defend himself against snares and the fox cannot defend himself against wolves. Therefore, it is necessary to be a fox to discover the snares and a lion to terrify the wolves. Those who rely simply on the lion do not understand what they are about. (Machiavellian, 1515)

Machiavelli was known for this treatise on leadership as well as his seven books on the _Art of War_ and seemed to have an understanding of the requirement of the leader to be able to change his nature based on the need. He goes on to say,

Therefore it is necessary for him to have a mind ready to turn itself accordingly as the winds and variations of fortune force it, yet, as I have said above, not to diverge from the good if he can avoid doing so, but, if compelled, then to know how to set about it. (Machiavellian, 1515, Chapter XVIII)

This supports the notion that the concept of Demand Morphism has been around for a very long time but had yet to be clearly conceptualized. In the same way, science understood there were germs that caused illness long before anyone put a concept to the underlying cause. In essence, _germs_ are conceptual thinking that describes a whole host of bacteria and viruses that cause illness. They were around
long before Louis Pasteur discovered them; he merely proved their existence. This research has suggested the same premise.

Symbiotic Mutualism

Symbiotic Mutualism emerged as an elaboration of the concept of Demand Morphism. Initially, it was thought that this was part of the concept of Demand Morphism, but with further interviews and sorting, this concept differentiated itself. Clearly, it is vitally connected to Demand Morphism as it is part of the phenomenon that occurs as a result of the relationship between leaders and followers. The two concepts are different in that Demand Morphism is about the internal driving force of the leader and his/her work to meet the needs of the follower. It contains a self-serving component. It was clear from the data that there was something else going on that was far more interactive between leader and follower and was not just about the satisfaction of the leader. It had yet to be clearly differentiated.

Although the concept of Symbiotic Mutualism surrounded the data, it took some time to flesh this piece out and understand the differences from Demand Morphism. It required hours of going back and forth over the interviews and memos and communicating with various respondents several times before the terminology began to look appropriate. In the end, it was biology that came to the rescue.

It was clear that a relationship between leader and follower required a connection and that connection had some benefit to leader as well as the follower. Immediately a chapter in animal biology came to mind and led to research regarding...
the various types of relationships among organisms. Moving beyond basic biology led to research regarding population ecology. "Ecology is the study of all those complex interactions referred to by Darwin as the condition of the struggle for existence" (Haeckel, 1870).

Within this science the concept of symbiosis appeared to make sense. Symbiosis can very simply mean living together, but if the definition is narrowed, it can suggest two species deriving mutual benefit from the association (McGill University, 2003). This association can have a wide range. It includes the concepts of phoresis, using the larger organism as a transport host as in whales and pilot fish; commensalism, in which the association is neither harmful or beneficial but exists as a sharing of space, substrate, defense, shelter, transport, or food such as rattlesnakes and bears sharing the same winter hibernation caves; or mutualism, in which the association creates mutual benefit to both organisms (McGill University, 2003).

In mutualism the associations are very intimate and obligatory; the organisms simply cannot survive without one another. In keeping with the idea of leadership failing to exist without followership, this appeared to be a good fit. The joining of the two concepts together made sense within the realm of a new theory that would not reference biology or ecology but pertain to the interaction and association of human beings within the context of the leader/follower relationship. The concept Symbiotic Mutualism was born.

In conceptualizing Symbiotic Mutualism, leaders that were interviewed talked about the nature of the interaction that existed between themselves and their
followers. There was a constant ebb and flow that appeared to take place as the relationship continued. How the leaders reacted, how they proceeded with their plans, or what decisions they made on a day-to-day basis appears to depend on the reaction from the followers. A negative reaction causes some discomfort on the part of the leader and might require an adjustment or change of course. There had to be a reinforcement for the leader to motivate him/her to continue on their present course or role or to move with more force in that direction. This reinforcement might occur as ego satisfaction, praise from the leader’s superior, or praise from one’s followers. In the same way, a negative reaction from followers would cause a response from the leader. Where Symbiotic Mutualism differed from Demand Morphism is that in Demand Morphism we are considering only the leader’s response. In Symbiotic Mutualism we are suggesting that reaction and behavior of both was so interconnected that one simply could not exist without the other—similar ideas but more fully expanded parts of a whole.

If there was only negative response, lack of support or enthusiasm, the leader was far less likely to proceed on the same path or direction as previously planned. Conversely, positive reinforcement appears to be a necessary for the leader to continue leading the plan as designed or to accelerate it. An illustration of Symbiotic Mutualism can be visualized as two connected tanks of water. This suggests the relationship between leader and follower. Within each tank is a line that represents the optimal level or equilibrium for the two tanks. As we pour liquid into the first tank (followers), there is an reaction in the second tank (leader). The same is true when
reduce the amount of liquid in one of the two connected vessels. This presents the
process of cooperation required in the leader/follower relationship. If we consider
these vessels in an environment in which at any time the amount of liquid might be
changed by rain or snow, or reduced due to sun or evaporation, we have a sense of
the constant change that occurs in the leader/follower relationship and some insight
into the complexities of the relationship. Adam Smith appeared to have exposed a
sense of this concept in his Wealth of Nations.

When an animal wants to obtain something either of a man or of another
animal, it has no other means of persuasion but to gain the favour of those
whose service it requires, a puppy fawns upon its dam and a spaniel endeavors
by a thousand attarations to engage the attention of its master who is at dinner,
when it wants to be fed by him. Man sometimes uses the same arts with his
brethren, and when he has no other means of engaging them to act according
to his inclinations, endeavors by every servile and fawning attention to obtain
their good will. He has not time, however, to do this upon every occasion. In
civilized society he stands at all time in need of the co-operation and
assistance of great multitudes, while his whole life is scarce sufficient to gain
the friendship of a few persons. In almost every other race of animals each
individual, when it is grown up to maturity, is entirely independent, and in its
natural state has occasion for the assistance of no other living creature. But
man has almost constant occasion for the help of his brethren, and it is more
likely to prevail if he can interest their self-love in his favour, and show them
that it is for their own advantage to do for him what he requires of them.
(Cannan, 1937, p. 14)

Smith appears to negate the idea of negative leadership and considers only the
good will of the followers and leader to one another in their interactions. He forgets
to consider the coercion aspect of leadership and leadership which is evil in its nature
and yet still manages to illicit the support of followers. However, he uncovers the gist
of the premise of Symbiotic Mutualism, and in doing so lends credence to the
direction of this core variable as being appropriately situated within the theory
construct. This suggests once again that at some level nothing new is ever created; we just keep rethinking old concepts.

Creating Theory

Once these concepts were expanded and understood based on the data, it was necessary to fit all the pieces together in the form of theory. How to fit the pieces together and how to name the theory in a way to fit the specific context of the concept became a challenge. In some way, the naming of a theory has context to the researcher’s perspective, knowledge, values, and ideas. Looking at the word *life* and trying to define it offers some insight into the challenge of naming this new theory and providing the appropriate expression yet remaining conceptual in essence.

If we try to define life, it would largely depend on one’s experience, education, theoretical and cultural orientation. To medical science, life is a biological function and has defined lines of demarcation. To the religious leader, life has a spiritual component, and one who does not believe in God may be considered without a spiritual life. Within the context of the social scientist, an individual who lives in isolation as a hermit would lack a political life. The cultural elite living in cities like New York and Paris would likely consider many of the rest of us without cultural life.

Looking at life from this perspective does not take into account questions that include quality of life, when life begins, and how Eastern cultures define life. So defining the word *life* universally becomes a challenge. In the same way, the study of leadership presented many of these kinds of challenges. The study defined concepts
that were specific to a context, yet the resulting theory had a more universal appeal. This is precisely why the term *transpersonal leadership* fits both context and general applicability.

The Theory of Transpersonal Leadership is another link in the line of process theories that have evolved regarding leadership. It provides insight into the internal forces working within the individual that drive him/her toward leadership, which is something that has been rarely or fully explored. Also, it provides some explanation into the relationship of leaders and followers. This area has often been researched but rarely from the point of interpersonal connection. This theory is about the people that live leadership. It not a sterile compilation of statistical information providing us with a proof for or against a null hypothesis. It is rich and alive and open to amendment. It is available for comment and discussion. It is ready to be tested and expanded.

The Theory of Transpersonal Leadership

Transpersonal Leadership falls into the category of a process theory. This process underlines the unconscious forces within the individual that drives us toward decisions in our life that require leadership. The coming together of various forces and drives in our life that move toward decision making regarding leadership represents a moment in time. This moment is known as the Catalytic Confluence.

With the choice to lead, a relationship is assumed between leader and follower. The one does not exist without the other. In the case of the relationship of the leader to the follower, there is a demand/need—need/demand that is constantly
shifting back and forth. Ultimately, the leader responds to the needs of the follower and matches his/her orientation, response, or style to a level that allows or creates a level of gratification for the self and provides a response that is satisfactory to the follower. Without this gratification, the leader is unlikely to continue in his/her role.

In the choice to lead there exists a relationship between leader and follower that is intrinsic and vital in its nature. One fails to exist without the other. This relationship is based on a process of reciprocal reinforcement of the action, response and behavior of the two. This ebb and flow in the leader/follower relationship is known as Symbiotic Mutualism.

These three concepts together provide insight into the leader/follower relationship and into the practical application of leadership and its exercise.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Theory of Transpersonal Leadership provides a snapshot of thoughts and ideas regarding leadership that were specifically guided by the data collected from interviews in the field. If some other kind of research methodology besides grounded theory had been used to analyze this data, this study might just end here. However, grounded theory provides a conceptual view of the data, and concepts, unlike other sorts of data, have a much longer shelf life.

The true treasure of grounded theory is that the resulting emergent theory often produces concepts that are applicable to various other fields and disciplines. This is undoubtedly true when we consider leadership from a conceptual perspective, since as a phenomenon it can be found in every field, country, religion, social group, government, or group of gathered individuals. The concepts of Catalytic Confluence, Demand Morphism, and Symbiotic Mutualism, which are uniquely defined by this research, have generalizability beyond the life of the individuals interviewed. As an example, Catalytic Confluence can be easily superimposed upon thoughts associated with a spiritual or religious transformation. Demand Morphism has attributes that apply to the parent–child relationship and Symbiotic Mutualism, the intricacies of any interpersonal relationship, especially a relationship of intimate partners.
Opening these concepts to broader implications suggests that there is more research that might springboard from these concepts. Obviously, further research on leadership itself is applicable. These concepts may be decidedly Western in their disposition. Only further research can indicate whether these concepts would play out in a culture vastly different from our own. One area of further research would be to perform the same data collection and analysis in an Eastern culture. With China fast becoming one of the great economic powers of the future and perhaps the next superpower, such research would provide insight into Chinese concepts of leadership. Understanding and knowing where there are differences or similarities in our thinking as nations may provide insight on how to work and co-exist harmoniously.

A quantitative study may also be indicated as a result of this research. A survey, based on the concepts in this study of various groups of public leaders, would provide great insight into the reasons why individuals have chosen to lead. For each individual, understanding and defining the Catalytic Confluence that brought them to the point of leading would be beneficial information. Survey data, based on conceptual ideas discovered in this research, would also allow insight into what leaders understand regarding their role and responsibilities with respect to followers. Such research may expand the concepts of Demand Morphism and Symbiotic Mutualism. In the field of public administration, this could provide an important piece of information for governments, organizations, and universities trying to attract individuals in public administration training programs, and as future leaders. Surveyed, this information could be quantitatively analyzed to ascertain if there is any
statistically significance to these experiences, and if so, aid in directing future leadership education and recruitment of individuals into all kinds of leadership positions.

Finally, there are implications that are transpersonal. One individual reading this research stated, "Your research affirmed to me that I am still a leader even though I choose right now, not to take a leadership role, it doesn't mean I am not a leader, there is power in that choice" (R. Chandler, personal communication, September 23, 2003). Understanding and clarifying the internal catalyst that drives individual leadership decisions is psychologically empowering. It also affirms individuals in ways they may have previously denied. For example, when mothers were interviewed, they rebuffed the idea of the leader label, yet this research would grant such entitlement.

Transpersonal refers to development beyond average. According to Bruce Scotton, a psychiatrist and Jungian analyst, such higher functioning is much more common than originally thought (Scotton et al., 1996, p. 3). The development of leadership within the individual from the transpersonal approach fits in that it suggests development beyond an individual’s ego and beyond the concerns of the self. One example of this approach would be individuals who prescribe to Dr. Martin Luther King’s nonviolent revolution in regard to social justice and risk their lives in the pursuit of higher values. These larger goals thus transcend the importance of personal survival for the sake of the greater good. This level of functioning in human
consciousness is “potentially available in all cultures with widely varying content and context” (Scotten et al., 1996, p. 4).

The Theory of Transpersonal Leadership opens the role of leader to each and every one of us. It allows the role to be expanded and individuals to see the internal decision-making process that goes on in each of us as we are faced with various potentials to lead in our life. It suggests that the choice to lead is a decision for the greater good over the individual good. Considering the demands of followers (Demand Morphism) and working on a mutual relationship (Symbiotic Mutualism) that is beneficial to both leader and follower enriches and continues to drive this experience in the transpersonal realm.

Choosing at any given moment not to lead does not mean one is not a leader; it merely indicates that one chooses not to exercise that role at the present time. This is far different from suggesting that only a few, privileged individuals have the ability to lead. In its essence, it is a choice to move to the next phase of interpersonal development in our lives. This allows us to move forward in Maslow’s hierarchy. Comparably, it is no different from holding within our genetic code a gene that might have a predisposition to heart disease but to take such good care of oneself that the gene never manifests. The leadership gene is within all of us. Whether it manifests itself is a choice we each must make.

This leads to a discussion regarding the pragmatic nature of the Theory of Transpersonal Leadership. Pragmatism is a term first coined by Charles Sander Pierce during a course of meetings at the Metaphysical Club, an informal group that met in
the early 1870s (James, 1907, p. xii). Pragmatism is the view that the “meaning and value of a thought lie in its practical consequences” (James, 1907, xii). James himself credits the forerunners of pragmatism to the early philosophies of Socrates and Aristotle who were known to test their theories against ordinary experience. James saw pragmatism as a “new name for some old ways of thinking” (p. xii).

*Pragmatism* is a word that has been overused today and can be seen in nearly every field imaginable. It has come to be understood as a compromise of values and principles, which is far different from the essence of its true philosophical foundation. James suggested pragmatism as an alternative to essentialism and foundationalism (James, 1907, ix). He suggests two distinct views of pragmatism. In one notion, the pragmatic method is a way to find solutions to metaphysical dilemmas by comparing the practical consequences that result from adopting the alternative perspective. It is not a way to propose new metaphysical concepts but to prove old ones. Secondly, pragmatism is a theory of truth with verification. Truth in this way is a belief that can be made consistent with both existing beliefs and new experience. This final statement seems to hold promise for the pragmatic nature of the Theory of Transpersonal Leadership. This theory has its roots in various disciplines and fields and is a new approach to the combination of old ideas.

One would have to ask the following questions to test this theory from the pragmatic perspective. Is the Catalytic Confluence regarding interpersonal choice a far more logical interpretation of how leaders emerge? Is it not more likely that each of us have the ability to lead as part of our human make-up than to think that only a
few individuals are bestowed this ability? Or is it only if the right situation occurs and the right person happens to be present that leadership will occur? Let us consider the following as an analogy: does it fit more effectively with our current beliefs about human nature to believe that we are all born with the capacity to show kindness and to be humane? Yet, individuals choose to be cruel and inhumane. It makes greater sense to believe that a whole deluge of things in individuals' lives come together in a moment in which they chooses either kindness or cruelty as their way of dealing with the world and that this is an internal and individual decision. Otherwise we must believe that some people are just born mean and cruel and it is part of their internal make-up from birth.

This fits for transpersonal leadership and it is possible to suggest the same sort of thoughts regarding each of the concepts. Leaders must pay some attention to the demands of their leaders or they lose their followers. Even if leadership has a negative perspective and the followers are caroused or enslaved, the leader who does not pay attention to the demands of followers will have them die off or escape at their first opportunity. The result is no one left to lead. Having no followers defies the very definition of leadership.

Serendipitously, William James is also considered the father of modern transpersonal psychology and psychiatry. He is actually the first to use the term transpersonal and is considered a pioneer in parapsychology. (Scotten et al., 1996, p. 21). James suggested that psychology was a scientific study of mental states and that thoughts warmed by emotions flow like a giant river (Scotten et al., 1996, p. 23).
This provides a similar metaphor to the understanding of the Catalytic Confluence. Like a river, gathering up the experiences, education, development, and thoughts of the individual, it takes in and leaves behind parts of its self along the path, which eventually ends in a gulf or some other larger body of water—that gulf being the decision to lead. The termination of the river to a larger body of water describes the ending of the individual’s ego that needs to become part of the greater needs of the group.

The Theory of Transpersonal Leadership in many ways is a springboard. Although the concepts defined in this research have what Dr. Glaser refers to as grab, the expanding of this theory is of great personal interest to this researcher. The combining of theories and concepts regarding leadership with a transpersonal approach is an evolution in the line of leadership theories. It is also suggests a personal evolution. It is one more way to move forward in our own development as human beings with an interconnectiveness with our neighborhoods, our communities, and, ultimately, the world at large.
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