

Transactional, Transformational, And Transcendent Leadership: Metaphors Mapping The Evolution Of The Theory And Practice Of Governance

By **John Jacob Gardiner**, Professor of Leadership, Seattle University

Academic Citation: John Jacob Gardiner, “Transactional, Transformational, and Transcendent Leadership: Metaphors Mapping The Evolution Of The Theory And Practice Of Governance,” Kravis Leadership Institute *Leadership Review*, Vol. 6, 2006. pp. 62-76.

About the Author: **John Jacob Gardiner** is a professor of leadership at Seattle University. John served on the Board of the International Leadership Association (ILA) and on the Board of its founding association, the Center for the Advanced Study of Leadership at the University of Maryland-College Park. John chaired ILA’s 2002 Global Conference. His research focuses on leadership, governance, renewal, and emerging organizational forms. E-mail: gardiner@seattleu.edu.

Keywords: governance, metaphor, transactional, transformational, transcendent leadership

ABSTRACT

Shared governance is a process of making decisions that involves broad participation of diverse groups. The metaphors of transactional, transformational, and transcendent leadership provide a map to understanding the evolution of theory and practice of governance. These metaphors, seen as a continuum, offer a tool for the analysis of the theory and practice of shared governance as defined by its six major characteristics: a climate of trust; information sharing; meaningful participation; collective decision making; protecting divergent views; and redefining roles. The prevailing model of governance that sets the leader apart from the rest of the organization must be challenged if true shared governance is to emerge. We must move from decision making by a leader to one by a leadership circle and, beyond, to leadership by the collective will ... from transactional, to transformational, to transcendent governance.

“Higher education needs new metaphors, metaphors so beautifully in keeping with the times that they succeed in getting us all to rise and rededicate ourselves once more to fulfilling our society’s highest hopes” (Plante, 1990, p. 31).

Governance is the art of making decisions. Increasingly, governance is viewed as a shared process involving broad participation of many diverse groups. The metaphors of transactional, transformational, and transcendent leadership provide a map to understanding the evolution of theory and practice of governance.

Transactional, Transformational, and Transcendent Leadership

Transactional leadership, in which an exchange takes place between leader and follower, represents the traditional influence model found within most human groups. Bass (1990, v), who dedicated his handbook to the late John W. Gardner as scholar, leader, and public servant, wrote extensively about transactional leadership. Like Gardner, however, Bass' later writings and work focused more on Burns' (1978, p. 462) transforming leadership, now called transformational leadership, which was ennobling, "lifting people into their better selves." "The result of transforming leadership," Burns (p. 4) asserted, "is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents." It was this leadership that Bass' (1990, 1997) other writings emphasized, as it was this leadership that John W. Gardner embodied.

Other writers contributing to the syntheses and understandings of both transactional and transformational leadership included Gary Yukl (1998) who offered a unique perspective on the behaviors of transactional and transformational leadership. "Bass," Yukl (p. 325) noted, "views transformational and transactional leadership as distinct but not mutually exclusive processes, and he recognizes that the same leader may use both types of leadership at different times in different situations." It is as if situational leadership, which called for different responses under different circumstances, was proving to be the integrating construct of the status quo – merging the behaviors of transactional and transformational leadership into the best combination for specific situations. Hershey, Blanchard, and Johnson's (1996) use of situational leadership offered a good synthesis of the theory and practice of this pragmatic solution to dual leadership frames and is widely employed today by leadership scholars and practitioners. Hershey, Blanchard, and Johnson's emphasis on task and relationship – and the leader's use of each determined by situation - appealed to American pragmatists. Much earlier, Chester Barnard (1938) had suggested a similar balance between effectiveness (task) and efficiency (relationship). Focus on that balance has dominated leadership theory and practice for nearly a century. Its close alignment with the dominant American philosophy of pragmatism helped assure the ongoing primacy of situational leadership.

Albert Einstein once said that a problem could never be solved at the same level of consciousness that created it. A new leadership frame, transcendent leadership, has emerged with greater focus during the past several years. Possibly, David Bohm (1980), Robert K. Greenleaf (1977), and Mohandas K. Gandhi/ Jean Monnet (Gardner, 1995, pp. 268-284), among others, inspired the formation of this new metaphor of leadership. Diane Larkin, a doctoral dissertation advisee, was the first to coin the word "transcendent leadership" to describe a special leadership she observed among leaders who transcended self into compassionate being and action (1995). Since then, other writers including Lisa June Aldon (2004) have written about such related matters as transcendent leadership and the evolution of consciousness.

Erik Erikson (1969, p. 413), writing about Mohandas K. Gandhi noted, "Truth in Gandhi's sense points to the next step in man's realization of man as one all-human species, and thus to our only chance *to transcend* what we are." Regarding Gandhi and the leverage of truth, Erikson emphasized, " If we add that man must learn to face himself

as he faces others, we imply that so far in history he has made every effort not to see that mankind is one species” (p. 431). *It is this ability to lead from a consciousness of wholeness, modeled by Gandhi, that most distinguishes the transcendent leader.* Arun Gandhi, grandson of the Mahatma and a great force for peace himself, suggested that this is the meaning of peace: “if we have found peace in our lives it is useless keeping it for ourselves in our heart. It will perish with us. But if we allow it to interact with all the elements then we can spread peace all over the world” (Gandhi, 2003, p.11). It is all about an ability to lead from a place of wholeness, from a consciousness of service above self.

Speaking about this wholeness to Joe Jaworski (1996, pp. 81-82), David Bohm (1980) explained: “Yourself is actually the whole of mankind... The past is enfolded in each of us in a very subtle way. If you reach deeply enough into yourself, you are reaching into the very essence of mankind. When you do this, you will be led into the generating depth of consciousness that is common to the whole of mankind and that has the whole of mankind enfolded into it. The individual’s ability to be sensitive to that becomes the key to the change of mankind. *We are all connected. If this could be taught, and if people could understand it, we would have a different consciousness.*”

The transcendent leader would be centered in this metaphysical truth and then teach others to live within its perspective. The leader would be reflective, value- centered, global in perspective and a facilitator of dialogue, a process David Bohm promoted for accessing the implicate order. The leader would respond to John W. Gardner’s challenge to win “an oddly self-destructive conflict, the parts waging war against the whole” (1990, p. 95) that apparently still dominates our world stage today. The leader would be “a quiet presence,” “fully present, being open in mind and body and heart, listening unconditionally, modeling the new leadership that places service above self” (Gardner, 1998, p.124).

Dialogue, this core interactive process used by the transcendent leader, was described by David Bohm as being ancient, yet new, to modern man “From time to time, (the) tribe (gathered) in a circle. They just talked and talked and talked, apparently to no purpose. They made no decisions. There was no leader. And everyone could participate. There may have been wise men or wise women who were listened to a bit more – the older ones – but everyone could talk. The meeting went on, until it finally seemed to stop for no reason at all and the group dispersed. Yet after that, everyone seemed to know what to do, because they understood each other so well. Then they could get together in smaller groups and do something or decide things.” (Jaworski, 1996, p. 107).

The transcendent leader would embody this collective consciousness, as best he or she could, then encourage others to enter its shores of understanding through the process of dialogue. Dialogue would provide the tool for what John W. Gardner called “renewing the moral order” (1963, p.127). As Gardner noted, “*In the ever renewing society what matures is a system or framework within which continuous innovation, renewal, and rebirth can occur*” (p. 5). Dialogue could provide such a system to help the transcendent leader invite others into a consciousness of the whole.

In Howard Gardner's creative study of leadership seen through the eyes of a cognitive psychologist, he concluded with a section about Mohandas Gandhi and Jean Monnet as leaders "beyond national boundaries" (1995, pp. 267- 284). "Jean Monnet (1888-1979) and Mohandas K. Gandhi (1869-1948) devoted their lives to the creation of forms that did not respect national boundaries. Monnet was interested primarily in international governmental forms; Gandhi, in direct relations among human beings the world over" (p. 268). "For both Monnet and Gandhi," Howard Gardner emphasized, "in the deepest sense, their methods were their message" (p. 278). Gandhi and Monnet serve as excellent models of the emergent transcendent leader – focused on horizons unseen as yet by most of the world's people. Their success, Gardner speculated, came from "their steadfast concentration on the same core message, along with flexibility in how it is presented, and openness to the message being apprehended at a number of levels of sophistication" (p. 292). This description serves as excellent advice for practitioners of transcendent leadership.

Robert K. Greenleaf (1977) promoted a related metaphor of *servant leader* describing the leader who was servant first. Greenleaf's metaphor inspired and is aligned with the metaphor of transcendent leader – different only in emphasis. Both metaphors point to a movement away from an emphasis on interdependence to one on wholeness; both embody the emergent consciousness of "quiet presence" (Gardiner, 1998, pp. 116-125).

Brian Hall in his book on *Values shift: A guide to personal and organizational transformation* offered useful schema related to the stages of human development – personal and organizational, grounded in a comprehensive research effort conducted worldwide (1994). Hall's studies on how values shape consciousness offer a framework for future research toward developing a cogent, operational definition of transcendent leadership. Hall's developmental cycles correspond to an evolutionary process from transactional, to transformational, to transcendent leadership. Hall's concept of the values gap lends deep understanding to the challenges facing all leaders – but, particularly, to those facing transcendent leaders. These cycles and the values gap help develop our understandings of the evolution of governance via the metaphors of transactional, transformational, and transcendent leadership.

Governance as the Process of Decision-Making

As noted earlier, governance is the art of making decisions. Increasingly, leaders worldwide are viewing governance as a shared process, one that involves the broad participation of many diverse groups. Renewing the metaphorical infrastructure to deal with the increased complexity of problems and the greater need for a broader ownership on the part of participants will involve new language and new thinking; it will involve a new level of consciousness regarding the leader's role in the governance process.

The fact that the rhetoric of shared governance has outpaced the reality is no surprise; not many decades ago, we did not even have the rhetoric. What are the characteristics of

shared governance? Venable and Gardiner (1988) identified six characteristics of shared governance which must be honored to assure an authentic shared governance process:

- 1) *a climate of trust* (integrity, consistency between words and deeds);
- 2) *information sharing* (disclosure of data necessary for decision making);
- 3) *meaningful participation* (broad involvement in all aspects of decision making and planning);
- 4) *collective decision making* (moving toward group consent);
- 5) *protecting divergent views* (valuing, nurturing alternative perspectives); and
- 6) *redefining roles* (all members are leaders).

This last characteristic is important in the context of interdependence and/or wholeness since in a transformational/transcendent organization, all members must be viewed as leaders. The tasks of the group are shared by all; therefore, all are leaders regarding some group goals and objectives. As John W. Gardner cautioned, “The larger topic of which leadership is a subtopic is *the accomplishment of group purpose*” (1990, p. xii). A change in the nature of human interactions will be needed in order for a true transformation in shared governance to take place. Possibly, some of the early stages of such organizational transformation and renewal are taking place within the nonprofit organizational sector of our society.

Peter Drucker (1990) declared the primacy of nonprofit organizations as leaders of organizational transformation with important lessons for all. “In two areas, strategy and effectiveness of the board, they are practicing what most American businesses only preach. And in the most crucial area – the motivation and productivity of knowledge workers – they are truly pioneers, working out of policies and practices that business will have to learn tomorrow ... The nonprofits ... are forging new bonds of community, a new commitment to active citizenship, to social responsibilities, to values” (pp. 23, 44).

Nonprofit organizations are winning the hearts of workers and thus offering insight regarding the nature of the change required to transform shared governance in all organizations: *well-defined missions, functioning/ empathic boards, trained volunteers, and value-centered communities of learners*. In related research regarding worldwide leadership in Rotary International, the author found this alignment most apparent in the emerging roles and responsibilities of the new district governor – once “sovereign” now “steward” (Gardiner, 2002). The nonprofit sector was leading the world with new metaphors of being and doing.

Metaphors as Tools of Analysis

Lakoff and Johnson asserted in their book, *Metaphors we live by*, that “our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of what we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature” (1980, p. 3). The “essence” of a metaphor, they noted, “is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” (p. 5). Later, they concluded that “Metaphors create realities for us, especially social realities ... In this sense metaphors can be self-fulfilling prophecies...*The metaphor was not merely a way of viewing reality; it constituted a license for policy change and political and economic action*” (p. 156).

The authors continued: “Political and economic ideologies are framed in metaphorical terms...A metaphor in a political or economic system, by virtue of what it hides, can lead to human degradation...Consider one example: LABOR IS A RESOURCE.... What is hidden by the metaphor is the nature of the labor. No distinction is made between meaningful labor and dehumanizing labor...For all labor statistics, there are none on *meaningful* labor...The blind acceptance of the metaphor can hide degrading realities, whether meaningless blue-collar and white-collar industrial jobs in ‘advanced’ societies or virtual slavery around the world” (pp. 236-237). Metaphors are tools which must be used with great care and intention; they can be powerful instruments for good or for evil.

The metaphor of relationship as an alternative to individual and group, or as an alternative to leader and community, offers great promise in the process of restructuring our consciousness for higher levels of shared governance (Bergman & Surrey, 1993; Gardiner, 1995). We must move beyond our individualistic, mechanistic understandings of leadership to ones that recognize the unity of all life. We must create organizations that model new approaches to human relationships and interactions, to organizational structure, and to collective decision making. The future of our planet depends on increasing the level of authentic communication and authentic relationship among human beings. A new leadership paradigm must be created that focuses on the weaving of human relationships, that brings down the artificial walls that separate people from each other. The new organization can no longer be defined by the sum of its individual actions, rather it must be defined by the quality of its collective interactions. Plato noted long ago that “the desire and pursuit of the whole is love.” The new leader models these loving understandings in the relationships that underlie shared governance.

Another metaphor of great significance for the emerging collective vision is that of the *leadership circle* (Gardiner, 1995, 2001). The leadership *team* models an old competitive frame in a universe of scarcity. The leadership *circle* emphasizes the reality of relational contexts. Circles are cooperative and focus on abundance and possibility. Circles promote life, discipline, and sacrifice for the common good. In dysfunctional organizations, circles help people to heal themselves; circles promote standing up to structures that are oppressing people. Circles remind us of our interconnectedness and the great energy that comes from weaving our stories together. The leadership circle is proposed as a useful metaphor for the decision making nexus of the emerging world society – more cooperative than competitive. The leadership circle moves us from a metaphor of war to one of peace. *Metaphors structure our reality ... and serve to move us into preferred realities.* The leadership circle is a metaphor that can help in the great global transformation toward true shared governance.

One of the great metaphors of our time is *the particle-wave metaphor* of quantum physics. The basic building blocks of the physical world, it was discovered, behave in some situations like particles and in other situations as waves. As Robert Gilman suggested, “Might we humans also, in some mysterious way, have both particle-like individuality and wave-like shared beingness and interconnectedness?” (1993, p. 11). Noting that we are interconnected in profound ways, Gilman explains the nature of the crisis. “Philosophically, interconnectedness stands in opposition to separateness – the idea that we are each isolated, sovereign, and self-contained. Since most of the distinctive institutions of western civilization – materialistic science, market economics, our legal system, the Bill of Rights – are based on the assumption that the world is composed of discrete units, the idea of interconnectedness rattles the foundations of our whole society” (pp. 11-12).

The essential nature of matter, we are taught by the particle-wave metaphor, lies in its interconnections; a web of relationships is the essence of all living things.

Gareth Morgan (1986), in *Images of Organizations*, suggested two other powerful metaphors that should be considered in viewing organizations in the context of emergent leadership: *organizations as organisms* and *organizations as brains* (pp. 39-109). Both metaphors emerge from the discipline of biology. Organizations as organisms offered an emphasis on the need for functional integration; organizations as brains offered an emphasis on organizational learning and capacities for self organization. With the dual metaphors of humanity as nervous system and our home planet as global brain, the emphasis on wholeness and integration becomes more evident. “Learning and self-organization generally call for a reframing of attitudes, emphasizing the importance of activeness over passiveness, autonomy over dependence, flexibility over rigidity, collaboration over competition, openness over closedness, and democracy over authoritarian belief” (p. 109).

Values may be found at the heart of all human enterprise. As noted earlier, Brian Hall’s (1994 , p. 160) work on *Values shift: A guide to personal and organizational transformation* offered a useful context for our consideration of governance and the metaphors of transactional, transformational, and transcendent leadership. Under Hall’s schema, there exist seven cycles of organizational development with their core values and related leadership styles: 1) safety/ security (dictator); 2) security/ family (benevolent); 3) family/ institution (manager); 4) institution/ vocation (enabler as mentor); 5) vocation/ new order (collaborator); 6) new order/ wisdom (servant); and 7) wisdom/ world order (prophetic/ visionary). As Hall noted, “The first three cycles are various forms of autocratic leadership and are all characterized by a leader-follower format, with management governing through carefully designed hierarchical structures in order to achieve efficient institutional functioning” (p. 165). These first three cycles correspond to transactional leadership. Cycle four, according to Hall, is a transitional cycle moving toward the collaborative model. Cycles five and six represent the collaborative model and correspond to transformational leadership. Cycles six and seven emphasize servant and prophetic leadership and correspond most closely to transcendent leadership “with wise

and internationally prophetic leaders enabling others to lead globally and collaboratively, enhancing the declared values of the system....The value system at this level is concerned about its positive global impact on people, societies, and the environment... Leaders at this level are able to plan at least 50 years into the future” (pp. 165, 184).

Hall’s (1994) research offered a schema based on comprehensive, global data collection and analysis that could record the “values shift” between these seven cycles and thus offer a paradigm to consider the transition between transactional, transformational, and transcendent leadership, as well as a lens to consider the transitions within the evolving theory and practice of governance.

Hall (1994, pp. 13-14) offered an example of this values shift in the Roman Catholic Church in the form of a council of bishops: Vatican II. “Until the 1960s the Catholic Church was the largest, most efficient hierarchy the world had known. It was the ultimate mechanical Newtonian organizational system. Vatican II led by Pope John XXIII altered the mindset of the whole Catholic Church overnight. Since the fourth century the Mass had been celebrated by the priest, who stood in front of the altar with his back to the congregation – a very clear and intentional hierarchical structure. The council declared that the priest should now stand behind the altar facing the people. This simple symbolic but archetypal change altered the relationship of the church and its leadership to the people. Leadership was now collaborative and participative in a new relational arrangement. A shock wave went through the church-700 million members! ... The church was ahead of its time in experiencing a massive shift in its way of viewing the world – the Values Shift had begun. Since that time, practically all the leading institutions in society have begun to deal with the same issues of human equality and emancipation....At the heart of the Values Shift is the idea that *values can be chosen consciously and measured, and can become a tool that allows us to choose a new set of futures, rather than live our lives under some other person’s directive.*”

These schema offered by Hall prove to be a useful tool of analysis to consider the evolution of theory and practice of governance through use of the metaphors of transactional (cycles 1-4), transformational (cycles 4-6), and transcendent (cycles 6-7) leadership.

A Crisis of Governance

Corporate governance structures have traditionally been “a private matter between shareholders and managers with some state law restrictions, but the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOA) has made structures governing the conduct of the corporation a matter of federal law. Even the adoption of a code of ethics ... is now a requirement under the SOA ... To regain the confidence of the financial markets a revolutionary approach to corporate governance is needed” (Tipgos & Keefe, p. 1). As the authors noted, “The systemic problems at companies such as Enron, WorldCom, and Tyco International arose because of an imbalance of power in favor of top management in corporate organizations ... At the core of restructuring corporate governance is empowerment at all levels – shareholders, the board, top management, and the employees ... The best guarantee will

come from a reengineered corporate structure predicated on checks and balances whose constituent parts adopt the qualities of truth, honesty, and integrity of financial reports as part of their shared vision” (pp. 2-6). Maximum profit for shareholders as the overriding purpose of business would have to incorporate personal honesty and social responsibility as guidelines; boards of trustees would need to model trust, personal and social responsibility, not simply be rubber stamps for management actions.

The issue of trust in governance is an important topic for future research. “The issue of trust, or more accurately mistrust, transcends level of authority in the discussion of higher education governance ... ‘efficient’ organizations are built on trust” (De Boer, 2002, p.292). “In times of uncertainty, unpredictability, insecurity, trust is needed but scarce” (p.294). A lack of trust will lead to serious problems by trustees such as exorbitant micromanagement and excessive dependence on rules and regulations. Trust, on the other hand, “facilitates stability, cooperation, and cohesion” (p. 48). Thomas Friedman (2005, p. 45) noted that “everywhere you turn, hierarchies are being challenged from below or transforming themselves from top-down structures into more horizontal and collaborative ones.” Possibly, these global convergences, described by Friedman, will encourage movement toward increased trust and increased collaboration (2005).

In this time of crisis, focus remains on the ills of our current governance structure with its imbalance of power in favor of top management. As Joan Wallach Scott (2001) noted in her lecture to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), “It is not only boards of trustees who abrogate faculty governance. University presidents, assuming the CEO model, do it as well ... a devaluation of faculty status: the faculty’s capacity to govern itself and to participate in university decision making has had to be compromised for the corporate model to succeed” (pp. 4-5). Indeed, in another paper being presented at this International Leadership Association (ILA) conference on presidential leadership teams, the author concluded that “college and university chief executive officers increasingly focus on the bottom line of resources and appear to lack the courage to speak out on issues affecting their institutions and our larger society – state, regional, national, and international” (Gardiner, 2005, p. 12). As the *Report of the Commission on the Academic Presidency: Stronger leadership for tougher times* (1996, p. 11) asserted, “the president has gradually become juggler-in-chief, expected to meet an endless stream of individual needs and special demands.” Emphasized ethicist Robert Payton, “Developing and advancing institutions is about mission and purpose and moral values. Only secondarily is it about resources” (1997, p. 59). The American college and university had lost its way. A radical reconsideration of organizational governance structure and leadership was in order.

Governance and the Metaphors of Transactional, Transformational, and Transcendent Leadership

Estela Mara Bensimon and Anna Neumann (1993) in their comprehensive study of collaborative leadership noted, “[t]he language or dominant discourse associated with the prevailing model of leadership sets one person (the leader) apart from the rest of the organization, asserting that this person provides a global perspective and direction that

ensures the survival and progress of all. This assumption underlies most leadership frames in use today.” (p. 16)

Can we afford to spend limited institutional resources to uphold this illusion of separateness, of one-person leadership? Can shared governance be possible without overriding the illusion of one-person leadership?

Transactional leadership

“Frames are mental structures that shape the way we see the world... Reframing is social change... Reframing is changing the way the public sees the world. It is changing what counts as common sense” (Lakoff, 2004, p.xv). The movement from the frames of transactional leadership to transformational leadership to transcendent leadership follows the movement toward a shared governance that satisfies the six criteria identified by Venable and Gardiner (1988): *a climate of trust; information sharing; meaningful participation; collective decision making; protecting divergent rights; and redefining roles*. As Bass noted, “Most experimental research, unfortunately, has focused on transactional leadership ..., whereas the real movers and shakers of the world are transformational leaders” (1990, p. 23). Transactional leaders give something to get something in return; transactional leaders trade benefits with their followers. A hierarchy-driven model dominates the structure surrounding transactional leadership. Here the six criteria of shared governance are largely unmet: trust is low (at best, one of benevolent autocracy); information is shared on a limited, need-to-know basis; participation is controlled and has little influence on outcomes; decision making rests with one powerful leader not with the group as a whole; divergent thinkers are viewed as “trouble makers” and often removed from the organization; and roles are determined by the head of the organization – usually not open for review and revision by the group. While every mental structure has its exception, the metaphor of transactional leadership engages the world with low levels of shared governance.

Transformational leadership

“The transformational leader asks followers to transcend their own self interests for the good of the group, organization, or society; to consider their longer-term needs to develop themselves, rather than their needs of the moment; and to become more aware of what is really important. Hence, followers are converted into leaders” (Bass, 1990, p.53). The metaphor of transformational leadership moves governance into a more collaborative reality. Regarding the six criteria of shared governance: trust is higher between leader and follower (though the hierarchy itself remains in place); information is shared more openly by leader with followers; participation is more meaningful – though many transformational leaders still employ one person decision making in practice; collective decision making is encouraged though not necessarily in a systemic way; divergent views are more protected with the follower being encouraged to become a leader herself/himself; at its best, leaders view themselves as *primus inter pares* and their followers as associates ... and in this way roles are becoming redefined – though actual roles and responsibilities of the players are often not open for debate and revision collectively. As

Bass and others have noted, in the real world, transformational leaders often use transactional methods; in the real world, situational leadership, which makes use of both these frames, transactional and transformational, results in a pragmatic blend which suits American leaders well. The blend does not, however, move shared governance into a place where its six criteria are addressed adequately.

Transcendent leadership

A new metaphor, transcendent leadership, answers a planetary call for a governance process which is more inclusive, more trusting, more sharing of information (it's happening anyway via the internet), more meaningfully involving *associates* or *constituents* (almost anything but "followers"), more collective decision making through dialogue and group consent processes, more nurturance and celebration of creative and divergent thinking and a willingness to serve the will of the collective consciousness as determined by the group – in essence, a leadership of service above self. The fact that there are too few Mohandas Gandhis and Jean Monnets among us should not deter our intention to create more and more such leaders who think about the long term needs of people – locally and globally.

The metaphor of transcendent leadership moves us away from the tired language of our transactional/ transformational reality into a reality worthy of a united planet, a planet of one humanity, moving from interdependence to wholeness. The metaphor of transcendent leadership, deeply aligned with the central criteria of shared governance, offers us a language to help us transcend the current governance crises of Enron, the United States, and our home planet. The complex problems of our world today will not be resolved by the consciousness that created them. Transcendent leadership offers us a metaphor to help us move more closely to a world where human talents and energies will be maximized for the betterment of all – personally, organizationally, and globally.

Concluding Thought

Dee Hock (1999, p. 28), founder and CEO emeritus of VISA, described the current crisis accurately, "Today, it doesn't take much thought to realize we're in an accelerating global epidemic of institutional failure ... organizations increasingly unable to achieve the purpose for which they were created, yet continuing to expand as they devour scarce resources, demean the human spirit, and destroy the environment." Citing David Bohm, Dee Hock (p. 127) emphasized, "Suddenly, in a flash of understanding, one may see the irrelevance of one's whole way of thinking ... along with a different approach in which all the elements fit in a new order and in a new structure." Transcendent leadership provides such a revolutionary frame of viewing human interaction in organizational settings. As John Carver (1997, p. 212) said on the concluding page of his work on *Boards that make a difference*, " 'To rule is easy,' counseled Goethe, 'to govern difficult.' The greatest difficulty may lie in shifting from old to new paradigms." The road ahead may be difficult, but the course is clear: a new paradigm is needed to bring human efforts to higher levels of synergy, to involve a more diverse people in true shared governance: *the metaphor of transcendent leadership*.

This paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Leadership Association, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, November 4, 2005.

References

- Aldon, L.J. (2004). *Transcendent leadership and the evolution of consciousness*. London: Lightning Source UK Ltd.
- Amaral, A., Jones, G.A., & Karseth, B. (Eds.).(2002). *Governing higher education: National perspectives on institutional governance*. New York: Springer.
- Barnard, C. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership; Theory, research, and managerial applications*. (3rd ed.). New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational dynamics*, 18 (3), 19-31.
- Bass, B.M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national borders? *American Psychologist*, 52 (2), 130-139.
- Bohm, D. (1980). *Wholeness and the implicate order*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bergman, S.J. & Surrey, J. (1993). The changing nature of relationships on campus: Impasses and possibilities. *Educational Record*, 74, (1), 13-20.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Carter, J. (1997). *Boards that make a difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- De Boer, H. (2002). Trust, the essence of governance? In A. Amaral, G.A. Jones, & B. Karseth (Eds.). *Governing higher education: National perspectives on institutional governance*. New York: Springer.
- Drucker, P.F. (1990). What can nonprofits teach us? *Harvard Business Review*, 68, (3), 23, 44.
- Duryea, E.D. (2000). *The academic corporation*. London: Garland Science.

Erikson, E.H. (1969). *Gandhi's truth: On the origins of militant nonviolence*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Friedman, T.L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Fritz, R. (1989). *The path of least resistance: Learning to become the creative force in your own life*. New York: Fawcett Columbine.

Gandhi, A. (2003). Leadership and nonviolence. In C. Cherrey, J.J. Gardiner, & N. Huber (Eds.). *Building Leadership Bridges 2003*. (1-11). College Park, Maryland: International Leadership Association & Center for Creative Leadership.

Gardiner, J. J. (1988). Building leadership teams. In M. F. Green (Ed.), *Leaders for a new era: Strategies for higher education* (137-153). New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Gardiner, J.J. (2005). Building leadership teams: A comprehensive study of America's college and university presidents, 1988-2003. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Leadership Association, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, November 6, 2005.

Gardiner, J.J. (1995). Creating new metaphors of governance for world higher education. Proceedings of the 13th International Conference of the Association of Management, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, August 5, 1995, Education Studies and Research Group, XII (1), 56-62.

Gardiner, J.J. (1990). Excellence in research: Restructuring higher education for the 1990's. *Educational Record*, 71, (2), 51-53.

Gardiner, J.J. (2001). Growing leadership circles for Rotary's emergent future. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Leadership Association, Miami, Florida, November 3, 2001.

Gardiner, J. J.(1998). Quiet presence: The holy ground of leadership. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership*. (116-125). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Gardiner, J.J. (1991). Interdisciplinary groups and leadership teams: Restructuring world higher education for information processing. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 16, (3), 269-272.

Gardiner, J.J. (2002). Sovereign to steward: Emergent roles and responsibilities of Rotary International's new district governor. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Leadership Association, Seattle, Washington, November 16, 2002.

Gardner, H. (1995). *Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership*. New York: Basic Books.

- Gardner, J.W. (1990). *On leadership*. New York: The Free Press.
- Gardner, J.W. (1963). *Self-renewal: The individual and the innovative society*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Gilman, R. (1993). The next great turning. *In Context*, 33 (Winter), 11-12.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1977). *Servant leadership*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Hackman, R. (2002). *Leading teams: Setting the stage for great performances*. Cambridge: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Hall, B. P. (1994). *Values shift: A guide to personal and organizational transformation*. Rockport, MA: Twin Lights Publishers.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K.H., & Johnson, D.E. (1996). *Management of organizational behavior*. (7th ed.) Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Hock, D. (1999). *Birth of the chaordic age*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Jaworski, J. (1996). *Synchronicity: The inner path of leadership*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Johnson, C.M. (1991). *Necessary Wisdom*. Seattle, WA: ICD Press.
- Kerr, C., Gade, M.L., & Kawaoka, M. (1994). *Troubled times for American higher education: The 1990's and beyond*. Buffalo: SUNY Press.
- Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant: Know your values and frame the debate*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Larkin, D. (1995). *Beyond self to compassionate healer: Transcendent leadership*. (Doctoral dissertation, Seattle University, 1995).
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (1996). *The connective edge: Leading in an inter-dependent world*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of organization*. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Plante, Patricia R. (1990). Leadership and the making of new words. *Liberal Education*, 76 (1), 31.

Scott, J.W. (2002). The critical state of shared governance. *Academe*, first annual Neil Rappaport Lecture on Academic Freedom and Shared Governance, October, 2001.

Tippos, M.A. & Keefe, T.J. (2004). A comprehensive structure of corporate governance in post-Enron corporate America. *The CPA Journal*, a publication of the New York State Society of CPAs, December, 2004.

Venable, W. & Gardiner, J.J. (1988). Synergistic governance, leadership teams, and the academic department head. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, St. Louis, Missouri, November 5, 1988.

Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations*, (4th ed.), Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.