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ABSTRACT

An alternative social constructivist based approach to leadership and culture management is developed for, and evaluated in conjunction with, a five member senior management team for a large social service agency. The research is praxis-oriented, emergent in design, and emancipatory in its intent (Lather, 1991; Morgan, 1993). Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) method of Naturalistic Inquiry is used to guide the conduct of the inquiry. The central purposes of the study are to: (1) develop a constructivist based theory of social organizing through the conceptual integration of leadership and culture; (2) design and conduct a training and application initiative focused on the construction of a leadership theory customized to the participants’ culture; and (3) engage participants in an open-ended evaluation and exploration of the training to inform and sophisticate the training process as an applied knowledge construction. The paper begins with an overview and subsequent deconstruction of the fundamental values and assumptions underlying the positivist leadership discourse. Out of this deconstruction emerges a constructivist reconstruction of leadership which integrates the concepts of leadership and culture into a dialectical continuum. This theory serves as the foundation for the development of a training and application initiative. The research focuses on an emergent evaluation and exploration of the training initiative. Data are generated through two series of semi-structured interviews, a detailed reflexive journal, and a series of final member checks. The results indicate that the training process met the evaluative criteria established to assess its meaningfulness and practical utility. The broader exploration agenda produces insights into the training process which could not be anticipated in advance of the inquiry. These include the unanticipated emotional impact the process had on individual participants, and the powerful destabilizing effect the process had on the team’s cultural order. Caution must therefore be exercised in conducting this form of training with groups that lack sufficient trust, emotional maturity, and supportive relationships. Recommendations for additional research are offered.
...for there is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so...

Hamlet
Act II, Scene II
Hamlet, Prince of Denmark
William Shakespeare
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The subject of this dissertation emerged through a series of consultative discussions between myself and members of a senior management team for a large mental health agency. In these discussions we established that one of their central organization development objectives was to incorporate a common model of leadership into their normative management practices. On a very intuitive and embryonic level, we concluded that the ideal leadership model would be one which served as a framework for guiding both their proactive management of everyday events, and their efforts to intentionally shape the nature of their organizational culture.

With the project so conceived, it was my responsibility to explore the leadership literature to identify which of the myriad of existing theories best met these criteria. Upon identifying a suitable theory, my task was to introduce a training program for the management team which, if evaluated positively, would be incorporated into their overall organization development plans for the training of other management level personnel.

An extensive search of the mainstream leadership literature revealed that no existent theory met the team’s criteria for a framework to facilitate proactive leadership and culture management. However, within the emerging social constructivist leadership literature, there were at least theoretical abstractions suggesting a relationship between leadership and organizational culture (e.g., Schein, 1985; Smith & Peterson, 1988). On the basis of this information I proposed a praxis-oriented research initiative (Lather, 1991; Morgan, 1993) wherein I would develop a constructivist-based leadership model and training process intended to meet the management team’s criteria, and they would participate in a preliminary study to evaluate and further develop this package for possible application within and beyond their own organizational context. Their acceptance of this proposal signalled the commencement of this research initiative.

Overview of Chapters

This dissertation is divided into four chapters: Introduction, Training Process, Methodology, and Results and Discussion. Rather than include my discussion of the training process in either the introduction (as it is theory-
Chapter 1: Introduction

based) or method chapter (as it is the focal point of data generation), I have put it in a separate chapter. In so doing, the process by which the leadership theory developed in the first chapter was translated into a applied training initiative becomes more apparent. I have also merged the results and discussion into one chapter. In a qualitative study such an integration can facilitate a more coherent picture of the research findings, as the interpretations are immediately linked to the data upon which they are based. In this section I provide an overview of each of these four chapters.

Chapter One: Introduction. In the opening sections of the first chapter I review and deconstruct the positivist discourse on leadership. Deconstruction, as a method of analysis, is intended to dissect a body of discourse to illuminate its implicit values, assumptions, and contradictions and thus reveal its sociopolitical ramifications (Lather, 1991; Rosenau, 1992). By subjecting the positivist leadership discourse to deconstruction, I develop the argument that the ontological and epistemological foundations upon which virtually all mainstream leadership theories have been constructed, are highly problematic.

Out of this deconstruction I develop a reconstruction of leadership grounded in a social constructivist ontology. Central to this reconstruction is the integration of the concepts of leadership and culture as dialectical aspects of the more general process of "social organizing" (Weick, 1979). The integration of these two typically distinct concepts gives rise to a theory of leadership which represents a radical departure from mainstream conceptualizations. In this regard, the central defining feature of leadership shifts from techniques of unilateral influence (i.e., leader to follower), to collective processes of dialectical reality construction which simultaneously shape and are shaped by organizational culture.

These changes in the conceptualization of leadership are so fundamental that by the end of the chapter it is questionable as to whether the term "leadership" should even be retained. In the end, I select to do so for a number of reasons. The two most pragmatic of these are: (1) the starting point of this research was leadership, and the participants continued to think about
the intervention in terms of "leadership training" even as they transformed their formal understanding of the concept; and (2) use of the term seems to provide a familiar and comfortable point of departure for those starting to redefine the concept. That is, while referring to it as a "leadership theory" tends to evoke numerous irrelevant preconceptions, these have been more easily overcome than the rather blank responses that ensue when I have referred to it as a theory of "event management" or "social reality construction."

**Chapter Two: Training Process.** In the second chapter I focus on the conceptual development, content and techniques, implementation, and modification of a theory-based leadership and culture management training process. I begin by outlining the application concepts I derived from the theory to steer the training process. Mirroring the theory itself, each of these guiding concepts stands in sharp contrast to traditional approaches to leadership training. For instance, at its core, the training was group process rather than role performance focused, and culturally contextualized and participant driven instead of generic and prescriptive in its orientation.

From here I move into a discussion of the three-phase design I developed as a framework for the training process. On the basis of this design, the training was to begin with a period of familiarization with the major theoretical concepts: reality construction, a redefinition of leadership, and group culture. With this as the foundation, the focus was to shift to a culture audit through which participants would generate the data necessary to customize the leadership theory to their specific cultural context. In the final phase, the training was to focus on integrating the general theory with their specific cultural objectives to produce a leadership and culture management process supportive of their unique cultural agenda. This was to be accomplished through application sessions focusing on use of their emerging theory in the management of actual organizational events.

In the closing section of this chapter I discuss how this three-phase plan was modified by participants to address their specific concerns and interests. For instance, I detail their decision to advance the culture audit phase and distribute the theory familiarization sessions over the course of the training. In
addition, I discuss the unforeseen dynamics that emerged which influenced the course of the training process in several important respects.

**Chapter Three: Methodology.** The third chapter is devoted to a discussion of the praxis-oriented research initiative I undertook to evaluate and explore the training process. Accordingly, I begin with an overview of the epistemological foundations upon which the research initiative was constructed. I present my rationale for employing a praxis-oriented approach, discuss the nature of the underlying emancipatory concerns which drove the research, and outline the complementary constructivist methodologies I utilized in the design of the study. In this discussion I outline the dual purposes of this approach: to facilitate the participant’s own process of intentional change and self-determination, and to generate data which would inform and sophisticate the training process as an applied knowledge construction.

I then discuss the specific objectives of the inquiry, detailing the nature of the two parallel research agendas I developed to focus data generation and analysis, and shape the training process as it unfolded (i.e., evaluation and exploration of the training process from the participants’ perspective). From here I describe the methodology, including the natural setting and participants, data generation and analysis procedures, and the measures I took to ensure that informed consent and confidentiality were maintained throughout the study. As the inquiry was designed to be emergent (i.e., continually responsive to new data), I also provide a summary of the unfolding research design that explains the changes made in response to unanticipated insights. I end the chapter with an overview of the criteria I employed to assess the adequacy of the data generation and interpretation process, and the achievement of the intended emancipatory outcomes.

**Chapter Four: Results and Discussion.** In the fourth chapter I report the results of the inquiry and offer my interpretations of these findings. The chapter is divided into three sections, each of which corresponds to one of the central research agendas: Evaluation, Exploration, and Adequacy Criteria. I concentrate first on participant evaluations of the meaningfulness and utility of the training as a vehicle for more intentionally managing events and shaping
their culture (i.e., the objectives defined by participants which launched this study). These results were uniformly positive, and in several respects, exceeded the a priori evaluation criteria.

Following the evaluation, I shift my focus to the data which emerged through the open-ended exploration of the training, and discuss how these emerging insights were used to modify the training process as it unfolded. My interpretation of these results focuses on broadening the base of understanding concerning the potential positive and negative ramifications of the training process. In addition, insights emerge into the manner and degree to which participants may modify the training content (i.e., the original leadership theory) during their process of constructing a local leadership and culture management framework.

Finally, I discuss the data and procedures utilized to demonstrate the adequacy of the data generation and interpretation process and to confirm the achievement of the emancipatory objectives of the study. With respect to the adequacy of the research process for generating credible and dependable data and interpretations, all mandated procedures and practices were satisfied. Regarding the adequacy of the study for facilitating emancipatory outcomes, the data support the conclusion that the participants’ process of self-empowerment was facilitated through the inquiry. In closing the chapter, I present participant generated criteria for facilitating the transferability of the training to other contexts. In this regard, I discuss participant recommendations regarding characteristics of the group and skills of the trainer considered necessary to ensure safety, and facilitate the success of, future training initiatives.

Metatheoretical Foundations

In this chapter I develop an alternative theory of leadership through a critique of the central assumptions and values underlying mainstream theories. To set the stage I begin by broadly outlining the two metatheoretical frameworks around which this discourse is organized: logical positivism and social constructivism.
Contrasting Logical Positivism and Social Constructivism

Logical positivism’s origins lie in the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century. Since this time, this metatheory has developed and endured to become the grand narrative of Western scientific thought (Brown, 1992; Dachler, 1988; Gergen, 1992; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Rosenau, 1992). Central to this philosophical position are the notions that: (1) reality is independent of the observer and therefore that objective and ultimate truths exist (a realist ontology); (2) that facts about reality exist independently of values (therefore, science is ideally value-neutral); (3) that every event in the world has an antecedent cause (linear causality); and, (4) that reality and its underlying causal mechanisms can be revealed through the empirical methods of scientific testing (primacy of method as a “truth seeking” mechanism). On the basis of these assumptions positivists contend that it is possible to accumulate timeless, generalizable, value-free knowledge of objective reality. Success in this regard is measured in terms of the ability to predict, and ultimately control, the phenomenon in question.

In contrast to the long history of positivism, initial development of social constructivism is generally attributed to Berger and Luckmann’s (1966) seminal work to develop an alternative sociology of knowledge. In fundamental respects then, social constructivism is founded on ontological and epistemological assumptions that challenge those which constitute positivism (Brown, 1992; Dachler, 1988; Gergen, 1992; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Rosenau, 1992).

In general terms, constructivism is based on the notions that: reality is a mental construction of the observer and therefore that all truths are necessarily subjective and context specific (a relativist ontology); facts have no meaning except within the context of their specific value-based knowledge systems (therefore, science is necessarily value-laden); observed actions are dialectically produced by a large number of mutual shapers, each of which is simultaneously influencing and being influenced by all others (dialectical causality); and, since objectivity does not exist, the objective of research is the generation of insights into the subjective realities of people in particular
sociocultural contexts (research as a flexible “insight seeking” process). Thus, the central criteria of success in constructivist inquiry is ever increasing understanding of the social phenomenon in question. The insights gained are necessarily temporal and local in nature, but may have applicability to other contexts depending upon the degree of similarity between the point of origin and intended point of transfer.

Sampson (1991) effectively contrasts these two metatheories in the following terms:

Two metaphors demonstrate the fundamental difference between the conventional and the sociohistorical points of view: the conventional view regards science to be a mirror of nature, an accurate reflection of reality; the sociohistorical view considers science to be a story, a proposal about reality. (p. 7)

In essence then, while positivists assume objectivity, universality, certainty, and the quest for absolutes, the constructionists assume subjectivity, context specificity, inevitable uncertainty, and the quest for immediate pragmatic insights. Moreover, where the positivists look for continuity in reality, permanent knowledge, and direct causal relationships in nature, the constructivists adopt the view that reality itself is dynamic and relative, knowledge is socially constructed, and that all causality is dialectic in nature. Given that the constructivists reject the possibility of value neutrality and advocate a science which is overtly sociopolitical, the point is no longer to identify timeless laws. Rather, the point is the interpretation of immediate experience to facilitate intentional social transformation (Gergen, 1992; Lather, 1991; Rosenau, 1992).

I acknowledge that the brevity of this synopsis does an injustice to the richness and complexity of each of these metatheories. However, the radical contrast between these two competing sets of ontological and epistemological assumptions serves to preface the fundamental transformation that this and other constructivist approaches to leadership represent within the overall theoretical discourse.
Deconstructing the Positivist Leadership Discourse

The study of leadership predates the advent of formal social psychological inquiry by many centuries. Jesus in the West and Lao-tze in the East were among the earliest to define the nature and circumstance of successful leadership. In the centuries which followed, such thinkers as Confucius, Plato, Machiavelli, Carlyle, Nietzsche, Weber, and Freud, attempted to unravel the mystery of leadership phenomena, and offer prescriptions to those who sought positions of social influence (Fiedler & Garcia, 1987; Gibb, 1969; Hollander, 1985; Misumi, 1985; Smith & Peterson, 1988).

The social psychological roots of leadership research, which gave shape to positivist conceptualizations of this phenomenon, can be found in the leadership atmosphere studies of Lewin, Lippitt and White (1939). In these studies, comparable groups of boys were led by adults through a series of mask-making tasks. The adults were carefully trained to play one of two (and eventually three) constructed roles. Each group leader consistently behaved in an “autocratic,” “democratic,” or “laissez-faire” manner, and the groups were monitored and scored on several qualitative observation categories (e.g., “hostile criticism,” “friendly cooperation”). Different experimental conditions were arranged to enable the researchers to assess the reactions of the children under the different leadership conditions (e.g., the leader would be deliberately late, the leader would leave the group unattended, etc.) (Lewin, et al., 1939).

While relatively confounded by current mainstream standards (e.g., the leadership concepts were heavily biased by the politics of the day and Lewin’s personal political experiences), these experiments embodied the essential elements of the Lewinian approach to social psychological experimentation and set the stage for much of the subsequent leadership research. They involved a complex situational variable (leadership atmosphere) which was manipulated in a controlled fashion, within the context of a simulated natural setting. They employed systematic observation techniques which enabled the researchers to gather quantitative data to verify the success of the manipulations. Efforts were made to ensure that self-consciousness on the part of subjects was minimized. The original independent variables were selected on the basis of a theoretical
rationale but the early experimental findings were used to implement changes in subsequent experiments. Finally, the manner of data collection emphasized the interpersonal processes over and above the observable outcomes of the interactions (Jones, 1985).

By the 1980's many within both the positivist and social constructivist leadership camps were questioning the merits of much of the accumulated body of research. It was argued that while the field had become one of the most heavily researched within social psychology, it remained one of the least understood (e.g., Andriessen & Drenth, 1984; Bass, 1981; Calâs & Smircich, 1988; Dachler, 1988; Hollander, 1985). Other prominent theorists took serious exception to this assertion which initiated a sometimes heated discourse (most notably House, 1988). At present this debate appears to have reached a stalemate as evidenced by Hogan, Curphy, and Hogan's (1994) recent article entitled *What We Know About Leadership*. The central premise of this paper is that "although psychologists know a great deal about leadership, persons who make decisions about real leaders seem largely to ignore their accumulated wisdom" (p. 493).

Ironically, where most leadership theorists do come to agreement is with respect to conclusions drawn from the anthropological literature. There is ample evidence to support the notion that leadership can be framed as a ubiquitous aspect of human social life. That is, from a Western understanding of social organizing, leadership in its various forms and manifestations spans the entire range of recorded human history and culture (Bass, 1981; Campbell, 1988, 1990; Hollander, 1985). The modern world seems to have embraced leadership as a fundamental aspect of the organizing function of any social body, from small group to nation. It is considered axiomatic that on any occasion where people come together with the intent to coordinate their activities to accomplish a task, some form of formal or informal leadership process is identifiable (Bennis & Shepard, 1965; Hollander, 1985; Hosking & Morley, 1988; Katz & Kahn, 1978).

I will suggest that while the leadership construct can be fruitfully applied to understand a central and enduring aspect of the human condition (i.e., the
process of social organizing), the manifestation and social experience of leadership is subject to a wide range of variations over time and across cultures. Expressions of leadership, expectations about leadership behaviours, and definitions of necessary leadership qualities have consistently reflected the cultural and historical characteristics of societies and their wider environmental and sociopolitical contexts (Bartolke, 1987; Bass, 1981; Dachler, 1988; Hunt, 1984; Misumi, 1985; Smith & Peterson, 1988). Bass provides the following illustration:

The Egyptians demanded of their leader the qualities of authority, discrimination, and just behaviour. An analysis of Greek concepts of leadership, as exemplified by different leaders in Homer’s Iliad identified: (1) justice and judgment - Agamemnon; (2) wisdom and counsel - Nestor; (3) shrewdness and cunning - Odysseus; and (4) valour and action - Achilles. All these qualities were admired by the Greeks. Shrewdness and cunning are not regarded as highly in our contemporary society as they once were. Thus, the patterns of behaviour regarded as acceptable in leaders differ from time to time and from one culture to another. (1981, p. 5)

Further, I will argue that the failure of mainstream theorists to distinguish between leadership as a general theoretical construct and specific sociohistorical manifestations has served as a major barrier to the development of an integrated and widely applicable theory of leadership. The central problem in this regard appears to have been the lack of a conceptual framework to support the construction of such a distinction. As a result, much of the research which has been conducted with the aim of identifying generalizable aspects of leadership has been unwittingly biased by the specific sociohistorical contexts within which it has been examined (i.e., interpretations of how leadership is practiced in a given cultural time and place are generalized too quickly to other cultural contexts). There has been relatively little appreciation for the notion that history and culture (both societal and organizational) have a significant impact on the manner in which the leadership process is socially conceptualized, articulated, and enacted.
From this perspective, I will argue that most of the social psychological leadership literature accumulated to date is essentially an historical account of what leadership means to the 20th century industrialized Western world (Dachler, 1988; Hunt, 1984; Smith & Peterson, 1988). While this information has, in some measure, been useful and meaningful to certain groups within this particular historical context (e.g., particularly the white male elite), the fact that it is normatively sustained means that its relevance as social conditions change will necessarily diminish (e.g., as the power of women and minority groups grows and their social agendas present an ever increasing challenge to those of the status quo). The same problem is evident when efforts are made to generalize these bounded conceptions to alternative cultural contexts (e.g., non-industrialized nations, preliterate cultures, etc.) (Gergen, 1985).

The very concept of leadership is itself reflective of a Western mode of thought. This is attested to by Smith and Peterson's (1988) observation that in the Japanese language there is no indigenous word for leadership. This is not to suggest that those social processes represented in the West by the term "leadership" do not occur in Japan. However, it does imply that the Japanese have come to think about and engage in processes of social organizing in qualitatively different ways. Even among Western cultures there are questions regarding the equivalency of meaning. For instance, Graumann (1986) raises this concern in his discussion of the translation and usage of terms in German, English and French. He states:

While *Fuhrung*, like *leadership*, has a variety of interconnected meanings (the position or role of leader, the quality or capacity to lead, the acts or behaviours of leading, as well as a group of leaders), many other usages require different translations, such as guidance, direction, control, management, command, conduct, morale. As always it is not a proper definition but only the context that determines that analogous problems arise between the French and the English or German usages. Political and industrial leaders in France would rather be labelled as *chefs, dirigeants*, or even *leaders* than as *menteurs*, a term that carries a historically explicable pejorative connotation. (p. 7-8)
On the basis of such cross-cultural observations, constructivist theorists argue that what leadership observers see is the leadership reality they have constructed (Calás & Smircich, 1988; Dachler, 1988; Hunt, 1984; Pondy, 1978). As Dachler (1988) comments:

The ontological emphasis is on leadership as something that cannot be known independently and “outside” of the scientific observer. In this sense it does not exist previous to the act of observation, and it does not inform the observer objectively. “seeing” and being informed require an active construction of the reality of leadership by the observers. As a consequence, what is “seen” is the leadership reality we as leadership observers have constructed. What we accept as objective facts are then actually nothing more than what we have collectively constructed within our discipline in the context of our culture.

The ethnocentricity of the mainstream perspective is a natural out-growth of the epistemological tradition upon which modern Western psychology rests. The positivist’s mechanical metaphor borrowed from Newtonian physics, with its ahistorical and acultural outlook, strict belief in value neutrality, reductionism, adherence to models of linear causality, and quest for discovery of objective truth, does not easily lend itself to the interpretation of social processes across time and culture (Bruner, 1990; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Rosnow, 1981; Sullivan, 1984). This approach has so dominated the study of leadership that the concept itself has become mired in the limitations of this epistemological framework.

Indeed, the constructs currently used, and the manner in which theorists typically use them, have created many of the current theoretical issues as much as they have initiated discourse and research regarding others. In short, current problems facing leadership researchers are largely problems of the way in which members of Western culture have come to think and talk about leadership. In order to reframe current understandings of leadership and transcend the limiting perspective offered by culture-bound experience, it is necessary to challenge the very nature and meaning of the constructs used in defining the subject.
in this regard, over the last decade a call for a paradigm shift has been initiated by a small faction of leadership theorists who generally fall under the rubric of social constructivism. The first part of this dissertation represents an effort to consolidate theoretical patterns in this emerging discourse and examine some of their central implications. In so doing, an idealized model of the leadership process is developed which provides a framework for making sense of the processes of social organizing across cultural time and space. In effect, this reconstruction serves as a conceptual template for exploring, interpreting, and comparing the processes by which collectives go about negotiating their particular social realities and coordinating their activities. Thus, my goal is not to explore objective social reality, but rather, to provide an alternative interpretation of how the social process of reality construction and organizing might occur within groups and organizations.

In the following section I begin with a summary of the concept of leadership as it has evolved within the mainstream, positivist discourse. I then move into a deconstruction of the concept of leadership from a social constructivist perspective. The radically different set of ontological and epistemological assumptions upon which social constructivist thought is based, offer a serious challenge to traditional assumptions regarding the nature of leadership and what it can and cannot be expected to accomplish. The reconstruction that emerges from this deconstruction has the effect of transforming the essential meaning of the concept of leadership.

**Review of Positivist Conceptualizations of Leadership**

The evolution of positivist leadership theory is typically divided into three distinct and largely successive schools of thought: trait-, behaviour-, and contingency-based conceptualizations. Each of these is characterized by a set of philosophical assumptions regarding the nature of leadership, and each of these sets of assumptions are largely reflective of their respective social *zeitgeist* (Andriessen & Drenth, 1984; Chemers, 1984; Hollander, 1985; House, 1988; Sashkin & Lassey, 1983; Smith & Peterson, 1988; Yetton, 1984). This section briefly summarizes each of these schools toward the development of a
normative conception of leadership.

**Trait-based Conceptions**

Through World War I, social class largely determined positions of leadership and followership. The upper class officers who led men into battle achieved their leadership roles by virtue of the fact that they had been “born to rule.” In similar fashion, the men under their command were viewed as “born to follow” (Yetton, 1984). This ontology merged with two coincident trends giving birth to the era of trait theories. First, as the prospects of social mobility increased and social standing became less a matter of lineage and more a matter of ability, an interest in “what it takes” to be a leader emerged. Second, the psychometric assessment movement of the early 1900’s made such a question seem relatively easy to answer; all one had to do was identify how leaders differed from followers on measures of naturally occurring psychological traits (Danziger, 1990; Hollander, 1985; Smith & Peterson, 1988).

Given this set of social circumstances two central questions drove leadership research during the subsequent period between the World Wars. First, how do leaders differ from followers, and later, how do effective leaders differ from ineffective leaders? These questions were predicated upon the assumption that differences in leadership ability and performance resulted from preexisting and stable personality trait differences and that effective leader traits produce effective group outcomes (Danziger, 1990; Hollander, 1985; Yetton, 1984).

The downfall of the trait conceptualization was its total failure to produce a set of traits which could be universally applied (Andriessen & Drenth, 1984). Factors which successfully discriminated between leaders and followers in one study invariably failed to replicate in others. The rather bleak results of this body of research were summarized by Stogdill in his 1948 review of the literature. The only general finding was that, on average, individuals defined as leaders tended to score slightly higher on intelligence tests than non-leaders. In 1974 Stogdill concluded in his *Handbook of Leadership* that there is no perfect correlation between intelligence and leadership. Generally, leaders
were only slightly more intelligent than the group average, and in the case of leader emergence studies, the most intelligent person in the group was not the one most likely to become leader. Yetton (1984) proposed that the major contribution of the trait approach was its lack of findings. That is, while trait theories were unable to explicate what leadership was, they did identify one thing that it was not: a set of personality traits.

**Behaviour-based Conceptions**

After World War II, disillusionment with trait theories reached a peak and as a result, the focus of mainstream leadership thought shifted dramatically. Leadership was still viewed as something done by leaders to followers, but the focus was now on behavioural differences rather than inherent traits (Hollander, 1985; Sashkin & Lassey, 1983; Yetton, 1984). Individuals were no longer viewed as "born to lead"; they could be made into leaders if only those behaviours which optimized leadership effectiveness could be identified. This was the fundamental assumption which linked together the theories of the behavioural movement (Smith & Peterson, 1988; Yetton, 1984).

The origins of this perspective can be traced to the initial studies conducted at the University of Michigan's Survey Research Centre and Ohio State University's Personnel Research Board that began in the late 1940's. Initially it was suggested by the Michigan group that leadership behaviour could be characterized along a single continuum with one end representing employee-centred behaviour and the other production-centred behaviour (e.g., Katz, Maccoby, & Morse, 1950). The results of later studies at both Michigan and Ohio State University (e.g., Stogdill & Coons, 1957) suggested that these two opposing styles were better thought of as two independent dimensions of leader behaviour. This modification was adopted as theorists acknowledged that leaders were, to different degrees, capable of engaging in both types of behaviour (Hollander, 1985; Sashkin & Lassey, 1983).

The Ohio State studies represented an ambitious attempt to identify and measure the fundamental dimensions of leadership. Of the 14 dimensions originally identified, two, "consideration" and "initiating structure," were able to
account for the majority of explained variance. The promise of the approach coupled with the development of multiple scales with which to measure perceptions of leadership behaviour led to a wide range of research, the majority of which was aimed at correlating combinations of these behaviours with such group outcome measures as performance, satisfaction, and cohesiveness (Hollander, 1985; Sashkin & Lassey, 1983; Yetton, 1984).

From this, Blake and Mouton (1964, 1978) developed a training program they referred to as the “Managerial Grid.” It was their contention that while the dimensions represented different aspects of leadership and were therefore conceptually independent, they were not independent in practice. That is, a follower's perceptions of a leader's action in initiating structure would be influenced by the degree of consideration demonstrated in current as well as previous leadership acts. Consequently, Blake and Mouton argued that the single most desirable or ideal style of leadership was one which incorporated high levels of both consideration and initiating structure (i.e., the “9,9” approach).

The results which emerged from the behavioural approach also failed to generate generalizable conclusions. The relationship between leadership style and group performance was highly variable and there was the problem of demonstrating causality. Behaviour could be an outcome or a cause of performance and satisfaction. Theorists began to acknowledge the limitations of this perspective, particularly with respect to its inability to take into account the myriad of circumstances within which leadership occurs. Thus, while the intuitive appeal of the behavioural approach has not entirely waned, particularly in much of the popular literature, most of the current mainstream theorists have abandoned this approach in favour of contingency conceptualizations (Smith & Peterson, 1988; Yetton, 1983).

**Contingency-based Conceptions**

The contingency theories emerged in the 1960's. Their commonality is the premise that to be effective, leadership behaviour must differ in accordance with specific contextual conditions. There is no single framework within the
contingency school. Each theory holds different facets of the leadership context as paramount, and therefore tends to underplay or entirely ignore facets which are central to other theories. Generally, the theories which represent this generation are more complex than either the trait or behavioural approaches, although they frequently incorporate concepts from the earlier generations into a contingency framework (particularly the concept of “initiating structure” versus “consideration,” or in other terms, “task” versus “maintenance” orientations) (Hollander, 1985; Yetton, 1983). In order to illustrate the range and variety of perspectives which fall under the rubric of the contingency approach I will summarize four of the most noteworthy theories: Fiedler’s Least-Preferred Coworker Model, House’s Path-Goal Theory, Vroom and Yetton’s Decision Model, and Hersey and Blanchard’s Situational Leadership Model.

The earliest and most extensively researched of these theories is Fielder’s Least-Preferred Coworker (LPC) contingency model (Fiedler, 1967, 1974, 1978). Fielder incorporated elements of the trait and behavioural approaches with three situational factors: the quality of the leader-member relationship, the degree of task structure, and the extent of leadership position power. The leader’s LPC score was essentially a personality measure intended to differentiate between high and low LPC leaders. Those who scored high were considered to be primarily relationship-oriented, those who scored low were considered to be primarily task-oriented.

The fundamental hypothesis was that both high and low LPC leaders could perform effectively; however, they would each perform best under different combinations of the three situational factors which defined the favourableness of the leadership situation. In this regard, low LPC leaders should perform best in situations of either high or low favourableness (i.e., good relations, high structure, and high power, or poor relations, low structure, and low power). High LPC leaders should perform best in situations of medium favourableness (i.e., conditions where the three factors were mixed or moderate). Fiedler’s primary objective was to measure leaders on the LPC scale and match them to appropriate leadership situations. When this was impractical, the alternative objective was the modification of situations and the
introduction of leadership training, both of which were intended to correct mismatches.

Fiedler’s theory has been the centre of longstanding controversy for many research based and theoretical reasons. Some of the criticisms that have been levelled at this theory centre on the reliability and validity of the LPC scale; the unidirectional model of influence; the static model of group dynamics; inattention to individual characteristics of followers; and, an overly sharp distinction between consideration and initiating structure (Hollander, 1985; Yetton, 1983). His recent work with Garcia (Fiedler & Garcia, 1987) represents an effort to modify the theory to accommodate some of the most serious criticisms.

The Path-Goal Theory (e.g., House, 1971) is an expectancy theory which seeks to prescribe how a leader can be effective by making rewards contingent upon accomplishment of specific goals. It incorporates the fundamentals of the behavioural approach (i.e., initiating structure and consideration) with the fundamental assumptions of the contingency approach. While Fiedler’s LPC theory proposed that those leaders who were effective were those whose traits match the situation, the Path-Goal Theory focuses on the behaviours that leaders select. The basic premise of Path-Goal Theory is that followers will be motivated to do what a leader wants if the leader first ensures that followers understand how to accomplish those goals, and second, ensures that followers achieve their individual goals through their engagement in the process. Thus, effective leaders are described as those who assess the task environment and select behaviours which are most likely to motivate followers to strive to achieve the group objectives.

While much research has been done on the Path-Goal Theory, the results of these investigations form a rather equivocal picture. Predictions regarding the relationship between leadership behaviour and the satisfaction of workers have had limited support; however, predictions regarding performance outcomes have been largely unsuccessful. Frequent use of the Ohio State scales has opened much of the research to the methodological criticisms typically levied against these measurement tools. In addition, many of the
studies explore only parts or various isolated aspects of the entire theory, making assessment of the overall theory difficult (Smith & Peterson, 1988).

Vroom and Yetton (1973) consider leadership from yet another angle by focusing on leader styles in decision-making. The Vroom-Yetton Decision Model identifies seven situational dimensions which leaders use to determine whether to include subordinates in the decision-making process, and if so, how they should be involved. The factors include importance of decision quality, amount of information available, degree of problem structure, and need for follower acceptance. The leadership styles representing increasing degrees of subordinate participation classified by this model are “autocratic,” “consultative,” and “group.” The research conducted on the Vroom-Yetton Model, while not voluminous, is generally supportive. A central criticism, however, is its leader bias; followers' perspectives are only considered to the degree that followers must accept and support the final outcome (Smith & Peterson, 1988).

The last contingency theory I will discuss, Hersey and Blanchard's (1982, 1983) Situational Leadership Model, uses differences among subordinates rather than problems as the basis for determining leadership effectiveness. Their assumption is that leaders are able to change their behaviour to fit particular situations; and the most important situational variable is subordinates' level of “follower readiness.” Follower readiness is defined as a combination of ability to do a particular job (high or low) and the willingness or confidence to do that job (high or low). When placed into a two-by-two matrix this creates four possible combinations of follower readiness. Hersey and Blanchard proposed two dimensions of leader behaviour and four styles of leadership which correspond to the four levels of follower readiness. The behavioural dimensions are similar to the traditional concepts of relationship-orientation and task-orientation.

Currently, the Situation Leadership Model is one of the most popular among North American leadership trainers and practitioners, primarily because of its intuitive appeal rather than research support. Relatively little research has been conducted on this model, and that which exists has produced mixed results (Smith & Peterson, 1988). Perhaps its single most important theoretical
contribution is the notion that leadership style must be adjusted to fit every follower. Most other contingency theories do not take into consideration the follower's characteristics as part of the task environment and treat leadership as though it were a uniform blanket of social influence. However, the model is limited because the only contingency which it considers is the level of follower readiness.

The constructivist perspective adopted here will provide a serious challenge to many of the fundamental (and largely implicit) assumptions upon which the current leadership zeitgeist is founded. From this perspective I will argue that all of the positivist approaches focus on the various observable dynamics and surface features of leadership to the exclusion of the less obvious dynamics of social meaning and culture (Smircich & Morgan, 1982). That is, the behavioural approach, evident in most of the contingency theories, is so focused on the observable aspects of the social process that it is insensitive to the unique and various meanings assigned to behaviour across social time and space (i.e., culture). Even more fundamentally, the vast majority of the mainstream theories regard leadership as though it were an objective social fact rather than acknowledging its socially constructed and culturally relative nature. It is to a social constructivist critique of the underlying assumptions of positivist leadership theory that I now turn.

**The Politics of Positivist Leadership Theory**

As alluded to in my previous discussions of the conceptual origins of leadership, the cultural dynamics of modern Western society, and particularly its sociopolitical character, have served to create the mainstream meaning of the term. A deconstruction of this social understanding of leadership reveals that this concept has, and continues to be, regarded in relation to the maximization of productivity. The fundamental function of leadership discourse has been toward the improvement of worker and work group efficiency and effectiveness (e.g., cars off an assembly line in less time as a measure of competitiveness and profitability; the U.S. Army's now infamous emphasis on "body counts" during the Vietnam era and "destruction of assets" during the Gulf War as
measures of “winning the war”; and “clients served” or “contacts made” as measures of organizational effectiveness in the social service sector). Thus, the positivist view of leadership is an outgrowth or cultural artifact of the industrial revolution.

Even after three quarters of a century of research, however, a great deal of disagreement remains among theorists regarding what constitutes leadership and consequently, what criteria should be employed in the determination of leadership effectiveness (Chemers, 1984; Gibb, 1969; Smith, 1984; Smith & Peterson, 1988). As evidenced in part by the preceding historical overview, theorists have typically hypothesized linear causal links between leadership and such global outcome measures as group productivity, grievance rates, absenteeism, turn-over, team cohesiveness and/or follower satisfaction (Andriessen & Drenth, 1984; Bass, 1981; Hollander, 1985; McCormick & Ilgen, 1985; Pondy & Boje, 1980; Smith & Peterson, 1988; Yukl, 1981).

The logic of these associations is true to positivist conceptions of causality, and is given form by the assumptions of the existence of both linear causal relationships and objective indicators of effective performance. Moreover, this approach is indicative of the uncritically adopted management values bias (i.e., performance outcomes) which permeates the thinking of mainstream organizational theory (Smith & Peterson, 1988; Sullivan, 1984). Close scrutiny of the assumptions which underlie these linear causal chains raises serious concerns regarding the viability and utility of these hypotheses.

Assumptions of Positivist Theories

Several prominent themes can be abstracted from an examination of mainstream theories of leadership and their associated research strategies. In this section I will examine and critique the central causal assumptions underlying positivist approaches to the study of leadership.

A basic assumption regarding the role that leaders perform is that they cause followers to behave in ways which cause certain outcomes (Andriessen & Drenth, 1984; Dachler, 1988; Jaques, 1970; McElroy & Hunger, 1988; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1975; Pondy, 1978; Sims & Manz, 1984; Vroom, 1976; Yukl, 1981).
This general statement of causation can be summarized in the following syllogism:

Premise 1: What followers do determines group outcomes.
Premise 2: Effective leaders influence the behaviour of followers.
Conclusion: Therefore, leaders are responsible for group outcomes.

This syllogism rests on an amalgamation of modern Western values and assumptions concerning the nature of the individual in relation to the collective, causal relationships in the social world, and the relationship between personal control and responsibility. In the West the individual is typically viewed as an autonomous and intentional agent who is consequently held responsible for the results of all those actions which he or she commits (although this assumption is qualified to some degree if one occupies the role of "follower," as evidenced by the plea of "I was just following orders"). This image of the individual, as that which is distinct from the collective, differs radically from Eastern (Campbell, 1988, 1990; Chemers, 1984), premodern (Sampson, 1989), and constructivist (Guba & Lincoln, 1989) images which are premised on a view of the individual as an inseparable element of the collective.

It is out of this modern Western image of the individual that current assumptions pertaining to leadership are based. Most noteworthy are the assumptions that: (1) power is an enduring characteristic of the individual (versus regarding it as a transient quality of social relationships embedded within a particular sociohistorical context); (2) powerful individuals are able to influence and/or control others in a unilateral fashion (as opposed to viewing social influence as a dialectical process); and, (3) individuals act autonomously in the world and therefore are directly responsible for controlling that over which they hold power (versus viewing the individual as simultaneously influencing and influenced by the situation, environment, social structure, etc.) (Gergen, 1992; Smith & Peterson, 1988; Sullivan, 1984). On the basis of these assumptions, leadership from the positivist perspective is viewed as a characteristic of the individual. Consequently, a leader is expected to use her or his power to exercise control over subordinates. The concept of influence by
subordinates is not considered.

In sharp contrast, the alternative constructivist assumptions lead to a view wherein leadership is regarded as a central aspect of the social process of organizing. In Western cultures, the membership of a group typically grants a greater degree of legitimate power to some members (i.e., those designated “leaders”) over other members (i.e., those designated “followers”). This view acknowledges that while the distribution of power (i.e., socially sanctioned authority to define reality on the behalf of others) is typically unequal, social influence is necessarily a dialectical process and thus all members of the group exert influence on all other members, although not necessarily to equivalent degrees. On the basis of such a construction all members are recognized as participants in the establishment and maintenance of the group power dynamics, for the nature and quality of the group interactions, and the outcomes the group achieves.

Dachler’s (1988) assertion that the assumptions made determine the questions that are asked puts into perspective the logic underlying mainstream constructions of leadership. Because it is assumed that the leader role is both necessary and universal, and that individuals occupying leader roles are responsible for group outcomes, the typical mainstream leadership questions become: what makes for an effective leader? and, how can the leader role be optimally performed? These questions lie at the heart of the leadership criterion problem in that the focus has been exclusively on leadership traits, styles and behaviours divorced from the social context in which the leadership role is enacted.

Alternatively, framing leadership in terms of a dialectical interpersonal process leads one to ask such questions as: what is the function of the leadership process in a group? and, how can this unfolding process be represented? With this reconceptualization, the focus is removed from the individual as a manifestation of particular leadership traits or styles and placed instead on the study of contextually grounded group dynamics.
Implications of the Positivist Position

Prior to moving into a reconstruction of leadership in constructivist terms, I will examine and critique four themes which permeate the positivist leadership discourse. These are: (1) the centrality of bi-dimensional conceptualizations of leadership; (2) a preoccupation with the role of leader, to the exclusion of the role of follower; (3) the transformation of the white male leader stereotype into the leader ideal; and, (4) a narrowly defined set of criteria for the assessment of leadership effectiveness. Each of these critiques includes an analysis of key theoretical and social ramifications which result from the dominance of these themes.

Bi-dimensional Conceptualizations of Leadership

The majority of positivist leadership theories assume two fundamental dimensions of leadership in organizational contexts: instrumental and social maintenance. These are variously described as "production-centred" and "employee-centred" (Katz, Maccoby, & Morse, 1950), "initiating structure" and "consideration" (House, 1971; Stogdill & Coons, 1957), "task-oriented" and "relationship-oriented" (Fiedler, 1967, 1974, 1978), "concern for production" and "concern for people" (Blake & Mouton, 1964, 1976), "task" and "relationship" (Hersey, 1984; Hersey & Blanchard, 1983), "performance" and "maintenance" (Misumi, 1985). Essentially, this view is based on a machine metaphor where a group, like a machine, must be maintained if it is to perform properly and with optimum efficiency.

This instrumental-social maintenance distinction is a compelling and intuitively appealing concept, and in many respects represents the single greatest advance the field has made over the insight that leadership is not a set of personality traits. However, from a constructivist standpoint, this bi-dimensional perspective is more problematic than it first appears.

The key criticism is that these hypothesized dimensions are not easily demarcated. For instance, depending on the social context, the meaning that individuals assign to leadership acts is highly variable to the point that what is regarded as social maintenance behaviour in one setting or circumstance can
be viewed as instrumental behaviour in another. For instance, after conducting an extensive review of the relevant Western and non-Western literature, Smith and Peterson (1988) concluded that, "a supervisor who frequently checks up that work is done correctly may be seen as a kind father in one setting, as task-centred in another setting, officious and mistrustful in a third" (p. 100).

Philosophically, this bi-dimensional perspective is problematic in that it is a product of the above outlined linear logic which holds that the leader's role is to cause followers to accomplish a task. It is taken as axiomatic in Western culture that the function of leadership is task achievement. Thus, social maintenance behaviours are typically regarded as necessary to facilitate or enable the accomplishment of the task. Consequently, the distinction between these forms of behaviour becomes further confounded in the sense that social maintenance activity is transformed into a form of instrumental activity initiated with the intent of furthering the achievement of the task (in terms of a machine metaphor, it represents work done on the machine to keep the machine working).

**Implications.** In practical terms the acknowledgement of this hierarchical primary/support dynamic between dimensions has led to the recognition that any maintenance activity in which a leader engages is merely a technique for achieving the real objective -- task accomplishment. A leader does not treat followers with consideration because she is considerate, or because that is the type of social environment that he wishes to participate in creating. Rather, a leader uses consideration as a social influence tool to further the accomplishment of the management defined task (e.g., to motivate employees to achieve peak performance). This rationale is explicitly employed by leadership theorists to induce managers to engage in social maintenance activities, and at the same time, has unintentionally served to foster suspicion and mistrust between leaders and followers.

Unions have been particularly quick to recognize the implications of this social maintenance rationale and have effectively capitalized on this realization to further entrench their power by undertaking efforts to “protect” their membership from demonstrations of management's “consideration.” This has
been taken to the point where even well intentioned and largely innocent efforts on the part of management to "humanize" the work place or merely "improve relations" are routinely blocked by unions. For instance, I have witnessed a union halting a company's attempt to provide employees and their families with free tickets to an amusement park on the grounds that if employees were to benefit from the company in any way, it would be through union won concessions.

The final problem with the adoption of the current hierarchical bi-dimensional conceptualization of leadership is that it is based on an uncritical acceptance of the values and assumptions of Western industrialism which lead one to accept that task achievement is the only reason a group would or should exist. This acceptance serves to inhibit the reciprocal view that a group may exist to continue its own existence. Consequently, it seldom occurs to leadership theorists that instrumental activities could be construed as functioning in support of, or to facilitate, the social maintenance of a group.

In this regard the example of the family (a social unit typically ignored by leadership theorists which provides a different perspective on leadership) serves as a useful example. The family's most obvious purpose over time has been social maintenance. Unlike the formal organization which exists to accomplish a task (typically to turn a profit), the family accomplishes tasks (only some of which involve earning money) in order to continue to exist. This reversed model of the dynamic between the instrumental and social maintenance dimensions is better suited to understanding leadership dynamics in contexts which are less outcome driven, and therefore, where values of effectiveness and efficiency are not of paramount concern (e.g., religious congregations, tribal bands, social clubs, etc.).

In an effort to transcend the problems I have identified in bi-dimensional conceptualizations of leadership, in a later section I propose that the objectives of leadership be redefined from task accomplishment to the attainment of coordinated activity among members of a collective. In this sense, the emphasis shifts from outcomes to achieving and sustaining a particular condition of social interaction.
Exclusive Focus on the Role of Leader

As I suggested above, a further implication which stems from reliance on the Western view of the individual and assumptions of unilateral social causation is a singular focus on the actions of the leader as the means for controlling individual members, and by extrapolation, group outcomes. Viewing the leader as possessor of this magnitude and latitude of power over people and group outcomes inhibits recognition of the powerful influence which both environmental factors (e.g., physical, legal, cultural, technological, political, economic, historical, etc.) and group members (individually and collectively) exert on the group process and ultimately on the nature of outcomes achieved (Andriessen & Drenth, 1984; Denmark, 1977; Jaques, 1970; McElroy & Hunger, 1988; Pfeffer, 1978).

Perhaps the most significant implication which stems from this singular focus on leader control is that it gives rise to a conceptual blindness which prevents recognition of the influence that the less powerful (typically the designated followers) exert on the more powerful (the designated leaders). That is, these assumptions have inhibited the introduction of a conceptual framework for investigating the influences operating within the group as members attempt to make sense of, and interact with, their social environment (e.g., a leader-follower dialectic).

In similar fashion, this leader bias ignores the role of culture. Group culture functions to ensure that leaders are never entirely free to perceive, think or interact as they please. Culture, as an emergent and evolving normative order, places significant constraints both upon the range of interpretations a leader can realistically draw upon to make sense of a set of circumstances, as well as on the actions that the leader may utilized in his or her efforts to win group compliance. For instance, the notion of "the unthinkable" (whatever that may constitute within a particular social context) represents interpretations and actions which are indeed imaginable but which exceed the culturally prescribed limits of discourse and action.
Implications. Given that both the influence of followers and culture is largely ignored by mainstream leadership theorists, it is common practice to assign the vast majority of responsibility to the leader, both in terms of initiating task relevant behaviours, as well as in the assignment of credit or blame for perceived group outcomes (Hunt, 1984; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Pfeffer, 1978; Vroom, 1976). It is Pfeffer's (1978) contention that this leadership control myth will be difficult to dispel given its centrality in the perpetuation of the existing social order. He states:

The identification of certain organizational roles as leadership positions tends to guide the construction of meaning in the direction of attributing effects to the actions of those positions.... When causality is lodged in one or a few persons, rather than being a function of a complex set of interactions among all group members, changes are made by replacing or influencing the occupant of the leadership position, and the causes of organizational actions are easily identified with this simple structure.... The personification of social causality serves too many uses to be easily overcome. (Pfeffer, 1978, p. 29-30)

Further support for this position comes from Hunt (1984):

It is easier to conceive of an ameliorization of circumstances where cause is laid at the door of an identifiable individual rather than its being a consequence of social, cultural, economic, and political transactions. The oversimplification is both comforting and optimistic.... A "leader" is an easily observable antecedent who satisfies the preference for unitary explanations. (p. 172)

From the perspective of theory and research, these attributions of control and responsibility have had the simultaneous effect of focusing a tremendous amount of attention on the role of leader, and almost none on the reciprocal role of follower.4

This tendency to ignore the role of followers is a product of the value that Western culture places on control. Leaders are valued over followers for they are perceived as the agents of causality, while followers are regarded as the objects of causality. One only has to look for a training program on followership...
against the backdrop of a plethora of leadership training programs to recognize the value placed on leadership and those who perform it. Indeed the very term "followership" sounds awkward and the concept of training people to be effective followers seems almost absurd. The implicit assumption is that followers need no training to be influenced by leaders for they are passive recipients of influence attempts. This is in sharp contrast to the way in which leaders are traditionally characterized: active, initiating, heroic, and therefore, highly valued and worthy of significant investments of time and money.

From the perspective of everyday life in Western society, there is reason for concern regarding the impact that the social expectations resulting from these attributions can have on the individuals enacting both the leader and follower roles. For instance, what are the potential ramifications of the leader being regarded as the central point of focus for achieving performance, yet being unable to exercise the degree of control necessary to consistently ensure such performance? Similarly, what might one who enacts a traditional follower role experience as a result of being denied social acknowledgement for the central role he or she plays in shaping the nature of the group process and outcome?

With respect to those occupying leader roles, one might anticipate that many would experience stress resulting from the social pressure to "make things happen." In those many instances where it is not possible to cause all that "should" happen to happen, it is not unimaginable that feelings of stress might be compounded by a sense of frustration, distress, helplessness, personal failure, depression and perhaps general resentment directed toward the members of one's role set. Given this scenario, over the long term it is conceivable that an important element of manager "burnout" might be the unrecognized paradox which is created and sustained through this culturally sanctioned belief in the leader's ability and responsibility to control more of the social environment than is reasonably controllable.

From the perspective of the individuals performing the follower role, the socially sanctioned de-emphasis and undervaluing of their contribution to both the group process and outcome can also lead to undesirable experiences of
group life. To a greater or lesser extent, Western society gives permission to those enacting the role of follower not to feel accountable for their contribution to the group. Thus, without genuine social recognition (as opposed to the often patronizing statements from group leaders such as "I couldn't have done it without my team"), those who perform this role may well experience feelings of powerlessness, alienation, and degradation. It is conceivable that such feelings could lead to self-depreciation and perhaps even "learned-helplessness" in the face of opportunities to act constructively.

Finally, this uncritical reliance on assumptions of unilateral causality and management defined outcomes has led to lines of reasoning which seriously over-simplify the dynamics of leadership. Consequently, the field is characterized by mechanistic theories which emphasize an approach to the study and practice of leadership which seeks to identify specific strategies or techniques intended to cause followers to be maximally productive (Sullivan, 1984). As Smith and Peterson (1988) state:

The implicit behaviourism of the earlier generation led them to seek to predict the effects of leader personality or behavioural style upon outcomes of value to managers.... The further assumption was made that once the linkages between styles and outcome had been determined, we could in a similarly mechanistic manner select or train leaders to use appropriate styles. (p. 46)

A fundamental problem with an approach based on a unilateral "influence strategy" or "technique" lies in the image that these words typically evoke; an agent operating on an object to produce a desired outcome. Such an image itself inhibits a dialectic view of the social process of leadership. Emerging from this basic causal conception come the behaviouristic hypotheses upon which the majority of positivist leadership theories are founded. For instance, initiating task structure and consideration for employees are typically regarded as the key independent variables which control the dependent variable -- group outcomes (Dachler, 1988; McElroy & Hunger, 1988; Pondy, 1978; Pondy & Boje, 1980).
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The problem with operationalizing leadership effectiveness in these terms lies in the weakness of the premises upon which the causal attributions are based. To begin with, there is good reason to question the validity and universality of the commonly hypothesized links between such variables as worker satisfaction, team cohesiveness, the provision of task structure, and consideration, and productivity or efficient task accomplishment. For instance, there are countless examples of highly satisfied workers who put minimum effort into their work; indeed, license to invest minimum effort may be one of the factors contributing to their satisfaction. Similarly, there are extremely cohesive teams that work effectively against accomplishment of the management-defined objectives, structured tasks which discourage worker initiative, and considerate leaders who are exploited by their followers.

This closed system causal logic ignores the role of individual differences, treating every follower as though he or she had identical viewpoints, values, needs and desires and, therefore, was malleable by the correct S-R programming. It is blind to the informal status and authority structure between followers which gives some members more influence than others over how a team functions. It is insensitive to the advent of various political bodies (e.g., unions) or power dynamics (e.g., management arrangements which centralize power) which can severely limit the immediate leader's ability and legitimate authority to influence followers' behaviour. Additionally, cultural mores, legislation, technology, economics and organizational policies frequently place significant limitations on the leader's range of authority and influence over followers.5

The Leader Stereotype

Part Seven of Bass's (1981) revised edition of Stogdill's (1974) Handbook of Leadership is entitled "Special Conditions." This section contains chapters which deal with aspects of leadership considered tangential to the central focus of the theory and research literature. The three chapters which compose this section are entitled "Woman and Leadership," "Blacks and Leadership," and "Leadership in Different Cultures." In the Third Edition (Bass,
1990) the structure of the Handbook changes little, but several titles are altered to make them more politically correct (i.e., Part Seven is entitled “Diverse Groups,” and the original chapter on “Blacks” is expanded to incorporate other minority groups and is retitled “Leadership, Blacks, Hispanics, and Other Minorities”).

The inclusion of these chapters contrasted with the absence of a chapter entitled “White Males and Leadership” is extremely telling. It reveals the implicit sexism, racism, and Eurocentrism which underlies the vast majority of positivist leadership theory and research. As numerous theorists have pointed out, because most positions of leadership in North America have traditionally been dominated by white middle class males, this population has been the central focus of study (Dachler, 1988; Denmark, 1977; Hollander, 1985; Korabik, 1988). Moreover, psychology itself has traditionally been a middle class male dominated profession (Sullivan, 1984). The uncritical acceptance of these social dynamics have led psychologists to regard male dominance as a social fact which represents the universal and "real" leadership reality.

Implications. The vast majority of positivist leadership theories are built on the implicit assumption that leadership is defined by the way in which males, especially white middle class heterosexual males, enact the leadership role. On the basis of this logic, theorists inevitably came to assume that those traits traditionally regarded as "male" (e.g., competitiveness, self-confidence, objectivity, aggressiveness, forcefulness, desire for responsibility and authority, self-control, etc.) constitute leadership effectiveness (Rowney & Cahoon, 1988). As Dachler (1988) states: “The 'problem' of women as leaders, for example, is then a problem because male traits as predictors of effective leadership are so unquestioningly accepted as the objective 'God-given' reality” (p. 264).

This definition of the "reality" of leadership leads to a serious naturalistic fallacy. Like the assumption of the necessity of leadership roles, the cultural status quo is translated into the leadership ideal (i.e., what is, is what should be). In essence then, the vast majority of modern leadership theories serve a social maintenance function for they unquestionably accept the social status quo as the natural order, and then seek to explain leadership in these same
terms. The first corollary of this position is that any approach to leadership which is not characteristically associated with how white heterosexual males are expected to lead is fundamentally inferior. The second is that those who do not represent the white male ideal should strive to emulate it if they wish to be effective leaders.

This contributes to the creation of a double-bind which fosters the marginalization and oppression of those who have traditionally been denied access to formal positions of leadership. That is, those who obviously do not fit the physical stereotype of the leader, but who attempt to perform the role of leader, are at one and the same time encouraged to, and sanctioned for, behaving like white heterosexual males (i.e., “emulate white males if you want to be an effective leader, but do not behave in ways inconsistent with your own social station in life”). One need only reflect on the nature and number of the derogatory terms assigned by both sexes to women who are perceived to act in a manner which is regarded as “too masculine” to become aware of the degree to which this double-bind functions to inhibit women and non-stereotypical men from assuming positions of power and authority.

**The Leadership Criterion Problem**

Implicit within the criteria for the assessment of leadership effectiveness I outlined in the previous section is the “management perspective” which permeates positivist leadership theories. The uncritical adoption of this perspective by theorists has led to the assumption that the function of leadership is the efficient accomplishment of management defined objectives. As Smith and Peterson (1988) have argued, this is an entirely singular and narrow view which does not necessarily correspond to other stakeholders' perceptions of effective leadership. By failing to acknowledge competing perspectives on effectiveness, these criteria have come to be regarded as objective measures of leadership success, rather than as subjective criteria defined on the basis of the interests of the most powerful stakeholder group.

Implicit value biases such as these have gone unacknowledged within social psychology, in part, because researchers believe themselves to function
within a system of value neutrality based on the subject-object dualism of traditional science (Dachler, 1988; Georgoudi, 1983; Gergen, 1973, 1984; Gergen & Basseches, 1980; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Morgan & Smircich, 1980; Nuyten, 1990; Rosnow, 1981; Strike & Posner, 1983; Sullivan, 1984). In this section I will address this myth of objective criteria in more detail.

After exploring numerous positivist based conceptualizations of leadership, Smith and Peterson (1988) conclude that it is “not possible to identify an uncontentious criterion of leader effectiveness. Any measure of effectiveness must be effectiveness as defined by a particular party and others may not agree with the priorities implicit within that criterion” (p. 30). An added dimension to this problem is the observation that most groups do not organize around one goal, but rather work simultaneously toward the achievement of a variety of goals. Moreover, each of these goals may be assigned differential weights of importance by observers with different agendas (Smith & Peterson, 1988; Weinberg, 1975).

In any evaluation process, the point most frequently overlooked is that value is itself a human construction and therefore, the process of valuation is an entirely relative phenomenon. Objects, events, and outcomes do not possess value in and of themselves but rather, are valued or devalued relative to the agenda and interpretations of the stakeholder(s) involved (Gergen & Gergen, 1984; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Silverman, 1971). For the group, subjectivity finds its origins at the point at which the group purpose and goals begin to be defined. Thus, it is vital to recognize that while human beings both act upon and are acted upon by the physical and social environment, their actions to influence these environments are predicated upon socially constructed and value based visions. That is, decisions regarding courses of action are made with reference to what stakeholders regard as valuable, desirable or important (Gergen & Gergen, 1984; Strike & Posner, 1983).

Implications. The recognition that there are multiple perspectives on the question of leadership effectiveness forces the acknowledgement that the leader is subject to a myriad of potentially conflicting evaluations of his or her performance, often based on outcomes over which he or she has limited
control. Such inconsistencies present a leader with what is perhaps the single greatest source of role conflict: incompatible definitions of desirable group outcomes from his or her role set (Smith & Peterson, 1988).

For instance, a factory production team and their supervisor might informally set an internal group production ceiling of ten widgets per hour in direct contradiction to the management agenda which values the maximization of production. If management is convinced that this level of production is below what is reasonably possible, this outcome will invariably be assessed as undesirable and indicative of poor leadership on the part of the team leader. From the team members’ perspective however, such an outcome would be regarded as functional, highly desirable, and indicative of effective leadership.

By shifting away from outcomes as the basis of assessing leadership effectiveness and focusing instead on the nature of the unfolding leadership process (a model of which I will present later), effective leadership can be said to have occurred within this work group. That is, if the group successfully negotiates an internally defined, consensually validated view of reality (i.e., the shared belief that only ten widgets should be produced per hour), and individuals coordinate their actions toward the achievement of the goals defined by this reality (i.e., members collaborate to ensure that only ten widgets are produced in an hour), one can say that the group leadership process was indeed effective regardless of how one evaluates the outcome.

The use of outcome criteria becomes even more complex when one considers the subjectivity involved in the determination of the evaluation time frame. The example of productivity measurements as an indicator of leadership effectiveness conducted over the short and long term effectively illustrates this point. Very different conclusions may be drawn from an evaluation of a leader’s effectiveness at influencing his or her group to optimize performance over the course of one week versus an evaluation which spans a period of one year.

From a positivist perspective, where the goal of science is to predict and control, measured outcomes are typically looked upon as though they are objective, absolute and finally achieved. Furthermore, they are regarded as predictors of future group outcomes rather than as information pertaining to a
specific period of group functioning. This interpretive logic stems from the positivist's quest for the discovery of rule governed, linear cause and effect relationships (e.g., a desirable outcome is indicative of effective leadership, and effective leadership is a quality or skill of an individual).

From the constructivist perspective however, outcome measures are interpreted through a very different lens. Outcomes are seen as socially constructed, and therefore, subjectively defined phenomena which create information that cannot be generalized beyond the specific spatio-temporal context. While such data can indeed be instrumental and informative to the specific group from which the information is drawn, due to the spatio-temporal limits of that data, one cannot assume that the same or similar outcomes have been achieved in the past or will be achieved in future. Consequently, such bounded information cannot be assumed to represent the nature of the group process into the future (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Weick, 1979).

On the basis of these arguments, it seems unreasonable to treat management defined outcomes as though they represent objective and enduring properties of the group process which can be relied upon as objective measures of leadership effectiveness. Continued reliance on outcome criteria seems to offer little more than justifications for or against the use of a particular leadership approach in a particular social context (McElroy & Hunger, 1988). My position is that the adoption of a social constructivist approach which focuses on the nature of the group process rather than group outcomes, offers greater promise for the construction of a theory of leadership which has relevance across cultural time and space.

In summary, doubt is cast on the logical validity and widespread applicability of the primary assumptions which form the foundation for the vast majority of positivist leadership theories. This deconstruction suggests that the generalizability and utility of the conclusions to which these assumptions lead must be regarded with caution. In particular, the reliance on outcome measures as indicative of effective leadership gives rise to many problems in understanding the nature of leadership in real settings. At the same time, the
contention that there is a simple way of defining and subsequently measuring leadership effectiveness through the evaluation of group outcomes is of such central importance to the positivist construction of reality that researchers have demonstrated an intense reluctance to abandon it (Smith & Peterson, 1988).

In what follows, I will replace the fundamental values and assumptions of positivist approaches to leadership with values and assumptions consistent with a constructivist perspective. The central issues I will address include: the reframing of the concept of group from a social object to a social process; the incorporation of a dialectical perspective on interpersonal influence processes; the reconceptualization of leadership as a social process of event interpretation and meaning management; and, the conceptualization of group culture as both the accumulated product of, and social context within which, the leadership process unfolds. What emerges is a theory of social organizing grounded in the integration of the formally distinct concepts of leadership and culture.

**Reconstructing Group Leadership**

Through this reconstruction I will argue that there is much to be gained over positivist conceptualizations of leadership by reframing the concept in terms of a social constructivist ontology. The emergent social process view of leadership serves as a foundation for differentiating the role of leader from the process of leadership, sets the stage for the introduction of culture as an essential and complementary organizing process to that of leadership, and culminates in the construction of an alternative theory of leadership as a social organizing process. It is this new theory that served as the framework for the development of the training process that became the research focal point of the second half of this project.

**Underlying Assumptions**

In this section I present a foundation of interrelated constructivist assumptions upon which the subsequent reconstruction of leadership will rest. These underlying assumptions are: (1) reality is a subjective construction of the observer, not an objective representation of actual objects and events; (2)
groups are not entities, but rather social organizing processes; and (3), interpersonal dialectic processes are critical to the process of reality construction. I will discuss each of these in turn.

**The Subjectivity of Reality**

The human information processing and retrieval system can be thought of as the means by which each individual experiences and makes sense of his or her physical and social world. A vast body of literature has emerged from studies in cognition which suggests that the basic processes of this system (i.e., sensation, perception and memory) are not copying systems which produce a duplicate of the external world in the inner world of the psyche. Rather, it appears that each of these processes are selective, generative, decision-making systems involved in constructing a version of reality unique to the observer (Bull & Clifford, 1979; Gergen, 1985; Smith & Peterson, 1988).

For my purposes, the conclusion to be drawn from this literature is that the inherent characteristics of human cognition ultimately preclude unambiguous access to reality. All views of reality must therefore be regarded as active, creative and idiosyncratic constructions by the perceiver (Hunt, 1984; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Luckmann, 1983; Morgan, 1986, 1993; Morgan & Smircich, 1980; Smith & Peterson, 1988; Weick, 1979).

The central implication of this conclusion is that no view of reality can be evaluated in terms of its inherent proximity to an ultimate or “objective” reality. All realities are necessarily subjective constructions which reflect as much about the perceiver as the perceived. One construction of reality may be of greater utility than another to a given individual, group, or society at any point in time, but such an evaluation is based on the idiosyncratic priorities and values of those defining reality (Bartolke, 1988; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Morgan & Smircich, 1980; Sampson, 1991; Silverman, 1971; Smith & Peterson, 1988; Weinberg, 1975).
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According to Weick (1979), just as every individual is continually confronted with ambiguous or equivocal information of which she or he must make sense in order to function, so too are groups. Consequently, like individuals, groups must engage in reality constructing activity. Thus, when group members are confronted with equivocal information, they are compelled to engage in a process of “organizing” their collective experience. This process of collective reality construction enables individuals to coordinate their activities with one another toward a collective response. In my view, this collective sense-making and resultant coordinated activity are the central defining features of a group. As Weick (1979) contends:

Organizing is directed initially at any input that is not self-evident. Happenings that represent a change, a difference, or a discontinuity from what has been going on, happenings that seem to have more than one meaning (they are equivocal) are the occasion for sizable collective activity. Once these inputs have become less equivocal, there is a decrease in the amount of collective activity directed at them.... [Thus] organizing serves to narrow the range of possibilities, to reduce the number of "might occurs".... An organization attempts to transform equivocal information into a degree of unequivocality with which it can work and to which it is accustomed. (p. 4-6)

Group members reduce equivocality and arrive at an acceptable interpretation of reality by working toward agreement concerning which features of the group context are most salient and which are to be taken as real or illusory (Holzner & Marx, 1979; Schein, 1985; Silverman, 1971; Stryker & Statham, 1985). Weick (1979) refers to this process as the "negotiation" of social reality. Negotiation, in this sense of the term, refers to the natural interchange among group members, based on largely common rules of interpretation, through which situations are given meaning and equivocality is reduced. Weick refers to a successful negotiation process as "consensual validation" of reality. Once consensual validation has been achieved, group members' information processing resources are freed from the attention-demanding task of defining the situation and can be used to integrate their
actions in a manner consistent with their current construction of reality.

According to this view then, the mainstream tendency to conceptualize groups as social objects is misleading. Rather, groups are better regarded as dynamic social processes which organize and reorganize in the face of equivocality. As "organized processes of reorganizing," group memberships are transformed from "being" a group to "doing" a group through the continual negotiation of consensually validated social reality.

**The Group as a Process of Interpersonal Interaction**

The process by which a group membership actually goes about negotiating consensually validated realities is the subject of this final set of assumptions. I assume that the construction of social reality is inseparable from the process of interpersonal interaction. It is through interpersonal interaction that social reality is constructed, and in turn, existing and emergent social realities shape and constrain the interpersonal process. As Stryker and Statham (1985) contend:

Regardless of whether a person constructs a definition before entering a situation, using whatever information or cues may be available as a basis for the construction and regardless of whether ready-made cultural definitions are available, the person typically revises or reconstructs definitions in the course of interaction with others. Tentatively held definitions are repeatedly tested and reformulated on the basis of this experience. A dialectic occurs in which putative definitions permit interaction to begin; reactions from others to the definitions implicit in one's actions serve to validate or invalidate these definitions wholly or in part, and revised definitions become the basis for additional interaction. (p. 322)

This dialectic suggests that causality in reality construction and interpersonal processes is better regarded as a dynamic process of multilateral or mutual influence rather than a linear pattern of reciprocating cause and effect interaction (Stryker & Statham, 1985; Weick, 1978, 1979). For the purposes of reconstructing leadership, this dialectical conceptualization has three important implications: recreation of the group in time, the emergence of group history,
and indeterminacy of the group process.

First, group interaction processes are dynamic and therefore transformative over time. This notion of transformation is based on the assumption that change is constant (Gergen & Gergen, 1984; Krippendorff, 1984; Weick, 1979). This endows the concept of group with a spatio-temporal property (Hosking & Morley, 1988; Morgan, 1986, 1993; Morgan & Smircich, 1980; Morley & Hosking, 1984; Potter & Wetherell, 1987). That is, the idea of a group achieving a static state is necessarily illusory. To achieve the appearance of stability (e.g., harmony within a team), members must engage in reconstructing the familiar arrangement of interaction patterns from moment to moment (Georgoudi, 1983; Holzner & Marx, 1979; Morgan, 1986, 1993; Morgan & Smircich, 1980; Weick, 1979).

This spatio-temporal nature of the group process gives rise to another important property of the evolving relations and realities among participants --- history (Goldner, 1980). The formation of history produces the potential for the development of routinized interaction patterns, norms, and common understandings of behaviours between interaction participants. All of these serve to stabilize the interaction process and enhance the probability that participants will reconstruct the fundamental nature of their process even in the face of the constant forces of change. Recollections of the past, as imperfect as they may be, will have a significant impact on the present, which in turn shapes the future course of the member interactions (Weick, 1979).

Finally, as a counter-balance to the stabilizing force of history, the negotiated nature of reality and interpersonal process denies the possibility of an entirely determinant model of social interaction. This gives the concept of group an emergent and indeterminant character, and implies (in contrast to mainstream views of leadership) that no group member can predict with any degree of certainty, or unilaterally control, the actual course of any given group process (Pfeffer, 1985; Stryker & Statham, 1985; Sullivan, 1984; Rychlak, 1976).

In the following section I use the preceding conceptualization of the nature of reality construction and group process as the building blocks for a
reconstruction of leadership as a group process. In sharp contrast to the positivist view of leadership as a set of behaviours enacted by a leader toward followers, I present a case for framing leadership as the collective process of negotiating consensually validated definitions of reality.

**Leadership as Social Reality Construction**

It is my view that leadership can be equated with the above outlined process of group reality construction. That is, I contend that rather than a behaviour enacted toward others, leadership is better regarded as the process by which group members negotiate consensually validated definitions of reality in response to equivocal situations ("negotiate" in this sense refers to a dialectical process whereby all group members are seen as active participants in the interpretation and validation of reality) (Bruner, 1990; Hosking & Morley, 1988).

In this regard I offer a generic model of the leadership process to illustrate what I conceptualize as the cyclical dynamics that emerge through, and simultaneously influence, the course of group functioning. Figure 1 represents the recurring process of leadership which unfolds on multiple levels of meaning as group members negotiate, maintain and alter their reality within a particular sociohistorical field.

The Leadership Process Phase Model (LPPM) can be utilized as a framework for understanding and interpreting group activity on multiple levels of group formation and functioning. It can be used to interpret the full spectrum of interpersonal events from the process by which group members formulate their mission, through the general means by which members intend to achieve their ends, to the process by which a single group member copes with difficulties experienced in integrating his or her activities with those of the remainder of the group.

According to the model there is no beginning or end to the process; only unfolding phases of interpersonal interaction, which, when successfully negotiated, give rise to the emergence of subsequent phases in the process. In short, while specific leadership processes will vary widely, the model represents
a prototypical pattern intended to reflect abstract commonalities in the unfolding process of leadership (i.e., social reality construction) across cultural space and time.

Figure 1

Leadership Process Phase Model

Because the model has no objective beginning or end phase, one may choose any starting point to explore its dynamics. Given the emphasis of this dissertation on the process of social organizing, it is appropriate to begin with the phase of Coordinated Activity. Of the five phases outlined in this model, it is only during this phase that the group process is specifically focused on the achievement of its mission(s) or purpose(s) -- however these might be defined by the collective. A group can be regarded as functioning within this phase when members have reached consensual validation of a definition of reality and are intentionally coordinating their activities in an effort to move toward attainment of, or approximate the internal social conditions of, the group objectives. All other phases are elemental to enabling (or if negotiated poorly, inhibiting) the group's achievement and maintenance of a phase of Coordinated Activity.6
Events in the sociohistorical environment provide the group members with information which either supports or challenges their current definition of reality. Those social forces and events which are consistent with, confirm, and reinforce this definition of reality facilitate the continuation of a phase of Coordinated Activity. However, those social forces, events, or insights which challenge this collectively held definition of reality, and which therefore inhibit the group from continuing in a phase of Coordinated Activity, represent the next phase of the process -- the *Equivocal Situation* (Silverman, 1971). This phase can be characterized by a range of subjective experiences, from vague incertitude to confusion and frustration and even despair, as group members struggle with their loss of focus and certainty (Weick, 1979).

The phase of *Situational Assessment* emerges out of this uncertainty as group members begin the struggle to reduce equivocality and bring meaning to events. In this phase, group members engage in activities intended to clarify the situation, to interpret events as they unfold within the environment, and ultimately, to reduce the experience of equivocality. Thus, group members or designated individuals within the group gather information and, in some sense, analyze and interpret the data for its relevance and implications.

Out of this assessment phase comes *Reality Assertion*, which typically consists of an offered definition of the situation and may involve a specified prescription for group action. Once a definition of reality has been asserted, group members evaluate that reality with respect to their experience and perceptions of the situation, as well as their anticipations of the reality's utility for achieving group, and typically, personal objectives. In this phase of *Reality Evaluation*, two broad classes of events can occur. The asserted reality may be rejected, drawing the process back into a phase of situational assessment, or the asserted reality may achieve consensual validation. If the definition of reality is accepted, a new phase of *Coordinated Activity* emerges which is maintained as long as the current view of reality is sustained against competing interpretations and inconsistent evidence.

Should members fail to negotiate their way through any phase of the process the group itself is vulnerable to disintegration. Thus, this model
illustrates the process by which a group is created and maintained but it does not imply that the group will invariably work through all phases of this process. Indeed, depending upon the centrality of the issue for the group, failure to successfully negotiate any single phase could jeopardize the continued existence of the group. In the sections which follow, I will explore the central dynamics and key implications of this model in greater detail.

**Leadership as a Dialectical Interaction Process**

In this section I examine the prototypical nature of the social influence process through which groups negotiate shared realities (i.e., the leadership process). As I proposed in my discussion of underlying assumptions, because the course of a group process is the product of the dialectical interactions of the members, no individual can accurately predict or solely determine the specific course of the group process. At the same time, however, individual members can and do influence the nature and course of the group process and the realities they negotiate. Each individual does so (with differing degrees of intentionally) via her or his choices of action, to which others assign particular degrees of significance and various meanings.

According to the process phase model, in order for coordinated activity to occur, the group must achieve a common definition of reality. This is not to suggest that everyone in the group will agree with, like, or actively support this definition. It merely suggests that each member must have at least a minimal understanding of the reality around which the group is attempting to organize, and be willing to comply with the activity implied by this definition. Thus, the achievement of coordinated activity requires two complementary forms of leadership activity: "reality assertion" and "compliance." The following sections delineate the nature of these generic forms of leadership action and their dialectic relationship.

First, however, it should be understood that these two forms of activity are role-independent. That is, there is no necessity that "leaders" assert realities and "followers" comply. It may be normative in the case of a given group that the leader asserts and the followers comply (e.g., within a military unit), but it is
equally possible that the formal leader will comply with the asserted definition of reality offered by a group member (e.g., during a committee meeting). In this sense then, the leadership process is independent of the roles of leader and follower. I will have more to say on this point as my discussion unfolds.

**Assertive activities.** Interpretations of reality (i.e., what is happening, what does it mean to us, what should we do about it?) constitute the leadership process phase of Reality Assertion (see Figure 1: LPPM). These assertions play a fundamental role in resolving all instances of equivocality, not the least of which occurs during initial group formation when equivocality is typically at its maximum. During a group's formative period a common view of reality is constructed in response to two fundamental, and often implicit, conceptual questions: Why should the group exist? and, What general approach should be taken in order to accomplish the group goals? The construction which results from consensual validation of a particular asserted reality represents the group's mission, and functions as a *foundational reality* through which group attention is focused, events are perceived, interpretations are made, and courses of action calculated. A group's foundational reality is typically questioned only under the most equivocal of circumstances and, as I will argue in a subsequent section, represents the core of group "culture."

Once this foundational level of reality has been established, the nature of assertive activities becomes more pragmatic. As equivocal situations present themselves over the course of everyday group functioning, assertive activity emerges in response to two very practical questions: What does the situation mean for the group? and, What actions should be taken in light of this meaning? On this level of immediate reality definition then, assertive activities function to bring meaning to equivocal situations and to define the courses of action around which group members can coordinate their activities in a manner consistent with the group's foundational reality.

Assertive activities include all those behaviours which are interpreted by other group members as efforts to present the group with a definition of reality, challenge the utility of an existing definition of reality, or present an alternative definition. Thus, assertive activities may take the form of imposing a definition of
reality and prescription for action on the group (e.g., "Here is what is happening.... This is what we are going to do about it"); responding to requests to reduce ambiguity by providing a definition of reality (e.g., "I don't think we are faced with a crisis at this point"); proposing a definition for the group's consideration (e.g., "Here is what I believe happened, and this is why I think it poses a threat to our organization"); or challenging the current definition (e.g., "I no longer believe that management is working in our best interests") (Smircich & Morgan 1982).

In addition, assertive activities may appear in more subtle forms. For instance, one may conceptualize and articulate that which has been implicit or unspoken within the group (e.g., "Throughout our discussions, we have all been assuming that it is necessarily Roger's responsibility"); provide images and interpretations which focus attention on unique and unconsidered aspects of the environment (e.g., "To this point no one has considered how our plans could be affected by the anticipated economic recovery"); or, consolidate, question, or redefine the current wisdom upon which the group definition relies (e.g., "I feel that it is time to consider whether or not our belief about the necessity of maintaining large stock piles of parts is in fact the most efficient way to build our product"). The interpersonal process which ensues when one or more group members engage in such actions can have the effect of more clearly focusing and/or significantly altering the realities of the remaining members (Smircich & Morgan, 1982).

It is not necessary for a group member to provide the final definition of reality or prescription for action in order that he or she be perceived to have played an assertive role. Frequently, individuals will initiate the phase of Reality Assessment by providing the group with a procedure through which the group may coordinate its activities to interpret a situation. Thus assertive activity may take the form of eliciting interpretations of reality from others (e.g., "What do you think about the situation, Jean?"); providing critiques of various interpretations (e.g., "I agree with what you said initially, but have you thought about...?"); or more directly influencing the group to adopt some form of procedure of information gathering and interpretation through which the group may arrive at
a shared definition of reality (e.g., "Why don't we each go back to our respective departments and ask our people what they make of the situation. Then we can come back here, share the results, and make a more informed decision").

**Compliant activities.** As early as the middle of this century, Sanford (1950) acknowledged the importance of followers' actions in the leadership process. He stated that:

> There is some justification for regarding the follower as the most crucial factor in any leadership event.... Not only is it the follower who accepts or rejects leadership, but it is the follower who perceives both the leader and the situation and who reacts in terms of what he perceives. (p. 4)

Only a small number of theorists have actually acknowledged Stanford's view and taken steps to incorporate this dialectic between the leader and follower into their constructions of leadership (e.g., Andriessen & Drenth, 1984; Bass, 1981, 1985; Heller & Van Til, 1982; Lippitt, 1982; Smircich & Morgan, 1982; Smith & Peterson, 1988; Weick, 1978; Yukl, 1981).

As I indicated in the introduction to this section, I separate the process of leadership, as a collective reality defining process, from the roles of leadership. Thus, I divorce the acceptance or rejection of reality assertions from the role of follower and recast it in terms of compliant and noncompliant activities which any group member, regardless of role, can enact as part of their participation in the reality definition process. I define compliant activities as those behaviours which can be interpreted as demonstrating submission to, acceptance of, agreement and cooperation with, or active promotion of a particular view of reality proposed by another. They may also take the form of support for another's call to evaluate the utility of a particular reality construction and/or its underlying assumptions.

Examples of compliant activities include those instances where an individual uncritically accepts or submits to another's definition of an event and the prescribed course of action (e.g., "Yes sir, right away sir"); where one evaluates and comes to agree with and openly advocate or support another's offered definition (e.g., "I think you ought to listen to her. Her view of the
situation offers some unique insights”); and, where an individual supports the efforts of another to question the utility of the status quo (e.g., “Maybe he is right. Maybe it is time we took a long, hard look at our basic assumptions”).

While compliant activities may in some forms appear to be relatively passive in nature, in my view this is not a defining feature of this form of activity. All instances of compliance and noncompliance with a proposed definition of reality require an active process of decision-making, and frequently involve intense and critical evaluation of the interpretation of events.

The decision-making process may be as straightforward as an individual's deciding in advance that he or she will unconditionally accept the definition of reality and prescription for action proposed by another (e.g., as a result of the trusting nature of the relationship, the urgency and equivocality of the situation, the anticipated rewards and/or punishments associated with compliance and non-compliance, or because of cultural expectations concerning obedience to authority). At the other extreme, decision-making may be a multi-staged process in which a decision is made to adopt a much more tentative stance. For instance, the group member listens to the other's definition of events, evaluates it in terms of its concordance with her or his own view of reality, questions certain features of it, even asserts a modified or counter-definition before finally accepting or rejecting the interpretation of reality. In any event, the decision to comply (by coordinating subsequent activities with others) or not to comply (by withholding cooperation) with the proposed definition of reality and subsequent prescription for action is one with which all group members are confronted as part of the reality construction process.

When framed in these terms the amount of influence that each group member can actually exert in the leadership process beyond asserting realities becomes more clearly evident. Whatever any given member chooses to do (i.e., comply or not comply) will have a significant impact on the course of the unfolding leadership process. The choice of compliance is therefore as fundamental to the leadership process as the assertion of reality.

The leadership process defined. On the basis of the preceding reconstruction, it is now possible to offer a definition of leadership grounded in a
social constructivist ontology. As I have indicated, the leadership process can be regarded as an inevitable and inseparable component of the processes involved in group formation and everyday functioning. In this regard, I view leadership as the process of negotiation by which a group interprets equivocal information toward constructing a consensually validated definition of reality around which member activity can be organized. Accordingly, the leadership process is essential for group formation, adaptation to the environment, and collective mobilization toward the achievement of common objectives.

Perhaps the central most implication of this definition is that leadership is reframed as a property of the group process rather than a property of an individual or individual's behaviour (Dachler, 1986; Lippitt, 1982; Smircich & Morgan, 1982; Smith & Peterson, 1988). Thus, all group members are seen as playing an essential part in shaping the course of the leadership process, whether it be through asserting a definition of reality, evaluating and complying with a given definition, or a combination of both forms of activity at various points in the process.

The corollary of this position is that leadership is not something that a person or sub-group of persons "does" to the remainder of the group. Rather, leadership is framed as a multilateral influence process which unfolds through the participation of all group members regardless of the formal roles they are assigned within the group (this assertion is supported by theorists of both positivist and constructivist orientations -- e.g., Andriessen & Drenth, 1984; Barrow, 1976; Crowe, Bochner, & Clark, 1972; Dachler, 1988; Farris & Lim, 1969; Heller & Van Til, 1982; Hosking & Morley, 1988; Kapoor, Ansari & Shukla, 1986; Lippitt, 1982; Lowin & Craig, 1968; Sims & Manz, 1984; Smircich & Morgan, 1982; Smith & Peterson, 1988; Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1983; Weick, 1978; Williams & Podsakoff, 1989). On the basis of this reconstruction, I now turn to an exploration of the implications this perspective holds for the traditional notion of leadership roles.
Leadership Roles and the Leadership Process

The roles of leader and follower are, implicitly or explicitly, fundamental components of virtually all mainstream leadership theories. To this point however, my discussion has only alluded to individuals performing the roles of leader and follower, and at no point have these roles actually been incorporated into my reconstruction of leadership as a social process. Instead of focusing on roles as necessary components of leadership, I have focused on two general forms of activity (i.e., assertive and compliant) necessary for the successful negotiation of reality. In so doing, I have attempted to avoid linking either of these forms of activity with the performance of any particular role.

This reflects my objective of demarcating leadership as a process of negotiating social reality, from the social roles we in the modern industrialized world have constructed for habitually enacting this process. The purpose of this section then, is to reframe the roles of leader and follower in terms of the preceding reconstruction of leadership, and explicate how they are frequently useful but in no way essential to the enactment of the leadership process. In so doing, the roles of leader and follower become manifestations of but one possible system of leadership.

The definition and dynamics of the leader and follower roles. According to Smith and Peterson (1988), a role can be defined as a label for a set of behavioural expectations communicated by members of a social network. A role is therefore a social construction that reflects something about the normative order of the collective that creates it. Given this, I define the leader role as a legitimized position of a collective which is based on the shared expectation that the role performer is obliged to function as a principal in the definition of social reality. Accordingly, the individual in the position of “leader” is given the primary responsibility for acting as the group’s central information processor and interpreter of events. She or he is expected to analyze information from various sources, interpret it to make it meaningful, and finally, provide the group with an interpretation of the ambiguous situation. In the terms of the definition of leadership I have just presented, leaders are expected to engage in proportionately more “assertive activities.”
Roles only exist in relation to other roles. Thus, the leader role necessarily implies the complementary role of follower (Bass, 1981; Hollander, 1985; Kelley, 1989; Sederberg, 1984). While positivist theories of leadership acknowledge the role of follower (by virtue of the fact that they uniformly separate the leaders from the led), they typically pay little or no attention to the active participation of the follower in the sense-making process. In contrast, I view the follower role as a legitimized position within a collective which is based on the shared expectation that the role performer will orient to the leader during periods of equivocality, and adopt and act in accordance with the leader's definition of reality (Smircich & Morgan, 1982). In the quintessential sense of the term, the group members assuming follower roles are expected to engage in organizationally appropriate "compliant activities" in response to the leader's efforts to define reality. The leader therefore serves as a focal point to which followers orient for a definition of reality when a situation appears equivocal (Hollander, 1985; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Smith & Peterson, 1988).

Smircich and Morgan (1982) describe the interdependent dynamics which define and link the roles of leader and follower:

Power relations embedded in a leadership role oblige others to take particular note of the sense-making activities emanating from that role. We have characterized this in terms of a dependency relation between leaders and led, in which the leader's sense-making activities assume priority over the sense-making activities of others.... The existence of leadership depends on and fosters this dependency, for insofar as the leader is expected to define the situation, others are expected to surrender that right.... Leadership as a phenomenon depends upon the existence of people who are prepared to surrender their ability to define their reality to others. (p. 269-270)

Herein lies the implicit dialectical power dynamics that bind leaders and followers. The leader is entirely dependent upon the "willingness" of those occupying the follower role to adapt their activity in accordance with the asserted view of reality. Simultaneously, the role of follower is entirely dependent upon the individual occupying the leader role to undertake efforts to define the reality facing the collective.
In pragmatic terms, the emergence and legitimization of the leader and follower roles represents a fundamental division of labour which focuses the attention of role performers in different directions. Group members performing the role of follower are largely freed from the attention-demanding task of independently interpreting each new situation, and therefore, can focus the majority of their energies on coordinating their activity internally. Reciprocally, the leader can devote his or her attention to the intragroup dynamics, task needs, and external environment, in order to monitor the appropriateness of the collective's current definition of reality. Moreover, this division functions as a framework for orienting the attention of group members during periods of equivocality. That is, by stipulating that followers orient to leaders, all members of a collective have a standard course of action when confronted by equivocal events (Bartolke, 1988; Smircich & Morgan, 1982; Smith & Peterson, 1988).

While the role of leader has traditionally received much attention, the corresponding role of follower has received comparatively little. The irony of this imbalance is that one cannot function as, or understand the role of, leader without simultaneous reference to the role of follower (Hollander, 1985; Kelley, 1989). As Kelley (1989) states, "followership dominates our lives and organizations, but not our thinking, because our preoccupation with leadership keeps us from considering the nature and importance of the follower" (p. 125). Consequently, basic questions concerning how, why, and under what circumstances individuals will typically assume the role of follower, and willingly submit to another's definition of reality, are seldom considered in the literature.

**Leadership as process versus leadership as role enactment.** Implicit within the preceding conceptualization of leadership roles is the notion that these roles can themselves be viewed as consensually validated constructions of reality. Viewed from this perspective, the roles of leader and follower are cultural artifacts which reflect the manner in which the leadership process is habitually enacted within industrial societies.

In contrast, I take the view that the leadership process does not rely on having people designated to interact in terms of these roles. Rather, "leader" and "follower" are social constructions which reflect how we have come to
believe groups should organize. As a consequence, the roles of leader and follower have become so ingrained in the foundational reality of the West, we have difficulty even considering the possibility that these roles are not essential.

In failing to separate the roles of leadership from the process of leadership, we have equated what we have come to expect leaders to do in the performance of their roles with leadership. This not only confuses the issue, it limits us in terms of the range of options we permit ourselves for generating alternative arrangements of collective organizing. Moreover, this perspective serves to conceal many instances of reality negotiation that do not conform to the unilateral influence (leader to follower) assumed to define leadership. For instance, mainstream leadership theories would have difficulty accounting for situations wherein reality is asserted by one with less power, and is complied with by one with more power. Without a reliance on roles, the model of leadership developed here has no difficulty dealing with this situation as an instance of an unfolding leadership process.

Overall, just as there is nothing fundamental or essential about collectives organizing on the basis of a hierarchical system (a direct manifestation of the leader-follower dynamic), leadership need not be done on the basis of people performing the roles of leader and follower. For reasons I have already outlined, this is often a highly efficient way of going about the process of leadership, but it is in no way essential to the process. Moreover, the uncritical acceptance of this arrangement tends to foster and legitimize normative orders with a restricted range of values, assumptions, and objectives (e.g., to be efficient, productive, controlled, and orderly, and to do so on the basis of unequal distributions of power).

This argument underscores the point that the model of leadership emerging through this discourse is fundamentally descriptive rather than prescriptive. The generic nature of the process that it describes can then be overlaid with information about any specific collective to analyze how it is that they are or have come to enact the leadership process. In most instances, on a fundamental level this will involve a reliance on specific people performing the roles of leader and follower. However, the presence of roles becomes an issue
of the collective's cultural habits and preferences rather than characteristics endemic to the leadership process. Thus, the particulars of how any given collective actually goes about negotiating their reality, or should go about this process, must be determined on a case-by-case basis -- and in particular, with a thorough understanding of the cultural context within which the process is occurring.

In the following section I introduce a constructivist conceptualization of group culture. This is integrated with the preceding reconceptualization of leadership to produce a theoretical framework which supports the contextualization of leadership processes within their specific cultural settings. This integration of leadership and culture serves as the theoretical framework for guiding the praxis-oriented research component of this project.

**Group Culture**

By seating leadership firmly within the individual, positivist leadership theorists effectively decontextualized the concept. If leadership is a set of inherent personality traits or learned behaviours, then leadership is self-contained within the person and the sociocultural context within which the person functions is irrelevant. Indeed, this was very much what the positivists hoped to discover, and what current leadership seminars promise to deliver: reliable generalizations regarding what works on all people in all circumstances.

In contrast, in the preceding reconstruction I endeavoured to remove leadership from both the person and the role, and shifted it directly into the social context by reframing it as an aspect of the collective organizing process. When this transformation occurs, the sociocultural context within which leadership unfolds becomes an issue of central importance. Leadership therefore becomes contingent upon, and inseparable from, the culture within which it unfolds. My purpose in this section then, is to lay a foundation for contextualizing the preceding reconstruction of leadership within specific cultural contexts.
I begin this section with the introduction of a general definition of group culture based on an amalgamation of current constructivist perspectives on the subject. Subsequent to this, and with a view to my overall objective of reconstructing leadership, this basic definition is elaborated such that a unique and more comprehensive construction of group culture emerges.

Defining Culture

Over the past decade the concept of culture has witnessed a re-birth among organizational theorists. It remains however, an ill-defined concept in that there is little theoretical convergence with respect to both the definitions and the purposes for which the concept is invoked (Frost, Moore, Louis, Lundberg, & Martin, 1991; Smircich, 1985).

According to many constructivist theorists, culture can be regarded as an emergent, shared system of meaning and understanding, composed of various symbols and representations. It is, in a sense, the social glue by which group members are bound together (e.g., Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Bruner, 1990; Louis, 1985; Van Maanen & Barley, 1985). The central limitation of this conceptualization is that it focuses a disproportionate amount of attention on what is immediately observable. In so doing, it overlooks the possibility of examining culture in terms of abstract and implicit themes which represent the underlying, socially constructed, conceptual foundation that gives rise to the more observable aspects of the phenomenon. One construction of culture which penetrates beyond surface manifestations is offered by Schein (1985, 1987a, 1991). He contends that culture can be regarded as,

...the pattern of basic assumptions that a given group has invented, discovered, or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, and that have worked well enough to be considered valid, and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (Schein, 1987a, p. 262)

Accordingly, culture serves as a way of breaking down and managing the complexity of the experienced world. On the surface it is a shared collection of
socially habitual ways of perceiving and thinking about the world, evaluating events and solving problems, and interacting with the internal and external environment (Hunt, 1984; Schein, 1985, 1987a). Underlying the surface manifestations is a shared set of values and assumptions that have emerged and evolved over the course of a collective’s history and which are central to shaping the membership’s way of perceiving and being in the world.

Thus, culture functions as a conceptual framework through which a group membership tells itself how to interpret situations and what to do about them without the necessity of long ontological, epistemological, or ethical reflection and debate. Accordingly, it represents that body of accumulated knowledge regarding what is real, important, legitimate, and reasonable from which established group members enculturate new members. At the core of culture is a relatively enduring set of values and assumptions which, through their manifestations, serve to maintain the consistency and predictability in interpersonal interactions. Culture, then, represents the social force for stability through re-creation.

Schein’s definition forms the foundation for my conceptualization of culture. It penetrates beyond surface manifestations to emphasize the underlying assumptions upon which the collective perception, thought and action of the group are based. That is, this construction produces a bi-level conceptualization of culture where the foundational reality of values and assumptions is distinguished from the surface reality which manifests these assumptions through various social processes and symbols.

His definition also alludes to what I regard as the central function of culture in social organizing: enabling the group to draw on its common experience to interpret events and guide collective action in a manner consistent with its established values and objectives. On the basis of this definition, I devote the remainder of this section to developing a dynamic process view of culture which complements my earlier reconceptualization of leadership.

The structure of culture. Schein (1985, 1987a) offers a three-level model of culture. The first level is that of artifacts and creations which
represents the organization's technology, art, and visible and audible action patterns. This is the aspect of culture which is easily observable to both those who are and are not enculturated into the organization. However, these objects, events, and processes are typically difficult to interpret without reference to the two deeper levels of culture, the organization's values and basic assumptions.

I argue that while Schein's notion of surface and foundation levels of culture offers particular advantages over previous conceptualizations, separating values and assumptions into two different levels is an unnecessary distinction. For my purposes, it is entirely sufficient to distinguish between a group's foundational level of culture (i.e., abstract values and basic assumptions) and the surface manifestations (i.e., artifacts and creations). The level of fundamental values and assumptions represents the ethical, ontological, and epistemological elements of culture. The level of surface manifestations represents the actualization of these foundational abstractions in the form of the group's persistently enacted social interactions, dynamic structure and roles, approaches to task accomplishment, evolving literature, and features of its physical environment. I shall detail the specific nature of this bi-level distinction in the following paragraphs.

The level of the group's fundamental values and assumptions represents its evolving ethical, ontological and epistemological foundation. The ethical aspect can be equated with the emergent and enduring group values which connote how things "should be" and "should be made to be" (Hodgkinson, 1983). Thus, values represent the answers to such questions as: What should be brought into being and what should not? How should things be done and not done? What is valued and not valued? What is good and what is evil?

The ontological aspect represents the group's assumptions regarding what is real and illusory, immutable, and undisputable. It addresses the assumed nature of time and space, human nature, human activity, human relationships, and the collective's relationship to their environment (Bruner, 1990; Schein, 1985, 1987a, 1991).
The epistemological aspect represents a composite of values and assumptions which are in answer to issues of knowledge and knowing. Thus, these value laden assumptions pertain to: What is knowable and not knowable? What knowledge should be sought? What counts as valuable information or knowledge? What sources of information can be regarded as factual or reliable, and which are to be mistrusted or discounted? What are the appropriate and acceptable methods of gathering information? (Burke, 1985).

For the most part, one does not typically witness elements of the foundational level of culture directly, but instead gains insight into them through their everyday manifestations. This surface level of culture can be regarded as manifested through a diverse set of largely (although not necessarily) explicit or observable mediums. Chief among these are the physical and linguistic interaction patterns represented by social processes such as rituals, ceremonies, normative or routine acts, symbolic gestures, forms of humour, specialized forms of discourse, and rhetoric and ideologies reflected in the repeated stories, myths, metaphors, and allegories that a culture tells itself about itself (usually regarding significant triumphs and tragedies, heroes and villains, lessons learned, etc.) (Bass, 1985; Burke, 1985; Clampitt, 1991; Lather, 1991; Louis, 1985; Schein, 1985, 1991; Weick, 1979).

In this regard, I suggest that insights into the foundational reality of a collective’s culture can be gained through the exploration of their:

(a) evolving internal network of relationships as seen through the organizational structure (formal and informal) and corresponding roles (power and status dynamics) (Orton & Weick, 1990).

(b) implicit and explicit relationships with interrelated and interdependent groups and organizations.

(c) literature, including the mission statement, standard operating procedures, rules and regulations, policies, and long and short-range plans (Clampitt, 1991; Weick, 1979).

(d) explicit and implicit criteria for entry (hiring policies, membership requirements, etc.) and maintaining membership (membership expectations, performance appraisals, etc.).
(e) forms of information (e.g., scientific, intuitive, magical, etc.) and information sources regarded as credible (i.e., who or what is regarded as authoritative), and the methodologies by which such information can and cannot be gathered.

(f) long-standing and commonly experienced fears, frustrations tensions, conflicts, controversies, and philosophical differences; unresolved issues and/or questions of procedure and/or philosophy.

(g) approach to task accomplishment as seen through their operating theories, associated methodologies, and choices of techniques and technologies.

(h) resource allocation (i.e., where and to what tasks, time, energy and material resources are consistently allocated and/or withheld).

(i) inanimate objects such as organizational symbols, equipment and furnishings, layout, and building architecture (Louis, 1985; Williams, Armstrong & Malcolm, 1985).

In essence, there is virtually nothing that an organization produces (artifacts) or that its members do on a habitual basis (normative social processes) which cannot serve as an avenue for the exploration of underlying values and assumptions. On the basis of this conceptualization then, I propose the following model to illustrate the structure of culture (see Figure 2).

The Structure of Culture Model incorporates Schein's original levels concept with the notion of a continuum of observability and consciousness. With respect to this second point, it is Schein's (1985, 1987a, 1991) contention that not all aspects of a culture will necessarily be conscious. He argues that the levels of culture lie on a continuum of conscious awareness which decreases as one moves from the predominately visible level of artifacts and creations, to the predominately invisible level of basic assumptions. Accordingly, the specific content of culture becomes increasingly obscure as one moves closer to the foundational level, to the point that the most basic of a culture's assumptions are "preconscious" in nature. Consequently, the content of the foundational level is so much a part of the enculturated members'
experience of reality that they cannot easily articulate these assumptions even when prompted to reflect on them.

Figure 2
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The generally preconscious nature of these core values and assumptions has the important effect of making them largely unquestionable and hence, powerful determinants of the ways in which a collective functions (Bruner, 1990; Sullivan, 1984; Thomas, 1993). Indeed, given the centrality of a group's basic values and assumptions as the foundation of their reality, it is often the case that members find it inconceivable that thought or action could be based on any other set of premises. It is not unusual then, for the most central values and assumptions of a group to assume ideological proportions. This serves to make the group's foundational reality largely "nonconfrontable and nondebatable" (Schein, 1985, 1987a, 1991).

The two-by-two matrix design of Figure 2 incorporates Schein's notions of differing degrees of consciousness with the concept of levels in a somewhat different manner than he originally proposed. While I accept that, in many cases, a majority of values and assumptions will indeed be preconscious and therefore largely unobservable (i.e., Figure 2, Quadrant 4), it is also possible for some values and assumptions to be more or less conscious and often explicit (i.e., Quadrant 3).

For instance, an organization's explicit values serve as the basis for members' intentional efforts to achieve what they believe "ought" to be, or maintain the group and/or its environment in a way that they consider it "should" be maintained (e.g., "Amnesty International advocates fair and prompt trials for all political prisoners and opposes 'disappearance,' torture, extra-judicial execution and the death penalty in all cases without reservation" -- Amnesty International Mandate). Further, explicit assumptions regarding the power of the organization and/or nature of its environment can have a significant influence on the efforts undertaken to intentionally change that environment (e.g., It is a fundamental assumption of Amnesty International that governments will yield to the pressure of negative media coverage and world-wide letter writing campaigns).

Thus, while it is frequently the case that those socially sustained values and assumptions which underlie member actions in the everyday world soon tend to become "taken for granted", as Schein puts it, I argue that they need not
necessarily enter the realm of the preconscious in order that they be regarded as legitimate aspects of the group's foundational level of culture.11

The second revision to Schein's position I propose through this two-by-two conceptualization lies in the acknowledgement that while the majority of the manifestations of culture are conscious and explicit (i.e., Quadrant 1) it must also be acknowledged that not all such manifestations are likely to be easily observable, explicit, articulated, or conscious (i.e., Quadrant 2). Shared, but largely unspoken understandings of values and assumptions can produce manifestations of the foundational reality which are shared but implicit, unarticulated, and even preconscious to the entire, or vast majority of, the group. For instance, it is often the case that the functional organizational structure (as opposed to the formal chart), which will emerge as a reflection of values and assumptions, is largely preconsciously enacted and understood. Moreover, it is frequently the case that group members on the outside of this informal structure lack even a preconsciously awareness of these dynamics.12

**Culture as social process.** Many culture theorists do not clearly identify a source of culture, and therefore, as they work with the concept it tends to take the form of a social given. This has the effect of reifying culture so that it becomes a social object that is largely independent of the individuals who organize themselves within its influence. An alternative view which I prefer is that culture is not external and apart from the people who are subject to it. Rather, the source of culture is the people themselves who engage in collective activity which serves to continuously create, re-create, and transform culture. In this sense the core of culture is an evolving, collectively held abstraction, and its manifestation is not a social object, but rather a process of social interaction and discourse. The adoption of this perspective avoids the problem of reification by encouraging one to think in terms of groups and organizations "doing" culture rather than "having" culture (Clampitt, 1991; Smircich, 1985; Weick, 1985).

In my view, the most fundamental dynamic of the culture process is its evolving historical nature. The foundational reality and surface manifestations of culture are unique expressions of the accumulated history of the group, formed through the continual process of interpreting and defining reality (i.e.,
through the leadership process). Thus, the process of culture is based upon the collective recollection of the accumulated group values, and ontological and epistemological assumptions.

In this sense, the process of culture is the social utilization, in the present, of the accumulated group wisdom and habits formed in the past (Burke, 1985; Schein, 1985, 1987a, 1991; Sullivan, 1984; Van Maanen & Barley, 1985). This evolving historical character of culture narrows the range of social interaction and response patterns, and thereby provides the group with a degree of stability, continuity, and predictability in the face of a constantly changing and often unpredictable environment (Clampitt, 1991; Schein, 1985, 1991; Van Maanen & Barley, 1985). In essence then, culture represents that process by which the group identity is both formed and maintained.13

On the basis of this perspective, the process of culture can be represented in terms which parallel, and are complementary to, the Leadership Process Phase Model (LPPM). The Culture Process Phase Model (CPPM -- see Figure 3) is intended to illustrate, in generalized terms, the process by which group members rely upon their common foundational reality to maintain coordinated activity. The CPPM, like the LPPM, has no objective beginning or end point. Only phases of interpersonal interaction occur which, when experienced as unproblematic, give rise to the emergence of the subsequent phase in a process. Thus, regardless of the specific structure of a given culture, the model illustrates abstract commonalities in the unfolding process of a group's own process of re-creation.

Given that culture represents those social forces which function to re-create and maintain the established group process, I will begin with the phase of Coordinated Activity. This phase represents the condition of collective interaction which both the leadership and culture processes function to achieve, and therefore, is the only phase of the organizing process which is common to both the LPPM and the CPPM.

As group members coordinate their activities with one another in a normative manner, the intra- and extra-group environments will present new circumstances and situations to which the membership must respond or adopt
in order to maintain coordinated activity. In those instances where the circumstances and situations which emerge are perceived by the group to be normative, the group is in an assessment phase referred to in the model as the Unequivocal Situation. This assessment of normality is typically habitual and therefore demands little in the way of processing and interpretation by group members. Indeed, this phase is characterized by that which is routine and predictable, for the changes the group experiences fall within the realm of what is expected and/or considered within the normative range of possibilities.

Figure 3
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In the face of routine events, the group membership draws upon their shared repertoire of habitual responses around which to coordinate their activity. That is, the collective experience of the unequivocal gives way to the selection of an established or routine response. Thus, Habitual Response is the last phase of the culture process which, if indeed appropriate to the situation, represents the move back into a phase of Coordinated Activity.

*Culture redefined.* On the basis of the preceding reformulations, I offer an expanded definition of culture which summarizes its structure, process, and function in social organizing. Culture is here regarded as a concept which
represents the present and potential manifestations (artifacts and creations) of a group's evolved (invented, discovered or developed) history of constructing a consensually validated reality. The foundation of culture is composed of a relatively enduring and largely implicit set of values and assumptions which serve as a social force for consistency and predictability in interpersonal interactions. Thus, culture functions to define the group's sense of the normative, and provides the group membership with proven responses to recurring situations, events, and problems. Culture is therefore regarded as a continuous dynamic process that is recreated by a group membership toward the maintenance of their own internal organization as they interact with their environment.

Throughout the preceding discussion of culture I have made passing reference to a fundamental link between it and leadership as organizing processes. In the section which follows leadership and culture, typically regarded as distinct social phenomena by the vast majority of theorists, will be integrated to create a larger construct representative of the process of social organizing.

**Integrating Leadership and Culture**

In this section I offer the view that the previously presented reinterpretations of leadership and culture can be regarded as two entirely interrelated, dialectical, and therefore inseparable, aspects of the same social organizing metaprocess. My objective in constructing such a perspective was to address the interests of the management team who requested a leadership training intervention in support of their efforts to proactively manage both daily events and their broader organizational culture. Thus, in addition to offering theoretical insights which transcend those garnered by examining leadership and culture as isolated topics, the resultant process theory serves as the foundation for the development of the training process I present in the following chapter.

From a theoretical standpoint, I would suggest that the single most important aspect of this integration of two typically distinct concepts is that it
Chapter 1: introduction

gives rise to a theory which is well suited to addressing both the issues of maintenance and transformation in organizing collectives. As Sullivan (1984) contends, an over-emphasis on social maintenance has been a long standing limitation of mainstream psychological theory. That is, historically most theories have been conservative in nature, focusing on order, habit and determinism. This theoretical predilection stemmed, he argued, from a psychology based on prediction and control which consequently had little interest in how things changed.

Given this, one of my central objectives in constructing this theory of social organizing is to transcend this theoretical bias by addressing social transformation while simultaneously avoiding a reactionary stance that discards or under-emphasizes the issue of social maintenance. To accomplish this the interdependent and dialectical relationship between habitual maintenance (here expressed as the process of culture) and intentional transformation (the process of leadership) becomes the cornerstone of the theory. Accordingly, I assume that social reality is fundamental to both maintaining and changing the social order of an organizing collective. That is, the foundational reality of a group's culture functions to habitually maintain or recreate the social order, while the process of leadership through which social reality is negotiated, functions to transform (or intentionally maintain) the social order. In addition, I maintain the view that neither culture or leadership are objectively real phenomena, and therefore, that there are no actual boundaries which separate one from the other.

**Leadership-Culture Continuum Theory of Social Organizing**

**Constructing a Leadership-Culture Continuum**

I have invoked the concept of culture to represent the collective process for re-creation and stability in the face of a continuously changing environment. In this sense culture represents the largely habitual or preconscious social force for maintaining the collective and accumulated values and assumptions of the group and their manifestation in the social realm. The concept of leadership, on the other hand, represents the creative and intentional transforming process by
which the group membership works to prevent themselves from stagnating, becoming unresponsive to changing circumstances, and initiating proactive projects on and within their environment. Thus, leadership represents the largely conscious and intentional social force for operating within the social and physical world.

Underlying this conceptualization is a dialectic relationship wherein the process of culture forms and transforms through the process of leadership (i.e., culture represents the history of the group's efforts to define reality), while the leadership process is simultaneously shaped and constrained by the process of culture (i.e., particular patterns of event management become normative for a group) (Nicholson, 1984; Quinn & McGrath, 1985; Schein, 1985, 1987a; Smith & Peterson, 1988).

A useful way of expressing such a relationship is in terms of a social process continuum. The concept of a continuum is drawn from Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity which, among other things, replaced the Newtonian conception of time and space with space-time. His use of a continuum metaphor fundamentally altered the way people thought about these formerly distinct concepts. In similar fashion, a continuum effectively conveys a sense of leadership and culture as two aspects of the same phenomenon. That is, the continuum elucidates the notion that culture cannot unfold in the absence of the leadership process for leadership, as the process of constructing reality, gives rise to, shapes, and transforms the cultural process. Similarly, leadership cannot occur in the absence of culture as culture serves as the consensually validated definition of reality through or against which the leadership process unfolds. This makes the leadership process either an expression of, or response to, culture. In the remainder of this section I explicate this social process continuum in greater detail.

**The dialectics of leadership and culture.** During the initial phases of group formation, there is no established group culture. Accordingly, the broader sociohistorical culture serves as the common referent for the membership during this early phase of collective organizing. While this largely common cultural grounding places certain limits on the nature of the leadership
patterns which may emerge within the forming group, they will generally be much broader than those which characterize the cultural processes of an established group (Chemers, 1984). As patterns of leadership emerge and are successful at enabling the group to achieve coordinated activity, they become ingrained as part of the group's cultural process. Over time, some of these patterns become so trusted (and typically, so habitual) that they come to be regarded as the only avenues for defining reality (Clampitt, 1991; Nicholson, 1984). Of course, in those equivocal situations where reliance upon these normative patterns fails to produce a common definition of reality, the group membership will be forced to explore avenues which stretch the cultural status quo.

One of the central advantages of culture is that this process facilitates the coordination of activity around recurring, predictable events and problems, thus minimizing the need to continually redefine social reality. When novel situations emerge, culture facilitates the leadership process by providing the membership with established guidelines to enact the reality definition process. In this respect, culture typically identifies who is to play a predominantly assertive or compliant role in the process; the appropriate ways of assessing and interpreting situations; and, which definitions of reality and courses of action fall within the culturally defined range of acceptability. In complementary fashion, the leadership processes is invoked to negotiate consensually validated definitions of reality whenever events are perceived as novel. As the group membership enacts the leadership process, their experience of these efforts to define reality form and transform both the foundational and surface levels of culture.

In summary then, culture is at one and the same time the legacy of the leadership process as well as the foundation upon which leadership unfolds. Put in the inverse, the leadership process both emerges from and shapes the process of culture. Herein lies the essence of the continuum. The leadership process does not take place in a sociohistorical vacuum. Rather, it occurs within, and necessarily with reference to, a specific cultural context. At the same time, the culture process cannot come into being or be sustained without
an avenue for transformation in the face of change. Hence, the interdependence and inseparability of these two aspects of the social organizing process.

To illustrate this concept I offer the Leadership-Culture Continuum Model (LCCM) (see Figure 4). This model places leadership and culture at opposite ends of a continuum. However, rather than one ending at the mid-point and another beginning, as in the case of a one dimensional continuum, this two dimensional continuum has the processes penetrate one another such that as the overtness of one increases, the other correspondingly decreases (i.e. becomes the backdrop or shadow to the other). Thus, the upper end of the continuum represents culture as the overt and dominant social process, with leadership functioning as the inferior supporting process. That is, the group's accumulated history of event management serves as the foundation upon which the culture process is now preconsciously enacted. Conversely, the lower end represents leadership as the overt and dominant social process, with culture functioning as the sociohistorical referent. That is, culture serves as the context against which the leadership process is intentionally enacted.

The continuum is divided into four conditions, each of which typifies a general form of collective organizing based on a different combination of the processes of leadership and culture. As with all previous models I have presented, these are only divisions of convenience and no actual or distinct boundaries are considered to exist between conditions. Furthermore, there is no sequence implied by the numbering of these divisions, or superiority of one over the other implied by their vertical arrangement.

Condition One of the continuum represents the process of Normative Interaction. This form of the organizing process represents unproblematic day-to-day functioning of the group and is therefore characterized by dominance of the cultural process over leadership. Situations which the group encounters are perceived as unequivocal and thus, the leadership process is only relevant as the history of how the group membership reached the point of being able to coordinate their activities in a habitual fashion in response to these events. Normative Interaction therefore describes a collective process that is most
stable for it is based upon the largely preconscious re-creation of the group membership's common past.

Figure 4

The Leadership-Culture Continuum Model
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3. Normative Leadership

4. Radical Leadership

LEADERSHIP PROCESS
Condition Two represents the process of *Enculturation*. This form of the organizing process is characterized by those situations in which new members of a collective are socialized into the group culture by the established membership or their designate. The new members of the group experience equivocality as a result of their lack of cultural knowledge, and therefore are unable to effectively coordinate their activity with the remainder of the group. Conversely, the enculturated members experience no equivocality in the same circumstances as they automatically draw on their established cultural knowledge base to interpret the situation and choose an appropriate (i.e., habitual) course of action. This produces a dynamic where the fully enculturated members engage in leadership activities intended to define reality for the new members with close reference to the existing culture. Thus, the leadership process draws exclusively on the foundational reality of the group and all of its many manifestations as the basis of the definitions asserted through the process. In essence then, in this condition there is no intent to transform or vary from the established cultural norms. Instead, the reality definition process functions to impart the normative order and processses to initiates.

Condition Three represents the process of *Normative Leadership*. In this form of organizing, the experience of equivocality occurs for the group membership in response to a particular non-normative situation -- but one which is not so removed from the collective experience that it poses a challenge to the group’s foundational reality. Thus, this condition represents event management processes which are fully embedded within the framework of the established cultural foundation. That is, reality is defined entirely with reference to the established values and assumptions of the collective. Leadership is the dominant process, but it unfolds in accordance with the culturally established patterns for defining reality with members drawing upon the established foundational reality for their interpretations. In this sense, the leadership process functions to resolve equivocality, but it does so in such a way as to reaffirm and reinforce the existing normative order. In essence, the intent is to bring the equivocality into accord with the cultural status quo.
The process of *Radical Leadership* is represented by Condition Four of the continuum. This form of organizing emerges through the experience of equivocality on the level of the collective's foundational reality, and hence represents a cultural crisis of some magnitude. This is the leadership process which is operative beyond the framework of values and assumptions which form the core of the culture. The cultural foundation, for whatever reason, is called into question by one or more of the group, by a powerholder from outside the group, or by the recognition that events are fundamentally contradictory to this reality. Thus, the objective in this condition is to redefine reality toward the transformation or restabilization of the cultural process. That is, this form of organizing is leadership in relation to culture, but which reacts against or subverts the existing cultural framework (in part or whole) to begin forming a qualitatively different foundational reality.

In essence then, the leadership process is not confined by the established patterns for defining reality or the existing values and assumptions which constitute the foundational reality of the collective (e.g., the previously "unthinkable" enters the realm of the "thinkable"). In Radical Leadership one witnesses the most creativity and transformative potential of all forms of collective organizing. At the same time, it is also the condition of greatest collective upheaval, for there is serious question as to whether the group will, can, or should reorganize around their familiar foundational reality.

The general pattern reflected in the LCCM then, is the notion that as one moves up the continuum the process of culture as a re-creative and maintaining preconscious force becomes progressively more dominant, whereas, as one moves down the continuum the process of leadership as a creative and transformative conscious force becomes progressively more dominant.

*Leadership and culture in dynamic tension.* At the same time that the processes of culture and leadership are interdependent and complementary, they are also in dynamic tension. Culture places constraints on how group members may perceive, interpret, and act, and the enactment of the leadership process is subject to these constraints. These constraints on the leadership process, in turn, constrain the nature of the realities that are likely to
be constructed, and therefore, how and in what ways a given culture might develop and transform.

In hypothetical terms, the enactment of the cultural process in complete absence of leadership would signify a condition of collective stagnation. The group process would be characterized by purely habitual action and interaction. The likelihood is that the collective would become unadapted and therefore, disintegrate as a social process the moment the unfamiliar was introduced. Conversely, if it were possible to enact the leadership process in the absence of culture this would signify a condition of collective chaos. With the loss of shared systems of understanding the group process would be characterized by purely novel action precluding the possibility of coordinated social interaction. The likelihood is that the collective would become completely unstable and uncoordinated and therefore, disintegrate as a social process.

In more practical (and realistic) terms, a highly dogmatic culture is not typically an adaptable collective, and conversely, a highly laissez-faire culture is typically unstable. The key point here is that an overemphasis on one of the processes of collective organizing, at the wrong time or over the long term, can lead to collective disorganization of varying degrees (i.e., from mild disorganization to total disintegration). Given that the environment imposes continual change, if the collective organizing process leans too far in either direction members risk being unable to coordinate action with one another for lack of a common foundational reality or, unable to adapt to the changes imposed due to an overpowering reality that is ill suited to the current environment and circumstances. However, when this tension is balanced with respect to the particular group environment these dual processes enable a collective to avoid either a state of complete disorganization or total rigidity.

**The process of the Leadership-Culture Continuum.** In the two previous sections of this dissertation I presented models of the processes of leadership and culture (i.e., Figure 1 -- The Leadership Process Phase Model and Figure 3 -- The Culture Process Phase Model). By integrating these models the interdependence, complementary nature, and dynamic tension between these two aspects of social organizing comes more clearly into focus.
The resulting Leadership-Culture Process Phase Model (LCPWM) serves to illustrate, in generic terms, the unfolding dynamics of the two central processes by which members of a collective organize themselves (see Figure 5).

**Figure 5**

*Leadership-Culture Process Phase Model*

Simply stated, normative or routine day-to-day group interaction is based on a collective understanding of the group’s culture. That is, culture functions as the dominant process for coordinating group member action when situations are perceived as self-evident and unequivocal. When, however, the situation is perceived as equivocal or non-routine, the leadership process becomes the dominant avenue for collective organizing. This is the group’s process for making sense of an undefined situation so that the membership may organize themselves toward reestablishing a phase of coordinated activity.
Chapter 1: Introduction

Coordinated Activity is the phase of group interaction which links these processes for it is out of this phase that both processes are initiated, and it is the phase which both processes function to re-create. It should be noted, however, that if at any point in the cultural process the group experiences an equivocal situation the culture process is "short-circuited" and the leadership process is engaged. Similarly, if during the enactment of the leadership process it becomes apparent that the situation is not equivocal as initially perceived, then the cultural process is once again enacted.

The process continuum perspective I have developed in this section furnishes two important insights over the positivists' treatment of leadership and culture as distinct social phenomena. First, the notion of process conveys a sense of the continuous unending flow of social organizing. Second, the notion of a continuum creates a gestalt which provides insights into the dialectics of leadership and culture which cannot be discerned through an examination of either of these concepts in isolation. In essence, this process continuum perspective emphasizes that these aspects of organizing are so intimately intertwined that any attempt to separate them is arbitrary and will result in the loss of meaning and insight that the two, taken together, can provide.

The Question of Terminology

My proposal of an alternative conceptualization of leadership creates a problem of terminology which needs to be resolved before proceeding. That is, when I refer to "leadership" I now mean something very different from the normative understanding of the term. Accordingly, I can rename the new concept or ask people to think differently about the term when I employ it. There are advantages and disadvantages to both approaches. While "leadership" carries with it powerful connotations of individualism and unilateral influence which are counter to the position I assume, there is also merit in retaining the term. In particular, it is a term with a long and prominent history in Western culture and is therefore unlikely to disappear or be replaced in the foreseeable future. From both pragmatic and theoretical standpoints, I see more advantages to retaining the term than to discarding it. In this section I provide my rationale
for this decision.

From a theoretical perspective, it was never my objective to contribute to the demise of leadership as a social concept, but rather to its transformation. This is particularly evident when one considers that the social actions that positivist theorists would point to as instances of "leadership" are identical to those that I would identify as "leadership." The critical difference lies in how we would perceive the same sequence of social interactions we would use the same term to signify.

In somewhat oversimplified terms, the positivist would be predisposed to understand such an interaction in terms of formal or informal roles. Thus, his or her first objective would be to identify the individual performing the leader role, and then observe his or her actions with an eye to determining the effectiveness of those actions for inducing desirable behaviours in followers. In sharp contrast, I would focus on the dialectical nature of the interaction with an eye to understanding the cultural context (i.e., the history of constructing reality among participants, which may or may not involve clearly delineated roles of leader and follower). My objective would be to determine how the players were negotiating a definition of reality and corresponding plan of action, intended to resolve some form of equivocality. Consequently, in those cultural contexts characterized by the enactment of leader and follower roles, I would regard followers as active agents and attend to their activities as much as to those of the leader, toward understanding the overall reality negotiation process.

Thus, we interpret these interactions through fundamentally different theoretical lenses. As a result, we attend to different features of the interaction, and draw very different conclusions from what we perceive. In essence, we see the same stimuli, refer to those stimuli with the same term, but understand and interpret them in fundamentally different terms. A useful metaphor in this regard was the transformation in thinking which occurred when the earth was replaced by the sun as the centre of our universe. The word "sunrise" was just as useful for referring to the sun's appearance on the horizon after people decided that the earth revolved around the sun, as it was when the sun revolved around the earth. The stimulus and the term remained constant, but the interpretation
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changed, and changed us in the process.

As I discussed in the introduction to this chapter, there are also two important pragmatic reasons for retaining the term “leadership.” First, the starting point of this research was leadership, and the participants continued to think about the intervention in terms of "leadership training" even as they transformed their formal understanding of the concept. Second, use of the term seems to provide a familiar and comfortable point of departure for those being introduced to the LCCT. For instance, during and after the training I have had the opportunity to discuss this project with numerous managers from other organizations. It has been my experience that while referring to it as a "leadership training process" evokes many powerful preconceptions that do not apply, these are more easily overcome than the rather puzzled or uninterested responses that follow when I have referred to it as training in “event and culture management” or “social reality construction.”

For these reasons I will continue to apply the term “leadership.” At the same time however, I will also use Smith and Peterson's (1988) term “event management” interchangeably with “leadership.” The advantage of this term is that it more concretely describes the nature of the social process to which I am referring. That is, it connotes that the process of defining reality occurs in response to an equivocal social “event,” and that the objective is to “manage” the unfolding of that event. While it is not an ideal term (i.e., “management” often connotes "control"), it better signifies the process of intentionally creating day-to-day reality to foster the coordination of activity around that reality.

Chapter Summation

In this final section of the chapter I present a summary of the insights generated through the preceding deconstruction and reconstruction of leadership. Following this I outline the purpose, objectives, and general nature of the applied research component of this project.

I developed the LCCT in response to inadequacies I perceived in the existent leadership literature as I sought to provide a practising management team with a framework through which they might more proactively manage daily
events and their organizational culture. I began the project by using the positivist conception of leadership as my point of departure. In the end however, my decision to pursue the issue from the perspective of a social constructivist ontology led to a total reconstruction of the concept.

As with many other psychological concepts (e.g., self, depression, aggression, etc.), many of the theoretical difficulties surrounding leadership stem from the objectification and reification which characterize most treatments of the topic. That is, research initiatives have typically been conducted under the assumption that leadership was a real and objective set of traits or behaviours which existed independently of the social scientists' efforts to elucidate them.

Through a process of deconstruction and reconstruction I have attempted to remove leadership from the person and seat the concept within the dynamics of social organizing processes. Toward this end, I invoked a constructivist conceptualization of culture to complement and contextualize leadership. As I did so, a new conceptualization of a dialectic relationship between leadership and culture took shape. This theoretical framework showed promise for addressing the interests of the management group for whom this project was initiated. Thus, the remainder of this dissertation is devoted to a praxis-oriented research initiative focusing on the development, evaluation, and exploration of an LCCT-based training process within the natural setting for which it was constructed.

**Inquiry into the Leadership-Culture Continuum Theory**

Using the preceding reconstruction of leadership as my foundation, I now outline the research purpose, objectives, and general methodological approach employed in this investigation.

**Statement of Purpose**

I contend that the vast majority of leadership theories have been seriously encumbered by theorists' longstanding uncritical adherence to the ontological assumptions of logical positivism. Advances in social critique,
theory, and practice could therefore be realized by reconceptualizing leadership in social constructivist terms. The LCCT is representative of such a reconceptualization. In this regard, the purpose of the research component of this project was to evaluate and explore an LCCT-based training initiative in cooperation with those for whom it was originally constructed. My intent in conducting this inquiry was twofold: to facilitate the empowerment of the participants by providing them with a leadership model useful for guiding their management of everyday events and shaping organizational culture; and simultaneously, to evaluate, generate insights into, and thereby enhance, the training process for future interventions within and beyond the original host organization.

These objectives were actualized using a praxis-oriented approach to research. Praxis-oriented research creates a dialectical influence process wherein theory serves as the basis for action to create change in social systems, and in turn, this action serves as the basis for transformations in the original theory (Lather, 1991; Morgan, 1993). Accordingly, I designed the inquiry such that the training initiative served as a natural vehicle for generating data which would improve subsequent training initiatives. Reciprocally, I anticipated that the unfolding nature of the research design would serve to inform, and therefore shape, the training process as it unfolded. In essence then, it was my intent to construct a theory-driven training initiative through which I could both support participants in their efforts to effect the changes they desired, and evaluate and improve the utility of the training initiative as an emancipatory knowledge construction.

**Research Objectives**

Scientific paradigms are founded on different sets of values and assumptions -- in essence, different definitions of reality. It is therefore inappropriate to generalize the objectives, methodologies, and evaluative criteria of one paradigm to research initiatives based on another. Objectives, methods and criteria emerge from, reflect, and are specific to, the paradigm of their origin. Consequently, it would be incongruous to conduct research on a
constructivist-based training process using a positivist research framework or vise versa (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993; Morgan, 1983; Morgan & Smircich, 1980; Strike & Posner, 1983). Accordingly, this inquiry was constructed with an "insight seeking" agenda, rather than on the basis of the positivist "truth proving" agenda (Morgan & Ramirez, 1983; Pondy & Boje, 1980).

Instead of testing hypotheses then, the central objective of the inquiry was to generate more informed and sophisticated constructions regarding the training process, toward enhancing its meaningfulness and utility to current and future users (Gergen, 1990, 1992; Lather, 1991; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Rogers, 1990). For Guba and Lincoln (1989), a construction of reality becomes more "informed" with an increase in the amount and quality of information generated. This enhances its credibility as a meaningful system of thought. A construction's "sophistication" refers to the ability to appreciate, understand, and make use of the information it offers. Thus, this second concept reflects the power with which a construction is understood and capable of being applied.

An important caveat in this regard is that,

...the development of ever more informed and sophisticated constructions should not be understood to mean that they are "truer" constructions; they are simply more informed and sophisticated. They may become harder and harder to challenge, but they can be overthrown in an instant should some really disruptive insight come to light. (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 87)

Accordingly, even the most informed and sophisticated constructions of reality can never achieve the status of "truth," and therefore, can never become impervious to revolutions in thought.

To actualize this constructivist design it was necessary to establish a framework for the data generation and interpretation process. In this regard, I constructed two interrelated research agendas. The first focused on an evaluation of the LCCT training initiative in terms of its central emancipatory objectives: facilitation of consciousness-reframing and the self-empowerment of participants. The second was devoted to a more open-ended exploration of
the training and its impact on participants, and conversely, their impact on the training as an applied knowledge construction. In essence then, these agendas served complementary roles in generating insights into the training process as an applied knowledge construction. The purpose of the evaluation agenda was to determine whether the training process was useful for that which it was developed, while the exploration agenda provided an avenue for the capture of insights, the nature of which could not be anticipated in advance of the study. I discuss each of these agendas in more detail in the following chapter.

To operationalize these agendas I employed an emergent research design based on a flexible training plan -- the course of which was negotiated with participants as the process unfolded. Data were gathered through two series of evolving semi-structured open-ended interviews. Each participant was interviewed at the training midpoint and again at its cessation. Interview questions were developed from the preestablished evaluation themes (i.e., meaningfulness and utility of the training) and in response to insights which emerged over the course of the actual training and application process. Data interpretation was an ongoing process, and therefore as tentative interpretations were generated (and recorded through the use of a reflexive journal) they were fed back to participants for the dual purposes of verification and explication, and steering the course of the training process.

Overall then, from a social change or emancipatory standpoint, my intent in undertaking this research was to facilitate the participants’ own process of self-reflection and self-empowerment by providing a training initiative through which they might generate a local event and culture management framework (i.e., one which was customized to their cultural context and objectives). From a theoretical standpoint, it was my intent that the interpretations generated through this process would produce a more informed and sophisticated training process which, in turn, would facilitate its transfer to other organizing collectives within and beyond this organizational context. In the event that these objectives were realized, I anticipated that this project would offer novel insights to the emerging discourse on social organizing processes.
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In order to address the participants' original interests in a framework for managing events and culture, the LCCT had to be translated into a practical knowledge construction that could be applied within their social context. Accordingly, the task was to formulate an LCCT training process through which participants could become familiar with the central concepts of the theory, adapt these to their specific cultural context, and incorporate them into their normative management practices. In accordance with my emphasis on praxis-oriented research, the training process was designed to be theory driven, and emergent and participative in nature.

In this chapter I discuss the process by which the training intervention was developed and implemented. I begin with a summary of the application concepts I derived from the LCCT to steer the design and eventual conduct of the training process. I then detail the specifics of a three-phase design I developed as a preliminary framework for guiding the training process. Finally, I discuss the actual conduct of the training. In this section I focus on modifications made to the initial training process design in response to participant input and the emergence of insights into the training's impact on participants and their team dynamics.

Foundations of an LCCT-Based Training Process

The application concepts I employed to design and guide the training process were derived from the central tenets of the LCCT. The logical infrastructure of the LCCT emerged through my rejection of the fundamental assumptions which implicitly or explicitly permeate the positivist leadership discourse, and which therefore typically drive mainstream training initiatives. On this basis, I designed the training to reflect these counter-assumptions. Accordingly, the training process was designed to be: (1) group focused rather than leader-role focused; (2) culturally contextualized instead of generic; (3) dedicated to generating event management processes in place of providing universal leadership prescriptions; (4) facilitative of intentional cultural influence as opposed to cultural control; and, (5) focused on culturally appropriate participation rather than leader stereotype emulation. In this section I explain each of these guiding assumptions in more detail.
**LCCT Application Concepts**

**Group versus role-focused training.** The distinction I drew between the process of leadership and the role of leader led to the conclusion that the leader and follower roles are in no way essential to a group's leadership process. The entire notion of leaders and followers is a social construction which has emerged from implicit Western ontological assumptions (e.g., the natural order of things is a hierarchy -- a reality which permeates the Judeo-Christian literature) (Bartolke, 1988; Smircich, 1985; Smircich & Morgan, 1982). From this perspective, the roles of leadership are cultural artifacts indicative of the manner in which social reality has come to be habitually negotiated in the Western world. What is essential to the leadership process, however, is assertive and compliant activities enacted by group members regardless of their formal roles (i.e., situation assessment, reality assertion, reality evaluation, and eventual agreement on the reality of an event -- or at the very least, on a common course of action around which activity is to be coordinated).

What this implied for an LCCT-based training process was that the focal point of instruction should be less on training participants to lead others (i.e., to impart skills necessary to perform the role of leader), and more on training with the group to intentionally and reflexively engage in the leadership process within their own culture (i.e., to define reality and manage the meaning of events in culturally consistent ways). Thus, in lieu of training participants to carry out their assigned leadership roles, I chose to focus the training on the team as an organizing collective whose purpose was to facilitate both their continued organization and the organizing processes of the wider agency.

**Culturally contextualized versus generic training.** Paramount among the objectives of positivist leadership theorists is the identification of a universally applicable, optimal approach to leadership. However, acknowledging the diversity of cultural forms and the approaches to leadership which simultaneously shape and are shaped by those cultural processes, it becomes apparent that what proves effective for generating consensually validated definitions of reality in one cultural context will often prove ineffective
in another. Furthermore, even if one were able to identify a single "best way to lead" within a particular group at a particular time, there can be no certainty that the effectiveness of that approach would extend to each new situation that the group faced, to each individual within the group, or over time as the group culture transforms. Thus, the search for a universal best way to lead is futile.

Alternatively, the logic underlying the leadership-culture continuum suggests the necessity of culture-specific approaches to the development of leadership theory and the subsequent design and implementation of leadership training programs. In most social situations there are an indeterminate number of approaches to reality construction which could effectively create and sustain coordinated activity. However, any given collective will place certain constraints on which of those approaches are likely to be embraced and enacted by the group membership at any one time (i.e., those which are compatible with the established normative order).

Accordingly, I took the view that the training initiative must be responsive to, and reflective of, the participants and their cultural dynamics. This meant incorporating some form of in depth exploration of the conscious and preconscious aspects of culture into the early stages of the training process. I anticipated that such a process would lead to the creation of a common knowledge base which would serve as the touchstone for customizing the LCCT concepts to the participants’ cultural context. This, in turn, would form the foundation for the development of a local event and culture management process (i.e., a customized leadership theory). I develop this concept more completely in a subsequent section on the culture audit process.

**Event management versus prescription-oriented training.** In contrast to positivist theories, the LCCT was never intended to provide concrete, universal behavioural prescriptions for people to apply unwaveringly across events and social contexts. Rather, my objective was to use the LCCT as a framework for generating culturally contextualized event management processes through which individuals and/or a collective could influence events and intentionally shape culture.
This approach is analogous to that utilized in the vast majority of psychotherapies. That is, therapists, regardless of clinical orientation, are typically guided in their interactions with clients by sets of principles (i.e., concepts through which to assess what course of action is most appropriate) rather than by standardized procedural rules (i.e., prescriptions which stipulate if the client does or says X, then you do Y).

Accordingly, in designing the training process I rejected the notion of training participants to learn what to do when, and emphasized merging their cultural knowledge with the LCCT framework to generate culturally specific event and culture management processes. In this regard, the ultimate objective was for participants' to use the theory as a foundation for developing their own local event and culture management process that was sufficiently flexible to facilitate their management of highly equivocal events in a manner consistent with their cultural ideals.

**Intentional influence versus control of culture.** In recent years, much has been written in the popular management literature regarding the importance of creating the optimum culture for achieving maximum organizational effectiveness (e.g., Peters & Waterman, 1982; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Peters & Austin, 1985; Peters, 1992). Adopting a more skeptical position, constructivist culture theorists have questioned whether it is even possible to manage culture. With respect to this argument, Weick (1979) and Schein (1985, 1987a) have speculated that the single most important thing a manager can do is manage a group's culture; however, in contrast to the popular literature they avoid claiming there is an optimum culture to achieve. Smith and Peterson (1988) assume a more cautious position and suggest that it may or may not be possible to manage culture, but if it is possible, it may not necessarily be desirable.

From the vantage point of the LCCT, I suggest that the nature of the question "can culture be managed?" is itself misleading. The question is based on the assumption that culture and leadership are separate and distinct aspects of social organizing and therefore, through leadership one might unilaterally influence culture. Conversely, a dialectic between leadership and culture
suggests that culture is neither the direct result of an omnipotent individual or collective, nor is it an intangible social force which subjugates all who are under its influence. Rather, while culture represents the outcome of human interaction and therefore, cannot be of individual design or control, at the same time it is socially negotiated and therefore open to influence. Thus, I contend that it is less a question of whether culture can or cannot be managed, and more a question of how much intentional influence one or a collective can exert on the continuous process of culture maintenance, formation, and transformation within a given setting?

Overall then, since culture is shaped through the leadership process and simultaneously, constrains the nature of the leadership process, I assume that it is possible to shape and influence the process of culture, but not to control or determine the course of its development. In addition, I assume that a group which makes an effort to be reflexive, and therefore aware of the foundational reality of their own culture in relation to their cultural ideal, will be in a superior position to intentionally influence their cultural processes than one which is relatively less reflexive (Bruner, 1990; Nicholson, 1984). On the basis of these assumptions I concluded that the training must take into account not only the culture of the group, but the group’s view of how their culture should ideally be enacted. This rationale was central to the design of the training process in that it gave shape to the previously mentioned culture audit. It was through this process that participants would generate emancipatory knowledge concerning their culture as enacted relative to their culture as they saw it ideally enacted.

**Participation in culture versus leader stereotype emulation.** In the first chapter I argued that the stereotype of the white heterosexual male has been equated with the leader ideal. This transformation of the status quo into the ideal means that those who do not fit the stereotype are regarded as "special conditions" of leadership (i.e., particularly women and minority groups), and are expected to emulate the stereotypical characteristics associated with white males. In contrast, the LCCT emphasizes the inherently idiosyncratic nature of culture across collectives, and therefore, the entire notion of "special conditions" of leadership is an extraneous distinction. Every group, irrespective
of class, gender, or racial composition, will be unique in terms of its normative order and therefore, the processes through which leadership unfolds.

In designing the training process then, I considered it essential not only to openly reject the leader stereotype early in the training, but also to actively foster the notion that personal styles or approaches to participating in the reality definition and event management process were not only inevitable, but also desirable. With the focus on leadership as a negotiation process, participants should be supported for participating in this process in ways which support and foster their cultural ideal and how they wish to be in relation to their culture, rather than for behaving in ways which emulate a leader stereotype.

In the following section I discuss how these application concepts were operationalized in the design of the training process. Then I report on the actual process by which the training unfolded. At various points throughout the remainder of this chapter I include reference code numbers to categories of data or the specific units of data upon which I made critical decisions about the course of the research (coding procedures are detailed in Appendix A: Data Codes). This practice is in accordance with procedures stipulated by Lincoln and Guba (1989) for demonstrating the adequacy of a constructivist inquiry.

**Designing The Training Process**

As I will discuss at more length in the following chapter, I utilized Lather's (1991) conception of liberatory pedagogy as a framework for conceptualizing the dynamics between the training and research aspects of this project (i.e., wherein teacher and students produce, transform, and are transformed through the knowledge they jointly produce). To facilitate an atmosphere conducive to Lather's conceptualization of the pedagogical process, my intent was to design a highly interactive and experiential training process. Thus, I minimized lectures and focused instead on developing a "workshop" format using illustrations, films, and exercises to illustrate concepts and generate discussion and reflexive critique. Moreover, to maintain consistency with the emergent design of the inquiry, the training was to be steered through ongoing negotiations between all parties to the process. Thus, participants had an equal
voice in determining the focal point, content, and activities for each session in
the training series (RJ-6).

I facilitated this open negotiation by soliciting evaluative feedback from
participants at the end of each session. Further, at the commencement of each
session I provided a tentative agenda based on my understanding of what
participants had expressed an interest in pursuing, and what aspects of the
theory I felt were most useful for supporting this agenda. They in turn had the
option of modifying or entirely changing this agenda at any point in the session,
and did so on a number of occasions (e.g., RJ.05.09.94-4).

Even though the training process was emergent, I considered it important
to establish a tentative training syllabus which could be altered to respond to
the needs and interests of the participants as the inquiry unfolded. In this
regard, I utilized the preceding series of LCCT derived application concepts to
construct a training plan segmented into three phases: (1) theory familiarization;
(2) culture audit; and, (3) theory application and customization. I reasoned that
the training should focus first on developing a familiarity with the two pertinent
bodies of knowledge (i.e., the theoretical and cultural), and then shift to
facilitating the integration of this information to produce a third (i.e., a theory-
based process of event and culture management, customized to the
participants' cultural context).

Accordingly, the first phase in this process was for the participants to
become familiar with the essential concepts and dynamics of the LCCT. In the
second phase we would have this common conceptual knowledge base as an
interpretive framework for generating and organizing the participants' cultural
knowledge base. The final phase would involve a joint effort to translate the
LCCT into a local (i.e., culturally sensitive) event and culture management
process. Overall, if the training proved both meaningful and useful to
participants, I anticipated that we would emerge with an entirely unique event
management process, conceptualized through the LCCT, but customized to
support and foster the participants' self-defined cultural ideal.
Initial Three-Phase Training Design

Phase one: Familiarization with the LCCT. My objective for the initial phase of training was to familiarize the participants with the central concepts of the LCCT to establish a common theoretical foundation around which to organize the subsequent phases. I identified three core themes I considered essential to the application of the LCCT: the underlying constructivist metatheory, the redefinition of leadership, and integrating leadership and culture. I designed a training session of 2.5 hours duration for each of these themes. Each session involved a presentation covering the central assumptions and concepts of the specific topic. Each of these presentations was supported with a film and series of illustrative and practical exercises intended to help participants relate the abstract concepts to their experiences and specific cultural context. I discuss the content of each of these sessions below.

Given that the LCCT is based on a social constructivist metatheory, and therefore contrasts with not only mainstream leadership theory but also with the predominant Western view of reality, I considered it essential to begin with a session on the central tenets of constructivism. For this session I developed a presentation and handout which summarized the key constructivist assumptions pertaining to reality and reality construction (see Appendix B: On Reality and Reality Construction). In addition I selected the documentary The Day the Universe Changed (Lynch & Reisz, 1985) which effectively illustrates and summarizes the constructionist perspective by examining key events in Western history which fundamentally altered the way in which people perceived reality and themselves in relation to their world. It goes on to illustrate cultural relativity by contrasting the modern Western view of reality with that of the Tibetan Buddhists.

In an effort to relate these concepts to participants in a more immediate and familiar way, I developed several illustrations and exercises. For example, since the participants were in the mental health field, I developed an illustration of the transformations in Western views of "madness" and "treatment" throughout history (see Appendix C: Changing Realities: Demonic Possession,
Madness, & Mental Illness). Further, to demonstrate the inherent subjectivity of reality in a very personal way, I constructed a reflexive exercise which presented highly divergent interpretations of the function of the participants' own agency from the perspectives of a clinical psychologist, a cultural anthropologist, and a Marxist sociologist (see Appendix D: BMHC from the Perspective of Three Different Knowledge Systems).

The second session focused on the reconstruction of leadership that forms the foundation of the LCCT. For this session I designed learning materials focused on reframing leadership from traits or techniques to a negotiative social process of event interpretation and management. In this regard, I prepared a presentation on the process models of the LCCT (i.e., Figure 1, the Leadership Process Phase Model; Figure 3, the Culture Process Phase Model; and, Figure 5, the Leadership-Culture Process Phase Model). In support of this discussion I selected the film Twelve Angry Men (Fonda, Rose, & Lumet, 1957). This classic film about a jury in deliberation can be viewed as a series of unfolding reality construction events. I anticipated that use of a film, rather than of a video tape of the participant group in a meeting, would help participants ground the highly abstract process phase models in a safe manner.

To supplement these resources I prepared a handout which contrasted the LCCT with mainstream theories of leadership (see Appendix E: Contrasts Between Modern Theories of Leadership & the LCCT). In addition, I created a handout to illustrate the concepts covered in the discussion (i.e., individuals' participation in making and sustaining social reality, conceptual illustrations of the dialectic relationship between leadership and culture, and implicit dynamics underlying the modern Western view of reality) (see Appendix F: Notes on the Dynamics of the LCCT). Finally, I prepared an "ambiguous stimulus" exercise which would have participants view and attempt to make sense of an ambiguous object (a highly equivocal item of pottery). The exercise was intended to illustrate the underlying questions represented by the Leadership Process Phase Model (Figure 1) (i.e, what is it? what does it mean for us? and, what should we do about it?).
For the third session on culture, which I intended as a precursor to the culture audit process, I prepared a presentation which focused on the Structure of Culture Model (Figure 2) and the Leadership-Culture Continuum Model (Figure 4). To support this discussion, I produced a handout which summarized the principle assumptions of the LCCT regarding the nature and dynamics of culture, and culture in relation to leadership (see Appendix G: On the Nature of Culture). Further, I selected a 16 minute segment from the film *The Gods Must be Crazy* (Troskie & Uys, 1980). With a playfully sardonic tone, this segment contrasts presumably superior modern Western industrialization with the hunter-gatherer society of an African tribe. I anticipated that this juxtaposition would facilitate the participants' own process of examining and critiquing the usually preconscious aspects of our own culture in the ensuing culture audit phase.

**Phase two: Culture audit.** The notion of a culture audit was based on the assumption that without an awareness of the possibility of choice there can be no alternative courses of action selected or initiated (i.e., if one cannot conceive of an alternative, then one cannot intentionally choose it) (Thomas, 1993). Accordingly, the generation of a cultural knowledge base though an audit of the group's underlying values and assumptions was intended to generate awareness of cultural alternatives, and therefore, new options for intentional cultural development and/or transformation. I designed the process in three stages: (1) identification of fundamental values and assumptions; (2) reflexive critique of values and assumptions; and, (3) cultural development planning (see Appendix H: Culture Audit and Transformation Process Outline). Thematically, these stages were based on the central questions of the Leadership Process Phase Model (Figure 1): “What is the situation?” “What does it mean to us?” and, “What should we do about it?”

The first of these stages was intended to facilitate participants own process of bringing their collective implicit values and assumptions (i.e., their foundational reality) into conscious awareness. To facilitate this process I developed a series of exercises through which participants could make the various subtexts which guided and shaped their daily interactions and
discourse explicit and examinable (see Appendix I: Culture Audit Process -- Stage 1: Identifying Fundamental Values & Assumptions). These exercises were based on the manifestations of culture presented in the previous chapter (i.e., Chapter 1: The structure of culture). I relied on specific types of manifestations (e.g., critical organizational incidents, normative language patterns, physical features, etc.) as interpretive inroads for establishing the underlying values and assumptions of the collective.

A group's identification of the foundational elements of their culture is insufficient for them to intentionally shape and transform their culture. The next stage required that these values and assumptions be critically examined in order to understand their place and origins in the group process, explore how they are manifested and sustained on a day-to-day basis, and particularly, to reflect on their past, present, and future implications (Bruner, 1990; Sampson, 1991; Thomas, 1993). In this regard, I considered it critical to analyze the forms of collective organizing the cultural order supported and inhibited. Moreover, it would be important to reflect on who might be supported, liberated, or oppressed as a result of the cultural status quo. For instance, through reflexive scrutiny it can become evident that a value or assumption, which at one point in a group's history was highly functional, may now serve as an impediment to the coordination of group member activity, or significantly frustrate others' efforts to be more self-organizing.

In contrast to the first stage where the objective would be for participants to generate a picture of their current culture and cultural processes, the purpose of this stage would be to generate a picture of their "cultural ideal" (i.e., an ideal but realistic normative order and underlying set of values and assumptions). To facilitate the reflexive critique required to generate such a picture I developed an exercise based on a progression of reflexive questions (see Appendix J: Culture Audit Process -- Stage 2: Critiquing Fundamental Values & Assumptions). These questions were intended to structure the participants' process of intentionally evaluating their foundational reality to determine those elements they valued and therefore intended to keep, those which they felt should be modified, and those requiring change.
Chapter 2: Training Process

The third stage was to engage participants in a process through which they might begin to consider ways to intentionally influence the nature of their culture. Through this process, the participants could develop plans for maintaining and reinforcing the still valued and functional facets of their culture, and modify or cease to enact those facets which were inconsistent with their cultural ideal. As with the previous two stages, I developed an exercise based on a series of questions that were intended to provide a supportive structure for their action planning process (see Appendix K: Culture Audit Process -- Stage 3: Culture Transformation & Development Planning). These questions were structured to guide participants through a planning process that became progressively more concrete -- moving from the formulation of general strategies for influencing culture, to detailed action plans for accomplishing these objectives. Also included were questions designed to help them establish criteria for gauging their success.

In closing my discussion of the culture audit process, it is important to underscore the point that this component of the intervention was not intended as a process through which to unfreeze, adjust, and refreeze the participants’ normative cultural order (this is reflected in the cyclical design of the “Culture Audit & Transformation Process Outline” [Appendix H]). Instead, the approach I developed from the LCCT was intended to assist participants in unfreezing their culture, and then inhibiting its complete refreezing through the introduction of processes for ongoing collective reflection and critique. In this regard, the intent was for participants to achieve a new awareness of their influence over culture through their participation in its constant re-creation, and a knowledge base to facilitate their efforts to intentionally and reflexively participate in cultural critique and transformation. Such a design embodies a key objective of praxis-oriented research -- to empower participants with respect to the issues upon which the research is focused (i.e., in this case, to conduct ongoing self-examinations of, and make intentional adjustment to, their own cultural foundation and processes).

**Phase three: Integration and application.** My intent for this final phase was integration of the two previously generated knowledge bases into a
practical process for guiding team members in their efforts to intentionally manage events and influence their culture. The objective then, was to create a local leadership theory by merging participants’ understanding of the LCCT with the specific values and assumptions of their team culture.

As I indicated in the previous chapter, the implicit values and assumptions underlying the positivist conceptualization of leadership are based on, and in turn foster, an overly narrow form of organizational culture (i.e., cultures which organize on the basis of production, profit, and the rational maximization of resources -- see Chapter 1: The Politics of Positivist Leadership Theory). Given that the LCCT is about processes of social organizing rather than group produced outcomes, I developed the theory so that it would be responsive to a much broader range of cultural agendas.

Accordingly, the LCCT was designed to function as a generic framework that is "hollow" until it is infused with the specific values and assumptions of a specific collective (i.e., "what we exist for," "what we believe and value," and "how we organize"). In this sense the LCCT cannot be meaningfully applied until it is merged with the cultural knowledge base of a specific group. This approach minimizes the imposition of an external cultural ideal (i.e., one implicit within the theory), and necessitates that participants customize the LCCT to their specific culture. The ideal result is a theory-based, culturally cognizant event management process which is entirely unique to the context within which it is developed and utilized.

To facilitate this merger, the training plan I developed included a series of application sessions to provide participants with an opportunity to work with their theory and culture knowledge bases to construct, test, and refine a local event management process (see Table 1: Proposed Progression of LCCT Training Sessions). What form such a process would actually assume would depend largely on what proved meaningful to the participants. They would be free to take from the LCCT and the culture audit data whatever concepts they considered meaningful and useful for supporting their management of daily events and the intentional influence of their culture. To support this process, I redefined my role from that of "teacher" (Phase 1) and "facilitator" (Phase 2) to
"coach." In this role I would be somewhat less active during the sessions, offering insights and providing support as requested, as participants worked to construct a practical process for applying the LCCT.

With respect to the format for these sessions, I envisioned participants selecting a team or organizational issue that they would ordinarily deal with during their regularly scheduled management meetings. We would then approach that issue using the LCCT framework, and incorporate their culture audit information and objectives to ground the issue and its resolution in their cultural ideal. No worksheets or exercises were designed in advance of this phase as I anticipated that if such tools would prove useful, it would become apparent during the actual application process.

**Overview of the training plan.** The preceding training plan summarizes the process as originally proposed to participants (see Table 1). It represents a series of eight training and application sessions, each of approximately 2.5 hours in duration, for a total of 20 training hours. I anticipated that the training process itself would take place over a two and a half to three month period, assuming an average of one training session per week and allowing for rescheduling due to unforeseen organizational events. The understanding between myself and participants was that, pending positive evaluations of the training process with the senior management team, this plan would be suitably modified (i.e. on the basis of the first round research results) and repeated with volunteers from the agency’s middle management level (I discuss this aspect of the training design at greater length in the methodology chapter).

**Implementation of the Training Process**

For reasons I will outline presently, the training process with the management team participants took approximately two and a half times longer than initially scheduled. By the final session, the training had spanned seven months, including a two month pause to accommodate those participants who had scheduled vacation time (approximately twice my original time estimate). A total of 20 sessions were conducted, each averaging 2.4 hours in duration (2.5
Table 1

**Proposed Progression of LCCT Training Sessions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Sessions</th>
<th>Culture Audit Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intro to Reality Construction</td>
<td>4. Initiate Culture Audit Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE: Create a space for reframing leadership and culture.</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE: Begin the process of generating insights into the preconscious aspects of culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reframing Leadership</td>
<td>5. Culture Audit Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE: Reconstructing the concept of leadership and the role of leader.</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE: Initiate participants’ own process of critiquing their team culture toward generating plans to intentionally influence its course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Dynamics of the LCCT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| OBJECTIVE: Familiarization with the theory, its objectives, and its dynamics. | |}

**Application Sessions**

6 - 8. Application of the LCCT
OBJECTIVE: Creation of a culture specific event and culture management process through culturally sensitive application of the LCCT to specific organizational events.

...times the anticipated number of sessions). This amounted to 48 hours of training and coaching time (2.4 times initial estimates). Of the 20 sessions, 12 were specially scheduled training and application sessions. These averaged 2.8 hours in duration and accounted for 33 hours of the total training time (or 2.6 times the expected). Subsequent to the training sessions an additional eight group coaching and facilitation sessions were held during the participants' regular weekly management meetings. These were an average of 1.9 hours in duration and accounted for the remaining 15 hours (twice my original estimate)
The Emergent Training Process

Renegotiating the sequence. As indicated in Table 1, the original training plan proposed three sessions devoted to an exploration of the central concepts of the theory followed by two sessions devoted to a team culture audit. During a pretraining briefing the participants reviewed this proposal and requested that we advance the culture audit phase of the training. They indicated that they had been through a protracted period of managing cut-backs and program transitions and were therefore anxious for the opportunity to reflect on their culture.

I considered it important to establish the metatheoretical context for the audit and therefore proposed that we allow one session for an introduction to the basic tenets of social constructivism. This would advance the culture audit phase from the fourth session to the second. In addition, I suggested beginning the first culture audit session by introducing the LCCT's culture models (i.e., Figure 2, the Structure of Culture; Figure 3, the Culture Process Phase Model). The participants supported this proposal and the training process unfolded on the basis of this revised plan (RJ.03.04.94-1).

By the end of training, we had covered virtually all of the information I intended to introduce to participants, however the original structure I had imposed on this material was radically altered from the outset. I utilized this pool of training material over the course of the inquiry as a resource to remain responsive to the participants' emerging concerns, interests, and objectives (see Table 2: Negotiated Progression of LCCT Training Sessions).

Culture audit. For the culture audit, I anticipated using several of the exercises I had developed to facilitate the participants' process of making preconsciously aspects of their culture explicit and examinable (see Appendix I: Culture Audit Process -- Stage 1: Identifying Fundamental Values & Assumptions). Accordingly, to introduce the process in a safe manner I selected what I considered the most innocuous of these: Exercise 3 -- Looking at BMHC
### Table 2

**Negotiated Progression of LCCT Training Sessions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Sessions</th>
<th>Culture Audit Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intro to Reality Construction</td>
<td>2. Initiate Culture Audit Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE: Create a space for reframing leadership and culture.</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE: Began the process of generating insights into the preconscious aspects of culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reframing Leadership</td>
<td>3. Culture Audit Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE: Reconstructed the concept of leadership and defined culture as a social process.</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE: Participants' initiated their process of critiquing their team culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Culture Audit Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBJECTIVE: Participants' continued the process of critiquing their team culture toward generating plans to intentionally influence its course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Dynamics of the LCCT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE: In depth examination of the theory, its objectives, and its dynamics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Application & Coaching Sessions**

6 - 12. Application of the LCCT
OBJECTIVE: Creation of a customized event and culture management process through culturally appropriate application of the LCCT to specific organizational events.

13 - 20. Coaching and Support
OBJECTIVE: Refinement of their customized event and culture management process.

*Through the Eyes of a First Time Visitor.* This ethnographic-like “thought experiment” focuses on extrapolating foundational values and assumptions through a reflexive exploration of the physical features and layout of an organization (i.e., as one set of surface level manifestations of the culture -- see Chapter 1: The structure of culture).
Using this scenario we "moved" from the parking lot into the lobby and reception area, extrapolating the underlying values and assumptions of the organization from the objects, signs, symbols, and furnishings as we progressed. The exercise itself was forgotten before we could progress into other parts of the agency as the mass of data the participants generated began to serve as its own stimulus for additional cultural insights. By the end of the first session participants had created what amounted to seven single-spaced pages of data on the foundational elements of their culture. No further exercises were therefore required as both the quantity and impact of the data had reached an almost overwhelming level for participants (RJ.04.08.94-1).

During the audit I played a facilitative role. I provided structures for participants to conduct their own process of cultural analysis and critique (see Appendices H through K), asked prompt questions when the process became stalled or lost focus, offered interpretations of patterns I detected in the data, and worked between sessions to organize and consolidate the data. With respect to this last point, I transcribed the data from flip chart worksheets and reviewed video tapes of each session to fill in the details and nuances I failed to record during the session. I then grouped the statements of values and assumptions into emergent themes and reflected these arrangements of categories back to participants for their confirmation, clarification, modification, and analysis in the next session (in a somewhat less rigorous sense, this process of group culture data analysis mirrored the process used to analyze the research data).

Grouping the values and assumptions thematically helped reveal broader cultural patterns which might not otherwise have become apparent. For instance, the sets of values and assumptions listed in Table 3 are excerpts from a "Treatment/Management Philosophy" theme which served to illuminate the powerful conceptual links between the participants' normative approach to the management of their agency and their clinical values and assumptions.

Moreover, it was through this theme that it became evident to participants that the tendencies they recognized as characteristic of themselves as team members tended to be reinforced in staff. For the most part this was not a surprising or problematic insight. However, they further realized that several of
their shared tendencies -- those which they did not consider consistent with their ideal view of healthy psychological functioning (e.g., “workaholism”) -- were also very much a part of their culture, and consequently, were being implicitly communicated as characteristics valued in staff. These types of insights provided participants with a foundation for defining their team cultural ideal and therefore, for initiating plans to address those aspects of their culture they most wanted to maintain and transform through their event management processes.

At the same time that this phase was generating powerful cultural insights and facilitating the participants’ process of defining their cultural ideal, it also proved the single most difficult period of the training. Participants uniformly reported high levels of stress and a sense of group “destabilization” as a result of number of cultural insights which proved both surprising and disturbing (Bl.2.4).

For instance, as early as the first audit session participants were becoming aware of contradictions between some of their explicit normative
values and assumptions (e.g., as in the above example: "we consider it important for staff to be healthy, and this includes taking care of oneself and one’s needs") and normative behaviours which communicated a different message (e.g., "we tend to overwork ourselves and therefore, implicitly convey that this is a desirable practice"). Thus, their cultural process was suddenly open to intense self-reflection and scrutiny. In so doing, they tended to focus their attention on those insights which they found inconsistent with other fundamental values and assumptions. This challenged their confidence in the overall integrity of their foundational reality. That is, suddenly, the implicit trustworthiness of their normative ways of thinking, acting, and interacting as an organizing collective had been called into question. Participants used words such as, "incredibly uncomfortable," "unsettling," "painful," "emotionally impactful," "anxiety provoking," and "frightening" to describe their experiences during this period of destabilization (Bl.2.4).

The following reflexive journal entry, recorded after Session Four, conveys a sense of the impact that the process appeared to have on participants, and my concern to support their process of restabilization:

The group often seems to overlook what they are proud of, and beat themselves up for what they are recognizing as things they would rather not recognize. Reflecting on the growing culture audit document we are generating, Lawren observed that "it is almost as though we have to explore everyone of these just to sort out what we want to be -- and then I get nervous because the list keeps getting bigger each time we meet." Drew and Jamie nodded their agreement and Alex stated that "we need a lot more sessions to deal with all this"...

I must admit I’m not entirely sure at this point how the process will unfold with respect to dealing with this lengthy and highly impactful list of insights. I will however, try to bring them back to focus on their sizable achievements -- it would do no good for them to be immobilized by the process. But I could see this happening, at least temporarily, if we don’t work to emphasize the positive. Ironically, I think they are so successful as a management team because they are bothered by exactly these sorts of things -- their drive for excellence. (excerpt from RJ.04.20.94-2)
Rather than choosing to terminate the culture audit, participants elected to continue the process until they felt more resolved regarding their central issues of concern. We therefore added a session to this phase, increasing its duration from two to three sessions (RJ.04.08.94-1; RJ.04.13.94-1; RJ.04.20.94-2; RJ.04.25.94-1). By the end of the third culture audit session (Session 4) participants indicated a desire for a break from the process and suggested returning to the theory for a somewhat more emotionally "neutral" session (RJ.04.20.94-2). I therefore used the fifth session to introduce more aspects of the LCCT, focusing in particular on the dynamics of the leadership-culture continuum (i.e., Figure 4, The Leadership-Culture Continuum Model; Figure 5, The Leadership-Culture Process Phase Model).

The stressfulness of these sessions led to the joint negotiation of a number of agreements regarding interactions during training (i.e., "safety protocols," discussed in detail in the final chapter). Our objective was to make the remainder of the process less stressful and threatening by guaranteeing support for any individual who might find him or herself struggling with the nature and/or direction of the group process at any given moment (RJ-4).

By Session Six, the first of the application phase sessions, it was evident that much work remained to be done with respect to the culture audit data before the participants would feel they had reached a satisfactory level of closure and collective restabilization. Consequently, we reached the decision (which had been openly discussed previously -- e.g., RJ.04.20.94-6) to extend the training beyond the originally scheduled eight sessions, and to exclude the middle management level personnel until we had more thoroughly assessed the overall impact and implications of the training for the original group of participants (RJ.05.07.94-1; RJ.05.09.94-2). This decision launched the theory application phase of the training which was ultimately extended from three sessions to seven, followed by an additional eight coaching and support sessions (refer to Table 2 and Appendix L: Record of Training Sessions).

**Constructing a local event and culture management process.** The purpose of the extended theory application phase was to begin applying the LCCT concepts and culture audit insights to actual team and organizational
events. The overall objective was the development of a customized event and culture management process (i.e., a local applied leadership theory) for participants' use beyond the training sessions. By using the Leadership Process Phase Model (Figure 1) to structure the group reality construction process, and culture audit data to ground the process in the group's cultural ideal, we began to develop a formal event management process tailored to the objectives, values, and assumptions of the management team. As this process became more elaborate, we created a reference document which summarized this process through a series of prompt questions. This emerging document came to be known as the "Event Management Protocol" (EMP) (RJ.05.09.94-4).

The first EMP was introduced as a concept document in Session 10 -- after four application sessions had been conducted (RJ.08.10.94-4). At this early stage it was essentially an exhaustive summary of LCCT application principles followed by two pages of prompt questions which summarized the event management process we had developed and experimented with during the preceding application sessions (see Appendix M: Event Management Protocol 1.0). This series of prompt questions was organized around the phases of the Leadership Process Phase Model (i.e., Situation Assessment, Reality Assertion, and Reality Assessment -- see Figure 1), and served as the basis for ensuing revisions of the document. In addition, it incorporated the insights into the theory's application which had come to light through the preceding sessions. For instance, as part of the Situation Assessment phase, it prompted participants to reflect on the realities held by the stakeholders to an event, and to analyze power dynamics.

Over the course of subsequent application sessions, this document underwent a series of four major revisions and two abridgments. The summary of LCCT application principles was removed, and the emphasis shifted to tailoring and streamlining the prompt questions to reflect the specific cultural objectives of the participants. Thus, by Session 15 (three sessions into the coaching series) it had become a three page series of questions which integrated concise statements of the participants' cultural objectives with the event management process we had jointly developed from the LCCT (see

This document guided participants through a two stage event management process: Situation Assessment and Reality Assertion, and Reality Evaluation. The Situation Assessment and Reality Assertion phase was divided into two subsections. The first focused on generating an information base with which to construct a comprehensive definition of the event. It focused on critiquing and reframing the initial definition of the event, generating insights into the realities of stakeholders, and analyzing the relevant power dynamics. The second subsection focused on the analysis of internal team dynamics. It prompted participants to reflect on the habitual group interaction patterns they identified during the culture audit as impediments to achieving their cultural ideal. A similar segment was included which prompted each individual to privately reflect on his or her participation in the process to discern whether he or she might be unduly influenced by personal issues or biases triggered by the event.

The Reality Evaluation section of the protocol guided participants through a thorough analysis of the event management plan they generated in the preceding section. It was designed to help them attend to the influence of team dynamics they wished to resist (e.g., a tendency to feel driven to achieve closure on events), and encouraged them to assess the immediate and broader cultural implications of their plan. In this sense, it prompted participants to consider whether the proposed plan was likely to simultaneously produce a satisfactory resolution to the event, and shape culture in the desired manner. This involved focusing on the anticipated reactions of stakeholders, and ensuring that the messages their actions were likely to convey were congruent with their cultural ideal.

In support of the EMP, two supplemental documents were developed. The first was a summary of the LCCT assumptions, principles and dynamics intended to serve as a reference document for explaining various aspects of the theory the participants had begun introducing casually to middle management staff during their daily interactions (see Appendix O: Principles and Assumptions of the LCCT). The second was a prompt page summarizing the
culture transformations participants had committed themselves to incorporating into their daily management practices (see Appendix P: Team Culture Transformation Plans). The basic content of both these documents came from the first segment of the original version of the Event Management Protocol (Appendix M).

Following the additional theory application sessions, eight coaching sessions were held. These occurred during regularly scheduled management meetings and served as opportunities for support and observation (RJ.08.15.94-5; RJ.08.22.94-1). As I have indicated, in the first three of these sessions we continued to refine the EMP. By attending to the nature of the issues dealt with in weekly meetings (ranging from series of largely routine issues handled in rapid succession, to the management of highly complex situations and events which could occupy an entire meeting or more) it became apparent that while the EMP was well suited to handling the non-normative issues, it was too lengthy for use with many of the more routine matters (RJ.08.29.94-4).

Consequently, at the suggestion of the participants, a five question "Reality Check" form was developed for use with the more unequivocal types of events (see Appendix Q: Reality Check) (RJ.08.22.94-2; RJ.08.29.94-6; RJ.09.06.94-1; RJ.09.12.94). Thus, while the EMP was designed to support participants in their efforts to analyze and manage more complex and equivocal events, the Reality Check was designed as a fast reference document for confirming that a given event management plan was consistent with the teams’ central cultural ideals. In the remaining five sessions we focused on applying the EMP and Reality Check documents during the participants' normal course of business (RJ.09.26.94-1).

In closing this section it is important to underscore the point that the objective driving the development of the application documents I have just discussed was not the documents as end products of the training. Rather, the point was to develop a common event management process which would support the participants in their efforts to individually and collectively manage events in a manner consistent with their cultural ideal.
The event management process emerged out of an integration of the general concepts of the LCCT with the participants' specific cultural objectives. Thus, it was a structured way of approaching the process of interpreting events and managing their meaning so as to foster their cultural ideal. The Event Management Protocol and Reality Check were documents that summarized this approach, and therefore, served as references for following the event management process. In this sense, the development and utilization of these documents was an interim step to facilitate participants' habituation of the event and culture management process they had designed for themselves. As I will discuss in the results chapter, this protocol approach proved effective for supporting participants' process of transforming new event management intentions into normative event management practices.
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This chapter is divided into three sections. The first provides a brief overview of the epistemological foundations upon which this research initiative was constructed. The second outlines the specific objectives of the study. The third summarizes the methodology including the setting and participants, data generation and analysis, and measures undertaken to ensure informed consent and confidentiality. Also included in this section is a discussion of the emergent research design, and the criteria for evaluation of research adequacy.

Methodological Rationale

In the first chapter I discussed the shortcomings of mainstream leadership theories resulting from a strict adherence to a positivist metatheory. I argued that this produced theories based on an exceedingly narrow view of leadership and group dynamics. To develop an alternative theory I undertook a reconstruction of leadership in social constructivist terms. Accordingly, in designing an applied research initiative on the LCCT it would have been logically inconsistent to employ a positivist methodology.

To maintain metatheoretical integrity then, I designed this research using the constructivist epistemological and methodological perspectives of Patti Lather (1991) (“Praxis-oriented Research”), Gareth Morgan (1993) (“Action Learning”), and Yvonna Lincoln and Egon Guba (1985) (“Naturalistic Inquiry”). While the views offered by each of these methodologists are philosophically consistent, each also offers unique insights into the design and conduct of constructivist research which were particularly germane to the specific nature and objectives of this inquiry. In this section I briefly discuss both the underlying commonalities and singular aspects of these methodological positions which I employed in the conceptualization, design, and conduct of this inquiry.

Praxis-oriented research. Common to the positions of each of the aforementioned methodologists is the primacy of praxis-oriented research toward the dual aims of generating more informed and sophisticated constructions of reality while simultaneously fostering the empowerment of the research participants. That is, central to each of these methodologies is an action component -- realized through a dialectic between theory and practice -- intended to produce knowledge systems that address the emancipatory
concerns of people in natural contexts. Hence, in contrast to the positivist objective of creating value neutral, totalizing theories intended to generalize across social space and time, these authors advance the view that research should facilitate the development of theories which are explicitly ideological with an emancipatory intent -- making them socially temporal, contingent, and local (Lather, 1991; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Morgan, 1993).

This emphasis on praxis means that inquiries take the form of interventions explicitly intended to tether theory and practice to facilitate the empowerment of the participants with whom the research is conducted. This overtly political agenda represents the underlying emancipatory interest common to each of these epistemological perspectives: that research generate forms of knowledge which challenge the status quo and facilitate the empowerment of those with whom the knowledge was generated to intentionally and self-reflexively transform their own social conditions. Accordingly, a fundamental objective of this inquiry was to facilitate the participants' own process of self-empowerment to address the concerns that initiated the research. The intent in this regard, was to provide them with a training process through which they might construct a local theory of leadership that would enable them to more reflexively and intentionally manage events and shape the nature of their culture.

This view of an emancipatory intent was drawn from Morgan's (1993) Action Learning perspective. For Morgan the objective of research is to generate learning on the part of the researcher and participants toward gaining better understandings of the participants' problems (i.e., generation of emancipatory insights which produce new options), and to facilitate appropriate action (i.e., empowerment of participants to transform their social conditions). This definition of emancipation contrasts with methodologists such as Lather (1991) whose emancipatory agenda focuses more on socially oppressed and disenfranchised groups (i.e., women and minorities). Morgan's agenda includes but extends beyond Lather's in the sense that he is interested in challenging the self-oppressive nature of cultural processes which restrict perception, interpretation, discourse, and action for any collective. Given that
this research was initiated to address the self-directive concerns of a functioning management team (a type of collective not typically considered “socially oppressed”). Morgan’s emancipatory model provided the most appropriate conceptual framework for this inquiry.

It is important to note that regardless of how emancipation is defined with respect to research intent and outcomes, a common view among all of these methodologists is that the research process itself must be empowering for the participants. It is considered essential that research initiatives actively involve the participants in shaping and steering the course of the actual inquiry (Lather, 1991; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Morgan, 1993). Such an approach is indicative of the dialogue between researcher and research participants largely regarded as an essential element of emancipatory focused research (e.g., Bruner, 1990; Dachler, 1988; Fetterman, 1989; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Sampson, 1991; Sullivan, 1984). Accordingly, this democratic discursive process through which participants gain an equal voice in how the research ultimately unfolds, was a fundamental guiding principle from initial design through to project cessation.

**A pedagogical approach.** In this project, the learning process was critical in that the theory’s application through the training process was the core objective. Lather, Morgan, and Lincoln and Guba all emphasize the pedagogical process as a defining feature of their respective conceptualizations of constructivist inquiry. In rejecting the objective of “truth proving” in favour of “insight seeking,” they uniformly advance the concept of research as a form of disciplined learning. However, of the three, Lather’s (1991) notion of “liberatory pedagogy” is particularly well conceptualized and therefore, was most useful for facilitating my research objectives.

Lather contends that a transformation in consciousness occurs in the interchange among teacher, student, and the knowledge they jointly produce. Accordingly, instrumentalization of these relations is resisted, while interactivity and equality is advanced. The teacher is viewed as overtly subjective (versus a neutral transmitter), the student as an active participant in the discourse (versus a passive recipient), and knowledge as dynamic and transformative (versus fixed and immutable). This reconception of the pedagogical process
intentionally obscures the traditional boundaries between theory, method and praxis, and gives rise to a dialectic process intended to actualize transformations in people and the knowledge they collectively create (Lather, 1991). This conceptual framework allowed me to establish general expectations regarding how the research process should function as a vehicle for both facilitating social change, and generating insights which would inform and sophisticate the training process as an applied knowledge construction.

First, I expected a dialectical learning process. That is, I anticipated that as participants learned about the LCCT and began applying their insights to actual team and organization events, I would learn more about the application process (e.g., which facets of the LCCT were and were not meaningful and useful for them; how they utilized these insights within their cultural context; how the training needed to be transformed to make it more useful, etc.). Second, if the training proved meaningful, I anticipated that participants would generate new insights into themselves as an organizing collective which would afford them new alternatives for intentionally shaping their cultural process. Thus, I anticipated that the learning process would serve as the vehicle via which data were generated to steer the research process, evaluate and enhance the training and application process, and facilitate the participants’ own process of reflexivity and intentional transformation.

An emergent research design. A central implication of incorporating the emancipatory and dialectical learning agendas was that the research initiative had to be highly responsive to emergent data and participant input. That is, if participants were to have a meaningful voice in how the process unfolded, and if the pedagogical process were to facilitate dialectical transformations among the participants, myself as researcher, and the knowledge system we were focused on, the research design had to be inherently flexible.

All of the methodologists I drew from in the development of this design advocate an "emergent" approach to research design. That is, each of these authors has argued that in constructivist inquiry the researcher cannot know a priori what it is she or he does not know (Lather, 1991; Lincoln, 1990; Lincoln &
Chapter 3: Methodology

Guba, 1985; Morgan, 1993). This uncertain nature of inquiry means that, for the constructivist,

...the term "design" designates nothing more than a broad plan relating to certain contingencies that will probably arise, but the precise nature of those contingencies is unpredictable. It is anticipated that the design will change as those contingencies are realized... (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 259)

Given this position, I designed the overall research, as well as the actual training component, so that they could unfold and transform in response to emergent information (i.e., interpretations and insights).

I considered Lincoln and Guba's method of Naturalistic Inquiry the best suited for facilitating a research process which was simultaneously emergent, negotiated, and rigorous (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Guba & Lincoln, 1989).1 Their approach to constructivist inquiry is well established as a framework for translating the central tenets of constructivism into a practical research framework. In particular, they incorporate a more extensive and rigorous set of adequacy criteria against which to assess the quality of both the inquiry process and its products. Moreover, this methodology has been extensively developed for use in evaluation studies (i.e., Guba & Lincoln, 1989), and evaluation of the LCCT training process was the first of two central research agendas guiding this project. I outline this methodology and the associated adequacy criteria in a subsequent section of this chapter.

To summarize, I drew from three constructivist methodologies to conceptualize, design, and steer this inquiry. The central commonality linking these perspectives is an emphasis on praxis-oriented research intended to generate emancipatory forms of knowledge which challenge the status quo and facilitate the empowerment of participants to transform their own social context. Since the research participants were from a functioning management team, I utilized Morgan's (1993) emancipatory agenda which calls for research interventions that challenge the oppressive aspects of group culture that inhibit reflexiveness and intentionality. Given that the research focused on a training process, I selected Lather's (1991) conceptualization of critical pedagogy
(which postulates a transformative dialectic among teacher, student, and knowledge) as a guide for developing the training initiative and steering the research process. Finally, the inquiry was to be both emergent in design, and empowering for participants. To actualize these objectives I chose Lincoln and Guba's (1985) method of Naturalistic Inquiry. With these guiding principles and techniques as the foundation, I turn now to a discussion of the specific research objectives I developed to guide the data generation and analysis phase of this initiative.

**Research Objectives**

*Evaluation of the LCCT Training Initiative*

There is no single, commonly accepted set of criteria for evaluating the application of a constructivist theory. Each constructivist theorist or researcher must establish their evaluative criteria from the values and assumptions which form the foundation of their specific epistemological system (Lather, 1991).

In this regard, and as I have just argued, social theory should be constructed with the pragmatic intent of facilitating processes through which social bodies are able to become more self-reflexive and critical of the social conditions they create (Bruner, 1990; Gergen, 1990; Lather, 1991; Sullivan, 1984). The generation of critical insights (what Lather [1991] refers to as "emancipatory knowledge") is intended to empower collectives to more intentionally shape the nature of their own cultural processes. On the basis of this ideological agenda, I contend that the application of such theories be assessed, not in terms of their truth value, but rather in terms of their pragmatic value to their users (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lather, 1991; Morgan, 1993).

For present purposes, I define "pragmatic value" as a subjective assessment of a theoretical construction's social meaningfulness (i.e., its intelligibility, relevance and consciousness-reframing potential for prospective users) and practical utility (i.e., its usefulness as a framework for facilitating action which fosters social conditions desired by the users) (Gergen, 1990, 1992; Lather, 1991; Rogers, 1990).² As Gergen (1992) has argued, the first measure of a theoretical construction "is not its database but its intelligibility,
and the very communication of this intelligibility already establishes grounds for its utility” (p. 217).

Accordingly, the most fundamental criterion within this evaluative framework is that the content of the training make sense to those it was designed to serve. It must not only be communicable in terms which are intelligible, it must also be meaningful in the sense that it is consistent with and relevant to the experiences of the intended users. Furthermore, it must be meaningful in that it facilitates the generation of critical insights into the phenomenon it was constructed to address (i.e., leadership and culture management). In this regard, the training must be able to take the users beyond how they were originally organizing their experience of the world, and which they therefore took for granted (Gergen, 1985, 1992; Lather, 1991). A meaningful training initiative would then be one which participants assessed as understandable, relevant to their experiences, and facilitative of their own process of consciousness-reframing.

To evaluate the meaningfulness of the LCCT training initiative, the following three thematic questions guided the inquiry:

1. **Intelligibility**: Does the content of the training (i.e., the concepts upon which the LCCT is constructed) make sense, in at least an abstract or conceptual sense, to participants?

2. **Relevance**: To what degree are participants able to interpret their present, and reinterpret their past experiences of group life and events through the conceptual framework provided by the training?

3. **Consciousness-Reframing**: To what degree does the training assist participants in generating new insights into the group process which they recognize as beyond those they generated previous to the training? That is, does the training enable them to restructure their analysis and interpretation of their own group's cultural and leadership processes in such a way that they are able to generate original insights into these processes?

I proposed that these three criteria of meaningfulness were the first fundamental steps in the evaluation of the training. If the LCCT training failed to
meet these criteria, then the experience would have little pragmatic value and there would be no point in proceeding with an exploration of its utility. However, if the training proved reasonably meaningful to the participants as it unfolded then, as Gergen contends, grounds for its utility would be established.

I did not deem interpretive power alone to be sufficient. Having insight into a phenomenon does not necessarily empower one or a group to do something to influence that phenomenon — as Freud observed, "insight is not cure". Thus, I established that the training should also serve as a vehicle for guiding intentional efforts to bring about the social conditions participants identified as desirable. This criterion represented the training's practical utility and underscored the point that it should serve as an agent of intentional social change — that is, that it facilitate the empowerment of the user. On the basis of this reasoning then, the training intervention would be regarded as useful if it facilitated new forms of self-reflexive social action intended to address the issues that the participants deemed worthy of their focused attention (Gergen, 1982, 1985, 1990, 1992; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lather, 1991; Rogers, 1990).

I translated this conceptualization of practical utility into a practical evaluation research agenda via the following three thematic questions:

1. **Event Management Processes**: To what degree do participants experience the training as a useful process for enabling them to participate more intentionally in influencing the course of the immediate group reality construction processes (i.e., leadership processes)?

2. **Culture Management Processes**: To what degree do participants experience the training as a useful process for enabling them to participate more intentionally in influencing (e.g., sustaining, modifying, and/or transforming) the group's foundational reality and normative processes (i.e., cultural processes)?

3. **Processes of Social Organizing**: To what degree do participants experience the training as a useful process for enabling them to participate more intentionally in influencing both the group leadership and cultural processes simultaneously?
I assumed in advance that these questions oversimplified the nature of the evaluation data to be generated. For instance, I anticipated that participants would have differing opinions regarding the meaningfulness and usefulness of the LCCT training. Thus, I regarded the above outlined questions as starting points for more extensive explorations into the impact of the training initiative, the opportunities it could afford, and the limitations it could impose. I introduced the following exploratory research agenda to facilitate the generation of data which would further this objective.

*Exploration of the LCCT Training Initiative*

I developed the exploratory agenda on the understanding that in constructivist inquiry the researcher cannot know in advance what it is that he or she does not know (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Guba & Lincoln, 1989). This agenda therefore served as a more open-ended avenue for the generation and analysis of information, the nature of which could not be anticipated.

In accordance with Lather's previously outlined conceptualization of the pedagogical process, this second agenda centred on an exploration of the dialectic relations that emerged and transformed the participants (individually and collectively), the researcher (as theorist and practitioner), and the LCCT training process as a practical knowledge construction. The primary objective was to gain insights into the training which would enhance its development and sophistication as a framework for facilitating more intentional processes of social organizing within this setting and possibly beyond.

Preliminary data collection on this agenda focused on the natural discourse between myself and participants as they learned about and gained experience using the LCCT as a framework for organizing their interpretations of events (i.e., during formal and informal training sessions). Subsequent data were generated through two series of one-on-one interviews. I generated initial interview questions pertaining to this agenda from the following three conceptual lines of inquiry:
1. An exploration of participant experiences as they learned about and applied the LCCT concepts, and the meanings they ascribed to these experiences.

2. An exploration of how participants made and did not make sense and use of the LCCT concepts. In this respect, it was important to learn how different participants interpreted the theory, how they put its concepts to use in their daily interactions, and in what ways these understandings and applications differed from the concepts as they were initially constructed.

3. An exploration of any changes/transformations that participants perceived in themselves, others, and/or their group as they became familiar with the LCCT and its application. In this regard, it was important to identify the indicators of change, as well as the meanings that these changes held for participants.

I anticipated that much of the data generated would have relevance for both the evaluation and exploratory research agendas. Therefore, these complementary agendas were pursued concurrently over the course of the study.

**Research Methods**

In this section I outline the methodological approach utilized in this inquiry with summaries of the research setting and participants, the data generation and analysis techniques, measures taken to safeguard confidentiality and ensure informed consent, and emergent research design. The section is concluded with an overview of Guba and Lincoln's (1989) research adequacy criteria, and a summary of the methods I employed to demonstrate their achievement over the course of this study.

**Research Setting and Participants**

As I indicated in the introduction to the first chapter, this research was initiated to address specific interests of a senior management team for a large mental health facility. Given that the research was praxis-oriented from its inception, the process called for recruitment of participants from the organization that initiated the study. The original research design called for an
initial training series with the senior management team to provide a preliminary assessment of the training's impact (Study 1). If findings warranted (i.e., the training was assessed as both meaningful and useful), this would be followed by a second training series with volunteers from the middle management level of the organization (Study 2).

By the end of the first study, the preliminary evaluation results were extremely promising, yet it was also apparent that the training process would require a significantly greater investment of time to actualize its potential and adequately evaluate the full extent of its impact. The impact of the training was of particular concern in light of participant feedback regarding the stressful and intensity of the training experience, and in particular, to unanticipated group destabilization effects. As I indicated in the previous chapter, in response to these insights all parties to the research (i.e., myself, the participants, and my committee members) agreed to extend the study on the level of the management team, and to exclude subsequent levels of the organization from participation. In this section then, I provide an overview of the organizational context, detail the recruitment process, and outline participant demographics and team conditions at the time of the research.

**Research Setting**

The research was conducted at the Birchview Mental Health Centre (BMHC) located in Southern Ontario, Canada. The centre received both private and government funding to provide a diverse range of long and short-term day and residential treatment services. At the time of the research the centre was providing various services to approximately 100 clients and had a total staff complement in excess of 200.

Both prior to and during the period of the research, there were no indications of serious intraorganizational conflict, tension, or stagnation. In comparison to other organizations within the field, the agency had a low turnover rate, and staff “burnout” was literally a non-issue. With rare exceptions, relations between senior management, middle management, and direct service staff were mutually supportive and highly respectful (e.g., the entire agency
worked on a first name basis; treatment decisions were consistently made by consensus among members of interdisciplinary teams; management and senior metal health care professionals had private offices, but no other special privileges set them apart from other members of the agency; etc.). Thus, the project was not initiated in response to a crisis situation, or on the recommendation of any form of external governing body. Rather, the agenda was to provide a highly competent management team with a leadership framework to support their self-initiated organization development agenda.

With respect to my relationship to the centre and staff, over the course of the five years preceding the research, I had served as a contract consultant on a number of organization development projects. The majority of my work had focused on training in interpersonal communication and group dynamics. In addition, I had facilitated a number of strategic planning initiatives with the senior management team. During these projects I had had considerable contact with all staff levels and occupational groups within the organization. Thus we had established a degree of mutual trust and respect which led the Executive Director and Program Managers to offer me access to BMHC for the purposes of this research initiative.

In the year preceding the research, my contacts with the organization were limited to several brief meetings with the Executive Director to plan the logistics of the initiative. Thus, the participants had no exposure to the specific content of the theory or training prior to the commencement of the actual research initiative.

**Negotiating Informed Consent**

The research project took shape through a series of discussions held between the three senior-most management personnel and myself. The focus of these discussions concerned their organization development objectives and culminated in the subject matter of this project. At the time of the project's definition it was understood that no staff (including senior management) would be under any obligation to participate in either the training or research aspects of the initiative. With its development, and after a thorough briefing on the
nature and details of both the training and research aspects of the initiative, I offered management team members a two tiered option for participation. First, they were each invited to participate in the initiative as participants in the training component. If they chose this first option they were then given the option of serving as research participants. Thus, their participation in the training was in no way contingent upon their decision to participate in the research aspect of the initiative.

Prior to the commencement of the research I obtained written consent from each individual who agreed to participate. In my briefing to the team members I made a concerted effort to communicate the potential risks involved in the inquiry. At the same time I emphasized that, due to the emergent nature of the study, not all risks could be foreseen in advance. Consequently, I promised that as any new risks became apparent, I would inform them so that they would have the option of withdrawing from all or any part of the training or inquiry.

In addition, I made every effort to communicate to participants exactly how I foresaw they might benefit from participating in this initiative, and I explained the role I was asking them to play as research participants. In accordance with the emancipatory agenda of this inquiry, their role was that of co-explorer and co-evaluator of the LCCT training process. The analogy I used to distinguish this role from that of the traditional research subject role was that of “test-pilot” versus “guinea pig.”

Subsequent to their agreement to participate in the training aspect of the initiative, group members were provided with two copies of an information sheet which outlined the nature of the research, their rights as participants and avenues of recourse, the precautions taken to safeguard the data they would provide, and the foreseeable benefits and risks involved (see Appendix R: Research Consent Form). Prior to choosing between participation and nonparticipation, I gave all group members an opportunity to thoroughly review this information and ask questions. After signing both copies, each participant received one copy while I retained the second. The copies I retained were filed in a secure off-site location.
**Participants**

At the time of the study, the management team was composed of five members, all of whom elected to participate in both the training and research aspects of the inquiry (hence, a reference to the management team is synonymous with a reference to the research participants). The team was composed of the Executive Director and four Program Managers, all of whom had moderate to extensive experience in management positions within the social service sector. The newest member had served in middle management for approximately five years prior to joining the team as a Program Manager. The remaining three Program Managers had each served in this or equivalent capacities for in excess of 10 years. The Executive Director had functioned in this position for over 10 years. The Executive Director and two Program Managers were long-standing members of the team (i.e., over ten years of membership -- henceforth, the "core members" -- Alex, Drew, and Lawren), while the remaining two Program Managers were relatively new to the team (i.e., under two years of membership -- henceforth, the "new members" -- Lee and Jamie).

The participant group was predominantly, but not exclusively, female in composition (to maintain anonymity of the participants I have assigned unisex pseudonyms and randomized the gender of all third person pronouns). Their approximate age range was between 35 and 50 years. The ages were evenly distributed, with a mean age of 44. All participants held university degrees, with a majority holding professional graduate level degrees. In addition, all had considerable clinical training and experience prior to entering management. Finally, four of the five participants reported extensive formal leadership training of various forms over the course of their respective careers.

At the time of the research, participants were dealing with the typical day-to-day problems and issues associated with the management of a large agency, coupled with the added pressures of dealing with significant government funding cuts and responding to the introduction of new forms of employment legislation. It was clear to me that all members were highly invested in the agency and the objectives and ideals it embodied. At the same time, they were
also keenly interested in reflecting on the nature of their culture, what they had come to stand for as a team, and in what ways they might develop themselves and their culture into the future. Thus, while they were uniformly proud of their membership in the agency and on the team (i.e., this was more than just "a job" to each of them), each was also invested in growth and development on a team, organization, and personal level. Indeed, this common growth agenda proved to be a fundamental value of the team culture.

The management team itself had a history of functioning in a very cooperative and mutually supportive fashion. There was minimal attention paid to formal position or title, although it was always understood that the Executive Director maintained the final word on decisions and policy (as much out of personal respect as formal authority). Among the Program Managers, at no point did I detect indications of such dynamics as "jockeying for position," status seeking, or efforts to amass or horde resources within their respective spheres of control. Indeed, the team approach they had developed was characterized by a common sense of responsibility for the overall management of the agency rather than to merely running their respective programs. Overall, the internal team dynamics were characterized by a sincere mutual respect for one another, and communal sense of responsibility to the agency's clients and staff.

Data Generation and Analysis

In this section I begin by providing an overview of the method of constant comparisons which served as the conceptual framework for the generation and analysis of data in this study. I follow this with a discussion of the specific techniques employed to generate, record, and interpret the data, as well as the procedures used to maintain confidentially and ensure informed consent for data generation.

Methodological Framework

Data generation and analysis in emergent research is open-ended and inductive, instead of focused and deductive. Further, data generation and analysis do not constitute separate and distinct stages of an inquiry. Rather,
they occur in an ongoing cycle of generation and analysis which serves to steer the entire inquiry process of creating increasingly complex, integrated, and sophisticated interpretations (Erlandson, et al., 1993; Fetterman, 1989; Guba & Lincoln, 1985; Lincoln & Guba, 1989; Morgan, 1993). As Erlandson, et al. (1993) describe, the researcher...

...responds to the first available data and immediately forms very tentative working hypotheses that cause adjustments in interview questions, observational strategies, and other data collection procedures. New data, obtained through refined procedures, test and reshape the tentative hypotheses that have been formed and further modify the data collection procedures. (p. 114)

This interpretive approach is referred to as the method of "constant comparisons" as the most recent information generated is overlaid on to, and integrated with, all previous information in order to identify consistencies, discrepancies, and anomalies. The new interpretations that emerge are then used to guide the future course of data generation and interpretation (Erlandson, et al., 1993). I utilized this approach to guide the data generation and analysis process throughout the inquiry.

Data Generation

The focal point for data generation was the participants' experiences of the training process (i.e., the meaningfulness theme), and how these experiences may or may not have influenced their individual and collective activities toward reflexively and intentionally managing events and influencing their culture (i.e., the utility theme). To generate data pertaining to these themes, as well as to ensure the process remained open to data which I could not anticipate (i.e., the exploratory agenda), I relied on two series of semi-structured, open-ended interviews (one interview with each participant in each series, with each lasting between one and two hours) and a detailed reflexive journal I maintained over the course of the research intervention. I discuss each of these data generation techniques in turn.
Interviews. The core questions for each series of interviews were generated from the above outlined evaluation research themes. Given that the first interview series was conducted midway through the training initiative (prior to the point at which we formally began applying the training to organizational issues), for this series I emphasized questions relating to the meaningfulness of the training. By the beginning of the second interview series, achievement of the primary meaningfulness criteria (i.e., “intelligibility” and “relevance”) had largely been established. I therefore shifted the emphasis of the questions to the more advanced meaningfulness criteria (i.e., “consciousness-reframing”) and to the utility criteria. Thus, in accordance with the emergent nature of this inquiry, as the interview process unfolded (both within and across the two interview series) and research focal points became more defined, I introduced new questions to pursue specific lines of inquiry, and omitted others as they began to generate redundant information (see Appendices S to V for four samples of the evolving Interview Protocols -- comparison of the first and final protocols for both interview series illustrate the evolution of the interview questions) (Erlandson, et al., 1993; Fetterman, 1989; Guba & Lincoln, 1989).

An important constant across all interviews was my desire to invite emic (i.e., participant derived) constructions from participants prior to introducing questions which encouraged etic (i.e., researcher derived) constructions (Erlandson, et al., 1993; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Thus, for every interview I used an opening question which asked participants to “free associate” on their experiences (i.e., “What comes to mind first when you reflect on the training we have done?”). I relied on this lead question to give participants the opportunity to frame their experiences in their own terms, free from the structure imposed by my research themes. My intent was to facilitate the generation of constructions indicative of what the participants considered important, useful, liberating, threatening, hindering, etc., about their experiences in the training, and in making use of their emerging local event management framework.

Participants varied considerably in their responses to this question with some providing initially short responses and others spending half our session
“freely associating”. For those who provided brief responses, I invited them to provide more information with probe and/or elaboration questions. I made an effort to ensure that participants felt they had exhausted their responses to this question prior to moving further into the protocol questions. In this regard, in addition to directly asking if there were other things that came to mind, completion sometimes became evident when participants made overtures for more structure -- which I subsequently provided.

Remaining with the emic theme, I considered that during the process of reflecting on their experiences through the more etic interview questions, participants might have thoughts or insights tangential (or for that matter, entirely unrelated) to the specific question I had asked, and which they had therefore discounted as irrelevant to my research interests. Thus, with the last question of the interview protocol I offered a second opportunity for participants to provide data in their own terms (i.e., “Is there anything I haven’t asked you about that has been on your mind, or that you think would be useful for me to know?”). In the majority of instances where participants responded to this question in the affirmative, they tended to use this as an opportunity to underscore points they had made in response to my opening question. On several occasions, however, this question generated data which otherwise might have been missed.

In accordance with the evaluation research agenda, during the interviews I was actively searching for indications of the training’s positive or negative impact on: individual participants; the management team as an organizing collective; or other segments of the agency where participants had begun applying training insights and/or their emerging event and culture management framework. In this regard I encouraged participants to describe their reactions to the theoretical concepts and their experiences during the training process. In particular, I focused on their interactions with other management team members and direct service staff, and their experiences applying concepts beyond the management team context.

With respect to the exploratory research agenda, I asked participants to respond to various tentative interpretations I was developing through the
reflexive journal, and to comment on points of central interest and/or concern which had been raised in previous interviews or which had emerged during group sessions. For instance, during the first interview series I actively explored indications that the training was considerably more stressful for participants than anticipated, and that the group culture had been destabilized through the process. Correspondingly, I explored avenues for ensuring the safety of participants throughout the remainder of the training (including the option of terminating the initiative). In the final interview series I pursued such emergent issues as the participants' integration of the concept of "self" with the LCCT, and team restabilization over the course of the process.

I was also concerned with generating data which would provide insights into the training from each participant's unique frame of reference. Thus, I was attentive to, and actively explored similarities and differences between the experiences of: the core members and new members; the executive director and the program managers; and among the program managers who each managed very unique types of programs (e.g., short versus long-term care; day versus residential programs; behaviour management versus psychotherapeutic focused treatment; recently launched versus established programs, etc.).

All individual interviews were audio taped with the use of two microcassette recorders. The second recording was made as a backup in the event that one unit failed or a portion of the primary tape proved inaudible. Each new interview audio tape was transcribed, and the text analyzed, prior to conducting further interviews. This practice ensured that new issues and tentative inferences emerging from earlier interviews could be explored in subsequent interviews. All raw data was transcribed verbatim (e.g., including pauses, idiosyncratic pronunciations, colloquialisms, laughter, etc.). During analysis this helped in the interpretation of participant's meaning in that the verbal responses were linked with any obvious affective information evident on the tape. This allowed the detection of nuances such as sarcasm, irony, or expressions of stress which would not necessarily be evident from the text alone.
Reflexive journal. A central medium of data generation and interpretation in Naturalistic Inquiry is the "reflexive journal" kept by the researcher. This document is used to record all relevant thoughts, feelings, reflections, tentative inferences, process notes, and questions regarding the research and research agendas as an initiative unfolds. Accordingly, the journal is a vehicle for tracking the development of the research themes, monitoring changes in emergent interpretations and tentative inferences, and making sense of the overall progression of the inquiry process. Moreover, given that it represents a detailed record of the entire research process, including critical decision points and the emerging rationale leading up to these decisions, the journal plays a central role in demonstrating achievement of several of the key adequacy criteria (discussed in the final section of this chapter) (Erlandson, et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1985).

Data for the journal came from two primary sources: group training sessions and individual interviews. To permit a detailed post-session analysis of the training, prior to each session I requested the participants' permission to video tape the proceedings. After each session I reviewed the video tape and extracted both summative and verbatim data and recorded this information, along with my reflections and tentative interpretations, in the reflexive journal. The tapes were subsequently erased. Likewise, immediately after each interview, and prior to transcription of the audio tape, I used the reflexive journal to record my thoughts and reflections on the process and content as it related to the overall inquiry. These entries covered a broad spectrum of topics from general speculations and interpretations for follow-up in subsequent interviews or group sessions, to reflections on the interpersonal dynamics between myself and participants, to self-evaluations of my performance during particular training or interview sessions.

In extracting data from both training and interview sessions, I focused on participant insights into the training process and/or content, their evaluations of their experiences, reports of utilization, and decisions regarding the unfolding course of the training and research process. Accordingly, the journal contained detailed accounts of emergent insights into the training including observations
pertaining to anticipated and unanticipated utilizations, limitations, implications, potential dangers, and additions and modifications to both the process and content. For instance, themes which emerged included the potential for alienation of new members, the training’s impact on individual identity, and group destabilization and restabilization.

There were two central advantages to incorporating data from both the group and one-on-one context. First, within the group context any participant could offer recommendations, reflections and evaluations of the training and application process which were immediately available to the other participants for their consideration and subsequent agreement, disagreement, modification, or refinement. In this way, participants actively participated in developing more informed and sophisticated constructions of the training and its impact (Lather, 1991). This was particularly evident with respect to such issues as the incorporation of the concept of self into their reconstruction of the LCCT, and speculation regarding cultural conditions under which the training might and might not transfer to other group contexts.

Second, the individual context of the interview provided each participant with the opportunity to convey their personal experiences and evaluations of the training without the concern that their reports should correspond to those of the others. Thus, individual interviews facilitated the generation of data pertaining to personal experiences which varied from the group norm. Such information proved critical for understanding how individual experience and evaluations of the training differed on the basis of organizational role and history with the team. Accordingly, this information led to insights into differences between core and new members regarding the relationship between culture and identity, and the cultural destabilization reported early into the training process.

**Informed consent for electronic recording.** I sought permission to record each group session prior to its commencement through the use of anonymous response forms. Every participant was provided with a form which offered the opportunity to anonymously grant or deny permission to record. These forms indicated that in the event that any participant expressed reservations through this anonymous medium, no electronic recording would be
done during that session. At my request, one participant was designated by the
other participants to review these sheets and inform me as to whether
unanimous consent had been granted (see Appendix W: Granting/Denying
Permission to Video Tape).

For individual interviews, I asked each participant for her or his
permission to record the session prior to the commencement of taping. With
their consent, the audio tape recorder was turned on and the participant was
asked to confirm that they were aware they were being taped and again asked
for permission to tape the session. I made every effort to establish an
environment which allowed for the expression of any reservation regarding the
recording of individual interviews and group training sessions. On five
occasions participants requested that recording be halted (three in interviews,
two during training sessions). After the issue under discussion was completed,
and with participants' consent, recording was resumed.

**Maintaining confidentiality.** Paramount to ensuring confidentiality is
the restriction of access to the data. Thus, transcribed interview and training
session data were coded so that the participants' names never appeared in
computer files with the data they provided. I reviewed audio and video tapes
away from the research site and in a secure, private location. I stored all
participant consent forms and raw data (i.e., audio and video tapes prior to their
transcription and subsequent erasure) in a locked filing cabinet in a secure off-
site location. Similarly, the computer upon which the data were transcribed and
analyzed was located in a secure off-site location, to which only I had access.
Finally, I stored a regularly up-dated computer back-up copy of the transcribed
data (with the names of the participants and agency replaced with codes) in a
second, secure, off-site location to which only I had access.

Finally, the nonparticipant staff and clients of the agency were not the
focus of this inquiry and therefore, information pertaining to specific staff or
clients was irrelevant to the study. Consequently, when staff or clients were
mentioned during any data gathering procedure, I used a string of six capital X's
(i.e., "XXXXXX") in place of the name in the transcript.
Data Analysis

Analysis of interview data. Analysis of the interview data was conducted in accordance with the prescribed guidelines of Naturalistic Inquiry (i.e., data unitization and emergent category designation) (Erlandson, et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1985; Lincoln & Guba, 1989). As outlined above, this approach to the analysis of textual data is based on the constant comparison of new datum to previous data to identify and build emerging patterns of meaning (i.e., descriptive, explanatory, and evaluative themes, interrelations and conflicts between themes, etc.). The ten interviews conducted during the two series generated 310 single-spaced pages of text (a mean of 31 pages per interview).

After each interview was conducted and my initial reflections on the session had been entered in the reflexive journal, the tape was transcribed verbatim. As soon as possible thereafter, and prior to the next interview, the raw data were unitized using inductive analysis to identify "units of data." Units of data were defined as:

...the smallest pieces of information that may stand alone as independent thoughts in the absence of additional information other than a broad understanding of the context... A unit of data is said to exist when there is but one idea found in a portion of content. A unit may consist of a few words, a complete sentence, or an entire paragraph. (Erlandson, et al., 1993, p. 117)

Accordingly, in this inquiry units of data typically took the form of complete ideas expressed during free associations, or in response to specific interview or follow-up questions. A total of 519 units of data were extracted from the interview text, for an average of 51.9 units per interview.

As units of data were identified they were assigned code numbers indicating their source, and assigned to provisional categories of ideas. When the content of a unit did not adequately match the content of any existing category, it became the first entry in a new provisional category. On occasion, a particular unit of data fit equally well into more than one category. In these instances I duplicated the unit within the original text file, assigned separate code numbers to each, and copied them to their respective categories. This
practice was minimized on the understanding that frequent cross-categorizations can weaken the overall analysis (Erlandson, et al., 1993). The assignment of data units was continued until the entire text of the interview had been unitized and assigned to categories. Original versions of each interview, both prior and subsequent to categorization, were maintained for the purposes of the audit trail.

As categories began to accumulate sufficient numbers of units of data (generally two to four), I constructed descriptive labels to serve as data unit inclusion criteria. I considered these category descriptors tentative, and therefore freely modified them as the interview and journal data appeared to warrant. This same tentativeness applied to the categories as well. Over the course of the inquiry I changed the categories as new data were incorporated -- some categories were dispersed, some were merged, and others split into two or three new categories.

The analysis of the first interview series produced 47 categories. By the end of the second series, an additional 12 had emerged for a total of 59 categories. As links between certain categories emerged, I began clustering these sets under similar themes. During the data generation and analysis process I allowed these themes to emerge naturally (i.e., a data driven approach), and in so doing, super-ordinate themes emerged (i.e., related categories were linked to become themes, and related themes were subsequently linked to form super-ordinate themes, etc.) (see Appendix X: Master Category List).

Once all interviews had been analyzed, I conducted a detailed review of each provisional category and created summaries of their contents. Through this process it became evident that several existing categories could be merged as their contents were insufficiently diverse to warrant separate categories. In addition, it became evident that several other categories had become overly diverse in their content and had to be split. Upon completion of this final analysis and summation, 61 categories had emerged from the interview data. At this point I used a theory driven approach to develop a taxonomy of categories. I organized super-ordinate themes, themes, and categories
according to the a priori established research agendas (i.e., evaluation, exploration, and adequacy criteria). Accordingly, those categories which did not correspond to the specific evaluation criteria (i.e., meaningfulness and utility) or to any of the adequacy criteria (see last section of this chapter), were organized under the exploratory agenda (approximately half of all categories).

As will become more evident in the following section on the analysis of the reflexive journal data, analysis of the interview data was influenced by, and in turn, influenced the course of the training process. Data unitization and categorization took place within the context of my emerging understanding and interpretations of the training process. The interview data, in turn, played an important role in shaping subsequent training sessions (e.g., development of training session safety protocols; incorporation of the concept of self into the participants' emerging event and culture management process, etc.).

**Analysis of reflexive journal data.** At the end of the training period, the reflexive journal was 156 single-spaced pages in length and contained 217 entries. Rather than a single long entry for each day, I had adopted the practice of writing a single entry for each distinct topic or issue. Each entry was therefore from several sentences to multiple paragraphs in length, and dealt with what I considered a distinct aspect of the research (e.g., an ethical issue, a specific research theme, an emergent interpretation, specific adequacy criteria, etc.). At the end of each day, each entry was assigned a date-based code number (see Appendix A: Data Codes), reviewed for thematic content, and a summary sentence containing key thematic words was added as a preface to the entry. This practice ensured that entries relating to specific themes or events could be easily identified and extracted from the body of the journal with a key word search.

Those entries which were extracted according to theme were copied from the original computer file to a new file specifically for the given theme, and arranged in sequential order (earliest to latest). This made it possible to review the development of the theme as it emerged over the course of the research. A total of eight reflexive journal categories were constructed. Two of these served to demonstrate achievement of adequacy criteria (Dependability and Fairness),
while the remaining six pertained to the most highly complex emergent research themes (i.e., participants' safety during the training; retrospective reality construction; emergence of the concept of self; participants' development of a leadership-culture-self dialectic; evolution of the participants' Event Management Protocol; and, participant management of their collective affective atmosphere).

Over the course of the research the two central functions of the journal were to provide a context from within which to interpret the interview data, and to maintain as an ongoing audit trail of the tentative inferences I was drawing. In turn, the observations and tentative inferences recorded in the journal shaped the course of subsequent data generation through modifications to the interview protocols. Thus, during analysis of the interview data, tentative inferences documented in the journal served as guides to linking categories into emergent themes. In turn, these emergent themes were used as a basis for generating data which could support, refute, or modify these interpretations. For instance, initial reflections on group destabilization led to interview questions that produced important insights into differences in the experiences of core and new members, and initiated the process of incorporating the notion of “self” into the leadership-culture continuum.

Overall, the reflexive journal played a key role in achieving a balance between an emic and etic perspective in data interpretation. It was through this medium that I was able to summarize my evolving understanding of the participants’ realities of the training (generated through interviews and training sessions -- i.e., the emic perspective), and merge this understanding with reflections from the perspective of the critical constructivist metatheory underlying this project (i.e., the etic perspective). In this sense then, the journal was the central forum for marrying my emerging interpretations of the empirical data with my metatheoretical reflections pertaining to the training process.

For instance, the participants very quickly incorporated their psychology of the self with the central concepts of LCCT. That is, early in the process they began forming links between the concepts of leadership and culture, and their ontology regarding the role of intrapsychic processes in social interaction. As
their's was a pragmatic agenda (how does this fit with what we know, and does it improve our ability to manage events and culture?), they were only tangentially interested in the theoretical and metatheoretical implications underlying this development. From my perspective however, this development had important implications for the training process as a practical knowledge construction that might be utilized in other social contexts.

**Member checks.** An important aspect of data analysis in most forms of constructivist inquiry is the practice of conducting formal and informal “member checks.” This involves feeding back preliminary interpretations to those who provided the raw information for their scrutiny, amendment, extension, and confirmation. This practice helps ensure that the researcher adequately represents participants’ constructions by stipulating that the participants themselves must be able to recognize their experiences in the researcher’s interpretations. As I will discuss in the final section of this chapter on adequacy criteria, this verification practice aids in establishing the credibility of the constructions that are generated, and is fundamental to steering the inquiry process (Erlandson, et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1985; Lather, 1991; Lincoln & Guba, 1989; Morgan, 1993).

Before proceeding however, a limitation inherent to the member check process needs to be acknowledged. There is always the possibility that information which contradicts the interpretations offered by the researcher will not be provided by one or more participants. For any number of reasons (e.g., defensiveness, a desire to please or conform, indifference to the research, etc.) participants may consciously or unconsciously withhold valuable information that would refute or modify a researcher’s offered interpretations. While the researcher can and should undertake certain measures to minimize this prospect (i.e., work to establish trusting relationships with participants, convey a sense that differing interpretations are welcome and important information for the study, conduct checks with participants in the absence of other participants, etc.), there is no way to ultimately prevent or be certain that this eventuality has not occurred. With this caveat in mind, I move now to a discussion of the member check procedures used in this project.
Over the course of the inquiry I conducted numerous informal member checks. These typically occurred at the beginning and end of each training session when I would share my emerging understanding of key aspects of the training with participants for their comment and critique (e.g., the direction I understood they wished to pursue, what they were and were not finding meaningful or useful, how I understood they were applying the theory, etc.). In those instances where my impressions were not confirmed, modifications to my initial interpretations were recorded in the reflexive journal.

In addition to the practice of conducting informal member checks, two formal group member checks were conducted at the end of the data generation and interpretation process, but prior to my final analysis and organization of the interview categories. Two sessions were held in order that any changes or modifications made by participants to the preliminary interpretations fed back in the first session could be incorporated and reverified in a second member check (see Appendix Y: Member Check Protocols).

During these checks, almost all of the interpretations I fed back to the participants were confirmed with little clarification or elaboration. The one area of exception, however, was with respect to participants’ views on the conditions under which the training might be transferred to other organizational contexts. My analysis and representation of their initial interpretations generated over the course of the inquiry prompted participants to engage in a detailed reanalysis of their initial transferability projections in light of a metaphor for the training which crystallized during these discussions (i.e., “it’s like family therapy”). Through this process they entirely reconstructed and broadened the conditions under which they anticipated the training could be transferred to other contexts. I detail the results of their reanalysis in the following chapter.

**Research Design**

The following section details the manner in which I utilized Lincoln and Guba’s method of Naturalistic Inquiry to structure and guide this study. I begin with an overview of the general three-phase design advanced by these authors. I then apply this structure to the current initiative, focusing on the initial design,
design modifications, and the rationale upon which these modifications were based. In the final section of this chapter I summarize Lincoln and Guba's adequacy criteria and describe the procedures undertaken to demonstrate achievement of these criteria within this study.

**Successive Phases of Inquiry**

In order to accommodate the uncertainty inherent in an emergent research design, Lincoln and Guba propose a three-phase research process. Phase One is termed "orientation and overview," and is devoted to establishing the salient features of the inquiry. The objective is to obtain sufficient information to determine, at least tentatively, what is most important to learn in the inquiry. Phase Two is referred to as "focused exploration," and is aimed at learning more about the focal point(s) of the study. That is, the objective is to generate data which will contribute to the construction of highly informed and sophisticated interpretations. Finally, Phase Three, termed "member check," is devoted to checking the interpretations generated through the preceding phases with those who provided the original data (Erlandson, et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

**Initial Research Plan**

Lincoln and Guba assert that no constructivist research initiative can or should follow their methodological framework verbatim. Every research initiative is unique in terms of its setting, nature, and objectives, and thus, one who seeks to make use of their methodology must do so by making appropriate adaptations (Guba & Lincoln, 1985; Lincoln & Guba, 1989). In the present case, each of the first two phases of the three-phase design were originally intended to serve as studies of the application of the LCCT on two separate levels of the organization (i.e., senior and middle-management). Through this process, the insights generated in the first study were to shape the format and research agendas for the second.

Phase One of the inquiry (Orientation and Overview) was to focus on the initial introduction and exploration of the LCCT with the organization's senior
management team. Contingent upon positive evaluations of the training, the inquiry would then move into Phase Two (Focused Exploration) where training with the mid-level managers would be used to facilitate a more in depth exploration and evaluation of the training process. Finally, in Phase Three (Member Check) all participants were to review and amend the preliminary interpretations generated through the study to ensure that they accurately reflected their constructions. An outline of the initially proposed research process is presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Initial Three-Phase Research Plan

Phase 1: Orientation and Overview
Initial Exploration and Evaluation of LCCT Training
- Introduction of the LCCT to senior management, and development of the participants’ specific agenda and plan for the training initiative.
- Training in the use of the LCCT concurrent with the initiation of a culture audit process, followed by coaching and support sessions (see Table 1).
- Initial interview series focusing on exploration and evaluation of the training’s meaningfulness and utility, leading to a decision regarding its dissemination to middle-management.
- Additions and changes to the theory and training process on the basis of preliminary interpretations.
- Establishment of the central research themes for Phase 2 on the basis of preliminary interpretations.

Phase 2: Focused Exploration
In depth Evaluation & Exploration of the LCCT Training
- Initiation of middle-management training series (contingent upon affirmative evaluations of the training in Phase 1).
- Training in the use of the LCCT concurrent with the initiation of a culture audit process, followed by coaching and support sessions.
- Second interview series focusing on evaluation of the training’s meaningfulness and utility with emphasis on its impact and implications for the organization and its teams.
- Review and critique of the phase and the interpretations generated, and final analysis of data before formal member check.
- Tentative additions and changes to the theory and training process on the basis of the emergent interpretations.

Phase 3: Final Member Check
Establishing the Adequacy of the Inquiry
- Feedback of preliminary interpretations to participants for verification, amendment & extension.
- Assessment, with participants, of the inquiry’s process and interpretations against the established criteria of adequacy.
Chapter 3: Methodology

As I discussed in the previous chapter on the training process, by the end of Phase One it was evident to myself and the participants that the unanticipated impact of the training warranted changes to the design of the second phase of the research. The revisions outlined below effectively refocused the study in accordance with the interpretations from Phase One while maintaining the overall integrity of the three-phase design and original research agendas.

**Research Plan Revisions**

As of the end of Phase One, participant evaluations of the training process were highly positive with respect to the meaningfulness criteria, and very promising with respect to the utility criteria. Even during those periods where participants reported experiencing significant stress, they also consistently evaluated the process as meaningful and important. At the same time, we were all of the view that the personal stress and group destabilization effects which were evident during the process could not be ignored or minimized. Through open negotiations the participants and I agreed that to restrict the training to the original plan of eight sessions would not only have been counter-productive with respect to their learning process, but more importantly, potentially damaging to their internal team dynamics.

Consequently, the participants indicated a desire to continue the process until they felt both more resolved regarding the central cultural issues raised through the process, and had learned more about the theory and its application. As Lawren, one of the core members, indicated at this juncture:

> I think it's important to... kind of settle ourselves around who we are and what we are and what we value in Birchview and ourselves. And what our culture is--what we want it to be. (Lawren/1.2-31)

Given the serious concerns regarding the psychological safety of the process, the participants and I concluded that the training had not yet been sufficiently investigated to warrant the commencement of a second training initiative with a new group of participants (RJ-5). Accordingly, we agreed that training for the mid-level managers should be postponed until the potential
ramifications of the training were better understood. In place of the second study then, we chose to use Phase Two to concentrate on a more in depth evaluation and exploration of the original training initiative (RJ.05.09.94-2). This revised research plan (summarized in Table 5) steered the course of the inquiry to its conclusion without significant changes or modifications.

Table 5

Revised Three-Phase Research Plan

Phase 1: Orientation and Overview
Initial Exploration and Evaluation of LCCT Training
• Complete as of the point of design revision.

Phase 2: Focused Exploration
In depth Evaluation & Exploration of the LCCT Training
• Group training and facilitation of LCCT application, concurrent with the culmination of the culture audit and "restabilization" process, followed by coaching and support sessions.
• Second interview series focusing on evaluation of the training with the emphasis shifted from meaningfulness to utility; exploration of the impact on participants, management team dynamics, and the treatment teams; and, an analysis of the participants' process of theory acquisition and application.
• Review and critique of the phase and the interpretations generated, and final analysis of data before formal member check.
• Tentative additions and changes to the training process on the basis of the emergent interpretations.

Phase 3: Final Member Check
Establishing the Adequacy of the Inquiry
• Feedback of interpretations to participants for their verification, amendment, and extension.
• Assessment, with participants, of the inquiry's process and interpretations against the established criteria of adequacy.

Establishing Research Adequacy

While the belief in objectivity is abandoned by constructivists, this does not mean that research can not be disciplined, rigorous, and publicly examinable. A principle mechanism for ensuring that the research process is not spurious and self-serving is the establishment of philosophically consistent criteria by which the research process is to be evaluated. In this regard constructivist theorists contend that traditional positivist criteria are
inappropriate for assessing constructivist research (e.g., Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lather, 1991; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Morgan, 1983).

Accordingly, Guba and Lincoln offer two sets of criteria for assessing the adequacy of constructivist inquiries: parallel criteria and authenticity criteria. The parallel criteria (parallel to positivist methodological criteria) are designed to provide a constructivist-based evaluation framework to assess the methodological rigour of an inquiry. Thus they function to establish the credibility, dependability, and confirmability of the data and interpretations generated through the inquiry. The authenticity criteria are designed to transcend evaluation based solely on methodology. These criteria are based on a participant empowerment agenda and therefore focus on evaluating the social process and impact of an inquiry (i.e., its success in facilitating transformations in thinking and action among research participants).

This approach to the assessment of research adequacy was particularly well suited to the praxis-oriented nature this study. That is, these two different evaluation agendas provided a framework for assessing my dual objectives of generating practical transferable knowledge through a process intended to facilitate change in a specific social context. These criteria, and the measures I undertook to achieve them in this inquiry, are summarized in this section. It is important to note that the following discussion only details the methods and processes through which these criteria were met. The specific results supporting the achievement of these criteria are reported in the final chapter.

**Parallel Criteria: Establishing Trustworthiness**

The first set of adequacy criteria "parallel" the four rigour criteria used in establishing the quality of traditional positivist research: internal validity, external validity, reliability, and objectivity. Guba and Lincoln's (1989) parallel criteria are however, grounded in the ontology and epistemology of constructivism.

**Credibility.** The credibility criterion parallels internal validity in the positivist model. It is concerned with establishing the correspondence between the realities constructed by participants and the interpretations of those
constructions attributed to them by the researcher (Erlandson, et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Lincoln and Guba identify six ethnographic processes which contribute to establishing the credibility of a constructivist inquiry. These processes and the methods by which each was addressed in this inquiry are outlined in Table 6.

Table 6

Processes for Establishing Credibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnographic Process</th>
<th>Methods of Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prolonged Engagement</strong></td>
<td>This requirement was met by virtue of my close five year association with the members of the organization. Over the course of this involvement a strong relationship of mutual trust and respect had developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial on-site involvement to establish rapport and trust, to immerse oneself in, and understand the culture of the context, and to reduce misinformation from participants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Persistent Observation</strong></td>
<td>The duration and intensity of the training process ensured ample opportunity for in depth observation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits the researcher to select the most salient aspects of the situation, and in so doing, to add detail, depth, and insight into the scope of these research issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer Debriefing</strong></td>
<td>Meetings were held with a peer debriefer. In addition, part of the normal function of a dissertation committee (particularly the chairperson's role) parallels the function of a peer debriefer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular meetings with a disinterested party to discuss, &quot;test out,&quot; and reconstruct interpretations, identify implicit information, and explore ethical issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Case Analysis</strong></td>
<td>This requirement was incorporated as a standard part of the data interpretation process, and all such analyses were recorded in the reflexive journal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising tentative inferences over time toward development and refinement of a construction until it can account for a majority of known cases. Achievement gives greater confidence that all alternative interpretations have been tried and discarded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic Process</td>
<td>Methods of Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progressive Subjectivity</strong></td>
<td>A central function of the reflexive journal was to maintain an up to the moment record of the emerging interpretations, their development, and transformation over time to ensure their ongoing scrutiny.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intent is to check the degree of privilege the inquirer assigns to his/her own constructions. If the inquirer “finds” only what s/he expected, it is likely that s/he is failing to regard participants' constructions with adequate attention &amp; respect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member Checks</strong></td>
<td>Member checks were conducted formally and informally throughout the entire inquiry. Further, a final formal member check was conducted at the inquiry's summation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member checks are conducted with the participants from whom the data were originally gathered. Participants must be able to recognize “a truth” in the offered interpretations. This increases certainty that the participant's views are understood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transferability.** This second criterion parallels external validity. That is, the concept of "generalizability" is replaced by "transferability." This new concept represents the empirical process for checking the degree of similarity between the inquiry context and a context of potential application. In claims of transferability, the “burden of proof” for justifying a transfer of research findings lies not with the inquirer, as with generalizability, but with the potential user. It is the responsibility of the original researcher to facilitate transferability assessments by providing as much detail as possible about the context and conditions under which the research was conducted. Thus, transferability is always relative and dependent upon the degree of conditions which overlap between contexts. It can never be established firmly or once and for all because the constructions produced through constructivist inquiry are only tentative inferences, and therefore, are inevitably subject to disconfirmation or non-utility across contexts and time (Erlandson, et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Morgan, 1993).

To facilitate transferability assessments, demographic data and descriptions of the participant group were reported earlier in this chapter. To supplement this data, in the results chapter I outline a set of tentative criteria.
generated by participants which suggest basic cultural conditions for a group or organization considering the training. This is supported by a proposed set of fundamental skills which a prospective trainer should possess to increase the likelihood of safe and meaningful applications within other cultural contexts.

**Dependability.** The third criterion parallels reliability as it is concerned with the data’s stability over time. Instability of data often occurs due to boredom, exhaustion, or experiences of intense stress on the part of the researcher. However, unlike conventional inquiry where changes in design are threats to reliability, in emergent designs it is expected that there will be changes in the methodology and alterations in the constructions produced. That is, rather than threats to dependability, such changes are regarded as indicators of a maturing and successful inquiry.

However, all changes and modifications must be recorded in such a way that they are trackable (i.e., open to public inspection). External reviewers must be able to examine the process, assess the decisions made, and understand the factors which led to the interpretations and decisions made by the inquirer. Thus, the inquirer must construct an audit trail of the research process so that reviewers are able to conduct a “dependability audit” of the process (Erlandson, et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1985; Lincoln & Guba, 1989).

The audit trail for this inquiry consists of comprehensive records from the reflexive journal which detail the salient factors and rationales for all changes and modifications to the research design, training process, and investigational themes. All entries pertaining to the dependability of this inquiry were extracted from the journal and assembled in a separate file to facilitate a comprehensive review of the entire research process (RJ-5). In addition, the key events and decision points outlined in the preceding discussions of the unfolding research and training processes have each been supported with references to the pertinent journal entries.

**Confirnability.** The forth criterion parallels objectivity. Confirmability is the process of establishing that the data, interpretations, and outcomes are legitimately grounded in persons other than the researcher. To this end, all datum must be traceable to their sources, and the logic used in compressing
and interpreting the raw data must be explicitly available for inspection and confirmation (Erlandson, et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1985; Lincoln & Guba, 1989).

To ensure the confirmability of this research, all results, interpretations, and tentative inferences have been supported with references to the original data from which they were derived. Thus, throughout the results chapter all assertions are followed by source codes which specify the interview data upon which they are based (i.e., specific units of data or emergent categories) and the associated rationale for these interpretations (i.e., as documented in relevant reflexive journal entries).

**Authenticity Criteria**

Guba and Lincoln's development of their authenticity criteria arose out of their desire to transcend evaluation of a research initiative based solely on methodological criteria (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lincoln, 1990). The parallel criteria discussed above, while adjusted to conform to a constructivist worldview, are nonetheless an outgrowth of the positivist perspective which emphasizes the primacy of method. However in Naturalistic Inquiry, outcome, product, negotiation, and method are all equally important criteria for judging the merit of an inquiry. Thus, Guba and Lincoln developed five authenticity criteria based on the emancipatory values and assumptions of their version of constructivism (Erlandson, et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1985; Lincoln & Guba, 1989). I define these criteria below and discuss the means by which I endeavoured to meet each in this inquiry.

**Fairness.** The fairness of an inquiry refers to the degree to which the constructions of the participants are solicited and honoured by the inquirer throughout the research process. Thus, the different constructions and their underlying value systems that are generated through the inquiry must be taken into account and presented in a balanced and respectful manner.

In practice, fairness is determined in two ways. First, it is established by the inquirer's demonstrated and consistent efforts to solicit the constructions of the various participants involved in the research. After identification, the
differences between constructions must be explicated (part of data generation and interpretation) and demonstrated via the audit trail. Second, fairness is established through open negotiation of the agenda for subsequent action throughout the entire inquiry process. Thus, open negotiation should be the social medium through which the unfolding research methodology is guided. This means that all negotiation must be conducted in full view of all interested parties (Erlandson, et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1985; Lather, 1991; Lincoln & Guba, 1989).

Fairness was established in this inquiry by actively soliciting the involvement of the participants in the planning and execution of every stage and every session of the inquiry process. For the purposes of verification, all efforts to engage participants in the research process were recorded in the reflexive journal. In addition, questions pertaining to the fairness of the inquiry were included in the first interview series (see Appendices S and T), and my interpretations regarding achievement of this criterion were fed back to participants for their verification and/or amendment during the final member check.

Ontological authenticity. Ontological authenticity refers to the extent to which the participants' own constructions are improved, elaborated and enriched through the research process. Upon completion of the inquiry it should be evident that the participants' conscious experience of the world has been expanded in the sense that they possess more information regarding their own constructions and assumptions, and are more sophisticated in their use.

Demonstration of the achievement of this criterion is accomplished via two techniques. First, ontological authenticity is established when participants can provide testimony that they now have insight into a broader range of issues, or that they feel that they better comprehend issues which were previously not understood. Second, entries of individual constructions should be recorded at various points in the audit trail (Erlandson, et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1985; Lather, 1991; Lincoln & Guba, 1989).

Accordingly, in the current study I compiled evidence supporting the achievement of this criterion from the testimony of participants during interviews.
My interpretations were subsequently verified during the final member check. In addition, my observations recorded in the reflexive journal that refer to the expansion of participant constructions have been used in support of testimonials.

**Educative authenticity.** This criterion builds on the previous one. It refers to the degree to which the participants' reach a greater understanding of and appreciation for the competing constructions offered by others. This is not meant to imply that they must come to like, agree with, or support the constructions of others, only that their understanding of those constructions, and how they emerge from the very different sets of values and assumptions, has been expanded.

Like ontological authenticity, educative authenticity is first established via the testimony of selected participants and second, through the audit trail. Testimonial evidence is often found in the negotiation process itself as participants demonstrate comprehension of the constructions of others. Thus, the audit trail must contain entries pertaining to the developing understanding of and appreciation for the constructions of others.

As with ontological authenticity, educative authenticity was established in this inquiry via the testimony of participants. In addition, I relied on entries from the reflexive journal regarding observations of participants who indicated increased understanding of the constructions of others as the research process unfolded (i.e., within the management team, within the broader agency, and beyond the agency).

**Catalytic authenticity.** Catalytic authenticity is intended to evaluate the extent to which the inquiry stimulates and facilitates emancipatory forms of action. That is, the process and results of the inquiry must generate a prompt to action and/or decision making on the part of those engaged in the initiative. This is established through two mediums. First, there must be testimony from participants which indicates an interest in and willingness to act on the basis of the inquiry results. Second, the resolutions emerging from the joint negotiation sessions indicate action plans which are "owned" by participants and which therefore should be more likely to get carried out.
In the present case, this was established through the testimonies of participants, documents generated by participants through the process which summarized their plans to intentionally transform their group culture (i.e., Appendix P: Team Culture Transformation Plans, and Appendix N: Event Management Protocol 1.3.1), and through the final member check.

**Tactical authenticity.** This criterion builds on the previous action agenda and refers to the extent to which the inquiry process goes beyond stimulating action, to assess the degree to which it empowers participants to act in meaningful ways. That is, it is not enough that participants intend to act, or even that they formulate concrete action plans. Through the inquiry participants must acquire the knowledge and skills which will enable them to follow through on their intentions and enact their plans. The first step toward such empowerment is made through the inquiry process itself which invites participants to have input into shaping and focusing the initiative. However, this empowerment theme must continue throughout the inquiry in order for the participants to be fully empowered to act beyond the termination of the research initiative.

Tactical authenticity is demonstrated through the use of two techniques. First, participants can be asked to attest to their experiences of empowerment during the inquiry process. Second, it is possible to make a judgment regarding the degree of empowerment experienced by the participants by asking retrospective questions focusing on participant experiences of the process (e.g., "Did you feel that the process was participatory?" "Do others feel that they were able to play a meaningful role in shaping the process?"). With respect to empowerment beyond the inquiry, one can ask participants whether they are confident that they have acquired the skills necessary to execute the plans they made during the inquiry. Tactical authenticity rests on affirmative answers to all such questions. For present purposes, achievement of this criterion was supported in a similar fashion to that of catalytic authenticity -- that is, through testimonies, recorded observations in the journal indicating specific instances of participant empowerment, and the final member check.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this chapter is to present and interpret the results of this research initiative focusing on the application of the LCCT-based training process within the context for which it was constructed. These discussions are steered by the central praxis-oriented objectives of this inquiry: to facilitate the participants' change process, and to inform and sophisticate the LCCT training process as an applied knowledge construction. Thus, the dual objectives of this chapter are to evaluate the training process as a vehicle for facilitating the empowerment of participants to change their social conditions, and to expand the training's knowledge base to facilitate its application within other social contexts.

I present the results and discuss my interpretations concurrently as this provides a more coherent picture of the research findings. Accordingly, in each section of this chapter, the participants' evaluations, reflections, and recommendations regarding the training process are followed by my interpretations.

The themes presented in this chapter come primarily from my analysis of the interview data. I make extensive use of quotations and anecdotes to demonstrate that the themes I have generated are viable re-presentations of the participants' assessments of the training as a process for actualizing their collective organizing objectives. To situate and contextualize these themes within the unfolding events of the training process, I incorporate supporting data from the reflexive journal. For the purposes of the audit trail, all reported results are supported by one or more references to interview data, reflexive journal entries, and/or the final group member checks (see Appendix A: Data Codes).

As I indicated in the previous chapter, I organized the research themes generated from the interview data in a hierarchical arrangement (see Appendix X: Master Category List). This taxonomy of themes serves as the structure for this chapter. The a priori research agendas (evaluation, exploration, and research adequacy) are used to divide this chapter into three sections. Each of these sections is subdivided according to themes (see Table 7: Taxonomy of Research Themes). Each theme has been assigned a code number which situates it within the overall taxonomy (see Appendix A: Data Codes). As themes serve as the headings for this chapter, I have included code numbers in
headings to facilitate references back to the research theme taxonomy.

Table 7

**Taxonomy of Research Themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agendas</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>A1. Meaningfulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda (A)</td>
<td>A1.2 Consciousness-Reframing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1.2 Utility of Event Management Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B1. Application Insights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy</td>
<td>C1. Trustworthiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria (C)</td>
<td>C1.1 Authenticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1.3 Transferebility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first section of this chapter focuses on the results and interpretations pertaining to the evaluation agenda of this inquiry. The emergence of the evaluation themes were, in part, driven by the demand characteristics inherent in this research agenda. That is, during interviews participants were asked to respond to open-ended questions relating to their perceptions of the meaningfulness and utility of the training. These questions served to frame participants' experiences in terms of my a priori research interests. The results generated through this evaluation indicate that the training process was highly meaningful and useful to participants in both anticipated and unanticipated ways. The unanticipated nature of some of the results indicates that, while the evaluation agenda was initially theory-driven, the open-ended nature of the interviews enabled participants to provide assessments of meaningfulness and utility from their own frames of reference (i.e., what they found meaningful and useful over and above the a priori criteria).

The second section of the chapter focuses on the exploratory agenda. Much of the exploration data emerged in response to the "free association" questions I included at the beginning and end of each interview. These questions were included to generate insights into what the participants regarded as interesting and/or important about the training from within their own frame of reference. Consequently, the generation of data through this agenda worked in reverse to that of the evaluation agenda; the participants initially defined the themes, and I subsequently pursued these themes in interviews, training sessions, and member checks. Thus, as intended, the inclusion of this agenda furnished insights into the training which could not be anticipated in advance of its conduct. Accordingly, the exploration section of this chapter deals with unanticipated insights such as the emotional intensity of the process, the destabilization and restabilization of the team, and the emergence of "self" as central to the participants' customization of the leadership-culture dialectic.

Finally, the third section deals with the data pertaining to the adequacy of the research initiative. The themes under this agenda were largely driven by Lincoln and Guba's adequacy criteria for constructivist research initiatives. As with the evaluation agenda however, the open-ended nature of the data
gathering process led to the emergence of information which was beyond the a priori established criteria. In particular, participants were very much interested in the potential transferability of the training to other cultural contexts (i.e., internal to their organization and beyond). Thus, the data which emerged under the transferability criterion were more diverse and exhaustive than the criterion itself demands. This led to the creation of multiple categories under this criterion (see Appendix X: Master Category List -- Categories CIII.1 to CIII.6).

With respect to the consistency of participant evaluations, consensus was achieved on the vast majority of themes. For some themes participants were of general agreement, but differed with respect to their unique experiences and/or utilizations of theoretical concepts or products of the training. For instance, all participants reported finding the Event Management Protocol extremely useful for facilitating their participation in the event and culture management process. At the same time however, there were differences among them with respect to how they preferred to make use of this document in their everyday activities. For instance, Jamie preferred keeping the EMP in his desk for quick reference, Lawren preferred using the shorter “Reality Check” version and carried it with her, while Drew reported committing the major points of the document to memory (All.1.3).

When differences among participants were evident, it was invariably between the reported experiences of the core team members (Lawren, Alex, and Drew) and those of the new members (Lee and Jamie). For instance, the core members’ experiences of the culture audit process were qualitatively different from those recounted by the newer members. In addition, the open-ended nature of the interviews meant that not all participants commented on every theme. This was remedied, at least in part, through the final member check phase. All participants were present for the formal group member checks, and therefore had the opportunity to confirm, reject, or modify my preliminary interpretations, regardless of whether they had initially provided input into a given theme (MC-1; MC-2).
(A) Evaluation of the Training Process

The evaluation agenda focused on participants' assessments of the pragmatic value (i.e., meaningfulness and practical utility) of the training as a vehicle for facilitating their own process of initiating transformations in their collective organizing processes (i.e., developing a local event and culture management framework through which to actualize their cultural objectives).

In the first phase of the research I placed greater emphasis on evaluations of the training's meaningfulness to participants. This approach was based on the rationale that meaningfulness would necessarily precede utility. That is, if the training content failed to make sense to participants, it was unlikely that they would experience it as useful. On the basis of strongly affirmative evaluations in the first interview series, in the second I shifted the evaluation emphasis to the training's utility (i.e., once the meaningfulness of the training had been established, and participants had adequate opportunity to apply and evaluate the impact and implications of what they had learned). Participants uniformly evaluated the training, and local event management process they developed through the training, in highly positive terms. A summary of the results of these evaluations is presented below.

(AI.) Meaningfulness

In Chapter Three I defined the meaningfulness of the training in terms of three sequential criteria: "intelligibility," "relevance," and "consciousness-reframing." I assumed that in order for concepts to be meaningful to participants, they must first be intelligible in at least an abstract sense. Second, they must be relevant in that participants easily related them to their own lived experiences. Only at this point could new concepts serve a consciousness-reframing function by enabling participants to intentionally reinterpret their past experience and reframe their understanding of events in the present. It was quickly established that participants found the training both intelligible and relevant to their experiences. As the research progressed it became evident that the training process supported consciousness-reframing in more facets of the participants' sociocultural reality than I had originally anticipated. I discuss
these results in greater detail in the following sections.

(Al.1) Training Content: Intelligibility and Relevance

As I indicted above, the intelligibility and relevance of the training was evident early in the process. In this section I draw from the interview and reflexive journal data to support this affirmative evaluation of the first two meaningfulness criteria.

Consistent with the concerns of some post-positivist metatheorists (e.g., Lather, 1991), I questioned whether constructivist concepts would be readily intelligible and/or acceptable to participants (RJ.04.06.94-1). However, after the first session which introduced the basic tenets of a constructionist world view, participants appeared to feel quite comfortable with the ideas I had presented (e.g., the social construction of reality, dialectical causality, cultural relativity, etc.). As I recorded in the reflexive journal:

...Evidently my fears that the constructivist metatheory upon which the LCCT is based might be too obtuse to be regarded as meaningful or relevant have not been realized.... The participants made sense of, identified central philosophical issues, and applied the information in ways consistent with my own sense making... (RJ.04.06.94-3)

I arrived at this preliminary assessment as a result of a number of observations. For instance, at the end of the session participants commented that “this way” of looking at social interactions made sense and fit well with their experience. It provided them with a conceptual framework and terminology with which they could easily frame and articulate their experiences of the social world. For instance, Jamie related the concepts to a new form of psychotherapy he had been introduced to at a recent conference.

Further, after the session I was invited to stay while the team analyzed a draft of a public policy document proposed by a consortium of mental health agencies. As they scrutinized the document, they drew upon the constructivist concepts and terminology previously introduced and observed that the document represented a very intentional effort to construct the reality of certain
governmental bodies. From their standpoint, the document seemed to present a definition of reality in terms which government ministries could best understand, but which did not reflect the predominant reality within the mental health community (e.g., as Alex commented after his initial review of the document, "...talk about constructing their reality!") (RJ.04.06.94-3).

In subsequent training sessions I introduced the essential concepts and supporting models of the LCCT. In the interviews and final member checks, participants uniformly reported that they found this information both intelligible and relevant to their experiences. They indicated that early in the process they were able to relate the training content to their experiences as both managers and members of the management team (Al.1.3; Al.1.4; MC-2).

For instance, in the first interview Lawren reported that during the team’s informal post-training session debriefings (a practice which developed spontaneously among participants), they had all agreed that the concepts introduced in the training made a great deal of sense. In her words, "our debriefing after is -- a lot of it is about some of the culture audit, but a lot of it is about how much sense the conceptualizing of this whole thing makes..." (Lawren/1.2-66).

Likewise, Lee indicated that the training was becoming increasingly meaningful to him as the process unfolded. He stated:

...I think its going to be really helpful. And what I've heard in terms of culture and realities and that kind of stuff... it just seems to fit -- for me -- its kind of different, like you say... (Lee/1.3-3)

He found that daily events frequently triggered an association with one of the concepts that had been introduced during a session (Lee/1.3-19). This was particularly so for the cultural concepts in that he had become very aware of the gradual and imperceptible transformations in cultural dynamics which can amount to significant changes over time. On this she commented,

...this makes me think, what are we doing now that five years from now, we're going to think "I can't believe we did that"? And yet we thought it was just the greatest! (laughing). It's frightening!
(Lee/1.3-9)

Alex found she was easily relating the concepts introduced in the training to actual past and present organizational events and her development as a manager. She stated:

...for me, its perfect -- I don't feel like I was looking for it (laughing) -
- But as it's presented, its fitting very well for me in terms of what I
would now look at in retrospect, what my next step is [as a
manager]. (Alex/1.4-49)

Other evidence in support of the intelligibility and relevance of the training came from participants' assessments of the learning process as it unfolded. Because the LCCT is based upon a different metatheoretical foundation from traditional approaches to leadership, I had anticipated that participants might well require opportunities to make sense of its central concepts through safe, abstract and/or hypothetical training activities. Consequently, I developed multiple training examples and exercises in support of each major concept.

In the present context, this assumption proved inaccurate. As the training progressed it became evident that one exercise supported by several examples was sufficient for participants to grasp each of the central concepts. They were then eager to apply the information to real issues within their own cultural context. This observation was confirmed through the interview process. For example, Lawren stated "I think everything -- every prop or example or analogy we've used... has really helped to drive home the point" (Lawren/1.2-74). Jamie's observations echoed this assessment when he stated:

I guess the thing about the films and the exercises, it makes it
really really concrete. So you get it. (Jamie/1.5-36)

Overall, participants uniformly indicated that both the hypothetical exercises and films employed over the course of the training were beneficial to their learning process. They felt they were indeed ready to proceed with more concrete and directly relevant activities immediately after these relatively brief
introductions to the core elements of the LCCT (Al.1.1; Al.1.2).

**Interpretation and Discussion**

My first concern was to determine whether the participants in this study experienced the constructivist foundation upon which the LCCT was formulated as an intelligible and acceptable definition of reality. My next concern was whether they would find the concepts which constitute the LCCT relevant to their lived experiences. The data summarized above suggest that both the constructivist metatheory and the theoretical concepts introduced to participants were understandable, acceptable, and relevant. These uniformly affirmative results support the assertion that the training process was successful with respect to the two most primary and essential meaningfulness criteria.

According to constructivists, no concept or idea can be universally meaningful across cultural time and space (Gergen, 1973; Rosenau, 1992). The most that can be said is that a given idea is understood and accepted within a given cultural context. While the data strongly support the notion that such was the case within this context, it cannot be said that because the training was both intelligible and relevant to these participants, that it will be equally so to others. What can be said is that the content of the training proved meaningful in the context for which it was intended, and on the basis of this conclusion it is therefore conceivable that it would prove so in other similar cultural contexts.

With respect to highly dissimilar contexts, it is conceivable that the constructivist metatheory upon which the LCCT is based would be rejected even before the concepts of the actual leadership theory were introduced. Alternatively, it is possible that the constructivist metatheory might prove meaningful, but also highly disturbing to a group originally based on an absolutist ontology (I repeatedly cautioned participants about this second possibility during the pre-research briefings -- see Appendix R: Research Consent Form). Prior to this project I had encountered both types of reactions while introducing constructivism to new audiences. While neither of these possibilities were realized in this case, they remain viable potentialities. As such, they represent fundamental limitations on the transferability of the training
process to other cultural contexts, and must therefore be the first line of assessment in determining the viability of an LCCT training initiative in a given cultural context.

With respect to the potential meaningfulness of LCCT concepts in other organizational contexts, had these proved unintelligible and/or irrelevant in this study, there would have been grounds to question the fundamental viability of the LCCT as an applied knowledge construction, and/or the means by which its concepts were communicated. However, as such was not the case (i.e., at least one group has experienced the concepts as meaningful), there are preliminary grounds for conducting additional application initiatives. According to the constructivist notion of knowledge transferability, the likelihood that these concepts will prove meaningful to other collectives will increase with cultural similarity and decrease with dissimilarity.

(A1.2) Consciousness-Reframing

With the intelligibility and relevance of the training established, it was essential to determine the degree to which the training facilitated the participants' own process of consciousness-reframing. It had been my intent that the training serve as a vehicle for taking participants beyond how they originally organized their experience of themselves and their world, and which they therefore had come to take for granted. By generating novel insights into the preconscious aspects of their cultural process, I anticipated that participants could identify and begin work to transform values, assumptions, and habitual group dynamics which were inconsistent with their cultural ideal. In this sense, I viewed consciousness-reframing as the critical link between the meaningfulness and utility of the training. If participants found that the training was not useful as a vehicle of consciousness-reframing, then they would not develop an emancipatory knowledge base to integrate with the LCCT to produce a local theory of leadership.

Overall, participant reports regarding their experiences of consciousness-reframing through the training process exceeded the parameters of the original evaluation criterion (i.e., for participants to generate
novel insights into their culture and internal group dynamics -- see Chapter
Three: Evaluation of the LCCT Training Initiative). As participants provided
accounts of changes in consciousness which I had not anticipated, I began
forming a series of provisional categories which I eventually organized into
three themes: "group-reflexiveness," "other-reflexiveness," and "conceptual
reframing."

The "group-reflexiveness" theme was based on data relating to insights
into participants' realities of their management team (AI.2.1; AI.2.2; AI.2.3;
AI.2.4). This theme therefore, corresponds to the original consciousness-
reframing evaluation criterion. The "other-reflexiveness" theme subsumed
those emergent categories relating to participant insights into the realities held
by those external to the management group (i.e., the perspectives of individuals
and groups within or outside the broader organizational context) (AI.2.5; AI.2.6;
AI.2.7). Finally, participants reported transformations in their conceptualization
of the dynamics of social organizing (AI.2.8; AI.2.9). The insights under this
"conceptual reframing" theme were central to the participants' process of
applying the LCCT to the interpretation of actual organizational events. The
category inclusion criteria for each of these themes are summarized below.

*Group-Reflexiveness:* Participant insights into the foundational
elements of their culture, normative group dynamics, and
interpersonal relations.

*Other-Reflexiveness:* Participant insights which bring into
awareness and/or reframe the realities of other individuals or
subgroups within or outside the agency.

*Conceptual Reframing:* Participant insights into the theory and its
application pertaining to group dynamics, event management,
culture, and the enactment of the role of leader within their cultural
context.

In this section I discuss each of these themes in turn. These discussions
are supported with examples from the interview data and observations
extracted from the reflexive journal.
Group-Reflexiveness. Participants indicated that during the training they generated novel insights into numerous facets of their group culture. Central among these were: (1) an increased awareness of their fundamental values and assumptions; (2) their identification of normative event management practices grounded in values and assumptions they considered contradictory to their cultural ideal; and (3) new insights into long-standing interpersonal dynamics. In this section I provide examples from the interview data to illustrate each of these forms of consciousness-reframing.2

Participants uniformly reported that the training process facilitated the emergence of powerful insights into collectively held values and assumptions (AI.2.1; AI.2.2). Alex conveyed a sense of this experience in the first interview:

...the process for me has been incredibly revealing. And its nothing that I haven't really, at some level known -- but the process has forced me to define what the issues are that we have as a management team.

I feel we do really well as a management group... But, when I look at it I think we have a lot of issues. And I would have kind of sensed that prior to the process, but it's put a structure to it that's forced me to define for myself what I think the issues are.3

I'm not saying I'm right about them, but there are areas of problems... that should be addressed if we're going to move forward, or we're going to grow... -- if we choose to stay the same then that's okay too. (Alex/1.4-5)

The consciousness-reframing effects of the training went beyond "revealing" to "unsettling." As Lawren commented:

...whatever it is doing to unsettle me personally... is all really good stuff -- because... well, to put it in the kind of... angle that you're looking at -- you've helped me look at my reality from different angles... (pause) ...angles, that I didn't think about before, or hadn't thought about clearly anyway, or from other people's eyes... and you don't always like what you see. It's not always what you thought it was. (Lawren/1.2-12)

This "unsettledness" increased as participants recognized the preconscious influence that certain values and assumptions had on some of
their normative event management activities. For instance, Alex indicated that the value the group placed on high productivity and hard work led to two dysfunctional event management patterns: tendencies to not take sufficient time to thoroughly analyze and manage the meaning of some events, and to be unintentionally inconsistent in the management of similar situations and events across time. As she described:

...what we don't do is take time to manage meaning. We do it spontaneously with many things, but we haven't been taking the time. When we make mistakes its because we don't take the time to do that.

And then the other thing that we do is we change our minds from one situation to the next. We can't remember what we decided last time. (Alex/1.4-37)

Accordingly, she indicted a desire that the management team make a clear commitment to counteracting these patterns through intentional use of the LCCT framework. In her words,

...one thing I would like is that at the end of it [the training] we're able to make a commitment as a management team, to take the time to use the model. Even though it would be easier sometimes to be more expedient.

But a commitment that its effective to take time in tediously going through things in the framework of the model, in order to manage the meaning of situations -- and be committed to that as a process.... And I'd like us to commit to each other that we're all willing to put the energy into doing major decisions, or a lot of decisions in that way. (Alex/1.4-59)

Moreover, participants were surprised to realize that some of the elements of their foundational reality contradicted others in important ways. Consequently, they recognized that they had been subtly and inadvertently communicating contradictory messages to their staff on a number of central values. In this regard, team members expressed some distress. As Lawren described:
I think that what we have experienced is a kind of an unsettling thing, an unsettling process.... I think part of the unsettledness comes from our own observations about what we’ve discovered for ourselves about what we think we’re projecting and how it could be interpreted in different ways [by staff]. And some of the unsettledness is from observations by yourself, which are really more like questions back: "Could it be this? Could it be that?... Things that we might not have thought before -- and I find it unsettling. (Lawren/1.2-3)

While reflecting on these insights he later explained:

i think our traditions and our value system have evolved without a refocusing on them. You know? Like taking on their own life. And you wonder now if it took on it's own life and it wasn’t ours, and now we need to make it ours again. (Lawren/1.2-13)

For example, an important explicit value within the team was that the most important role for management was to provide intensive support to frontline staff. This was based on the rationale that it was the frontline staff who performed the most important job in the agency (i.e., delivery of treatment to clients). During the culture audit however, participants recognized that a powerful implicit value among them was a “vow of poverty” -- a metaphor for the value that one should be thankful for whatever resources are available, and not ask for more (RJ.08.15.94-3).

Lee and Jamie reported that acknowledging the "vow of poverty" issue changed group dynamics in that their awareness and self-critique of the issue had made them aware of when it was operating. With this awareness they felt better able to intentionally resist this value, and be supportive of staff when they requested additional resources (Lee/2.5-5; Jamie/2.3-21 /2.3-23). As Lee conveyed:

I think -- that “vow of poverty,” I don't know how many times that's come up since we've identified it. It makes you think about it.... Those kind of things I found really helpful -- because see, you could get into a real judgmental mode.
I’ve noticed that one has come up and now we can laugh at it a bit where, before it was almost like a kind of a real revelation… when we identified it as, “Really, we do do that”… and then I remember all the examples started coming out and now it’s like, it’s that “vow of poverty,” and then we’ll laugh and think, “you’re right”…. We don’t have to be so angry about it because somebody asked for something or, just doesn’t quite view things the same way. (Lee/2.5-5)

Finally, with respect to reframing interpersonal dynamics, several participants reported new insights into their interactions with other team members (AI.2.3; RJ.05.17.94-5). Drew for instance, indicated that as a result of the training process:

...I’m actually hearing, for the first time, what [team member’s name] has tried to say ever so carefully, for years. Because I’m hearing what it does to his/her reality working here when I make a decision. That I can actually feel, as s/he talks to me now, like “Oh God! Of course it would be like that for you...” (Drew/1.1-37)

Overall, the process of generating these insights, particularly during the culture audit, was simultaneously meaningful and stressful for participants. In this respect, participants began using the analogy of psychotherapy to convey a sense of the powerful impact that the insights they were generating into their collective values and assumptions and internal group dynamics were having on their understanding of themselves as a team (AI.2.4). As Drew recounted when asked to “free associate” on the training:

What comes to mind is, that... it's extremely useful. It requires a psychological shift -- I think it can do for you almost what therapy can do for you... in the sense of how powerfully it can affect the way you look at things and the way you make decisions.

And, it's similar to that process in the sense that you have to hang in through some pain to start to see how beneficial it could be. Like you have to make a conscious decision that you'll get past trying it the first few times -- which is very threatening -- and that you will purposely from there on approach things differently. (Drew/2.2-1)
Alex drew a similar analogy.

To me it was like a revealing kind of thing. The process was almost a therapy in the sense of learning about myself, but also learning about the group and how we function and what issues we had that we were bringing to that functioning -- and how it was impacting on the agency. And through that, learning the good things that we do, and the things that need to be worked on. (Alex/2.4-5)

Overall, this analogy of comparing the training process to the psychotherapeutic process became central to the participants' interpretation of their experiences and collective transformations over the course of the initiative.

**Other-Reflexiveness.** In addition to consciousness-reframing with respect to the participants' group culture, participants also generated important insights into the realities and reality construction processes of those external to their team. The majority of these insights emerged during later training sessions which focused on the customization of the LCCT through its application to actual team and agency events (Sessions 6 through 12).

During this period it became evident that while the Leadership Process Phase Model (Figure 1 -- LPPM) was useful as a framework for facilitating the construction of the internal group reality, it did not explicitly incorporate data regarding the realities of those external to the group (i.e., the event "stakeholders"). As one of the participants' central values was to be sensitive to and respectful of those impacted by their decisions, the creation of this form of information was quickly negotiated into their emerging event management process (RJ.05.09.94-4; RJ.05.09.94-6; RJ.05.24.94-1).

Accordingly, included in the participants' Event Management Protocol (structured on the basis of the LPPM) were questions which prompted them to identify the stakeholders to any given event and to generate tentative projections of their realities (see Appendix N: Sections B, C, & G). This "other-reflexive" information became a central part of their overall assessment of situations, and therefore, shaped their emerging event management plans. I discuss this development in greater detail in a subsequent section of this
chapter. In the remainder of this section I focus on the nature of the insights participants generated into the realities of others.

Central among the other-reflexive insights generated were: (1) transformations in participants’ awareness of the realities held by groups and individuals outside the management team; (2) increased awareness of the potential for others’ perceptions of management team actions to be radically different from management’s own understanding of their actions; and (3), greater sensitivity to the impact that their actions and decisions could have on shaping the realities of others in the agency. I elaborate on each of these forms of other-reflexiveness in turn.

With the training’s emphasis on reality and reality construction, there was a growing awareness among participants that the day-to-day experiences, and hence the realities, of others within their organization (e.g., direct service staff, mid-level managers, professional/occupational groups, etc.) differed radically from their own (AI.2.5; AI.2.6). For instance, Drew reported that an exercise we conducted where participants were asked to imagine the experiences of a fictitious direct service staff as he came to work was extremely useful and had a powerful and lasting impact. It had increased his respect for the role they perform even more, and enhanced his sensitivity to their position and needs. In this respect, he had come to realize how “disempowering” the direct service provider job could actually be for people. In his words,

...the exercise about the frontline worker was immensely helpful.... Its been haunting me. [It] really increased my respect for them even more, and my sensitivity to how we’ve got to take even better care of them. What it would do to me to come in -- if I had to work like that! It really made me far more sensitive to [them], and how disempowering the job is anyway. (Drew/1.1-38)

Lawren and Jamie conveyed similar sentiments about the process. For instance, Lawren said that she could not imagine what it would be like coming to work every day without certainty as to which program she might be assigned.

...that exercise of you're a direct service worker coming into work and... not knowing where you're going to work your shift. As a
manager you just put people where you think you need them but you don't always think about... if I'm coming into work not knowing what I'm doing for the day -- well who has a job like that?... I don't know anybody who has a job like that! Where you don't know what you're doing every day. And we have a large system here -- we do a lot of sharing of staff. If you're a relief staff you might not know every day where you're working when you come in. But to treat full-time staff like they're relief staff might be the wrong message for people, and actually may lead them to dislike their work. Which is the opposite of what our goal is as managers. (Lawren/1.2-4)

Speaking more generally, Jamie discussed the impact that a deeper understanding of the day-to-day reality of direct service staff was having on her approach to team management.

I think the [training] process is helping me to be more sensitive to frontline staff. And really thinking about the need to build that group as a team, and it's a big job in our program to do that. And it's helping me to focus a little more on that group. Before I may have intellectually said, "oh yes, it's really important to take care of them and include them" and that kind of thing, but something feels more real for me, or clearer around working with them. (Jamie/1.5-39)

In addition, those participants who regularly interfaced with groups and organizations outside BMHC reported new insights into the different cultural realities they often had to work within. For instance, during the fourth training session Drew commented:

When I think of it this way, it puts into perspective why I feel such frustration with other organizations. And I think, "For God's sake! What is wrong with our communication?"

For you [speaking to the facilitator] to say that that's not the way everybody operates [gesturing to the team's culture audit document] comes as an absolute shock to me. It makes things different. (RJ.04.20.94-1)

Through the generation of these types of insights into the day-to-day realities of others, participants became increasingly aware that individuals and
groups outside the management team frequently generated radically different interpretations of the behaviours, decisions, and intentions of the management team (RJ.05.09.94-6; RJ.06.05.94-2). For example, Lawren reported becoming more aware that direct service staff’s realities were often radically different from management’s, and consequently, that the decisions management made could often be incomprehensible to staff. She cited an example of several internal hiring decisions which some staff had been at a loss to understand (Lawren/1.2-14 /1.2-52 /1.2-79 /2.1-23). As she described,

...for the staff at large -- all the variables aren’t available to them about how decisions are made -- its small wonder that there are some negative issues with staff. You know, if you think back to staff who haven’t been hired [into full time positions] but who other staff like, well their reality is completely different than mine. No wonder if I don’t hire so-and-so to a full-time job, and hire somebody else who’s newer but I feel is more capable for reasons I value -- how can I expect staff to understand that? Like, their reality is nowhere near there. They’d say, “Gee, so-and-so’s been here four years, they’re an excellent person, I golf with them every Sunday! They’re a terrific person! What’s Lawren missing!” And confidence in me goes down. I mean, all that stuff is explainable in this sort of way. (Lawren/1.2-14)

This increased awareness of the divergent realities that others often hold about one’s own actions, coupled with the impact that such divergence can have on intra-team dynamics, led Lawren to reflect on her choices for managing the meaning of decisions she made.

The problem for me is, how far do you go with what you do about that? Do you just have to live with that? Am I going to go to all the staff and say “look I know so-and-so’s a great guy, and I know that you golf with him every Sunday, but please trust me. There are other issues here”? Well I don’t know! (laughs) I’m not going to go explaining all my decisions... (Lawren/1.2-14)

Alex and Lawren both indicated a heightened awareness that even apparently innocuous events could lead others to construct unanticipated interpretations of reality which would have to be managed reactively (Alex/2.4-
14; Lawren/2.1-10). Alex stated that while he felt confident in his ability to understand the realities of others, what he realized through the training process was the necessity of stopping and taking the time to intentionally reflect on what those realities might be. As he commented:

...I think that what it taught me again was that, if you don’t stop and think about it, and take time and be [detailed] about it, that you don’t always know the reality -- I think I know it if I stop and think about it.

What it taught me was: The mistake I make sometimes is not stopping and thinking about it. And that some situations that seem benign are not benign. And if I stop and thought about it, and put myself in their shoes, I would realize that. But sometimes, I make decisions without doing that. (Alex/2.4-14)

Similarly, Lawren reported becoming more aware of the “fragile” nature of the process of attempting to manage others’ realities. That is, she realized that one can never be certain how others will interpret and evaluate the actions and words one selects to shape the realities of those others. This insight led to a certain amount of “anxiety” over the diligence she felt she must exercise to minimize the chance of being misperceived and conveying culturally inconsistent messages. As she remarked:

...I think as managers we can make what we think is a terrific decision thinking “well gee, this is one of the best decisions we’ve made!” But how it’s perceived is as important. And if its perceived as a stupid decision, because of somebody else’s reality or perception of what their needs are and we’ve missed the boat, it can be the total opposite of what we thought it was going to be. (Lawren/1.2-8)

A second important implication of the insights generated into the realities of those beyond the team was an increased awareness of the impact their decisions and actions had on the lives of other members of the agency (Al.2.7). In this regard, Alex stated:

...the biggest thing that I keep thinking about is that the process... forces people -- the structure forces people to discuss -- to accept
that the decisions we make affect people.... Which is something we
don't... really want to acknowledge. (Alex/1.4-39)

Likewise, Drew stated during a training session:

I said to you from the beginning, “its incredibly threatening” -- and
this isn’t new to you, but I mean, incredibly Ted. Incredibly.
And one level is what someone was saying about, its
overwhelming because what it says to you is every single little
decision that you make is... I’ll use the word, “hurting” somebody --
because of their reality. (RJ.05.30.94-2)

Similarly, both Lawren and Drew indicated a greater appreciation for the
high degree of influence they and the team had in shaping the perceptions and
realities of others. In this regard, they both expressed new feelings of concern
over the potential for manipulative leadership, and humility in their responsibility
to others to manage events in an honest and non-self-serving fashion
(Lawren/1.2-8 /1.2-45 /2.1-11 /2.1-30; Drew/1.1-34). Lawren commented:

I feel more responsible about the impact I might make on
people, and to... be very very concerned that however they’re
perceiving me or decisions I make or things I do... are perceived
as supportive and helpful. Not dictatorial.... I’m just trying hard to
validate people’s input. And so I’m kind of more humbled as a
leader. (Lawren/1.2-52)

**Conceptual Reframing.** The final theme to emerge under
consciousness-reframing pertains to transformations in participants’
conceptualization of the dynamics of social organizing -- that is, their theories of
organization and management. Participants reported that through the training
they reframed the way they viewed the dynamics of leadership and culture.
Furthermore, they reported using these new conceptualizations as frameworks
for bringing new meaning to actual organizational events (Al.2.8; Al.2.9). In this
regard, the five models developed to illustrate the concepts and dynamics of the
LCCT played an important role (Chapter One: Figures 1 through 5). I therefore
begin this section with an overview of the reported meaningfulness of the LCCT
models. I then provide illustrations of participants’ conceptual reframing drawn
from the interview data. Finally, I provide examples of participants’ applications of LCCT concepts to the interpretation of events within their agency.

The five models developed to illustrate the central concepts and dynamics of the LCCT were focal points for much of the training. Beyond training, three proved valuable as frameworks for theory application (i.e., as frameworks for the interpretation of events and subsequent event management planning). In this sense, these models facilitated conceptual reframing as they provided participants with an alternative framework for thinking about leadership, culture, and the overall process of social organizing. On the basis of observations I recorded in the reflexive journal, I classified the models in terms of their meaningfulness for facilitating the learning process ("heuristic value") and for supporting participants in their utilization of the theory for interpreting events ("application value").

With respect to heuristic value, all five models proved meaningful as vehicles for facilitating the participants’ learning process. With respect to application, only the Leadership Process Phase Model (Figure 1), the Leadership-Culture Continuum Model (Figure 4), and the Leadership-Culture Process Phase Model (Figure 5) proved meaningful. Each of these three models were utilized by participants as frameworks for the analysis of actual problems and events the team chose to manage during the application phase of the training (RJ.05.29.94-1; RJ.05.29.94-3; RJ.06.06.94-8; RJ.08.10.94-3).

In retrospect it is not surprising that the two models dealing solely with culture (Figure 2 -- The Structure of Culture Model; Figure 3 -- The Culture Process Phase Model) did not demonstrate application value. These models focus exclusively on the dynamics and processes of collective habit. Consequently, they are of little use as frameworks for actively supporting the intentional management of nonhabitual events, although they were vital as conceptual backdrops (RJ.04.08.94-1; RJ.04.13.94-2; RJ.05.24.94-1). In this regard, they were instrumental for introducing and supporting the culture audit, but were of little practical application value after completion of this phase. I turn next to specific examples of conceptual reframing reported by participants.
During the first round of interviews Lawren reported that his view of culture had changed in fundamental respects. He remarked that prior to the training he regarded culture as more solid and enduring, whereas through the training he had come to see it as fluid and subject to the changing values and beliefs of the people who create and re-create it as a social process. As a result, he concluded that one must be very "vigilant" about conveying messages which reinforce the cultural ideal, and to avoid mixed or contradictory messages about what is valued. Thus, this reframing of culture provided him with a new respect for culture as an organizing force, and an awareness that not everyone in a collective will hold identical realities regarding the nature of their culture (Lawren/1.2-46 /1.2-58).

Reflecting on transformations in his views of both culture and leadership, Lawren stated:

I used to think culture was harder. But now I think culture's fuzzy. And you have to be very vigilant to be careful of contradictory messages.... Your exercises helped bring that around, and that's what unsettled me. But, I think its good in the end. Because I think if you treat culture as fragile, and somewhat illusory, you respect it more (laughs). You just won't take it for granted.... And so, lets just not assume that everybody's taking it all the way down the line the way we meant it.

So I guess it has changed my thoughts about leadership and culture. I don't really separate the two. I think leadership is fragile too. I think your leadership is in the perception of others as well. If I think I'm an effective leader I hope I'm thinking others are thinking that (laughs). But I don't know. So I think my leadership persona is fragile too. And I think you do treat it with more respect if you think its more fragile and possibly illusory.

I've been thinking about it a lot actually. (Lawren/1.2-46)

Lee indicated that early into the theory application process (Sessions 6 through 12), she had developed a new appreciation for the complex interrelatedness of what she would originally have considered largely independent organizational events. For example, commenting on a session during which we conducted an LCCT-based analysis of the implications of her decision to move from managing one program to another, she stated:
...as we were in the training with you... just more and more started to unfold -- in terms of some of the dilemmas we might be faced with or the questions that people might ask, or how they would feel about it. Even in terms of our direction! (laughing). I mean, it was just absolutely amazing what it opened up. (Lee/1.3-2).

In acknowledging this degree of complexity and interdependence, what struck her most was the potential for apparently straightforward decisions to have unpredictable ramifications for other organizational events. While reflecting on a particular application session where the group identified important links between two pending situations that were initially perceived as unrelated, she stated,

...we could have dealt with them separately. But in some respects I see them connected. Whereas I probably wouldn’t have bothered or thought any differently about them before. What I mean by feeling that their connected is that, whatever we do with the first depends on how people are going to see whatever happens with the second. And whatever we do there, our decision should be reflective of what we decide to do about the first. So they’re not isolated any more. They’re not isolated decisions that you just go off and make. That’s the thing that I thought “Holy smoke! Its not that simple!” Their not that isolated. Its like everything is so interdependent. (Lee/1.3-35)

Similarly, Alex, Jamie, and Lawren reported becoming more aware of the importance of taking time to intentionally analyze the potential implications of even innocuous events before settling on an event management plan and taking action (Alex/1.4-63 /2.4-7; Jamie/1.5-10; Lawren/1.2-52 /2.1-8). For instance, reflecting on this insight Jamie stated:

...even planning for our first visitors day. There were a lot of tasks I had to get done and I just sort of took over -- there was a deadline and I got them done. I had a vision of how it should be and there was limited time and I did it and I knew that there was some staff reaction... but I tried to manage it a bit through groups, and writing memos, and “if they don’t like this set-up it will be changed” and this sort of thing. But in retrospect, I wish I would have taken more
time to deal with people individually around... what this event meant to them.

I had a sense that there was going to be a problem with what I was doing and how I was doing it... so I thought, "I'll have to manage it after...." And in retrospect it would have been a lot easier, because on the day of the event, I just had this sinking feeling like I achieved my objective in terms of what I wanted in the program but (laughs and sighs) at the expense of knowing that there was staff who were grumbling a little bit because they didn't like the fact that they had little input.

So I'm trying to use more intention, and bring preconscious things to consciousness (Jamie/1.5-10)

Turning to more concrete applications, participants reported using insights from of the LCCT to interpret unfolding events or long-standing patterns. These applications led to major transformations in participants' understanding of these events, and consequently, to changes in their original event management plans.

For instance, Drew cited an example of a treatment team struggling with a particular client who had not been responding well to their standard array of treatment approaches. For a protracted period of time the team's response had been to apply their normative approaches with ever-increasing diligence. Drawing upon the Leadership-Culture Process Phase Model (Figure 5) which illustrates the dialectical relationship between the processes of leadership and culture, Drew recast this situation in terms of an over-reliance on the cultural process and a corresponding under-utilization of the leadership process. Once the situation was redefined as non-normative, the leadership process was engaged and the team created an entirely unique treatment plan which was reflective of the unusual circumstances of the client (RJ.08.10.94-3).

Jamie reported that the concept of "radical" versus "normative" leadership illustrated in the Leadership-Culture Continuum Model (Figure 4) aided her in understanding why a recent change in the mandate of one of her treatment teams was so intensely demanding for all concerned. By framing the situation in these terms, she recognized that the situation was an inevitable but temporary condition of radical group culture transformation. In effect, she realized that the team was accustomed to having routines and routine
responses to many of the events they had encountered prior to the program changes. With the change in program mandate however, their routines no longer fit the typical nature of the events that emerged, and consequently, they found themselves in a period of turmoil as they struggled to establish new routine responses.

On the basis of this interpretation, she was able to predict that the current turbulent phase of constant ambiguity, which demanded a great deal of radical leadership, would gradually give way to a reconstructed culture that would support more frequent reliance on culturally habitual and normative leadership processes. She reported finding this a useful and stress relieving reconceptualization of her current situation (Jamie/1.5-6 /2.3-3). As she stated:

...what struck me from... the training is how much we rely on our culture and habitual responses, and it just sort of hit me, I think it was just a couple of weeks ago, it hit me that I don't have habitual responses and I'm in a new program that's different from some of the habitual responses anyway, but it would certainly help me if I had more habitual responses (laughs). So it helps me to... understand some of my struggles... it's just helped me to be a little more forgiving of myself (laughing). (Jamie/1.5-6)

Interpretation and Discussion

With its origins in the sociopolitical agendas of the constructivist metatheory and methodology of this study, consciousness-reframing was a critical evaluation criterion (Erlandson, et al., 1993; Gergen, 1990, 1992; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lather, 1991; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Morgan, 1993; Rogers, 1990). Consciousness-reframing is central to self-empowerment as the insights generated provide new options for thinking and acting. This creation of novel options is the first step in identifying and transforming social habits (i.e., aspects of culture) that have become more constraining than enabling.

Given the centrality of this criterion to the overall success of the training as a change facilitating process, it is noteworthy that participants repeatedly reported consciousness-reframing experiences which not only corresponded to, but in several respects surpassed, initial expectations. That is, in addition to
using the training process to generate novel insights into the nature and dynamics of their group culture (group-reflexiveness), participants also generated insights into the realities of those beyond their group (other-reflexiveness), and reframed their understanding of social organizing processes within their own organization (conceptual reframing).

Accordingly, with respect to the emancipatory agenda of this research, I propose that the training process not only met but exceeded the original consciousness-reframing criterion. The achievement of this criterion was essential to subsequent stages of the training as without the generation of critical insights into the group’s culture (i.e., creation of an emancipatory knowledge base), customization of the LCCT to their specific context would not have been possible. Moreover, the other-reflexiveness and conceptual reframing insights generated through the process also played important roles in the participants’ later customization and utilization of the LCCT within their organizational context.

For instance, with respect to theory customization, through other-reflexive insights participants came to recognize that to actualize their cultural ideal, it was necessary to take adequate time to thoroughly analyze the realities of others prior to formulating event management plans. This practice was eventually formalized through its incorporation in their Event Management Protocol. From the standpoint of application, the alternative conceptualizations of leadership and culture introduced during the training facilitated a number of important interpretive breakthroughs for participants who were struggling to make sense of complex team dynamics.

These forms of consciousness-reframing are also noteworthy in that they fostered an enhanced awareness of the power participants possessed to influence the realities of others. Out of this, participants reported experiencing a renewed sense of responsibility to their subordinates to construct realities which were non-self-serving, an increased diligence with respect to monitoring the cultural ramifications of their decisions, and humility in response to the considerable power they had to profoundly influence the lives and beliefs of others with less power. These transformations in participants' awareness
provided a context for the development of their collective event management process.

Turning now to the question of knowledge transferability, the current findings suggest that the training process has the potential to facilitate participants' transformations in cultural awareness essential for theory customization and utilization. In this regard, the culture audit was the central medium through which participants generated such insights. I discuss the prospects for its transferability in a subsequent section of the chapter, however, on the basis of this conclusion, it seems reasonable to suggest that there are grounds for anticipating that the training process, as currently conceptualized, would prove meaningful in at least other highly similar cultural contexts.

With respect to the "other-reflexiveness" results, it also appears reasonable to suggest that the process has the potential to facilitate forms of consciousness-reframing beyond those originally intended. That is, in addition to the training's potential for facilitating transformations in a group's conscious awareness of their culture, and for providing frameworks for reconceptualizing problematic events, it also offers the potential for facilitating consciousness-reframing on aspects of social organization which are reflective of the values and assumptions of the specific social context. As became evident in this study, in customizing the LCCT to their specific culture, participants incorporated an other-reflexiveness component which reflected the value they placed on incorporating the realities of others into their event management plans.

In initiatives in other cultural contexts it is therefore possible that participants would utilize the process as a foundation for generating consciousness-reframing insights reflective of their own values and assumptions. That is, just as with current participants, it is conceivable that others would choose to emphasize particular aspects of the LCCT and/or the underlying metatheory which they found particularly relevant for supporting their cultural objectives. Accordingly, such concepts would figure prominently in their unique customization of the LCCT to their cultural context.

For example, in sharp contrast to BMHC, the military is unlikely to place value on considering the realities of those within their ranks. Indeed, a central
objective of the military culture is to create a collective reality where the feelings and opinions of subordinates are virtually immaterial on the command level of decision making. Thus, if segments of the military were to use the LCCT, it is unlikely that other-reflexiveness (in the BMHC sense of the term) would be particularly meaningful or useful. However, the LCCT could easily be adapted to facilitate the analysis of the realities of the enemy, and this is a fundamental aspect of any military's foundational reality. Similarly, a corporate management team dealing with a strong union and aggressive competitors might recognize the benefits of incorporating both internally and externally focused other-reflexive processes into their customization of the LCCT. Such measures would support the generation of strategic information about the realities of both the union and their competitors.

In practical terms, this interpretation reinforces my original contention that the trainer must work to keep the training and application process responsive to the values and assumptions of the specific collective. While this is obviously not new, the findings from this study provide a clearer picture of what "responsiveness" might mean in future initiatives. That is, the trainer must develop an intimate understanding of the participants and their culture in order to appropriately facilitate their customization of the LCCT to their context. With such an understanding the trainer can help participants construct an event management process that supports the form of culture they seek to actualize.

For instance, by recognizing the value the BMHC participants placed on understanding the realities of others, and contrasting this with their observation that they too often tended to neglect an analysis of these realities, I was able to propose a "stakeholder analysis" as part of the Situation Assessment phase of their emerging event management process. As my earlier example of the military suggested, while this practice of other-reflexiveness proved highly useful for this group, it is unlikely that it would prove as functional in an organization with a radically different cultural composition.

In this regard, a facilitator must avoid even subtly imposing event management practices which have proven useful in previous organizational settings (e.g., other-reflexiveness), and focus on supporting the emergence of
practices which further the ideals of the group undertaking the training. Thus, if at any point the trainer considers it useful to offer recommendations regarding the nature of their emerging event management process, these recommendations must be firmly grounded in and reflective of the values and objectives of the participants themselves. This approach will help avoid the development of prescriptions dictating “how to lead and shape culture according to the LCCT.” This is a practice that the theory and training process were specifically constructed to counteract as it has the simultaneous effect of implicitly prescribing a particular cultural form.

(All.) Practical Utility

While transformations in consciousness are a critical aspect of this project’s emancipatory agenda, changes in thinking alone are insufficient. To be more than an interesting intellectual exercise, transformations in thought should give rise to and facilitate intentional transformations in action which foster the social conditions valued by participants (Erlandson, et al., 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lather, 1991). Given that the LCCT was designed to support participants in their efforts to more intentionally manage daily events and culture, I selected these as the criteria to guide the evaluation of the training’s practical utility. That is, building on the two fundamental conceptual elements of the LCCT (leadership and culture), my goal was to assess the utility of the training for facilitating participants’ processes of: (1) event management; (2) culture management; and (3) simultaneous event and culture management. I defined these criteria in terms of three thematic questions first presented in Chapter Two:

1. Event Management Processes: To what degree do participants experience the training as a useful process for enabling them to participate more intentionally in influencing the course of the immediate group reality construction processes (i.e., leadership processes)?

2. Culture Management Processes: To what degree do participants experience the training as a useful process for enabling them to participate more intentionally in influencing (e.g.,
sustaining, modifying, and/or transforming) the group’s foundational reality and normative processes (i.e., cultural processes)?

3. Processes of Social Organizing: To what degree do participants experience the training as a useful process for enabling them to participate more intentionally in influencing both the group leadership and cultural processes simultaneously?

In the initial interviews I used these thematic questions as the basis for developing more specific interview questions. It became increasingly evident as the interviews progressed that this three-tiered conceptualization for evaluating utility did not reflect the manner in which participants themselves were making sense of, or evaluating, their experiences. Rather, participant reports of utility were more readily organized into themes representing particular variants on the third criterion pertaining to the simultaneous management of events and culture. Consequently, this section of the chapter is structured in terms of the emergent utility themes rather than the three a priori criteria.

Participants uniformly reported that the event management process they developed through the training had a strong positive influence on their event and culture management activities -- first within the management team, and later within their own treatment teams. The most extensive changes participants made, pertained to their own internal group dynamics. Integrating the central elements of the LCCT with the insights generated into their culture during the culture audit process, they initiated modifications to their approach to analyzing and coordinating their activities around novel events. In essence, they modified their normative event management processes to support their efforts to more intentionally and proactively shape the nature of their team and organizational cultures. In addition, participants reported that they found the training useful for identifying, and working to overcome, impediments to their personal participation in event management processes.

My discussion of these results is divided into three subsections, each of which corresponds to an emergent utility theme: (1) utilization of the event
management process; (2) assessments of the utility of the event management process; and, (3) unanticipated utilizations of the training. The first theme deals with participant feedback regarding the success with which they utilized the event management processes they developed through the training to support their efforts to more intentionally and self-reflexively manage events and shape their culture. The second theme deals with participant analyses of the central benefits and drawbacks of their reconstructed event management process. The final theme deals with the manner in which participants utilized the training process to accomplish ends which were unanticipated, and beyond the original objectives of the project.

Prior to discussing these three utility themes, I will summarize the central event and culture management process changes participants negotiated through the training. This information both demonstrates how participants made use of the training process to modify their collective event management practices, and serves as a foundation for contextualizing their feedback concerning the pragmatic value of the training. The data for this section comes from three sources: the reflexive journal, interview data, and the event management documents generated with participants' during the application and coaching phases of the training (see Appendix N: Event Management Protocol 1.3.1, and Appendix P: Team Culture Transformation Plans).

**Reconstruction of Participants’ Event Management Process**

As I have emphasized, the central point of the training was for participants to tailor the LCCT to their cultural context to construct a local event management theory and process (i.e., a customized leadership theory) which would be useful for intentionally managing daily events and shaping their culture. Toward this end, the participants and I worked closely to develop and refine an event management process designed to support the perpetuation of the valued aspects of their culture, and to transform those which were inconsistent with their cultural ideal. In this section I discuss the emergent elements of this process. They include the participants’ Event Management Protocol which served as a concrete framework for conceptualizing and
actualizing changes to their normative event management process, and several Team Culture Transformation Measures introduced to counteract normative group interaction patterns which they deemed inconsistent with their cultural ideal.

**The Event Management Protocol.** The most important avenue for facilitating the development and utilization of the participants' evolving event management process was the Event Management Protocol (EMP). As I discussed in the second chapter, the participants and I worked through a series of six working drafts to create a highly refined protocol which merged the central concepts of the LCCT with the group's cultural objectives (i.e., those aspects of their cultural process they wished to maintain, modify, and transform) (see Appendix N).

The EMP integrated the process phases outlined in the Leadership Process Phase Model (i.e., Figure 1: “Situation Assessment,” “Reality Assertion,” and “Reality Evaluation”) and LCCT concepts participants found particularly relevant within their context (e.g., Figure 4: “normative versus radical leadership”), with the group's cultural objectives made explicit through the culture audit. In this regard, in addition to questions on “group-reflexiveness” intended to prompt evaluation of current group dynamics for their consistency with their cultural ideal (Appendix N: Sections A, D, & F), the protocol contained questions to facilitate “self-” and “other-reflexiveness.”

The questions on self-reflexiveness were the result of participants' integration of the LCCT concepts with their existing ontology. One of the outgrowths of this process was an emerging reality concerning the critical role that personal identity plays in shaping the reality definition process on both an individual and collective level. These questions were therefore designed to trigger awareness of personal issues which might unduly slant one's construction of reality or adversely effect the overall group process of defining and managing events (e.g., preconscious biases, emotions inappropriate to the situation, etc.) (Appendix N: Section E).

The questions relating to "other-reflexiveness" were the result of the insights I discussed in the previous section regarding the value participants
placed on incorporating the realities of stakeholders into the situation assessment and event management planning phases. These questions focused on the generation of insights into the realities of stakeholders and their likely responses to courses of action under consideration (Appendix N: Sections B, C, & G). In addition, participants included a section to remind themselves to assess the congruence of the messages they intended to communicate to stakeholders with the values underlying their cultural ideal (Appendix N: Section H). I discuss both of these adaptations of the LCCT process in the subsequent section dealing with the exploratory research agenda.

**Team Culture Transformation Measures.** Participants assessed several team dynamics identified during the culture audit as inhibitory to their effective management of team and organizational events. Central among these were three habitual patterns: (1) premature acceptance of the first asserted definition of the situation; (2) a collective drive to establish closure in the management of events; and (3), a reluctance on the part of each team member to vary from group defined event management plans when new information warranted changes. With this new awareness, participants began developing Team Culture Transformation Measures to counteract these normative interaction patterns which conflicted with their cultural ideal. In this section I discuss each of these patterns and the corresponding transformation measures in turn.

One of the intra-team dynamics participants recognized through the training process was a tendency for the first presented definition of reality to steer the team's subsequent event management process. They expressed a concern that, in truncating the situation assessment phase of the event management process, this pattern inhibited the generation and consideration of alternative definitions of events. In so doing, they recognized that this dynamic too often led to plans which were ill-suited to the specific circumstances and interests of the stakeholders. Moreover, they realized that uncritical acceptance of the first presented definition of events left them open to the possibility of managing events which may not have required managing in the first place. In
this regard, the participants identified a pattern of "hyper-vigilance" with respect to their identification of events in need of their attention. That is, they seldom left a situation or event unmanaged once identified.

On the basis of these observations, prompt questions designed to counter these tendencies were incorporated into the EMP. In the "Situation Assessment" section of the protocol three questions were included to increase awareness of the need to reflect on, and closely scrutinize, the initial definition of reality. Moreover, the title of this section ("Event Definition") was followed by a reminder that one option was to define the situation as a "non-event" (i.e., a situation which did not require intentional management).

**Situation Assessment & Reality Assertion**

A. Event Definition (Maybe, Rejection)

1. What is the question?
2. Is this a self-defined event, or was it defined for us as a problem?
3. Are we being hyper-vigilant by framing this as an issue/problem?

(Appendix N)

Later in the EMP, participants were prompted to reflect on the dynamics of their team process to ensure that their approach was not unduly driven by their initial definition of the event.

**Reflections on the Management Process**

D. Reflections on the Team Process

1. Is the process being overly directed by the first presented definition of reality?

(Appendix N)

Beyond the initial definition of an event, participants identified a "drive to closure" pattern which had resulted in the formulation and acceptance of event management plans which lacked sufficient analysis. Participants found that plans too hurriedly conceived and enacted tended to give rise to new events that required additional time and attention to manage. They also noted that the decisions they had typically been most satisfied with in the past were those
made and enacted after allowing themselves a period of time to reflect on their initial definition of reality and tentative event management plan. This enabled them to check their reality against new data, and allowed time for any strong feelings to subside which might otherwise obscure their judgment (RJ.06.10.94-2; Appendix P: Team Culture Transformation Plans).

On the basis of these insights, participants elected to adopt a "wait-a-week" operating rule which required a period of reflection on all preliminary event management plans for non-urgent events (RJ.06.10.94-2). This rule was incorporated into the EMP with three questions intended to trigger awareness of their "drive to closure" pattern so that they might intentionally resist it, and to prompt them to invoke the "wait-a-week" rule:

Situation Assessment & Reality Assertion
A. Event Definition
6. How much time do we have before a course of action must be selected?

Reality Evaluation
F. Team Process & Objectives
1. Have we reached closure because we think the plan is effective? Or have we:
   • given in to our drive for closure?
   • become bored with the topic?
   • done so to avoid conflict?

5. Should we give ourselves a week to reflect on this reality?
   (Appendix N)

Finally, participants became aware that one of the team's central strengths could also have the unintended effect of disempowering individual members. A defining feature of the participants' team culture was a high level of mutual support and assistance among the membership. Regardless of each individual's responsibilities for specific programs, all members were highly invested and actively involved in the functioning of the entire agency. Consequently, it was normative for team meetings to be utilized by members as a medium for the analysis of events which were directly relevant to one specific
program.

During Session Nine it became evident that while each of the participants very much wanted the continued input of their peers into problems which they alone were responsible for managing, there was a tacit feeling of being accountable to the group for carrying out team designed action plans -- even in the face of new and contradictory information received while enacting the plan (RJ.06.10.94-2). The following is an excerpt from these discussions:

Alex: ...I always find that, its one thing when we get in this room and we talk about something, but when you’re the one that has to face the person... the reality changes.

Like I can do all kinds of things about somebody else’s staff, but when its my staff, my position is very different -- and you should have a relationship where, when you go to implement this plan that isn’t about relationship you... [change it]. You have to do that.

Drew: That’s right.

Alex: I mean how can you live with yourself if you don’t go through a process that respects the relationship?

Drew: Yes. I think we all know that. We just don’t say it often enough. And so the person that leaves feels this heavy weight to bring it to fruition... (RJ.06.10.94-2)

When this implicit, but common, experience was made explicit for the first time, participants were in a position to identify and scrutinize the assumptions upon which it was based (e.g., "the group knows better than I!", and “the group expects me to follow through and therefore, if I deviate from the original plan, I will have to justify my decision”). They openly rejected these assumptions and initiated action to transform what they considered a group dynamic that disempowered group members by inhibiting individual initiative. They elected to adopt a “freedom to change in mid-stream” rule which gave each of them licence and support to vary from the original event management plan as their experience and intuition dictated. This rule was to remain in effect regardless of how much analysis and planning might have occurred around an event during a management meeting (RJ.06.10.94-2; Appendix P: Team Culture
(All.1) Utilization of the Event Management Process

In this section I focus on participant feedback regarding their utilization of the above outlined measures to transform their normative event management processes. All participants reported employing these measures, and uniformly evaluated the results of their use in highly positive terms. In this regard, I present examples from the interview data which illustrate the manner in which participants employed these measures to transform their internal group culture and influence their broader organizational culture (All.1.1; All.1.2; All.1.3).

Utilization of the Event Management Protocol. In this section I summarize participant reflections on the EMP as a medium for actualizing the objective of creating a culturally contextualized event management process. Overall, the data indicates that participants utilized the EMP to the point that it became a normative component of their approach to event and culture management (All.1.3).

All participants reported finding the EMP extremely useful. Drew, Alex, and Lee stated that the protocol effectively brought the theory to life for them, and therefore, they considered it a highly valuable tool for facilitating the desired changes to their event management process (Drew/2.2-22; Alex/2.4-49; Lee/2.5-14). As Drew described, she found it "exceedingly helpful" and stated that "if organizations could hang through the culture audit, and work out a protocol, it really comes alive" (Drew/2.2-21).

By the end of the training most of the participants reported that they had internalized the major themes of the protocol. For instance, Jamie remarked that going through the questions on the protocol had begun to feel "natural," and she had come to rely on it as a prompt for the intentional management of events. As she stated:

   It's just beginning to feel more natural. And, I still need to refer to questions and to the protocol and steps, because it's not totally a part of me at this point but, -- it's becoming more and more natural, and I'm finding more and more a part of my thinking. (Jamie/2.3-2)
In this regard, she found it particularly useful to help ground her during stressful situations, and for helping her to recognize when her personal issues were operating in any given event management situation. As she recounted,

...and to look at the protocol -- it's so handy -- it just takes a couple seconds to think about a few things to bring things to mind... It helps me when I'm busy and also helps me when I'm stressed....

And then there's things that I know on some level are really my issues and that I need to kind of get over them and get on with. There's a question in there about looking at "what's operating here really, and what issue is it hitting?" and that helps me to identify it and move on. (Jamie/2.3-2)

Similarly, Alex reported that the Event Management Protocol had been utilized by the team to the point that it that had become part of the team's normative discourse. Team members regularly used it as a common point of reference to remind one another of what they had come to understand about their event management habits, and correspondingly, what they had agreed to do differently.

I think its neat the way the protocol has become part of our language because I'll say things, or people will say "remember the rules..." -- like the things we've established that we know about ourselves.... The things that we came up with, I think will always be there for us. (Alex/2.4-24)

He added that to maintain its relevance, the Protocol must be viewed as an evolving document which needed to be up-dated at regular intervals to ensure it continued to reflect the group's cultural objectives. In this regard, he considered that there were slight modifications which could be made to their latest version to reflect the fact that they had already succeeded in transforming aspects of their cultural process. In his words,

...to make it meaningful on goingly, the thing I think that is important is that it's a process that can't stop. So, I think it's almost like we have to put ourselves into that structure where we set aside that amount of time and we create a structure where we go through it again in six months, and then again in six because I
think it changes with changing people... so, you can't keep that protocol forever.

It's probably changed already a little bit. There's still all those other things though. It hasn't changed that much. Like, I don't think closure is an issue, but I think if we didn't keep it in mind, it would become an issue again. It's not like a habit yet. (Alex/2.4-49)

In contrast to other team members, Lee reported that her particular circumstances had prevented her from making use of the Event Management Protocol beyond the team meetings. She stated that while the protocol made perfect sense, and was very helpful to her when utilized in the management meetings, her shift from managing one program to another during the training process had prevented her from using the protocol outside the management team context to the extent that she would have preferred. As she explained:

You see, everything is so new. It's the adjustment. But, I think after that -- Like it has meaning for me. It has meaning for me and makes complete sense to me. When you bring it out, it's like, "Yes, that's a good point." And then, it really helps you be able to look at; "is this the best decision?" If you've gone through all that, and you still can answer yes... Great!

But... I probably still need to work with that. It's not in me yet. And it's something that, as long as somebody else [on the team] is bringing up... it brings it to life more for me. (Lee/2.5-14)

**Utilization of Team Culture Transformation Measures.**

Participants consistently evaluated the Culture Transformation Measures developed through the training as useful for facilitating the intended changes in their team dynamics. In this section I provide examples from the interview and reflexive journal data which illustrate the manner in which participants utilized these measures to counteract their tendencies to: (1) accept the first presented definition of events; (2) circumvent a thorough analysis of events in an effort to achieve rapid closure; and (3), feel excessively accountable to the group for adherence to team defined event management plans which no longer fit the situation.
By the end of the training, team members noted an overall improvement with respect to their pattern of letting the first definition of reality drive their event management process (All.1.2). As Jamie recounted:

I think we're trying to watch the issue about the first definition driving the group process... more consciously. We're aware of that... it's been spoken... where it might not have been spoken out loud before, and now it is and now nobody wants to speak first... (laughs)... so we have long silences (laughing). But I think that has heightened awareness. (Jamie/2.3-24)

Lawren illustrated this change with the example of Lee's decision to begin managing a new program. Initially this event appeared unproblematic and straightforward, and therefore, the appropriate course of action appeared self-evident (i.e., make an organization wide announcement and proceed with the change). However, due to the large number of stakeholders the change would effect, two team members suggested analyzing the event with the use of the Event Management Protocol. As the group did so, they rapidly determined that the situation was not as it originally appeared. They realized that several stakeholder groups were not likely to see the change in entirely positive terms (e.g., those who would lose Lee as their manager). They therefore concluded that the process had to be managed in a much more strategic manner to garner uniform stakeholder support for the transition. As Lawren commented,

[Reading from a list of reflective prompts provided during the interview] "First definition driving the group problem solving process" -- I think we're better at that.... And in fact, that's what we did with Lee's situation. We challenged it and said, "Something's not right here." And I think [we] picked it up and were quite disturbed by it, knowing that we had missed things. And it ended up working out okay but.... (pause)
I think that we're pretty good about not feeling like the first person off the mark is the way we'll go -- you know, that "group think" thing... (Lawren/2.1-57)

Reflecting on the same event, Alex considered the undesirable implications that would have emerged had they uncritically accepted their first
definition of the event (i.e., the reality that this would be an unproblematic transition). She indicated that use of the EMP had forced the management team to collaboratively redefine the situation in advance of event management planning and action. Consequently, they were better able to recognize issues before they emerged, and to manage the event from a more thoroughly informed, and therefore strategic, perspective. As she explained,

...we could’ve announced Lee’s thing, and not worried about how people felt about it and let them just feel it ... and had chaos around that of course. But the one thing that struck me... it also forced the management team to not manage independently of each other.... it also forces issues to come out on a management level, rather than on a frontline level. Because they’ll come out.... (Alex/1.4-41)

Regarding the team’s “drive to closure” tendency, after the introduction of the “wait-a-week” operating rule participants were both observed invoking the rule within their team and reported significant progress with respect to resisting this tendency within and beyond the context of the management team (RJ.08.15.94-4; RJ.09.12.94-3; All.1.2). Lawren, Jamie, and Lee indicated that the implementation of the “wait-a-week” rule had been highly effective for prompting group members to take more reflection time prior to enacting event management plans (Lawren/2.1-62; Jamie/2.3-17 /2.3-22; Lee/2.5-6). Similarly, Drew stated that the training had “helped us immensely with the drive to closure... it’s helped immensely” (Drew/2.2-10). Alex summarized the group transformations she experienced in the following terms:

I think we’re getting better at the “drive to closure.” I think that’s probably the one that’s changed the most. And it’s probably the one that was the worst problem for us. I think we’re a lot more comfortable with letting things go... and making better decisions. I’ve seen that happen over and over again, and I’ve been feeling better about that... We’re much more methodical than we used to be. (Alex/2.4-38)

Finally, with respect to participants’ “change in mid-stream” operating rule implemented to counter their tendency to feel constrained by group
constructed event management plans, participants evaluated this measure in highly positive terms. After the introduction of this rule, participants both openly reinforced its legitimacy to one another, and invoked it individually as a source of self-empowerment (All.1.2; RJ.09.26.94-2). I observed a number of instances in which the group referred to this rule to empower one of its members to use discretion and intuition. The following is a reflexive journal entry which summarizes one such occurrence:

Lawren wanted to confirm a course of action with the other team members and ensure it was in line with messages they had sent their own staffs. They assured her that her plan was entirely consistent with what they had communicated to their respective teams. At this point she seemed to need reassurance, indicating she was prepared to proceed but then asked: "Once in there, what if I encounter things we didn't anticipate?" Drew immediately responded: "Remember the rule -- You can change mid-stream." (RJ.09.26.94-2).

From the standpoint of the individual members, participants considered this an important and highly desirable development with respect to their internal team dynamics. For instance, Jamie commented:

...we came to the issue of... if you have a plan with the management group, and you go to implement it, if it doesn't fit, it's okay to alter it. I found that incredibly reassuring because it usually happens to me.... It's so powerful, really! That they can, say, "Look it -- You get into a situation that's not fitting, change it."

And, to me that's incredible. I don't know where you go that you can get that kind of support. Where they're not going to worry about coming back and saying, "Well, I didn't really follow through, and it didn't fit," and then you're afraid you're going to get attacked by all your co-workers (laughs). But, there's no sense of that here at all. And in fact there's permission to do it... to change, and respect for you to do the change. So that, I find is wonderful. I just think it's very strong for a team. (Jamie/2.3-18)

Similarly, while reflecting on his experience of the recent changes in team dynamics, Alex explained that it had become a normative part of their interactions for team members to remind and support one another for doing
things differently. In his words,

...people will say “remember the rules that...” -- like the things we've established that we know about ourselves... And I think we’re much better at looking at, like even the rule where we say, “go away [with the plan] and if it doesn't fit [in the situation], it's okay.” Or “sleep on it a week.” (Alex/2.4-24)

Overall, in accordance with the central objectives of this project, the participants' Culture Transformation Plans developed through the training proved useful as avenues for increasing awareness of, and transforming, habitual group interaction patterns which participants regarded as inconsistent with their cultural ideal. In the coming section, I examine the data relating to reports of utilizations of the training process which were unanticipated at the outset of this study.

(All.2) Utility of the Event Management Process

Three interrelated themes regarding the fundamental utility of the participants' event management process emerged from the interview data. First, participants found it a valuable framework for organizing their thinking and making sense of highly complex events. In this regard, it often helped them to reveal the complexity in apparently straightforward situations. Second, participants reported that it enabled them to manage daily events and their cultural process more intentionally and proactively. That is, in using the process they were more purposeful in their event management activities, more conscious of the cultural messages they communicated, and proactive in the sense that they were better able to anticipate and work to avert potential problems. Third, to realize these powerful benefits of the event management process, greater time and energy had to be invested in the analysis of events. In this section I discuss and illustrate each of these themes with examples from the interview data.

Organizing framework. All participants reported that a central benefit of the training was the development of a local event management process which served as a culturally sensitive framework for the analysis and
management of daily events. In this regard, their event management process helped them organize their analysis of events (i.e., through the core questions of the LPPM: what is happening? what does it mean to us? what should we do about it?), generate forms of data they considered essential (e.g., stakeholder realities and power dynamics), and prompt awareness of individual and group tendencies which adversely influenced their event management processes (e.g., personal issues and disempowering team dynamics) (All.2.1).

For instance, Drew found that the event management process the team constructed was very useful as an organizing framework for guiding his analysis of events and construction of management plans. He explained:

I find for me -- I think it’s the same as most people -- but, for me theories or models... have tremendous value. If I can hang my intuition on something that makes sense then I can keep going back to that, and it just moves me. It’s like, “Oh yeah! Okay, that’s what’s going on,” versus being all muddled. So it’s helped a lot. (Drew/2.2-19)

Alex echoed this view when she stated:

...it’s given me a framework... like a backboard. Before it was sort of something that we did and we knew it was right, and that it was based on values, and principles and stuff like that but, it wasn’t theoretical. But once you put the theory to it and then trained us in the theory,... what it did was put into words a theory that I could use as a backdrop,... So it’s like a backboard. So there was something solid there... that I could come back to. (Alex/2.4-8)

She added that she constantly utilized the Event Management Protocol as a structure for being more “thought through” in the management of events. As she explained:

I keep using the process of the reality checklist... I have that constantly in my mind. And I know that I’ve done some things quite minor, like in terms of just how I manage through a situation, and other things quite significant, in terms of how I manage. I’m just a lot more purposeful. I thought I was before but... Well, I was purposeful but, maybe not quite as thought through as I am even
now. (Alex/2.4-7)

She also noted that in using the EMP it was often the case that the team’s initial starting point (i.e., what they thought they were likely to do) was often far removed from what they ultimately elected to do. For this reason she considered decisions reached using the event management process significantly more powerful than those generated when the process was not utilized. This provided a much enhanced sense of confidence in the decisions finally reached. As she explained:

I always feel like where we end up after your process is so much greater than where we started. And yet, before we used to stay there and make the decision.... I feel so much more confident with it because, when I’m making decisions at the beginning without going through the process, I’ll have feelings pulling at me where it’s not completely fitting. Where I think it’s okay, but I’ll have some anxiety. And then I’ll think, “Well, that’s just you.” Where when I go through it, I mean each time we’ve done that, I feel really confident with our decision. (Alex/2.4-18)

Lawren indicated that the structure provided by the EMP for managing events was more thorough and complete than any decision making framework with which she was previously familiar. She stated:

I find what you’re doing with us now is more comprehensive. It seems more thought out somehow and, really I think that we’re much more sensitive now to looking at the stakeholders in decisions that we have to make and, what they might perceive or concern themselves with, or in anyway at least what their thoughts might be around decisions we’d make... It’s really helped to steer us better. (Lawren/2.1-4)

Accordingly, she regarded the model as a “practical guide to making decisions and providing leadership” (Lawren/2.1-17; 2.1-63).

Jamie reported relying on the Event Management Protocol in several important respects. To begin with, he used it as a framework for being more intentional in the management of events. He stated:
I think that this process has really been helping me to step out a little bit more and to, think about the reality that I want to... shape and to look at the protocol, and to stop and to see -- it's so handy -- it just takes a couple seconds to think about a few things to bring things to mind. The structure helps me when I'm busy and also helps me when I'm stressed. (Jamie/2.3-4)

Further, he relied on the self-reflection prompt questions (Appendix N: Section E) to ensure that he was aware of the personal issues he might be bringing to an event, and to help him minimize their impact on his analysis of the situation (Jamie/2.3-4). Overall, he indicated that as a framework,

...its very freeing too -- that I don't have to go to a leadership manual and memorize all these... (laughs)... "how to delegate"... "how to hire and fire," you know? There's something about this process that's generic enough. Somehow, it -- this applies to many, many situations and it feels very well grounded to me. (Jamie/2.3-10)

Similarly, Lee commented that the training had provided her with a structure for integrating familiar concepts into a more meaningful whole. The protocol was particularly useful as it served as a practical framework for applying the central insights of the LCCT and their culture audit to day-to-day events during a particularly challenging period of transition. In her words,

...some of it was familiar in terms of making decisions, in terms of what you have to look for and what you have to be careful about. But, what I always find so helpful is when it's all collected. When it's collected information, then it's like a working draft versus it just kind of sits there...

...It was like, we built on it and you put it all down there as a little thing for us to keep going back to. I think that was very helpful. And especially in my situation right now. Because that's what I need. I need the structure. (Lee/2.5-21)

When queried as to whether the event management process might have become too complex, Lee indicated that this was not the case. In her view, if an event was particularly demanding, use of the Event Management Protocol to
conduct a thorough analysis of the situation actually helped people become more “settled.” That is, the EMP’s structure helped participants make sense of complexity, and therefore enabled them to begin to feel more in control of situations. As she explained:

I think sometimes, if the situation is heated, it’s probably overwhelming anyway. Like with a problematic staff or whatever -- I mean there’s a lot to look at. There’s a lot of factors that come into play. And it’s an emotionally tiring thing. So, in some respects, I think it settles it. It brings it back instead of, you’re off on ninety-nine tangents or you’re saying, “Oh well, that doesn’t matter.” And yet it really does, so when you start to look at it and you start to break it down a bit, it gives it some structure... In some respects I think, it could be the opposite.

I even noticed in the management meetings that, if it’s a quick little thing it’s like, “Ya, ya, no, that’s okay,” and then we just move on. And that we don’t have to be overwhelmed with every little darned decision that we make but, for the big ones... I think it helps put structure on things. In terms of where we’re going... What do we need to consider? Have we considered all of these things? (Lee/2.5-28)

This final point reflected a common view among participants; that the use of their event management process revealed the complexity of events, but at the same time, provided a practical framework for managing this complexity (MC-2).

**Increased intentionality.** Participants uniformly evaluated the training as useful for increasing the degree of intentionality they were able to bring to their analysis of events and subsequent enactment of event management plans. In this regard, they reported that the process supported their efforts to be more conscious of the cultural ramifications of the messages they communicated and the actions they selected. In addition, the process enabled them to be more proactive in the management of events. That is, they were better able to identify and manage problematic events earlier, and to avert those which were likely to emerge as stakeholders responded to their event management actions (All.2.2).

As the training progressed participants increasingly spoke of being more “purposeful” when managing events. For instance Alex remarked that, “through
the training process I think, I'm a lot more purposeful about it than I would have been prior” (Alex/2.4-44). Likewise, Jamie indicated that because the training had helped her become more conscious of the realities of other people, she had become more intentional with respect to the processes by which she introduced changes to her teams. She remarked:

What I'm really trying to do, is think about when there are changes -- and even in development of [my programs] -- being more conscious of what other people's realities are. I might just do something and... kind of have a sense that this might be a problem but I haven't thought it through enough to think "okay what are the realities now? What will it mean? Who are the stakeholders? -- like all that stuff we've been doing.

So this process has been helping me to be more purposeful in what I'm doing. (Jamie/1.5-8)

As a result she felt she was doing less “cleaning up after the fact” as her decisions were more strategic and less reactive or habitual in nature (Jamie/1.5-12). For example, she began delaying the implementation of certain changes to ensure that all team members understood what was proposed and had sufficient opportunity to provide input. In her words,

...sometimes it just means delaying something by a week which, I think has a tremendous benefit over saying "today we have to start our new plan." And it doesn't really matter if we delay our plan, it's not like the end of the world if we don't start until next week. But, there's an awful important process that we have to go through with that to see what it means for [staff]. (Jamie/2.3-11)

One of the central benefits of this framework was that it forced the management team to come to agreement on what an event meant and what they wanted to communicate to others about that event in advance of action. While this was a more time consuming process, it forced the team to manage events in a more conscious, integrated, and uniform manner. As Alex stated:

...if you have to go through a process where you're all agreeing what meaning you want to communicate and how you're going to communicate it to people, it forces a consistency, or a "coming
together." Its much easier to do it the other way. It's not as effective obviously, but it also forces issues to come out on a management level, rather than on a frontline level. (Alex/1.4-42)

There were numerous reports of highly successful applications of the event management process. For instance, Alex described an instance in which the management team utilized the EMP to analyze and strategically manage what initially appeared to be an entirely straightforward and innocuous event. One treatment team ("Program X") had received funds for minor renovations. Sometime later sufficient funds became available to purchase new equipment for any two programs in the agency. Initially, Program X was selected with one other. Because of vague intimations that other program staffs might have issues pertaining to management's resource allocation decisions, the team elected to use the EMP. In so doing, the they came to the conclusion that Program X, which they now realized was perceived as "special" by other sectors of the agency, would be perceived all the more so if they received the new equipment. Consequently the equipment funds originally earmarked for Program X were reallocated to another program (Alex/1.4-62).

The team concluded that because the reality underlying the allocation of renovation funds to Program X had not been managed with the same degree of intentionality in the first case (giving rise to perceptions of favouritism), they would have to "exaggerate" what they choose to do in this instance to ensure that staff perceived an equitable allocation of resources across programs. They also became more conscious of the broader perception that Program X had special status, and therefore managed future events to convey the message that all programs were equally valued. Alex reflected on these measures to change perceptions:

...something as simple as new office equipment, people are looking for that because that's an issue we created by not managing it the first time. So to undo it and start managing it more effectively, we have to exaggerate what we did and be very cautious.
I don’t know if I would have been as vigilant about that prior to the training.

As silly as it sounds -- but it isn’t about the equipment. It’s about perceptions. The problem is... people are seeing Program X as receiving special treatment. That’s the perception... and that was because we didn’t manage the meaning around the renovations, and where the money was coming from.

The second thing then, was damage control: Let’s make sure that every behaviour we do in regards to Program X doesn’t feed that perception -- in fact, counters that perception.

And I made a point of mentioning to my team, which programs were getting the new equipment. Because they might never have known that. That it isn’t Program X that’s getting it. I just made a point of saying who was getting the equipment. But its like, they’re listening for that. That’s what they’re listening for.

(Alex/1.4-62)

In a related vein, an invaluable aspect of their event management process was its function as an aid in managing events in a more proactive fashion. That is, the process prompted participants to expand the scope of their event analyses to anticipate problems before they constructed and enacted event management plans. Thus, when problems were unavoidable (e.g., resistance to a management decision from a particular stakeholder group), participants could still manage the overall event more proactively by constructing tentative courses of action to manage these problems in advance of their actual occurrence.

In this regard, Drew noted that as a result of utilizing their event management process, the team was more aware of, and prepared to deal with, the likely reactions stakeholders would have to their plans and decisions. In this sense, the team was better able to prepare and/or respond to those affected by their decisions. Thus, she felt they were less likely to be surprised by people’s reactions and better able to reach decisions which more people were likely to support. As she remarked,

...you can anticipate what’s coming or something but... It’s like it’s been more scripted out in your mind -- the ramifications. As opposed to being a bit thrown by something that comes in at you this way and thinking, “Oh! I should have thought of that. Of
course they'd be feeling that way," you know? But, not thinking of it. (Drew/2.2-15)

Jamie indicated that use of their event management process assisted him in his efforts to gather staff input into decisions. Accordingly, he felt better able to anticipate not only staff members’ reactions to decisions, but also how they were likely to react with respect to one another over a given decision. As he described:

I’m able to work with [my supervisors] to find out what [a decision] means to staff... it’s helpful with getting them... to think about that and to visualize it. [One of them] will say, “well can we start this on Monday?” And I’ll say, “Well let’s really talk it through and see what people think ...and if they don’t like something, what’s that going to do to the whole program? And what are they going to say to other people about it?” -- things like that. And I think that’s being proactive. (Jamie/2.3-13)

He used the example of a modification to work routines he and his supervisors intended to propose to staff. Using the EMP, he was able to anticipate that several highly influential team members were likely to react with disfavour to the proposed changes. Consequently, he anticipated that these individuals would probably work to negatively influence the realities of those with less influence (Jamie/2.3-15). On the basis of these predictions, he was able to construct a proactive event management plan to help ensure that those with less influence on the team would have an opportunity to consider the changes without undue pressure from peers.

Lawren reported using the process with his supervisors to proactively assess the potential ramifications of an idea to rotate direct service staff through a newly vacant staff position.

We were going to look at the medical support position that we have here... it’s a straight day position, Monday to Friday working with the physician. And, we were thinking of instead of one person doing it, putting it in a rotation, so all staff had a chance to work through it... We thought that was a great idea. So, I twigged into what you had done with us and I said, “Okay, let’s
just put it aside now -- let’s think of us making that decision and implementing it; how might the physician perceive it? The staff perceive it?” Even the clients?”

We spent a couple minutes on how the clients would perceive it, and it was slow to get going because what came out was -- Well, I think the staff would see it as an opportunity and I kind of worked that through, and I said, “That’s fine.” Then I said, “You’re a staff member, you’re looking at this decision; how might you see it?” And one of the supervisors piped up and said, “Well, I think some of them would see it as a lost opportunity for a great job. I think we’ve got several staff here who would love to apply for that straight day job, and in fact had talked about it and... they would see this as a lost opportunity, and might actually be bitter about it.” And then another supervisor added that some staff would be very intimidated or uncomfortable working in that role. The physician of course, would see it as lost consistency in standards and operating practices.

So, we saw many, many angles on it and actually ended up not going ahead with that for now, because we felt there were many things we had to sort out, so we didn’t actually go ahead with it. But, I thought it was just a neat way to try the reality construction exercise to help around what I thought was a pretty important decision to be making. And I mean it can be useful for smaller decisions but, I thought that was one that required that kind of thinking and really, I thought was a good preventative exercise because I think it prevented us from making a potentially bad decision. (Lawren/2.1-13)

Finally, Lee illustrated the proactive benefits of the event management process with reference to the previously discussed equipment allocation event. Participants realized that an apparently simple decision regarding the distribution of resources had far reaching ramifications for stakeholders’ perceptions of which teams had greater status and influence in the organization. He concluded that, had they not analyzed and managed this apparently straightforward and trivial issue through the EMP, they would not have recognized the ramifications until much later when perceptions would have been far more entrenched and difficult to influence. Consequently, they would have been “putting out fires” by trying to convey messages more consistent with the form of culture they wished to foster which discouraged
status differentials among programs. As she described,

You just initially start to think, "Okay,... it was just a snap of the fingers." But when you start to ask the questions then, all of a sudden! -- But to me, had we just done that, we would have been putting out fires. Back to the flipping drawing board (laughs) -- That's what we would've done. And messed up all that culture... (laughs) ...put out the fire and come back at it.

So... I think sometimes it can reveal how it is a little bit more than how simple you're initially making it. It might be a little bit more involved, which is not bad because in essence, you take a little time now but save time later... like I say, initially it sounded like it was a little minor decision. (Lee/2.5-29)

**Time and energy intensive.** As I have alluded to at various points in the previous two sections, the above outlined benefits to utilization of the event management process were to some degree tempered by participants’ observations that: (1) use of the process required time to transform into habit; (2) it increased the amount of time spent on the analysis of events; and (3) it demanded greater thought and energy from the user(s). Participants were of the uniform opinion that these factors were outweighed by the beneficial results of utilizing the process (All.2.3; MC-1).

As I observed participants using their emerging event management process, it became apparent that following its structure typically required a great deal of time and energy. During both series of interviews I therefore made a point of asking participants if they found the process inordinately demanding or laborious. In response to my question, Lee indicated that it was conceivable that people could make it such a complex process that it would become of little practical value.

_Ted: Do you think we could make it too complex?_

Lee: I think -- well yes, I think its like anything else. You can dissect things and assess things and never make a decision... Yes. I think we could. (Lee/1.3-36)
At the same time however both Lee and Drew argued that people will make of it what they will and therefore, if it were to become burdensome, it would be a reflection of those making use of it and/or the situation rather than something fundamental to the process itself (Drew/2.2-3; Lee/2.5-27). As Drew stated in this regard:

Drew: I think our decisions, certainly mine, will be twenty times greater but, boy do you ever have to put constraints on your usual style of doing things.

Ted: Could it be too much of a burden to be practical?

Drew: No. No, because I think it’s also flexible enough that people will use it in whatever way fits their style, when it suits their purpose. Which is fine.

Just in the same way as some people know, “I really ought to do this, such-and-such about myself better,” and when it suits, they’ll do it but, they’re certainly not making a life change.

We get so intense here that it’s like, if it’s good we say to ourselves, “It has to be a life change” (laughs). So, we make it burdensome. I think that’s inherent in us, not in it. (Drew/2.2-3)

Alex, Jamie, Lawren, and Drew acknowledged that utilization of the event management process was a time consuming and sometimes demanding process. They added that to make it an effective practice, people have to make a commitment to investing the time required to incorporate it as a normative part of their group culture (Alex/1.4-60/2.4-19; Jamie/1.5-43; Drew/2.2-3; Lawren/2.1-17). Lawren expressed this view in the following terms:

...the model requires, not only practice to use it but awareness to use it... like the practical guide to the universe, you’ve got to open it for it to be any good to you -- let’s get into the habit of using it and let’s go. It’s like learning to play a musical instrument. It is tedious at first, and you make a lot of mistakes, but soon you’re feeling a lot better about it and playing it every day. And, I see this as the same thing. You’ve got to go through that learning curve... where it’s very rocky and slow, and then you just start going because you have a history of good decisions. You’re more practised at using the terminology and the words. You’re not embarrassed to bring
out the sheet and say, “Hey! Let’s check this.” And a culture starts building up around the model... (Lawren/2.1-17)

In this regard, Drew and Alex reported being pleased that they had “forced” themselves to use the model, for through its use they were far more confident in the decisions they made and event management plans they constructed (Drew/2.2-3; Alex/2.4-19). As Alex explained:

Alex: I always feel like where we end up after your process is so much greater than where we started. And yet, before we used to stay there and make the decision.... I feel so much more confident with it because, even when I’m making decisions at the beginning without going through the process, I’ll have feelings pulling at me where it’s not completely fitting. Where I think it’s okay, but I’ll have anxiety a little bit. And then I’ll think, “Well, that’s just you.” Where when I go through it, I mean each time we’ve done that, I feel really confident with our decision.... (Alex/2.4-18)

...I don’t have much tolerance for detail. And yet, I’ll have tolerance for detail when it’s meaningful.... I found that to be meaningful detail.

Ted: Could it be too laborious?

Alex: No. But, I think it’s something that you almost have to force yourself through to be effective. And so, you have to be patient and force yourself to be patient because... I don’t think there’s a shortcut -- to do it well.

To really manage well, you can’t take shortcuts, like making decisions without thinking through all the things that we have on our checklist... Like what are our flaws? What are our downfalls? How’s this going to impact on others? That’s tedious. How many managers will even stop to think about that? I guess... they don’t think its crucial. (Alex/2.4-19)

Alex’s comments effectively illustrate the participants’ uniform view that while application of the LCCT was indeed time and energy intensive, the benefits of the process outweighed this limitation by a wide margin. In short, participants deemed the investment of time well worth the return in terms of confidence gained in decisions, prospective problems averted, and overall increased intentionality in the management of events (MC-2).
(All.3) Unanticipated Utilizations

In addition to the intended utilizations of the training, participants reported using the process in ways I had not initially anticipated. Just as on the group level, on an individual level they each used the training process to identify and change habits and tendencies which they evaluated as inhibitory to their individual participation in event and culture management processes. Further, several participants introduced elements of their emergent event management process to middle management personnel to include them in the analysis and management of complex events. In this section I present data which illustrate both of these unforeseen utilizations of the training process.

Personal changes. On the individual level, participants evaluated the training as useful for identifying personal habits which impeded their effective participation in event and culture management processes within or beyond the team. This awareness enabled each of them to develop personal plans to resist, counteract, or transform these habits and tendencies (All.3.1; All.3.2). As on the group level, several participants reported being better able to resist personal tendencies to move quickly to closure which often led them to circumvent a thorough analysis of events. In addition, a number indicated that they had increased their capacity to resist feelings of defensiveness when others offered differing interpretations of reality. In so doing, they reported becoming better able to manage disagreements and conflictual situations. In this section I elaborate on the nature of the individual changes participants reported making through the training process.

All participants conveyed the sense that the training had been useful as a vehicle for facilitating reflection on their individual approaches to participation in the definition and management of events. Similar to the culture audit, this personal reflection led participants to undertake efforts to transform those patterns and tendencies which they deemed inconsistent with their personal ideals as managers. For instance, a number of participants reported becoming aware that their personal tendencies to move quickly to closure often worked against their effective participation in event and culture management processes. Just as on the group level, these individual tendencies served to circumvent
thorough analyses of events, and therefore, resulted in the construction of premature event management plans. In this regard, Drew stated that while use of their event management process was often time consuming, he considered the decisions reached from doing so superior to those reached without going through the process. In his words:

...on one hand I guess you could say its burdensome -- simply because I like to have things over and done with. I have to fight that.

But, I honestly believe that the decisions are so much better that that’s powerful enough in me now to really counter -- so I can let it ride for a while and see what unfolds and... that kind of thing. And, and now I'm finding I'm doing it. (Drew/2.2-17)

Lee and Alex's experiences were similar to Drew's. Lee indicated that she felt a temptation to resolve organizational problems quickly. Consequently, she had, at times, found their new event management process "time consuming," "stressful," and "draining." However, at the same time she considered it "extremely helpful" and believed the disadvantages were outweighed by the considerable advantages (Lee/1.3-21). Alex reported becoming "more methodical" and better able to deal with her impatience over event management processes when her personal issues had been triggered (Alex/2.4-2 /2.4-10 /2.4-18). For instance, she had become better at allowing such processes to unfold while taking the realities of others into account, rather than pushing for closure. She stated:

...I tend to be into efficiencies. I can get into being quick. I'm probably less that way now. I'm more methodical as a result.

One of the things I realized was... I have to be more patient with the process. I think I'm good at process but, sometimes I get impatient. I want things done. I can be very patient with certain things... but, other things that trigger my issues... -- I don't want to tolerate -- like conflicts that are really escalated. Then I miss process. (Alex/2.4-16)

Overall, several participants reported that the training had enabled them to change how they felt about, and therefore approach, the management of
disagreements and conflictual situations. For instance, Drew indicated that the constructivist notions of subjectivity and reality construction had been instrumental in helping him depersonalize disagreements and focus on the content of the realities in dispute. As he remarked,

...it helps take away some of the emotions for me, because I can remind myself that what's going on, in part -- the reason there's disagreement is that they're coming from a different interpretation. They're coming from a different reality. It helps me a lot with letting go, and approaching it as something that is depersonalized -- separate from me. (Drew/2.2-17)

Similarly, Alex indicated that she had become less defensive when others offered alternative interpretations of events. She illustrated this with description of a recent team meeting in which she was able to avoid feeling defensive when one member disagreed with the definition of reality that she and the other team members had come to favour. As she recounted,

...in that meeting somebody said, "I understand what you're saying but, I don't agree with it." So, I said, "Okay. Well, what are you seeing?"

And s/he had a different construction of reality... and the whole table had it different and, s/he said, "I'm okay with it. I understand what you're trying to do, but I would go at it like this...".

And I said "well you know, you're right but, this is how we choose to define it" -- which is where I bring in your stuff [referring to the LCCT] -- "Well I guess I'm feeling more comfortable defining it this way. So, I think both our solutions are right. I think we're just picking which definition of the problem we're going to deal with." And so, s/he was comfortable with that.

It's an interesting way to manage. (Alex/2.4-45)

In essence then, Alex was better able to engage with the team member in a genuine examination of the two competing realities. This dialog ended with both acknowledging the validity of the others' proposed definition, but with an agreement to act on a single course of action. Neither perspective was ultimately defined as right or wrong, and a decision was reached without defensiveness or hostility.
**Utilization with supervisory staff.** Several participants reported finding basic elements of the team’s event management process useful when introduced to, and employed with, their respective treatment team supervisors (e.g., Stakeholder Reality Analyses: Who are the stakeholders in this event, and what do we anticipate they will think and feel about the situation? etc.) (All.3.3). Lawren was one of the first to do so, and described his experiences in the following terms:

> That whole part of checking other people’s realities, or checking realities beyond your own -- that part of it I find really useful. I’ve used it a few times over here with the team leaders and they jump right at it -- I mean they get right on to it, and really start thinking “ya there is another way of looking at this, and lets check decisions.”

> So that’s something already I’ve seen with other people -- it kind of opens up another... well another reality I guess -- another way of looking at the same situation. I’ve just gone through “Okay, we think it’s a good idea, what do you think staff would see it as? Put yourself in their shoes, how would they perceive it?” And some of it was the opposite of the way we perceived it. So that part of what you’re presenting to us I’ve found very useful. (RJ.06.10.94-1)

In similar fashion, Jamie reported finding the concepts of reality construction and other-reflexiveness useful for involving her supervisors in visualizing how others (e.g., team members and clients) were likely to perceive and react to plans and policies prior to their actual implementation. As she explained,

> ...I’m able to work with the supervisors around this... and explain to them why we need to delay a decision, or find out what it means to staff and that kind of thing. Its helpful with working with them, to also get them to think about that, and to visualize it. (Jamie/2.3-12)

**Interpretation and Discussion**

The first objective of this project was to facilitate the empowerment of participants’ through the construction of a local event and culture management
process capable of supporting their efforts to achieve their cultural ideal. Through the training process participants integrated their foundational values and assumptions with the conceptual framework of the LCCT to produce an event and culture management process customized to their cultural context and objectives. As evidenced by the participants' affirmative evaluations of their EMP and the various Team Culture Transformation Measures they designed and implemented over the course of the initiative, I suggest that the training process proved an effective vehicle for facilitating the emancipatory agenda of this project.

The improvements identified by the participants to their event management process did not come without some cost. Utilization of their EMP had the dual effect of making the management of events and culture more complex, but at the same time, more thorough, proactive, and reflexive. In contrast to traditional approaches to leadership training and practice that are intended to simplify the leadership process, the participants' event management process served to increase complexity.

In this regard, use of the EMP broadened the horizon of each event by prompting participants to generate forms of information that they came to regard as vital to managing events in a manner supportive of their cultural ideal. Thus, to their event management routine they incorporated sub-processes designed to: (1) generate insights into the realities of stakeholders; and (2), prompt attention to the personal and collective issues which might be inadvertently influencing their event management process. This had the effect of increasing the range of information the participants had to generate, and the quantity they had to process and integrate into their final decisions.

As participants reported, this often made the process tedious and complex. At the same time however, they were uniform in their agreement that engaging in this process improved their overall analysis of events as it also provided an effective structure for managing this complexity. Ultimately then, participants evaluated the training process and outcomes they produced in highly positive terms. They considered the process a useful vehicle for facilitating their development of a local theory-based event management
process, and evaluated the actual process they created as a useful framework for simultaneously managing events and intentionally shaping culture. In this regard, through the use of their event management process they felt more confident in the decisions they reached, and found they could anticipate and manage the ramifications of their decisions in a more proactive and reflexive fashion.

With respect to the second primary objective of this initiative -- to inform and sophisticate the training process as an applied knowledge construction -- a number of insights can be extrapolated from this evaluation of the training’s utility. The most straightforward of these is that the strong affirmative results of this initiative for facilitating the emancipatory objectives of the training suggest that similar results could be obtained in similar cultural contexts.

In this regard, the central objectives underlying the major revision made to the research design at its midpoint (i.e., to postpone inclusion of the agency’s middle management staff and extend the study with the senior management team), have been satisfied. This decision was reached when the management team was still in a somewhat culturally destabilized condition, and it was as yet unclear whether, or to what degree, the training would prove useful. The underlying rationale was to provide an opportunity for the team to restabilize, and to permit a more thorough evaluation of the impact of the training to assess whether a second training initiative was even warranted. Having completed this evaluation, the data seems to support the viability of conducting subsequent training initiatives. Obviously, any assessment of the potential pragmatic utility of the training in highly dissimilar cultural contexts must wait for studies in such contexts.

In more instrumental terms, a number of the evaluation findings presented above have relevance for shaping future training initiatives. Of particular relevance are the findings relating to: (1) the measures participants developed to transform aspects of their normative event management process which were inconsistent with their cultural ideal; (2) the personal changes participants made in their individual approaches to participation in the event management process; and (3), the time and energy intensiveness of the
participants' emergent event management process. I discuss the practical implications of each of these findings in turn.

**Supporting collective transformations.** Regarding the changes participants initiated to their existent event management process (i.e., practices implemented to resist their tendencies to be driven to achieve closure, and prematurely accept the first offered definition of reality, etc.), it is noteworthy that I had no formal procedures for facilitating awareness of normative practices inconsistent with their cultural ideal. In other words, these insights regarding habitual event management practices emerged naturally during the application phase of the training, and there was no predefined process to promote or facilitate their emergence. As I indicated in Chapter Two, this application phase was designed to be the most emergent and unstructured of the three training phases and while it nonetheless proved effective in this context, there is no assurance that such would be the case in other contexts. For instance, it is likely that this process was so successful because the participants themselves were highly reflexive about their own part in the event and culture management process.

Given that this level of reflexiveness cannot be assured in future contexts, it seems judicious to establish a preliminary framework for bringing more structure to the application phase of the training process. I see this as particularly important in view of my sense that I might have supported this process more intentionally and efficiently had I been more aware of and intentional about identifying these inconsistencies between habitual practices and underlying values and assumptions. In future initiatives, after the initial analysis of foundational values and assumptions, it might prove beneficial to incorporate an analysis of the participants' existent event management process to determine the consistency of their normative practices and group dynamics with their now explicit cultural ideal.

Such an extension of the culture audit represents the next level of analysis between fundamental values and assumptions and surface level manifestations which, while implied by the LCCT's model of culture, was not formally incorporated into the training process (see Figure 2 -- The Structure of
Culture). Such an analysis might focus on identifying dynamics such as shortcuts in data collection (i.e., as in this study where participants were not consistently taking time to analyze the realities of stakeholders), and inconsistencies between stated values and actual management practices (e.g., we value employee involvement, but we make decisions without their input, representation, or opportunity to react to proposals). This extension of the culture audit would be particularly important if working with a group that was somewhat less reflexive than the current participant group, and could be omitted or scaled down if the group demonstrated that they were already identifying and transforming such inconsistencies.

**Supporting personal transformations.** In a similar vein, the emergent results pertaining to the personal changes participants made to their respective approaches to participation in the leadership process suggest the possibility of incorporating a segment of the training to facilitate individual reflection on their habits, biases, and personal issues. For instance, if a group assumed that productivity improvements would be realized if the employees were regularly consulted, a manager might realize through such an analysis that she had a habit of dominating team meetings and impeding employee input.

The objective would not to be to make everyone’s approach to participation in the leadership process identical, but rather to ensure that elements of one’s unique approach are not in conflict with the collective event and culture management objectives. I expect that such an exercise would be conducted on an individual basis, and away from the group. Moreover, this could easily prove to be the most personally threatening portion of the training, and therefore, should probably be offered as an optional part of the process to those interested in engaging in this next level of analysis and critique.

Perhaps the single most interesting potentiality of such an exercise, beyond the ideas individuals might extract about their own habitual participation in the event management process, would be the prospects for the conscious identification of conflicts between personal values and assumptions, and those espoused by the collective. Returning to the above illustration, it might become
evident to the manager that she does not hold to the larger group's belief that employees have any seriously useful input to offer. The identification of such inconsistencies between one's personal reality and the collective's foundational reality could lead to a range of actions on the part of the manager. It may be a decision to manage according to cultural expectations in spite of personal beliefs, or alternatively, the manager may attempt to change the collective's reality on the issue. In the extreme case, the conflict between personal reality and the reality of the collective may be so great that the manager chooses to exit the organization.

**Application demands.** I turn now to a discussion of the implications of the participants' assessment that while the event management process they developed was superior to their original approach, it also demanded more time and energy to utilize. While it is entirely possible for some future group to construct an LCCT-based event management process which is actually less time consuming (particularly if they had previously been exceedingly slow in their efforts to manage events), prospective participants need to be cautioned that the process they create may prove more time and energy intensive than their current leadership approach. That is, prospective participants must be prepared for the eventuality that not only could the training process be demanding, but the subsequent application of the product of their work could be equally so.

In the present initiative this was one of my emerging concerns as the participants' EMP was under development; that their event management process might become inordinately demanding. If such had proved to be the case, the training would have proved meaningful to participants, but its application too impractical to be considered useful. Indeed, the early versions of the EMP were largely unworkable (contrast Appendix M: EMP 1.0 to Appendix N: EMP 1.3.1).

I anticipate that this eventuality might be greatest with a group primarily interested in becoming more "efficient" leaders. There is a large body of popular leadership literature focused on providing fast and efficient prescriptions for addressing one's management problems (among the earliest
and most notable is Blanchard and Johnson’s 1982 book *The One Minute Manager*. This literature both reflects and reinforces the desires of many organizations to become optimally efficient in every aspect of organizational life. Any group expecting to achieve outcomes of this nature from the LCCT training process seems likely to be disappointed in that it is not only not prescription focused, but at its core, it is based on a reflexive and deliberate approach to managing events. Consequently, I suggest that the training would most likely prove useful to collectives who are aware of and value culture as an important dynamic for organizational functioning, are process oriented rather than outcome driven, and willing to invest time to manage even innocuous events intentionally and reflexively so as to proactively shape culture.

*Evaluation Conclusions*

In closing this section I propose that the training initiative met, and in several respects exceeded, the original meaningfulness and utility criteria. With respect to meaningfulness, participants reported that the training: proved readily intelligible and highly relevant; played an important role in expanding their understanding of themselves as an organizing collective; provided an avenue for generating novel insights into the realities of themselves and others; and reframed their conceptualizations of leadership and culture. From the standpoint of the training’s practical utility, participants reported that the process enabled them to fulfill their original objective of generating a leadership theory effective for guiding both their proactive management of everyday events, and their efforts to intentionally shape the nature of their organizational culture.

Accordingly, the emancipatory aims of this inquiry were achieved. The training facilitated the participants’ process of generating critical forms of emancipatory knowledge (i.e., insights into the preconscious elements of their foundational reality), and then supported their efforts to use this knowledge as a foundation for initiating action to intentionally transform their social conditions.

From the standpoint of the development of the training process as a potentially transferable applied knowledge construction, these affirmative evaluation findings provide the grounds to assert that thematically similar
results could be achieved in similar cultural contexts. At the same time, interpretations of the data generated in this study suggest certain modifications to the training process that should be incorporated into future initiatives. In this regard, the evaluation agenda of this project has served to inform and sophisticate the training process in a number of important respects.

In particular, an interpretation of the manner in which participants brought their event management practices into accord with their fundamental values and assumptions suggests that further development of the application phase of the training is warranted. Providing greater structure to this phase could prove helpful to participants as they customize the LCCT framework to reflect and facilitate their cultural objectives. An additional segment of this process might be offered to individual participants to support their analysis of the congruence between their personal event management habits and values, and the cultural objectives they are attempting to foster.

In terms of preparing a collective for participation in an LCCT training initiative, in addition to the necessary cautions regarding the potential risks of the process, prospective participants need to be made aware that rather than simplifying the leadership process, participation could make it more complex. That is, participants need to appreciate in advance that the event management process they develop through the training could prove more time and energy intensive to utilize than their existent approach to leadership. This caution should be counterbalanced with thorough explanations of the potential benefits that might be realized through the process. Thus, as a result of this study the scope and depth of the potential benefits and liabilities that could be realized by participants is better understood.

On the basis of these interpretations I offer two general conclusions regarding future applications of the LCCT training process. First, there is sufficient evidence to warrant the judicious application of the training process with groups who are culturally similar to the current participant group (e.g., the next level of management at BMHC, other similar mental health centres, etc.). While there are risks involved in the process which must always be made explicit, it is clear that participation in the training has the potential to facilitate
participants' process of bringing about powerful cultural transformations.

Second, in ideal terms, the next step in the development of the LCCT training process as an applied knowledge construction would be to conduct a research initiative with a collective who are open to the constructivist metatheory, process-oriented, and willing to invest time and energy into the management of their culture, but who have created a dissimilar culture from that of BMHC. Other minimum cultural preconditions that should be in place are discussed at the end of this chapter when I present participants' feedback regarding the potential transferability of the training.

In the following section I turn to the exploratory research agenda. Given that in constructivist research the researcher cannot know in advance what it is he or she does not know, I incorporated this open-ended agenda to facilitate the generation of data which could not be anticipated. This avenue of investigation produced numerous insights into the application of the training process useful for refining and steering future LCCT initiatives.

(B) Exploration of the Training Process

While the point of the evaluation agenda was to determine whether the training process was useful for that which it was developed. The point of the exploration agenda was to capture insights into the process that could not be anticipated in advance of the research. Thus, this open-ended agenda facilitated the generation of data which were beyond the scope of the more narrowly focused evaluation agenda. Consequently, the data produced served to inform the theory and sophisticate the training process in ways which would have been impossible through the evaluation agenda alone. In this section I present and discuss the results which emerged through this second research agenda. The following three thematic questions served as initial guidelines for my explorations of the training process:

1. An exploration of participant experiences as they learned about and used the LCCT, and the meanings they ascribed to these experiences.
2. An exploration of how participants made and did not make sense of and use the LCCT. In this respect, it was important to learn how different participants interpreted the theory, how they put it to use in their daily interactions, and how these understandings and applications might differ from the theory as it was initially constructed.

3. An exploration of any changes/transformations that participants perceived in themselves, others, and/or their group as they became familiar with the LCCT and its application. In this regard, it was important to identify the indicators of change, as well as the meanings that these changes held for participants.

The process by which data emerged through this inquiry was in many respects steered by these general lines of inquiry. However, data generation was in no way restricted to these themes. Rather it was allowed to emerge according to participants' interests and insights as the training unfolded.

I have divided my discussion of the exploration results into two sections, each of which corresponds to an emergent super-ordinate theme. The first section focuses on the impact that the training process had on participants individually and as an organizing collective, and what can be extrapolated from these experiences for future training initiatives. The second deals with insights which suggest specific modifications to the LCCT training process. The majority of the themes I discuss in these sections emerged through the interview data, however, I have supplemented these results with supporting data from the reflexive journal.

**(Bl.) Impact of the Training Process**

In this section I focus on data pertaining to the unanticipated effects of the training process. I explore the impact which certain aspects of the process had on participants, both as individuals and as a collective. The section is divided into two parts. The first summarizes individual participant's reports concerning their psychological experience of the training. In this regard, a number of categories emerged which summarize participants' affective and cognitive responses to various aspects of the training. The second focuses specifically on the unanticipated effects that the culture audit had on the participants as an
organizing collective. Here I deal with participant feedback regarding the team’s destabilization, their process of restabilization, and participant speculations pertaining to potential ramifications of the culture audit in future training initiatives.

(Bl.1) Individual Impact

Participants reported a number of affective and cognitive reactions to the training, or various parts of it, which I did not explicitly anticipate at the outset of the research. Four major themes emerged from the interview data: (1) an increased openness to alternative interpretations of reality; (2) feelings of alienation among new members; (3) the stressfulness of the training process; and (4), the intellectual stimulation of the theoretical content. Participants typically offered this data in response to the “free-association” questions which I used to open and close each of the interviews.

**Increased openness to alternative realities.** Participants uniformly indicated that through the training process they had developed a greater “openness” to alternative and transforming definitions of reality (Bl.1.2). This increased openness was expressed in relation to: (1) the differing realities held by others; (2) the transitory nature of reality; and (3) the validity of their own constructions of reality in relation to those held by others.

Drew reported that the training had helped him become less attached to his own point of view. As he put it,

> I think it’s helped me let go. It’s helped me let go a bit, of my point of view. And made it a little easier for me to let things ride, and get synthesized over time. (Drew/2.2-4).

Moreover, this experience of being less invested in one reality generalized beyond the team. For instance, during meetings both within and beyond BMHC, he reported that prior to the training:

> I’d be a little more judgmental. I’m a little less so now. I do find myself thinking, “Isn’t that interesting. That’s... how they’re reading reality.” (Drew/2.2-6)
He indicated that this was instrumental in helping him deal with the realities of others in a less personalized way (Drew/2.2-18).

Likewise, Alex reported that the insights into alternative realities had been "very helpful" at work and beyond in the sense that she felt more at ease with people who expressed different realities from her own. This had enabled her to be less concerned about being "right" or being concerned whether others agreed with her reality. As she stated:

...it's been very helpful for me across the board. Not only at work, but everywhere -- that is, it's okay for people to have different realities and to not need to be right or care whether you agree.

It's a freeing kind of thing... It's more comfortable... [and] makes you less controlling... to know that there isn't a "right" way.

(Alex/2.4-46)

Accordingly, Alex found it easier to acknowledge and accept the changing nature of her own view of reality over time. This enabled her to avoid feeling "stuck" in her current reality, and to acknowledge it as a choice made among many possible choices which could be remade at a later point. She explained,

...for me, it's made me more open. Because, I also find I'm saying things to myself like, "Oh gosh! Probably in a year I'll think all this is stupid" (laughing). I take myself less seriously, and I also am more open to the fact that a year ago what I thought no one could budge me on... now, I'm thinking "maybe?" I remember somebody saying something two years ago and thinking "that doesn't make any sense." And now, I'm going back to that thinking, "That's exactly what we need to do."

It sort of makes you feel less stuck in your own reality... And so, when people get into thinking their right, they're right sometimes in terms of their perception, but not necessarily that they're perception is the only one to look at.

But this, it makes me much more comfortable with myself... I find that I'm not as committed to defending my definitions from other definitions of reality... You know it's yours as opposed to being "the right one," and that you don't need people to see it as the right one in order for it to be okay with you. I just see it as
mine. It's okay if other people see it differently: "Okay, that's your's and this is mine, and I'm not saying you're wrong, (laughs)... maybe next week I'll believe it."

My interactions I think are less defensive and more open. I'm probably more open to hearing what other people have to say. (Alex/2.4-46).

Similarly, Lee stated that he had begun to look at his current construction of reality with a new appreciation for its transitory nature. This gave rise to the understanding that aspects of today's reality would likely seem out of line or inappropriate at some point in the future. He indicated that this became particularly evident as he had been examining old policies which were appropriate when they were originally introduced, but which now seemed "so foreign" and out of place in the reality of the present. In his words:

...yesterday they were digging out old policies and saying "Lee, does this still fit? Do we still need this, do we still need that?" And like I say, with some of the stuff that was written, it made sense at the time, you know -- "telephone privileges" -- whatever. It all made sense at the time, and now it's just right off. It just doesn't fit at all. (Lee/1.3-9)

Finally, Jamie indicated that the concept of multiple realities introduced in the training had been freeing in that it had helped her realize that because her reality varied from those of others who she respected, it in no way invalidated her perspective. As she stated:

...to hear that there are many different realities gives it a perspective for me that, if mine's different it's not necessarily wrong. It's like this fear, that I'm wrong! (chuckles)... But, that part is reassuring to me. (Jamie/1.5-3)

**Alienation of new members.** During the first series of interviews, several of the core team members expressed concerns that the new members might be experiencing a sense of alienation or separateness from the remainder of the group. There concerns stemmed from the culture audit sessions. During this phase of the training the core members were most active
in the process (as they were most involved in the creation of the team culture), while the new members tended to adopt more of an observer role. In subsequent interviews I explored these concerns with the new team members. They confirmed that they had experienced feelings of alienation, particularly in light of the core members’ rich history of working and interacting with one another (Bl.1.1).

For instance, at one point early in the culture audit, when a flood of preconscious aspects of the team culture were being made conscious, Jamie felt that he “didn’t quite fit.” Moreover, he experienced a sense of loss for he had previously been a longstanding member of another team prior to joining the management group, and became acutely aware that he no longer enjoyed the security of knowing the established group history, interaction patterns, and ways of making sense of non-normative events. In essence, he became keenly aware that he had to “start from the beginning.” This contrast served to heighten his sense of alienation.

Jamie described this experience in the following terms:

...it’s a little bit of a difficult position, when you’re in a peer group that has had a long history together, and I haven’t really been feeling it strongly but, when we started the training there was a point... when I felt, somehow I didn’t quite fit or I didn’t have all this history. And its a little bit of a loss or a feeling of loss because where I came from, I had that history and I could tell all the stories of, “Oh back in 19XX this happened, this is why we don’t do this because we did it before and it was a disaster.”

And now it’s like, “Oh, I have to start from the beginning.” And so that heightened that for me. So its heightened my awareness. I hadn’t in the past, but somehow, I’m beginning to feel that... But this is just part of the growth process of being in the group. (Jamie/1.5-45)

Likewise, Lee indicated that at times she felt somewhat alienated as she lacked the intensity of relationships which the core members shared by virtue of their long, close, and trusting association.

I don’t feel sometimes as connected... I don’t have the history with them, and I don’t have the relationship, and they have gone
through a lot. So in some of that sense, I feel more distant. (Lee/1.3-10)

**Stressfulness of the training process.** All participants reported that at various points in the process they had each experienced the training as personally stressful (Bl.1.3). As I have suggested in my discussions of the culture audit, this phase of the process was the single most stressful for all participants (myself included). The central source of the stress for participants was the intimate nature of their cultural explorations. As they made the preconscious elements of their culture conscious, the normally implicit inconsistencies, disagreements, and points of contention became explicit and impossible not to acknowledge. The analogy of a family in therapy is informative in this regard. When that which is understood but unsaid is said for the first time, it is stressful for the entire family. A family norm is violated, and the typically unsaid issue is overtly exposed and cannot easily be ignored.

As Lee reported, the depth of the cultural exploration made the process "frightening" at various times, and led her to wonder at those moments whether it was all worth it. While she acknowledged that this type of introspection was the point of the process, it required a great deal of "emotional energy" to sustain.

...when we've been in there, we've been really dissecting things (laughing)... to the point where its been frightening at times -- when you think you know, should we just sow it back up and forget it! (laughing) ...who needs this! ...it somehow stirs up some conflicts that can be stressful. Certainly when you care about everybody in the room too, and you see that happening -- I mean, that's what the whole training is pushing towards, really. Is to come to that. And yet, to do it just takes an awful lot of emotional energy, and you wonder how many people would go through it really. (Lee/1.3-5)

Jamie commented that while the process was "helpful and reassuring" in some ways, it had also been "difficult" and "anxiety provoking" (Jamie/1.5-15). Overall, she reported that,
...It was probably a lot more emotionally impactful, then I was thinking... definitely the emotional impact is there. (Jamie/1.5-27)

Similarly, Alex indicated that the process had been "incredibly painful" in many ways for everyone in the group (Alex/1.4-6). He accounted for this pain in the following terms:

...my perception is, that we're getting on with being honest, and working through some important issues. So it doesn't feel like it usually feels. It usually feels comfortable. (Pause) So I don't think it's a matter of us being hurtful to each other; we're being honest with each other. (Alex/1.4-27)

Overall, he indicated that although the process had been unnerving at various points, he never felt the training should be terminated or that it would have been better never to have begun (Alex/1.4-53 /1.4-56). As he explained,

...I have been unnerved and I have been uncomfortable. But not in the sense of feeling like its not okay, or I don't want to do it, or I wish that this didn't happen. (Alex/1.4-53)

Lawren was of the view that the "unsettledness" she and the group had experienced was a necessary part of the process of examining the foundations of their culture from new perspectives. Thus, the stress they experienced was indicative of the team's unfinished cultural business. She suggested that the initial intensity of their experience had shaken their confidence in their motives, decision making, and history of adherence to values. While they were now more settled, none had been unaffected by the experience (Lawren/2.1-34).

**Intellectual stimulation.** As part of my efforts to ensure that the training did not become a "technique oriented" approach to leadership (i.e., where the underlying values, assumptions, and theoretical dynamics remain implicit), throughout the process I was careful to introduce and discuss the details and dynamics of the LCCT and its underlying constructivist metatheory. The participants found this aspect of the training both intellectually stimulating and exciting (Bl.1.5; MC-1).
For instance, Drew reported “loving the intellectual stimulation” of the process, and found the concepts introduced “absolutely fascinating” (Drew/1.1-5 /1.1-7 /1.1-52 /1.2-2). In similar fashion, Lawren stated that the training was “really interesting” and “very stimulating” (Lawren/1.2-33). In the first interview he said that he was enjoying the training and was looking forward to learning more about the theory. Moreover, he commented that he was certain that the members of the team were enthusiastic about the training because it was clear from their informal post-session discussions that the theory was making a great deal of sense to each of them (Lawren/1.2-65 /1.2-77). As he described,

I think we’re actually excited about it... And for my part, I kind of enjoy it -- I enjoy the intellectual exercise part of it -- I see value in it. And that’s why I’m eager to do more of the theory framework and the application... (Lawren/1.2-65)

Interpretation and Discussion

These findings regarding the trainings’ impact on the individual participants, offer a number of insights into the conduct of future training initiatives. They also raise some interesting questions for subsequent research. In this section I discuss the implications of these findings for informing and sophisticating the training process.

The increased openness to alternative realities reported by participants I attribute largely to their acceptance of the constructivist metatheory upon which the LCCT was constructed. Their feedback during sessions and the first series of interviews suggested that, for the most part, each of the constructivist concepts introduced in the first training session was familiar, but they had never had them presented as an integrated system for thinking about and perceiving social reality.

I consider these findings supportive of my original conviction that the constructivist metatheory should be made explicit form the outset of the training so that participants have a clear and conscious opportunity to accept or reject the definition of reality that it imposes. This is essential form both an ethical and pragmatic standpoint. Ethically, I see it as my responsibility to make my
ontological position explicit to participants as part of the informed choice process. Pragmatically, the LCCT makes little sense (beyond the Leadership Process Phase Model as a simple problem solving structure [Figure 1]) if the constructivist tenets are not understood and actively employed in the theory's application.

Thus, this enhanced level of openness to alternative realities I consider a necessary first step in the training process as so much of what follows depends on a willingness to think in relativistic terms. Accordingly, indications that participants are reframing their experiences of reality in such terms may serve as something of a preliminary benchmark for assessing the progress of the training in its earliest stages. Such an assessment could prove invaluable for ensuring that either the training is terminated early if the collective is not accepting of the constructivist metatheory, or that remedial measures are taken to help participants grasp the concepts and their implications within their social context.

In a related vein, participants began making remarks about the intellectually stimulating nature of the training early into the process. Indications of this sort might also serve as a preliminary benchmark regarding participant acceptance and incorporation of the LCCT’s constructivist foundation. I offer this interpretation in more tentative terms than the previous because it is entirely possible that in a less psychologically oriented setting, the underlying theory and metatheory would not be experienced in these terms. That is, the BMHC participants had a rich, highly developed, and ever-evolving psychological model at the core of their foundational reality. A group somewhat less inclined to theorize about human social dynamics may therefore not find the experience as intellectually stimulating even if they are finding that they have begun to reframe their experience of social reality in the terms discussed above. Accordingly, enthusiastic interest such as expressed by participants in this study may be a useful, through not essential, early indicator that participants are experiencing the training in generally meaningful terms (i.e., that it is intelligible and relevant to their interests and experiences).
Turning now to the findings relating to the stressfulness of the training process and alienation of new members, the most straightforward lesson to be taken for future LCCT initiatives is that these eventualities can, but will not necessarily, occur in the course of the process. Given that both personal stress and alienation have been demonstrated as real potentialities, they must be emphasized as possible effects of the process prior to a group’s decision to undertake the training, and before each member makes a decision regarding their individual participation. I discuss these and the other cautions that must be provided to participants to establish informed consent in a subsequent section of this chapter.

The second lesson to take from these findings is that the trainer and participants must be vigilant in watching for signs of individual stress or alienation that may cause psychological harm to individuals and/or the social fabric of the collective. While the trainer’s responsibility in this regard is obvious, with respect to participants’ responsibility, it would seem paternalistic and disempowering to place this responsibility only in the hands of the facilitator. Indeed, in this study it was the core members of the team who drew the alienating effects of the process to my attention in the first place.

As I will discuss in more detail later, participants were of the view that while I was responsible for facilitating the process in as safe a manner as possible, it was their responsibility as a collective to provide emotional support to one another and attempt to resolve any distressing issues within their team. In their view, this had been their responsibility before the training, and they would not have a facilitator after the training to manage such eventualities. Thus, responsibility should not be surrendered during the training. According to this view, if the process is to be fully empowering for participants, they must be involved in, and responsible for, managing the risks in full partnership with the facilitator. As I will discuss in the following section, safety protocols that all parties to the process are aware of and support, need to be built into the process from the outset.

Overall, the individual impact themes discussed in this section strongly suggest that the training process was an extremely powerful experience for
participants -- more so in fact, than any of us expected. These results are particularly interesting in light of the observation that leadership training initiatives are not typically noted for stimulating reflexivity or evoking intense emotional reactions among participants.

In my view, these findings underscore a fundamental difference between typical mainstream approaches to leadership training and the LCCT training process. As I discussed in the first chapter, mainstream training is intentionally generic (i.e., "there is one best way to lead in any given situation"). The consequence of this approach is that the content remains separate and distinct from the people it is intended to serve. Conversely, the LCCT training process was intentionally tailored to the specific participants, and therefore became an extremely intimate process. That is, in adapting the training process to the expressed needs, interests and objectives of the participants, it became a highly personal and involving experience for each individual. While their active participation in shaping the process exposed their vulnerabilities, it also generated considerable excitement and fostered personal insights that seem less likely through a more generic and less personal approach.

Perhaps the central most important implication of this interpretation is that, regardless of how many such initiatives are conducted in future, the inherent intimacy of the process will make it impossible to anticipate how each LCCT training initiative is likely to unfold. The built-in customization of the process makes it an inherently unpredictable process in terms of what participants are likely to make of the content, how they will choose to structure the process, and what they will ultimately create as their unique event and culture management process.

(Bi.2) Impact of the Culture Audit

From a theoretical standpoint, I had always regarded the culture audit as essential to the achievement of the central training objective of developing a culturally contextualized event management process. With respect to application, I had for the most part assumed that if the audit indeed proved meaningful, participants would consider it an important exercise which
produced information useful for more intentionally shaping their group culture (I did however, include a caution in the consent form and my briefing warning that they could generate insights that might prove "uncomfortable or disturbing" — see Appendix R). Moreover, I expected that if participants did experience serious distress during the training, it would probably be a result of taking seriously the constructivist principles of social relativity and reality construction. The reverse proved to be the case. As I indicated in the previous section, the participants found the constructivist principles highly stimulating and even liberating, and the culture audit disturbing and culturally destabilizing.

In this section I discuss the data pertaining to the participants' experiences of their collective destabilization and restabilization process. These discussion is followed by a summary of participant speculations regarding two unanticipated potentialities of the culture audit. First, participants observed that the culture audit could facilitate conditions which might lead to irreparable damage to the social fabric of a group. Second, these same conditions could vastly enhance the enculturation of new group members.

**Team destabilization.** While all participants reported finding the culture audit a distressing and destabilizing period of the training, the core members' experiences differed from those of the new members. The core members reported finding the process personally distressing and, at times, even psychologically threatening. In contrast, the new members reported experiencing the process as emotionally charged and draining, but distressing only in an empathetic sense. In spite of the stressfulness of the culture audit, participants unanimously elected to see the process through to completion, and considered it a valuable and indispensable segment of the training and application process (Bl.2.4).

To facilitate continuance of the audit without further concern that the process might became excessively stressful and/or damage relationships, we negotiated several "safety protocols" to empower any individual to halt or redirect the group process (Bl.2.2). In this section I discuss the impact of the culture audit on the team, with emphasis on the differences between the experiences of core and new members. In the section following this, I provide a
summary and evaluation of the safety protocols negotiated by participants’ to help manage the stressfulness of the process.

The destabilization of the team was particularly acute for the core members as they had participated most in the creation of their culture. That is, the culture was in many respects an expression of their personal identities. As Drew explained, the discussions which occurred during the culture audit were very intense to the point of being psychologically threatening because many of the cultural insights to emerge were reflections of personal values and biases. As she explained during the first interview,

Drew: [The culture audit] can be threatening and scary, but if you stick with it, I think you can only be a better organization as a result.

Ted: Scary and threatening, in the sense that...?

Drew: Because the stuff that is news -- that turns out to be news -- is usually related very much to your own values, or personality and biases. (Drew/1.1-10)

She suggested that the process was akin to therapy in that it challenged one’s comfortable view of reality about one’s self and one’s self in relation to others. As she stated,

...what you’re doing with that [referring to the LCCT training] doesn’t get anymore intimate than that. That’s exactly what goes on in marriage therapy... that’s an incredibly shaking experience. (Drew/1.1-25)

At the same time she acknowledged that this intensity was of the group’s own choosing, as they could have elected to approach it on a more superficial and less personal level (this observation was itself, culturally informative).

It’s very threatening. But one does that to one’s self, depending upon what level you want to take it to. If we had left the discussions at a more content level or a more superficial level, it doesn’t need to be. Though we purposely, pushed ourselves. But, it was very threatening, and has resulted in fairly deep,
significant, emotionally laden discussions... (Drew/1.1-2)

Midway through the training, Lawren indicated that he felt some nervousness about how the process would unfold into the future (Lawren/1.2-1). He observed that the process had “really shaken up” every one of the group members at various points. Even so, he indicated that this was part of the growth process and strongly advocated the training’s continuance (Lawren/1.2-9). He summarized his experience in the following terms:

I think that what we have experienced is a kind of an unsettling thing, an unsettling process... I think part of the unsettledness comes from our own observations about what we’ve discovered for ourselves about what we think about our agency or ourselves -- what we think we’re projecting, and how it could be interpreted in different ways.

And some of the unsettledness is from observations by yourself, which are really more like questions back: “Could it be this? Could it be that?... Things that we might not have thought before, and I find it unsettling -- although I understand the exercise is to do some of that... I think that’s healthy for us in the long run. (Lawren/1.2-1)

Lawren anticipated that the group would start feeling better as they began working to address the unsettling issues that had emerged (e.g., their patterns of a “drive to closure,” “vow of poverty,” etc.).

I think as we move on towards making something out of it, then I think we’ll start feeling better as a group -- not that we feel bad, but I mean, its just a bit of an unsettled experience... I think that that’s the part I’m unsure about. How do we do that now. (Lawren/1.2-22)

During Alex’s first reflections on the culture audit, she conveyed that while she felt very positive about what had transpired, it had at the same time been a very difficult process.

I’m feeling really good about what’s happened. But I also think that its been incredibly difficult. But, I’m defining the “difficult”
as the reason that it's good. If it wasn't difficult, I don't think it would be good! (laughing)  (Alex/1.4-1)

In this regard, she indicated that a number of the insights into the nature and dynamics of the team culture were experienced by all participants as "overwhelming" (Alex/1.4-16 /1.4-19 /1.4-23). At the same time however, none of the issues the group had struggled with were, in her view, so critical that the group would not continue to function if they were not resolved -- and their resolution would only improve the group. As she explained,

...the fact that things have happened inappropriately, or we haven't had good discussions is more of a reflection of a problem in our group around specific things that have happened.

And I'm not seeing the things that have happened as that major... And I think that the discussions that we've had have been very good, and haven't been that big a deal when you really step back and think about it...

And whether we move forward with this or not is okay with me. It's not that big a deal for me, because I feel like we're okay the way we are. If we were able to work through that, we would be better. But if we're not, I can live with that...  (Alex/1.4-16)

During the second interview Alex explained that the culture audit had been destabilizing because they had intentionally disrupted their "comfortable" ways of being in relation to one another. That is, the team began looking critically at many of those aspects of their culture which were most genial and therefore, least scrutinized. People began feeling vulnerable as that which was safe and familiar about the culture was opened for conscious and explicit critique. As Alex stated:

I think we had ways of being that were comfortable. So, I compare it to a crisis that's similar to any situation. I think that what happened was we started to look at things and... we started to challenge the things that were comfortable for us. And, when those were taken away from us, or when that was sort of revealed in the process as a group... I think we got insecure with each other. I think it's very safe if you don't ever challenge (laughs). I think you've got to be unsafe for a while... I think that process
opened things up and made the group vulnerable...

The experiences of the new team members were unsettling as well, but for somewhat different reasons, and to differing degrees. For instance, Lee stated that while the process had been “frightening at times,” it was difficult less in a personal sense and more in an empathetic sense. That is, the audit was stressful because it illuminated various tensions which existed between people who, at the same time, cared a great deal for one another -- and for whom he cared. This demanded an unusually high degree of energy. As he explained during the first interview,

…it somehow stirs up some conflicts, and that can be stressful. Certainly when you care about everybody in the room too, and you see that happening. I mean, that’s what the whole training is pushing towards. Is to come to that. And yet, to do it just takes an awful lot of emotional energy.... (Lee/1.3-5)

You see, some of the stuff is just not so real for me. So it makes me feel uncomfortable probably for different reasons. Because they’re the ones who are pushing it forward. The scary part is when they start to touch on their stuff.

It might be different (laughing) if they were talking about me! Because I don’t have a history with them and I’m so new to that group, it’s a different reality for me.

What happens for me is I start worrying about relationships - - “Gees, is s/he going to walk out feeling sad?” And you know, “what’s so-and-so thinking? That’s where it gets a little stressful for me. But I have to trust that people can manage that... (Lee/1.3-15)

Jamie commented that the process had been emotionally difficult for her as well, but in a different sense from the core members given that she was relatively new to the team and thus, much of the culture was not of her making (Jamie/1.5-46 /2.3-19). As she explained,

I think it would be less personal [for me]. I wasn’t here to take part in building [the culture], although I feel like I’m kind of a good match with the culture here. So in that sense I feel like I can own it in some ways. (Jamie/1.5-46)
Implementation of safety protocols. The stressfulness of the culture audit led to the negotiation of several "safety protocols" to empower individual participants to prevent the group interactions from becoming excessively stressful or threatening (Bl.2.2; RJ.04.29.94-7; RJ.05.07.94-2). Most significant among these was the unanimous agreement that any participant would be unconditionally supported for halting or redirecting the group process should he or she indicate that the proceedings were becoming too intense or personally threatening. In addition, it was agreed that any participant had the right to debrief with any other consenting participant at any point after a session, and that I would be "on call" as a support/resource for debriefing both immediately after and anytime in between sessions (RJ.05.09.94-3).

As a result of the implementation of these protocols, participants reported that post-session debriefings became common place. These debriefings dealt with a range of issues from personal concerns to broader organizational issues (Bl.2.2; RJ.05.09.94-3). In addition, at several points participants chose to debrief with me after sessions (RJ.04.13.94-7; RJ.05.20.94-5; RJ.09.12.94-5). At several points throughout the remainder of the training individuals exercised their option to halt or redirect the group process. As Lee reported,

I think what we agreed to last time was that if people were feeling uncomfortable or not wanting to talk about something, that we needed to say that. There was one point I remember where one person was suggesting we go in a certain direction, and another very clearly said s/he wasn’t comfortable doing that at the time -- and so that stopped it at that point. And there’s been other moments of that, so I would think that we should continue to do that. (Lee/1.3-14)

Overall, participants evaluated these measures as necessary and effective for creating a more supportive training atmosphere, and for making the remainder of the process safer and less stressful (MC-1).

Team restabilization. By the end of the training all participants agreed that they had largely restabilized their team. This restabilization occurred as participants gradually resolved or accommodated the unsettling insights they had generated into their collective identity. Essentially, as the
shock and surprise subsided over time, the insights which they found so disturbing remained concerns, but were incorporated into their overall understanding of themselves as a functioning team.

However, the accommodation of this information was not the sole factor in their restabilization, as it was not merely the novelty of these insights which led to their initial experiences of destabilization. The foremost factor in their temporary loss of confidence in their foundational reality was the realization that there were incongruous, preconscious aspects of their culture which influenced their day-to-day management activities in powerful ways. What was critical to their process of restabilization then, was their conscious and intentional reorganization in response to these formerly preconscious elements of their culture.

The Event Management Protocol and Team Culture Transformation Measures were instrumental in this regard. The purpose of the culture transformation measures, and one of the central objectives of the EMP, was to provide a common framework for counteracting and transforming those aspects of their culture which they considered inconsistent with their cultural ideal (BI.2.5; MC-1). In this section I discuss participant feedback regarding restabilization of their culture subsequent to the destabilization they experienced during and after the culture audit.

As of the first interview Lawren indicated that he was looking forward to reaching a point in the process where the team could:

...[confirm]... some basic assumptions about ourselves and values, and things we believe in, and how we want to work... so that we can reestablish that we’re solid.... I want to pull it back together... so that we can all feel solid again. But not in an illusionary kind of way -- I want it to be real. (Lawren/1.2-17)

By the second interview, Lawren indicated that while a number of culture audit insights had led the group to feel “less good” about themselves, they had managed to reconsolidate themselves as a team, in part through accommodating the new insights into their understanding of themselves as a collective (Lawren/2.1-8).
Drew indicated that the culture audit process had made him very fearful for a while as the process became highly personal and an "overwhelming" realization emerged that nothing about their culture was ultimately "true." By the end of the process, however, he viewed this period of fear as a phase in the reflexive process which, after the fact, no longer seemed threatening or damaging. He described the team's restabilization in the following terms:

...It scared me there for a while. I'll be honest with you.
At the beginning of the culture audit, and of course when it got more personal. Plus the point that others have made that it's overwhelming to just suddenly start thinking, "My God! You mean there isn't one consistent thing that we do" -- if you can just find it, you're safe. Like, "the truth." (laughs)
...It feels like that was temporary and now I wouldn't say it has had any detrimental effects. (Drew/2.2-7)

Similarly, Lee explained that while there were some very difficult moments over the course of the training, these were in the past and the residual effects of the process were positive and without lingering personal or interpersonal damage. Thus, in her view, there was nothing about the process which should not have occurred. As she stated,

...there were some painful moments. Some stressful moments. I think they've kind of come and gone and I don't think that it's been a big barrier. And I think we all went through it. Some of it's just because... we can get so intense that you want the best out of it.
Maybe we hit on some sensitive nerves sometimes but, I really don't feel that there's any hard feelings or stuff that we just didn't get over.
It was frightening coming in a few times. I was thinking "what can of worms are we opening?" (laughing) ...But, overall, there's nothing that really hits me as being something that we shouldn't have done. (Lee/2.5-15)

She added that given the high level of motivation the team members possessed to utilize their new knowledge to make the transformations to which they had committed, she predicted that the team would continue to consolidate themselves around their new reality (Lee/2.5-18).
It is important to note that while the team felt that they had restabilized, not only had they not restabilized around their original foundational reality, but the reality they did come to organize around was more tentative and open than prior to the training. In opening their culture to critical self-reflection, many of the cultural insights which led to their destabilization remained active in their minds even as they restabilized. Consequently, a certain degree of the unsettledness persisted which enabled the group to achieve a new level of openness to alternative interpretations and possibilities.

As Alex described in the first interview (at about the height of their destabilization), the culture audit had revealed certain things about their culture which they found distressing, and it was not possible to return to being comfortable by pretending that these insights did not exist. This observation led her to question how the group would make the cultural transformations, or go about putting these disturbing facets of culture in perspective so that they could reestablish a level of comfort even with the knowledge of these issues. In her words,

...I have been unnerved and I have been uncomfortable. But not in the sense of feeling like its not okay, or I don't want to do it or I wish that this didn't happen. More in the sense of “Boy this has revealed stuff, and now we know about it, its hard to just pretend it isn't there now that its come up.”

So, how do you either get it better? Or, how do you get it back in perspective? Or, back feeling okay while letting the issues continue?

But the comparison I make is the same comparison I would make to individual therapy, or working on yourself. That, of course you go through the process of thinking “I wish I didn't know this” or “maybe it isn't true” or “who needs this shit anyway?” (laughing) and not wanting to sustain in the pain, and looking for ways to get the pain back in perspective and one way is to minimize that it ever happened (laughing) -- “and I don't see it anyway” and that kind of stuff. (Alex/1.4-54)

In the second interview Alex indicated that the group had restabilized, but did so in a new configuration, organized around the insights gained from the training and culture audit. She considered this new organization superior to
their initial organization, even though some of the reflexive insights generated had not been resolved and had, in fact, been consciously “put away.” That is, all group members were aware of these unresolved issues, but tacitly agreed to let them remain so for the present. As she described,

...over time I think we’ve re-organized around the new learning. And we found ways of incorporating that to get things back to a safe kind of -- I think we each went away and worked it through and then kept coming back to it... to the point where we found -- like after a crisis -- I think we’re at a better place than we were prior.

Now, one of the things I do think is that some of the things that we weren’t able to do -- and we’ve got lots -- and we all know they’re there but, they got put away. Not everything got worked through -- I don’t thing we’ve resolved everything. (Alex/2.4-22)

The following dialog between myself and Lawren during his second interview effectively summarizes the nature of the group's restabilization around a more tentative collective reality.

Lawren: I think actually your work with us has just kind of opened up our eyes from different angles, and I think some of that original unsettledness is still there with me personally. Not at a large scale.

Ted: I was going to ask you if you felt the group was still destabilized?

Lawren: ...Yes, not at a large scale.

Ted: Okay... You’re not completely restabilized either?

Lawren: No, no. But, I don’t see that as bad.... Because, I think the whole purpose was to open up other possibilities that we might have been blind-sided about... And make better decisions based on a broader understanding of realities from different perspectives.... I think a certain amount of unsettledness really only means that we haven’t felt like we’ve got it all down pat.

The original intensity I think, is the unsettledness we felt when we checked our reality of our culture from different angles, and felt less about ourselves, and was a reaction to the whole idea
that there are other realities out there and we better pay attention to them.... But, I don't think it's totally gone for any of us... I know a few things have stuck with me quite strongly. And, I haven't really done anything about them yet, other than think about them and stay uncomfortable about them. (Lawren/2.1-33)

These reports of the nature of the team's restabilization are thematically consistent with one of the central objectives of this project. That is, the purpose of conducting the culture audit and developing action plans to intentionally transform their culture was not to "unfreeze" and "refreeze" their normative order in a new configuration of shared values, assumptions, and social dynamics. Rather, the objective was for participants to "unfreeze" and subsequently reorganize around a reality which was more resistant to "refreezing." In essence, the point was to renegotiate and enact their culture in a more "semifluid," open, and adaptive manner (i.e., more consciously, reflexively, and intentionally enacted) (see Chapter Two: Phase two: Culture audit).

On the basis of the participants' experiences of the destabilization and gradual restabilization of their team culture, several offered unsolicited speculations regarding a potential hazard and a possible benefit of the culture audit process. With respect to the unforeseen hazard, the intensity and intimacy of the culture audit meant that it was conceivable that a group might not be capable of restabilization if interpersonal relationships were seriously damaged during the process. Second, this same intensity and intimacy could be of tremendous value with respect to expediting the enculturation of new team members. The remainder of this section is devoted to a discussion of participants' speculations regarding these two potentialities.

**Risk of increased team dysfunction.** Extrapolating from their own experiences, several participants cautioned that it was conceivable that the power of the culture audit process to generate extremely distressing and threatening insights could lead to greater team dysfunction than existed prior to participation in the training. Given that participants had used the process to illuminate highly personal issues, in another group with less solid relationships, they felt it was indeed possible that trust could be degraded and communications inhibited (Bl.2.1). As Drew cautioned:
...if a team did it and weren't personally prepared to go through it, or didn't have the solidity of relationships that we have... they might never come back to where they were even before training started (laughs). (Drew/1.1-12)

The predicted consequence was that a group might not restabilize, but instead remain in a condition of destabilization characterized by uncoordinated, and even antagonistic or conflictual activity. The logical extreme would be group immobilization leading to their disintegration as an organizing collective. The view that this was a serious potential threat to a group's continued enactment was subsequently confirmed by all participants during the final member check (MC-1).

**New member enculturation.** The same conditions which could make the culture audit process potentially dangerous for a group -- the intense exploration and critique of fundamental values and assumptions -- also offer a unique opportunity for new or newer team members to gain in depth insights into the group culture (Drew/1.1-15; Lawren/1.2-35). As Drew commented, the culture audit process was so intimate and revealing that,

...it would be exceedingly useful for a brand new person coming in... Exceedingly! You're never going to get a more intimate view of what is it that is really wanted and expected, that would never likely get put in words in any other way -- "[what] I'm going to be judged by." (Drew/1.1-15)

These initial speculations by core members were subsequently confirmed by the new team members. Jamie reported that observing the process had been "helpful for me, to hear certain things stated that you maybe only had a sense of before" (Jamie/1.5-44). Lee indicated that while the process had been uncomfortable at various points, it had provided him with new insights into the interpersonal and cultural dynamics of the team (Lee/2.5-16).

**Interpretation and Discussion**

The cultural destabilization that participants experienced was a more personal experience for core members than new members. Consequently, the
stressfulness of the process was not equal among participants, nor was the experience of their stress uniform (i.e., personal versus empathetic). While there is no certainty that such would be the case in other groups participating in the training, this potentiality needs to be acknowledged with participants in advance, and the facilitator needs to remain aware that those who are most invested in the culture have the most at risk in the process.

This interpretation also suggests that cultural change will be most difficult for those most invested in the status quo, particularly if the status quo is of their own making and strongly reflects their own sense of identity. According to this view, cultural change would not merely involve asking core members to change habits, it could be asking them to change how they see themselves and who they have come to be. This could set up some extremely frustrating dynamics between established and new group members. For instance, while it was not the case in this study, it is possible that new members of a collective could fail to respect the existing culture and alienate themselves from the broader group by making pronouncements about the need for change and how to accomplish it. In return, they could have difficulty comprehending the established members' resistance to what they consider "perfectly logical changes."

With respect to safety protocols, it is clear that in future initiatives such measures should be negotiated at the commencement of the training. Moreover, they should be reviewed regularly to ensure they are reinforced in everyone's mind, and revised as necessary to respond to the changing dynamics of the group process. In the present case, the mere creation of the safety protocols seems to have been sufficient to decrease the stressfulness of the process to tolerable levels.

To create these measures the issue of stress and potential psychological harm had to be openly addressed in the group. I initiated the group discussion in response to individual feedback generated through the first interview series. Whether the identification and discussion of the feelings participants were having sensitized them to the fact that all were experiencing the process in similar terms, and/or the actual safety protocols gave individuals a greater sense of control over the process, was not a theme I explored in the interviews.
Thus, the specific dynamics surrounding the success of the protocols is not possible to determine. In future research initiatives, when safety protocols are built into the process from the start, it will be informative to determine participants' feelings about their development and use as the process unfolds.

With respect to cultural restabilization, the most important insights from the perspective of participant empowerment were that: (1) in restabilization, a certain degree of the unsettledness persisted; and (2), the group reorganized around a modified rather than the original foundational reality. Participants' indicated that their restabilization was therefore based on a somewhat less trustworthy but more fluid and flexible foundational reality that enabled them to remain open to alternative interpretations and new cultural possibilities. This finding is consistent with Weick's (1979) contention that organizations that both believe and at the same time doubt their foundational reality, tend to retain more flexibility and adaptive capacity.

While transferable conclusions cannot be drawn on the basis of these findings alone, this leads to speculation regarding the destabilization-restabilization process. That is, it may be that the destabilization of a collective is necessary to open a psychological space for a new and more open condition of cultural reorganization. Accordingly, this should be a central point of investigation over subsequent research initiatives. First, is the culture audit likely to be a destabilizing process regardless of cultural preconditions? If so, does this destabilization seem to be a necessary precursor to reorganization around a more fluid and flexible foundational reality?

From a more pragmatic standpoint, it is also interesting to note that not all issues identified in the culture audit were ultimately dealt with. Some had, by tacit agreement among participants, been "put away" (Alex/2.4-22). This is consistent with the observations made during the culture audit that the process could seemingly have gone on indefinitely, however the sheer volume of insights became overwhelming to all concerned. It seems reasonable to suggest then, that a facilitator should remain sensitive to the amount of cultural information being generated, and recommend cessation of the data generation process before participants reach the point of feeling overwhelmed (as occurred
in this study).

It seems reasonable that there is probably a limit to the amount of cultural information that can be processed by a group at any one time. Too much information, and too much critique of that information, could prove counterproductive and inhibit the group's restabilization process. Thus, discretion is called for in terms of determining when sufficient data has been generated, and an understanding must be reached that not all of the insights generated will necessarily be dealt with during the initiative.

This in turn raises the issue that the culture audit should probably not be considered a one time intervention, but should ideally be reinitiated at fairly regular intervals. From a theoretical perspective, this is consistent with the constructivist view of culture underlying the LCCT -- that culture is constructed, reconstructed, and evolves over time. Thus, intentional management of the cultural process calls for periodic reflection on the underlying values and assumptions, as well as their observable manifestations. Moreover, for the practical reasons just outlined, to keep culture adaptive, but to avoid overwhelming the makers of the culture, it should probably be examined gradually and with sufficient time for collective restabilization.

This raises the point the participants made with their caution that the potential power of the culture audit process carries with it the risk of increasing team dysfunction. While I cautioned participants in this study that the reflexive exercises might well be distressing, at that point I was still unaware of the extent to which the process would impact on participants and their normative order. Consequently, I did not consider the possibility that the process could lead to increased dysfunction that could end in group dissolution. Clearly this eventuality must to be discussed seriously with prospective participants prior to engaging in future LCCT initiatives. Conversely, the finding that the culture audit facilitated the new members' enculturation is a potential benefit of the training that prospective participants can be briefed on in advance of the training.

Overall, the impact of the culture audit in this study suggests that it could prove equally powerful in future training initiatives. At the same time however, it
is also possible that other groups would not find the culture audit as impactful and/or stressful. The participants in this study had an intense interest in the culture they had constructed and were highly invested in intentionally shaping its future course (this is reflected in their original objectives for this project). One of their basic assumptions was that a "healthy culture" was critical to providing quality treatment, and one of their basic values was the value they placed in the culture they had created. It is therefore conceivable that organizations not sharing this same concern with culture may not experience the training in equally powerful terms. Of course, it is also possible that the process would be even more so as they attended to the preconsciously elements of culture for the first time. Only additional research initiatives can shed more light on this issue.

**Application Insights**

In this section I examine three general themes which have bearing on future applications of the LCCT training process in other organizational contexts. The first theme is the most pragmatic in that it focuses on insights into requirements for negotiating informed consent with groups considering participation in future LCCT training initiatives. Participants underscored the importance of: (1) emphasizing the risks inherent in the process; and (2), ensuring group members fully appreciate the time required to learn, customize, and apply the LCCT. The second theme deals with the implications of the participants' integration of their concept of "self" into the leadership-culture dialectic. The third focuses on insights into reality construction processes which functioned to manage the group's affective atmosphere rather than their collective activity. The first two themes are based primarily on interview data, while the last is based on my observations and interpretations recorded in the reflexive journal over the course of the research.

**Negotiating Informed Consent in Future Training Initiatives**

It became evident as the research progressed that groups considering LCCT training need to appreciate that this type of initiative is unlike traditional forms of leadership instruction in two important respects. First, prior to the
decision to commence an LCCT training initiative, prospective participants must understand the nature and seriousness of the risks involved (BII.3; MC-1). Second, they must understand that the training requires a significant investment of time and energy if a meaningful local theory of leadership and culture management is to be generated (BII.4; MC-1). In this section I deal with both of these insights into negotiating informed consent for future LCCT training initiatives.

Despite my original cautions regarding the potential ramifications of the training, the feedback from participants indicated that they were nonetheless surprised by the emotional impact of the process. For instance, Lawren and Alex indicated that while they each heard the cautions, they discounted them on the assumption that such cautions necessarily accompany all psychological research. As Alex stated:

I thought when you brought it up I thought you were being silly (laughing). Just that I would be unnerved by any of this, or that it would bother me. I giggled a little bit thinking that it was probably something you had to do -- that you were told that you had to do -- but not really giving much meaning to it....

But, now that the process has started, I have been unnerved and I have been uncomfortable. (Alex/1.4-52)

Lawren echoed this experience:

...we didn't pay attention to the risk thing until it happened. You know, like when we started feeling down about a few things, or unsettled about a few things -- none of us, I believe, when you said "there are risks to this process," paid any attention.

So maybe at some point you'll be able to use us as an example and say... "I know this sounds, like its just an ethical routine thing that experimenters do... but believe me, there may be some times where you..." -- You know, maybe you could bring it home a little bit more because I dismissed it. I didn't think it was really anything but a standard formality that you had to go through. (Lawren/1.2-87)

In a related vein, Jamie indicated that at the outset of training his reality was that this was leadership training, and since he had been through a great
deal of leadership training before, he felt he largely knew what to expect. During the first interview series he conveyed that his experience of this training in no way resembled his previous experiences:

...It was probably a lot more emotionally impactful, then I was thinking. I was thinking “oh it’s some kind of leadership training,” or I mean “how to be leaders,” but it was much more experiential... definitely the emotional impact is there. (Jamie/1.5-26)

In purely applied interventions (i.e., where no research is being conducted) this form of discounting may not be as prevalent. However, as evidenced in the above quotations, people in North American culture frequently treat such caveats as legal formalities which can be ignored (e.g., disclaimers at the end of advertisements). Moreover, when people do take cautions as real potentialities, there is often a tendency to make the assumption that such cautions apply elsewhere and “it won’t happen here.” These tendencies to discount cautions or assume they apply only to others, will have to be intentionally countered in future training and research initiatives.

During the second series of interviews I explored the issue of whether participants considered the duration of the training process appropriate to their needs and objectives. Through these discussions it became apparent that the addition of training sessions that we negotiated as the process unfolded was essential to the creation of a customized theory of event and culture management. As Alex stated, the length of time the training required was necessary to provide group members with adequate opportunities to reflect on their cultural processes and the implications of enacting their group in this fashion (Alex/2.4-25). Lawren added that while the training process was indeed lengthy, she found all sessions helpful, worthwhile, and facilitative of the theory’s incorporation into their group culture (Lawren/2.1-48). Jamie acknowledged the lengthiness of the process, but countered that it was both necessary and valuable. In his words,

...it is very time consuming. It just feels like a process that really unfolded, and I don’t know if you can shorten that -- When we had
you there to work through -- to apply the theory to problems and I found that just incredibly helpful. I think the patience is certainly rewarded.

The problem when you go to a lot of workshops or training, I think that’s the thing... you can walk away and say, "That was really nice," but then, if you close the book and never use it, then it’s a shame really. But, I’m not finding that with this at all. It’s something that I can use so I don’t have huge frustrations with the amount of time.

Lawren and Alex suggested that not only was the process one which was worth the time they had invested, but that it needed to continue -- perhaps at six month intervals. This practice would provide the team with the opportunity to continually reassess their event management process in relation to their evolving cultural ideal, and to modify their EMP to reflect these changes (Lawren/2.1-48; Alex/2.4-25 /2.4-50). As Alex explained:

The thing I think that is important with it, is that it’s a process that can’t stop.

I think it’s almost like we have to put ourselves into a structure where we set aside an amount of time and we create a structure where we go through it again in six months, and then again in six. Because I think the protocol changes with changing people... you can’t keep that protocol forever. It’s probably changed already a little bit. (Alex/2.4-50)

On the basis of these assessments, participants concluded that the training requires a significant investment of time if a group is to realize its potential benefits. Moreover, they concluded that the culture audit should be reinitiated at regular intervals to ensure that a group’s event management process is continually refined and accurately reflects the group’s evolving cultural objectives. This information must therefore be included as part of the caveats provided to prospective users in future training initiatives (MC-1).

Participants’ Integration of Their Ontology of the Self

One of the most interesting insights to emerge from the exploratory research agenda emerged from the participants’ customization of the theory to
their cultural context. The participants very rapidly integrated their ontology of the self with the LCCT conceptualizations of leadership and culture. Accordingly, it became their view that personal identity or “self” was intertwined with the cultures they participated in creating and recreating (i.e., the management team and treatment teams). Moreover, their participation in shaping those cultures (i.e., through the leadership process) both reflected, and in turn, shaped their individual senses of self. Out of this conceptualization emerged a three-way dialectic between leadership, culture, and self (BII.5; BII.6; BII.7; RJ-1; MC-2). In this section I discuss the participants’ integration of their existent ontology of the self and intrapsychic dynamics with the core concepts of the LCCT. I then discuss the general implications of these results for subsequent training initiatives.

The highly personal impact of the culture audit I have discussed in previous sections was, in large measure, the impetus for participants’ creation of a dialectic relationship between culture and self. Reflecting on the personally threatening nature of the culture audit, Drew explained:

Drew: [The culture audit] can be threatening and scary, but if you stick with it, I think you can only be a better organization as a result.

Ted: Scary and threatening, in the sense that...?

Drew: Because the stuff that is news -- that turns out to be news -- is usually related very much to your own values, or personality and biases. (Drew/1.1-9)

In addition, as the training unfolded participants began forming a link between the LCCT’s notion that implicit cultural elements can inhibit a group’s ability to manage events, and their own intrapsychic concept that elements of an individual’s pre- and subconscious can inhibit his or her social functioning and adaptation (i.e., “personal issues”). What emerged was the view that a person’s unresolved issues can negatively influence her or his participation in the leadership process, which in turn contributes to shaping the culture that develops. As Alex explained:
...the other thing that it reemphasized for me, is that no matter how much you know and how much you know about what's right, that personal issues will always come into your construction of reality... and what you need. And so, if you're not in touch with what your personal issues are, it doesn't matter how much management training you've had, you'll create the reality around what needs you have, around your own personal issues. So, it just reemphasizes in a very powerful way for me that when you have personal issues, no matter what, it's so powerful that you'll construct reality to deal with these. And, if you're not in touch and you're not aware of that, and you're not fairly healthy... you'll alter [your reality] out of that, no matter how much common sense you have, or training you have, or knowledge you have.... (Alex/2.4-3)

Lawren provided the following example to illustrate her emerging notion of the interconnectivity of self with both culture and leadership:

...if I get a lot of my self-esteem out of being a good leader, then my self-esteem is somewhat fragile too... because your self-esteem is often in large part half maybe of what you think you are, but relies on the feedback of others to confirm it... so, its as fragile as other people's realities of you. I mean, you can just keep going with it really.... (Lawren/1.2-53)

...Whether you're the portrayer of the image or the receiver of the image, I mean, you're still all just individuals. And I do think that there is an identity -- self-image issue that's going to come out of this because what if I, who was worried then about how I was perceived as a leader, asked certain people out there the question: "How do you perceive me as a leader?" And I heard back: "Well, sometimes I think your decisions are stupid" or "I don't agree," -- and maybe it was anonymous so people were safe to give real answers, and I heard I was stupid... I was unorganized, didn't get back to people, even though I thought I was, but that was my perception, not other people's.

Well then I'm not going to feel very good. I'm going to feel lousy as an individual -- my leadership persona's going to be in jeopardy, my self-esteem's in jeopardy. And then it starts affecting culture again, because you start wearing that around. That becomes a contributor to culture. So I think they're all interconnected. (Lawren/1.2-55)
She went on to suggest that, given these connections, the impact of engaging in this process could conceivably effect one's sense of self beyond the organizational context.

I think, its possible it could carry into home-life. Depending on the unsettledness of the experience. The degree of unsettledness....

I think it takes some vigilance to watch for that. Because I do think -- if I start feeling awful at work, I might start feeling awful at home. And I think there are some lines drawn -- to connecting those things. (Lawren/1.2-56)

On the basis of this emerging construction, I considered it important to work with participants' to incorporate their reconceptualization of the LCCT into their evolving event management process. I began with the interpretation that not only was it the case that membership in this group was an important aspect of each participant's identity (as Gergen contends, "As we become increasingly conjoined with our social surroundings, we come to reflect those surroundings" [1991, p. 49]), but that the team culture was in some measure a manifestation of each individual's own sense of self (e.g., "who I am and what I stand for" -- as evidenced by the highly personal and intimate nature of the culture audit) (BII.7; RJ.05.20.94-4; RJ.06.11.94-1; RJ.06.13.94-1).

As I indicated earlier, this was particularly the case for the core members. However, it also applied to the new members for they had largely embraced the group's normative order when they entered the group. Indeed, their understanding of and respect for the management culture prior to their membership seems to have been a major impetus for their respective decisions to join the team.

On the basis of this interpretation, I reconstructed the original leadership-culture dialectic to reflect the participants' emerging conceptualization of these dynamics. This new three-way dialectic framed "self" as, in part, a product of group membership (i.e., participation in the cultural process), and group culture as, in part, a reflection of the identities of each group member. Further, group culture and each individuals' sense of self were framed as products of the
ongoing process of reality construction and, in turn, these reality construction processes were seen as shaped by both the group culture and the uniqueness of each individual who participated in the process. As with the original conception of the leadership-culture continuum, there were no causal links or true boundaries between these concepts; only the interdependence and mutual influence of a dialectic relationship.

I presented this reconceptualization to participants in Session 12. They indicated that this three-way dialectic accurately represented the manner in which they were making sense of the dynamics among the self, culture, and leadership. Moreover, in their view, it effectively accounted for the profound personal impact of the culture audit (RJ.08.22.94-1).

In practical terms, the participants' understanding that aspects of the self often played an important role in shaping one's participation in the event management process (and therefore, in shaping culture) led to the development of a section in the Event Management Protocol devoted to self-reflection.

\textit{Reflections on the Event Management Process}

\textbf{E. Reflections on My Participation in the Team Process}

1. How am I feeling as this process unfolds?
2. Have any of my personal issues been engaged?
3. Might it be helpful to bring a stop to the discussion and re-examine it later?

(Appendix N)

The purpose underlying the first two questions was to prompt awareness of personal factors which might preconsciously influence one's participation in the event management process. The point then, was to facilitate participants' efforts to be conscious of, and to intentionally resist, personal habits, issues, or biases which they considered counter to their personal ideals for participation as a team member (e.g., a personal drive for closure, a desire to preserve harmony and avoid conflict, etc.). Question three was intended to give permission to any participant to temporarily halt an event management process should she or he feel at psychological risk, and/or ill-prepared at the moment to manage a personal issue impacting on his or her participation in the process.
While the intent of the training was for participants to transform the LCCT into a framework customized to their context and ideals, I did not anticipate that they would integrate it with the core features of their foundational reality. That is, given that these participants were all highly trained and experienced mental health providers, their ontology of the self (i.e., their psychology) was at the very centre of their collective reality. The fact that they incorporated the concepts of the LCCT into this reality demonstrates the extent to which it is possible that the training can impact upon very fundamental levels of a collective's culture. Thus, not only did participants successfully customize the LCCT as a framework for event and culture management, in so doing the constructivist metatheory and core LCCT concepts became part of the basic foundation of the participants' culture. In this sense then the training process was not merely a vehicle for cultural change, it was also incorporated as a fundamental part of the change.

With respect to future LCCT training initiatives, this insight into the dialectical influence of the LCCT on the participants' culture and their culture on their conceptualization of the LCCT, suggests the importance of the facilitator gaining a thorough understanding of the existent foundational reality. This is an interesting dynamic in that it implies that all parties to the process must understand all knowledge bases required for constructing a local leadership and culture management theory. That is, while the participants must thoroughly understand the constructivist metatheory and LCCT framework to appropriately facilitate the process, the trainer must become the student of the participants when it comes to understanding their culture and cultural ideal. Only in so doing can all parties contribute what is required for a successful outcome.

Management of the Group's Affective Atmosphere

On multiple occasions I observed participants engage in reality management activities which focused on the emotional climate of the group. In these instances, their reality definition process was concentrated on negotiating or renegotiating the general affective atmosphere of the team rather than on achieving a condition of coordinated activity. Through these observations I realized that my initial failure to look for or take note of this dynamic in the group
process was a legacy of the cognitive bias I had preconsciously built into the original construction of the LCCT. That is, I had overlooked the importance of constructing realities which function to help or inhibit a collective from feeling particular ways about what they have done, are doing, or intend to do about an event (RJ-8).

For instance, on several occasions I observed participants renegotiate their reality of an event in an effort to restore a positive emotional state within the team. In one such instance, two team members were struggling with a particularly stressful situation involving several of their treatment teams. Both appeared doubtful that they had managed the situation appropriately. The remainder of the group advanced a definition of reality which was highly supportive of the decisions each had made (e.g., "you both made the best possible choices under extremely difficult circumstances"). On another occasion I observed the participants engaging in processes of affective framing and reframing which began with a reality that fostered an atmosphere of self-admonition for failing to recognize early signs of dysfunctional dynamics among several frontline staff. After accepting responsibility, they gradually constructed and accepted a definition of reality which supported an atmosphere of self-forgiving (RJ.08.21.94-2).

This insight is particularly important given that a definition of reality which shapes the collective affect will, in all likelihood, have relevance for the group's subsequent evaluations of asserted realities regarding the actions that should be taken. For example, a reality which promotes a sense of guilt and shared responsibility for the outcome of an event is more likely to lead to coordinated activity to remedy that outcome than is a reality which enables group members to feel blameless and without responsibility.

It is important to note that I formulated this distinction between forms of reality management as I observed team processes which were clearly affect management oriented. Once I became sensitized to the affective component however, it was clear that in many instances participants negotiated realities to simultaneously manage collective activity and the group's affective atmosphere.
On the basis of this awareness, I proposed adding questions to the participants’ Event Management Protocol designed to prompt analysis of the group’s affective atmosphere even as they were constructing event management plans. The intent was to facilitate participants’ awareness of the influence that their feelings might be exerting on their participation in the leadership process. These affect-oriented questions were gradually refined over the course of the EMP revisions. The final version of the EMP included the following questions.

**Situation Assessment & RealityAssertion**

_A. Event Definition_

4a. Which core values and assumptions are involved or have been breached?
4b. How are we feeling about this breach?

**Reflections on the Event Management Process**

_E. Reflections on My Participation in the Team Process_

1. How am I feeling as this process unfolds?

**Reality Evaluation**

_F. Team Process & Objectives_

4a. Is this reality one that we can all live with?

(Appendix N)

As I indicated above, my initial blindness to the affective atmosphere dynamic was largely a function of the cognitive bias I had built into my original conceptualization of the LCCT. The logic underlying the leadership-culture continuum originates from a model of reality definition which focuses on the cognitive (e.g., “what is happening?” “what does it mean to us?” and “what should we do?”). Consequently, the affective dynamics of the process were left implicit in the theory and had to be explicitly incorporated into the application process. For example, complementary questions to the second fundamental question “what does it mean to us?” are the questions: “how do we feel about it?” and, “how do we want to feel about it?” In addition, complementing the third question “what should we do about it?” is the question “how can we feel better about it?”
This incorporation of an affective component into the LCCT produces an interesting parallel with a central aspect of mainstream theory which I was highly critical of in the first chapter (see *Bi-dimensional Conceptualizations of Leadership*). That is, the realization that realities are negotiated to coordinate activity and manage the internal affective atmosphere of a group is reminiscent of the traditional distinction between the instrumental and social maintenance functions of leadership. In this regard, the event management process can be considered a reframing of the traditional notion of instrumental leadership, while the affective organizing process can be considered a reframing of the notion of social maintenance leadership.

The central distinction between these two conceptualizations is that, from the traditional perspective leaders are regarded as responsible for ensuring the satisfaction of the group’s task and maintenance functions, whereas the current reinterpretation frames both forms of reality construction as processes the entire group membership plays an active role in negotiating. That is, no leader, regardless of how powerful or charismatic, can unilaterally determine a collective’s reality or their affective atmosphere. All members, regardless of how powerless or compliant, are in some sense active participants with the leader in determining the reality of the group and its affective atmosphere -- even if this simply involves choosing to believe in, or merely comply with, the leader's asserted definition of reality.

Further, unlike the task-maintenance distinction, my proposed "event-atmosphere management" conceptualization does not stem from the assumption that the primary function of a group is to accomplish a task. Rather, it is based on the assumption that what defines a group is that those who enact it as a social process, organize themselves in relation to one another with respect to a largely common set of values and assumptions -- giving way to more or less shared beliefs, attitudes, feelings, objectives, and coordinated activity based on their negotiated realities. Thus, while it is undoubtedly the case that many if not most groups define themselves as existing to accomplish a task or range of tasks (among other things), this reconceptualization does not privilege the task over the affective atmosphere as is the case with the
traditional conceptualization.

While this interpretation was not explored in depth with participants, I consider it as an important refinement of the LCCT as an applied knowledge construction. This insight therefore needs to be formally incorporated into subsequent revisions of the theory, and explicitly integrated into the training process to support the more intentional management of a collective's own affective atmosphere. In this regard, this conceptualization provides a theoretical basis for focused investigation of the affective aspects of reality construction and event management in future application studies.

**Exploration Conclusions**

The exploratory agenda of this research initiative facilitated the generation of valuable insights into the training process which could not have emerged through the evaluation agenda alone (nor, for that matter, through a more conventional research design). In this regard, the most important findings of the exploration agenda pertain to the unanticipated risks and potential benefits of the training. In this regard, understanding of the potential impact of the training, for better and worse, has been considerably expanded. This information has served to create a more informed and sophisticated conceptualization of the training as an applied knowledge construction.

Beginning with the potential drawbacks and dangers that have been identified through this agenda, prospective participants need to be made aware that the process has the potential to give rise to considerable stress and distress as people confront unsettling insights into their culture, group dynamics, and even themselves. This stress, in turn, has the potential to seriously destabilize the group culture, and it is conceivable that this destabilization may be difficult or even impossible to resolve. Thus, a group needs to understand that there is a possibility that engaging in the training process could produce insights and dynamics that lead to group dissolution.

In a related vein, depending upon individuals’ investment in the group culture, it is possible that the long-time members could find the culture audit process more threatening than more recent members. That is, if they have
linked their identity with the culture they have participated in creating. Close scrutiny of the culture can be equivalent to close scrutiny of the self. New members, on the other hand, could experience serious alienation from the group as they experience the history and dynamics of the group all at one time. This experience could lead to feelings that they just do not belong, or could never catch up with the veterans' levels of experience working in and shaping the culture.

All prospective participants need to be aware that the training process is not a "quick-fix" or technique oriented approach. Rather, it is likely to require a significant investment of time and energy if they are to realize its potential. Moreover, they must anticipate that the local event management theory they will attempt to create through the process, could require more time and energy to use than their current approach to event management.

Overall, these risks ultimately imply that unanimous permission of the group membership must be secured prior to initiating the training process. If this is achieved, then group members must agree to participate in establishing, and to subsequently abide by, a set of safety protocols designed to empower individuals to prevent the process from becoming psychologically harmful.

Shifting now to a summary of potential benefits, participants can be informed that in addition to the potential for developing a customized event and culture management framework, there are several additional benefits that could be realized. To begin with, it is possible that if participants find the constructivist metatheory a meaningful knowledge system, they will subsequently experience an increased openness to alternative realities and greater ease in reframing reality from different perspectives. With respect to the culture of the group, it is also possible that cultural transformations could produce a more flexible and adaptive foundational reality.

Finally, for groups with new members, the culture audit process could prove invaluable as a vehicle for facilitating their enculturation. That is, through this phase of the process, new members could gain powerful insights in facets of the group culture which would otherwise remain implicit, seldom spoken, and largely out of view.
Overall, future LCCT training must not be undertaken without participants giving serious consideration to the potential risks to their psychological safety and/or the integrity of their group, and weighing these risks against their understanding of the potential benefits. Moreover, the potential for participants to discount cautions must be counteracted to ensure that they make their decisions fully cognizant of actual potential of these risks.

In the final section of this chapter I shift attention to an analysis of this inquiry's methodological adequacy. In this regard, I present data which support the achievement of the trustworthiness and authenticity criteria for constructivist research I employed to guide the conduct of this study. This is followed by a discussion of my conclusions and recommendations for future research.

(C) Adequacy Criteria

In the previous chapter I summarized the adequacy criteria for constructivist research advanced by Lincoln and Guba, and outlined the means by which each of these criteria were addressed in this inquiry (1985; Guba & Lincoln, 1989). This section details the results pertaining to the achievement of these criteria. The first two sub-sections deal with the data I offer to demonstrate the trustworthiness and authenticity of the inquiry. The third section summarizes emergent themes pertaining to the transferability of the LCCT training process to other group and organizational contexts.

(CI.) Trustworthiness Criteria

Credibility

The concern of the credibility criterion is with the isomorphism between the constructed realities of the participants and the reconstructions of those realities by the researcher. Lincoln and Guba identify six ethnographic techniques which contribute to establishing the credibility of a constructivist inquiry. The manner in which I have addressed each of these is outlined below.

Prolonged engagement. The prolonged engagement requirement stipulates that the researcher demonstrate that there has been sufficient involvement with participants to establish solid relationships and a trusting
rapport. The objectives in this regard are to ensure that a wide scope of data is obtained, misinformation is minimized, and opportunities are available for the detection of inaccuracies.

In this case, the achievement of this requirement was greatly enhanced by virtue of my close, five year association with the core members of the management team. Once the research commenced, the intensity and duration of the training initiative and data gathering process served to strengthen what were already strong relationships based on mutual trust and respect (i.e., over the course of the inquiry I spent approximately 70 hours on-site working and interacting with participants).

**Persistent observation.** The intensity, duration, and very nature of the training process (e.g., the culture audit) provided ample opportunities for close interaction with participants and in depth observation of their culture. This enabled me to identify the most salient aspects of the inquiry and explore them with participants in detail. The final eight "coaching" sessions (Sessions 13 - 20) were particularly valuable for ensuring the detailed exploration and verification of my preliminary interpretations regarding the meaningfulness and utility of the training. These enabled me to observe the development of the participants' utilization of their event and culture management process for two months beyond the completion of the formal training sessions.

**Peer debriefing.** Meetings with my committee chairperson (RJ.04.24.94-1; RJ.05.30.94-3; RJ.08.31.94-1) and peer debriefer (RJ.09.10.94-1; RJ.09.12.94-6; RJ.09.19.94-4) were held for the purposes of reflection and generation of new and/or alternative perspectives on the research process and interpretations.

**Negative case analysis.** This requirement for the continual revision of working hypotheses until they can account for a majority of known cases of data, was incorporated as a standard part of the data interpretation process. All such analyses were recorded in the reflexive journal.

For example, with respect to my interpretations of the emotional impact of the culture audit, the early journal entries reflect a simplistic and homogeneous interpretation of the participants' experience (i.e., that the root of participants'
stress was uniform, and related to their commitment to the team and organization) (e.g., RJ.04.08.94-1; RJ.04.08.94-2; RJ.04.13.94-1). As data relating to individual experiences began to emerge through the interviews, it became evident that participants experienced the training in radically different ways. Consequently, my interpretations grew more intricate and refined as they evolved to account for individual differences (i.e., the core members experienced the process as more personally distressing as the culture was most reflected of their identities, while the new members found it distressing in a more empathetic sense) (e.g., RJ.04.19.94-1; RJ.04.19.94-2; RJ.04.19.94-3). This process of refining interpretations eventually gave way to insights into the participants' integration of the central LCCT concepts (i.e., leadership and culture) with their existing cultural ontology (i.e., the nature of the self, and the dynamics of the self in relation to the collective).

**Progressive subjectivity.** The point of this criterion is to ensure that the researcher does not privilege his or her view of reality over those of the participants. This is demonstrated through transformations in the researcher's *a priori* constructions. A central function of the reflexive journal was to maintain a record of my initial interpretations, and to document their evolution over time. An examination of the progression of thematically related journal entries (e.g., RJ-1, Concept of Self; RJ-3, Leadership/Culture/Self Continuum; RJ-4, Participant Safety), and comparisons between the preestablished evaluative criteria and the results reported earlier in this chapter, demonstrate that the *a priori* constructions regarding what I expected to find underwent significant transformations as a direct result of the data provided by participants.

For instance, it is evident from the data that participants found the training process meaningful and useful in the ways that I had anticipated. However, their experience of the utility of the training did not emerge in accordance with the three step progression that I had anticipated (i.e., utility for managing events, for intentionally shaping culture, and for doing both simultaneously). They drew no distinctions between utility for event management and for shaping culture, as they practiced both simultaneously from the outset. Moreover, several meaningfulness and utility themes emerged which I had not anticipated.
**Member checks.** This process of verifying interpretations with those who generated them was conducted informally during training sessions and interviews. In addition, formal group member checks were conducted at the end of the inquiry. At this time my preliminary interpretations were presented to participants for their critique, verification, refutation, modification, and elaboration (Cl.1; Cl.2; MC-1; MC-2).

During these final checks, the vast majority of the interpretations I offered were confirmed. This I believe was due, in large measure, to the constant informal member checks I conducted over the course of the inquiry. The exception was with respect to transferability criteria. While participants recognized the initial interpretations I offered as reflective of their own, the group reinterpreted some of their original views regarding the cultural conditions they considered essential preconditions for an LCCT training initiative. The transferability results are summarized in the final section of this chapter.

**Dependability**

While changes and shifts in the design and interpretations of an emergent research process are regarded as important indicators of a maturing and efficacious inquiry, the rationale underlying all such changes and shifts must be traceable and publicly examinable. For the purposes of this study, the central medium of accountability is the reflexive journal.

Among other things the reflexive journal contains a comprehensive record of the rationale for changes and developments in research: themes, design, and tentative inferences. To facilitate a thorough review of the logic underlying the evolution of the research process, all relevant entries (38 in total) were extracted from the journal and assembled in a separate computer file (RJ-5). The preceding chapters’ summaries of the unfolding research and training processes were organized on the basis of this dependability file (see Chapter Two: *Designing The Training Process* and Chapter Three: *Research Design*). Thus, a dependability audit can be conducted by reviewing the journal entries referenced in these summaries. This will provide a reviewer with an
understanding of the salient factors operating at the time, and a detailed rationale for each of my decisions to alter the course of the research and/or to modify my emerging interpretations.

**Confirmability**

To establish confirmability it must be demonstrated that all interpretations and conclusions drawn in a study are legitimately grounded in the data provided by participants rather than in the researcher's imagination. To ensure the confirmability of this research, a central aspect of the data analysis process involved detailed coding of all units of data, making each traceable to its original source (i.e., interviews, reflexive journal entries, and member check sessions). Thus, all results reported in this chapter, including evaluations of the training and emergent insights, have been supported by references to the specific data from which they were constructed (see Appendix A: Data Codes).

**(CII.) Authenticity Criteria**

**Fairness**

This criterion is concerned with ensuring the equal involvement of participants in negotiating the course of the research process. This was accomplished in this study by soliciting input from participants into the planning and execution of every phase and session of the process.

This negotiation commenced with the research project's inception. As the time approached for the actual training, I held a logistics meeting with the Executive Director to outline the nature of the research initiative I was proposing and to establish a tentative format for its conduct (RJ.01.14.94-3). Subsequent to this meeting a session was held with the entire management team. In this session the theory was introduced in general terms, with emphasis placed on informing prospective participants about the anticipated benefits and potential dangers of participation in the training. It was in this session that the group elected to proceed with the training (the decision to participate in the research was left to each individual). At this time, participants elected to modify the proposed progression of training sessions (i.e., advance the culture audit
phase) so that the training would more rapidly address their most pressing concerns (RJ.03.04.94-1).

The training process was not arranged with a set curriculum (i.e., a progression of classes on predefined topics), but rather, took the form of presentations, discussions, and group facilitation sessions -- the order and content of which was determined by the participants on the basis of their self-defined needs and specific interests. This was facilitated by asking the participants at the end of each session to define the direction for the subsequent session. Through this negotiation process the participants and I jointly determined the course of each phase of the research (RJ.04.13.94-2; RJ.04.20.94-2; RJ.04.25.94-1; RJ.05.09.94-2; RJ.05.09.94-4). Fairness was also demonstrated in the process through which the group safety protocols were developed and implemented (RJ.04.29.94-7; RJ.05.07.94-2; RJ.05.09.94-3).

Finally, to verify that participants themselves considered the research process fair, questions relating to their experiences of participation in shaping the course of the research were included in the first series of interviews and in the final member check phase. It was evident from their feedback that they felt entirely involved in directing the course of the training (CII.1; MC-1). Indeed, at one point during the culture audit, they specifically asked for more direction. As I recorded in the reflexive journal:

...they openly sought more direction from me as they appeared rather overwhelmed at the point in the process where I kept giving them options (and inviting them to invent their own) with respect to how we might proceed. After a long silence, Lawren asked "can we have a recommendation?". It would seem that my value which compels me to include participants in all facets of the training and research process is sometimes exactly not what participants want. (RJ.04.20.94-2)

**Ontological, Educative, Catalytic, and Tactical Authenticity**

I selected Lincoln and Guba's process of constructivist inquiry as the methodological framework for this research largely because their fundamental
values and objectives (i.e., particularly as embodied in the authenticity criteria) are identical to those which drove my development of the LCCT. As a result of this congruence, assessments of methodological authenticity dovetailed with the primary objectives of the research -- to assess the training’s meaningfulness and utility. In this sense, consistent with Lather’s (1991) call for the collapse of the boundaries that traditionally separate theory, research, and praxis, a nexus forms wherein assessments of the consciousness-reframing and empowering properties of either methodology or praxis serve to confirm the other.

Given this convergence, it would be redundant to construct a detailed audit trail for each of the four authenticity criteria. Instead, I have demonstrated achievement of these criteria with references to the relevant evaluation data previously presented to substantiate claims of the meaningfulness and utility of the training. In this regard, evaluations of the training’s meaningfulness demonstrate the achievement of ontological and educative authenticity, while evaluations of the training’s pragmatic utility demonstrate catalytic and tactical authenticity.

**Ontological authenticity.** Ontological authenticity refers to the extent to which the participants’ own constructions about their world are expanded, improved, elaborated, and enriched through the research process. Data supporting the achievement of this criterion is drawn primarily from section A1.2 Consciousness-Reframing. The sub-sections **Group-Reflexiveness** and **Conceptual Reframing** are the focal points in this regard as they illustrate the manner in which participants transformed their understandings of their team culture and their function as managers within their organization. Additional support comes from the exploratory agenda. Section B1.1 **Individual Impact** contains the sub-section **Intellectual stimulation** which further attests to the ontological authenticity of the inquiry.

**Educative authenticity.** This criterion builds on the previous one and refers to the degree to which the participants’ generate greater understandings of the different constructions of reality held by others. In the present case, this pertained to participants’ understandings of the differing realities of the extra- and intraorganizational groups and individuals with whom they regularly
interacted. Evidence in support of the achievement of this criterion is provided by the Other-Reflexiveness sub-section of the Al.2 Consciousness-Reframing section. It deals with participants’ increased awareness of, and appreciation for, the realities of others. In addition, the Increased openness to alternative realities sub-section of section Bl.1 Individual Impact offers additional support.

**Catalytic authenticity.** Catalytic authenticity is intended to assess the extent to which the expanded constructions of an inquiry stimulate and facilitate action on the part of the participants. In the present case, data in support of the achievement of this criterion is drawn from the evaluation section All. Practical Utility. The sub-sections The Event Management Protocol and Team Culture Transformation Measures are most informative in this regard. These sections summarize the measures the participants developed through the inquiry to facilitate intentional transformations within and beyond their team culture.

**Tactical authenticity.** This criterion builds on the previous action criterion. It refers to the extent to which the inquiry goes beyond merely stimulating action, and assesses the degree to which it facilitates the empowerment of the participants to act in meaningful ways. Over the course of this research, participants both demonstrated and reported numerous intentional efforts to transform their leadership and cultural processes. Evidence in this regard is contained in section All. Practical Utility -- particularly, subsections All.1 Utilization of the Event Management Process, All.2 Utility of the Event Management Process, and All.3 Unanticipated Utilizations. In addition, Lincoln and Guba contend that participant involvement in steering the course of the training process itself is a fundamental form of empowerment necessary to demonstrate achievement of this criterion. This has already been established in the above section on Fairness.

**(CIII.) Transferability**

In addition to the participant demographic and cultural information provided in this and the previous chapter, the transferability data base has been supplemented by a body of data which emerged through the exploratory research agenda. Some of the earliest data participants volunteered pertained
to their assessments of the cultural characteristics a group would require to sustain and benefit from an LCCT training initiative. By pursuing this emergent theme in the interviews, descriptive criteria were developed to identify group cultures the participants considered most suitable for participation in the training. An added benefit to this exploration was the emergence of speculations pertaining to requisite skills for LCCT trainers. While highly speculative in nature, this information is a starting point for determining the viability of this training for other groups and organizations. In this section I summarize both of these emergent contributions to the transferability data base.

Requisite Cultural Conditions

As participants reflected on the intensity of their experiences during the training process, they frequently expressed skepticism regarding the ability of some organizations' to engage in and sustain such a process. As Lawren commented:

...I think that there are a lot of unhealthy organizations that maybe you wouldn't even do this with -- I'm not sure but, I mean, I think it can be helpful for any organization if there's an expectancy that those risks are going to happen. And that there is a planful way of responding to them, rather than "Oh-oh! What have I created? Now I have to figure out a way to get it back." I think its important to kind of have some safety valves... (Lawren/1.2-84)

The previously discussed insights into the psychologically demanding nature of the training process and the significant investment of time it required, coupled with these speculations regarding the limitations of transferability, indicate the necessity of a thorough preassessment with any future groups considering the training (CII.2; RJ.06.27.94-2). Participants shared the view that the likelihood of a successful training process would be strongly dependent on both the participants' level of investment in the group and their willingness to engage in an intensive and prolonged training and application process (CII.1; MC-1).
In addition, during interviews participants recommended various group characteristics which they considered essential for a successful training initiative (CIII.3). For the final member check these characteristics were reflected back to the entire group for their consideration (MC-1). Through the ensuing discussion the group reached consensus on the following set of antecedent cultural characteristics:

- a group which possesses, as a basic element of its culture, an awareness of, and investment in, social process (as contrasted with a culture which is solely product or outcome driven). This includes a genuine investment in how stakeholders external to the group view and relate to the group itself.

- intragroup relationships characterized by a fairly high degree of mutual trust and respect, coupled with a general level of social skills that enable members to provide support to one another while dealing with difficult insights, high levels of ambiguity, and emotionally charged issues.

- members who express a willingness to engage in self-reflexive activities and honestly explore both the functional and dysfunctional aspects of their culture; who have well developed personal boundaries; and, who possess sufficient emotional maturity to confront and process the highly sensitive collective and personal issues which are likely to emerge.5

- members who are willing to confront and deal with high levels of ambiguity, and to do so without the support of established and concrete prescriptions for action and thought. This is in acknowledgement of the fact that the training process was designed in reaction to approaches which provide prescriptions or high degrees of structure.

**Requisite Facilitator Skills**

As the training process intensified, it became increasingly clear to all parties that not only must a group be fully prepared to undertake this training, it is as important that the capabilities of the trainer are equal to the demands of facilitating the process (RJ.05.05.94-3; RJ.08.21.94-1). Before examining the
necessary competencies of the facilitator, however, it is necessary to contextualize these insights within participant views regarding their role in, and ownership over, the training process.

It was the view of participants that neither the theory or the trainer are responsible for the group process that ultimately unfolds (CIII.6; MC-1). As Alex explained:

The way I view it is that your job is to create a structure for us to discuss and look at ourselves, and to give us a framework for how to look at it. Then after the process starts, I think its up to the group to manage themselves, and I don’t see you as part of the group in that sense. Like you start a process going with the management team, but there comes a point where it’s inappropriate for you to intervene and somebody in the group should be intervening.

And the fact that things have happened inappropriately, or we haven’t had good discussions is more of a reflection -- we’re not going to have you when you leave (laughing) -- its more a reflection of a problem in our group around specific things that have happened. (Alex/1.4-13)

Participant ownership of the group process does not mean, however, that the trainer is not essential to, and responsible for, facilitating the group process in critically important ways (CIII.6; RJ.04.20.94-2; RJ.05.05.94-3; MC-1). It became increasingly evident that not only was this training process quasi-ethnographic in character, but also quasi-clinical (Al.2.4; RJ.04.06.94-3; RJ.04.19.94-1; RJ.04.19.94-3; RJ.05.20.94-6; RJ.06.27.94-1; RJ.08.21.94-1). On the basis of this conceptualization, it was suggested that the competencies required of the trainer/facilitator are in large measure an overlap of those required of the ethnographer and the clinician.6

For instance, the trainer must have the self-insight and reflexivity necessary to maintain a balance between an emic and etic perspective on the unfolding group process. This interpretation crystallized during the final member check (MC-1). Participants regarded such an equilibrium as essential for minimizing collusion with the group, while at the same time avoiding group objectification. For instance, the emic perspective allowed me to maintain the
trust of the participants during periods of high vulnerability (i.e., as they generated insights into their culture which were not only surprising, but at times, highly distressing). At the same time, the adoption of the an etic perspective enabled me to offer meaningful challenges to participants' realities (e.g., probing and making connections among their central values and assumptions in a tentative but non-judgmental manner). In this regard, Lawren commented that he had initial concerns,

...because you're so familiar with us, and have worked with us closely for so many years that you might have biases that would come through, or, you might be gentle on us... you might know our culture well enough that you can't see it differently yourself.

But, some of your observations and questions and things that you've been feeding back to us, I think you've been quite objective -- and actually, those are the kind of things that have gotten us squirming (laughs). (Lawren/1.2-38)

Moreover, this balance between the emic and etic perspectives was regarded as essential with respect to individual debriefings. Participants considered it an important role of the facilitator to serve as a "safety valve" in the process (MC-1). For this to be a meaningful role, participants must be able to regard the facilitator as a sympathetic outsider who is equally accessible to all group members, and who can be trusted not to reveal confidential information to other members of the group. Participants listed strong clinical and group process skills as essential for achieving this balance (e.g., social/interpersonal perceptiveness, cultural sensitivity and adaptability, emotional maturity, self-reflexiveness, well established personal boundaries, etc.).

Interpretation and Discussion

On the basis of the preceding participant contributions to the transferability data base, and taking a conservative stance with respect to a facilitator's responsibility to minimize risk, there appear to be three options if a preassessment concludes that a prospective group varies from the requisite cultural criteria: (1) not to proceed with the training; (2) modify the training to remove the most potentially threatening aspects of the process (i.e., the culture
audit); and (3), initiate a preliminary training program designed to foster the development of the deficient or absent cultural prerequisites. I discuss each of these options in turn.

The obvious and most expedient of the options is not to initiate the training. This seems to be the most prudent choice for those groups which are characterized by few if any of the requisite cultural conditions. The participants considered that the training would probably not be particularly dangerous to such a group as the membership would likely sabotage or "shut down" the process early into the culture audit. For instance, as certain unspoken collective secretees were close to being made explicit for the first time, formal or informal powerholders would likely find ways to divert the group process or introduce reasons to terminate discussions (i.e., "What has this got to do with anything? Why are we wasting time and energy on all this talk? Might not our time be better spent resolving our problems with distribution/ the client waiting list/ ISO 9000 quality standards..., etc.).

The second option is to construct a scaled-down, less invasive training initiative which focuses less on self- and group-reflexiveness, and more on other-reflexiveness (i.e., on understanding the realities of stakeholders external to the group). The training undertaken in this study ultimately focused on all three forms of reflexiveness, however as I have discussed, the most threatening and destabilizing aspects consistently stemmed from the self- and group-reflexive processes most prevalent during and after the culture audit.

Other-reflexive processes proved highly useful to participants as avenues for the analysis of situations and events (e.g., anticipating the realities that stakeholders were likely to construct around an event). A training initiative based on other-reflexiveness would therefore focus primarily on the LCCT concepts in that the existing realities of the group in training would never be the subject of intentional and sustained reflection. Consequently, this emancipatory data would never be integrated into the event management process. Instead, the emphasis would be placed on event management processes informed by interpretation of the anticipated realities of other stakeholders.
It was inferred by both myself and participants that such an initiative would, in all likelihood, be less threatening to the group's existing social order, but also far less impactful with respect to the group's ability to intentionally influence the course of their own culture (CIII.5; MC-1). That is, the group might benefit with respect to their ability to manage events in a more informed manner, but they would lack the emancipatory knowledge base that would enable them to intentionally and reflexively shape the nature of their culture into the future.

The central drawback to this approach is that it parallels the form of leadership theory and training that I rejected in developing the LCCT. That is, to decontextualize the training by omitting the culture audit effectively strips the theory of the leadership-culture dialectic which forms its conceptual foundation. In so doing, all that remains is an organizing framework for unself-reflexive problem solving that is informed by considerations of the realities of others. In essence then, such an application initiative would be based on many of the same failings as those which the LCCT was designed to address.

Finally, I anticipate that the third option would be most appropriate for those groups that are close to fitting the cultural prerequisites. In such a circumstance LCCT training might be undertaken if it proved feasible to conduct preparatory work with the group prior to the introduction of the LCCT. Such a period of preparation would focus on the enhancement of those group or individual skills which were deemed insufficient during the preassessment. I anticipate that this approach would only be feasible in circumstances where the group was very close to fitting the current criteria, or where a great deal of training time were available as such preparatory work would add to what is already a lengthy period of training and application.

Taking the contrary perspective for a moment, the problem with this set of criteria is that these conditions imply that work should only be done with a collective which is probably already fairly functional with respect to their organizing processes. If the assumption is that there should be minimal risk that the group will disorganize, then these conditions should probably be adhered to until more information is generated about the training process and its potential
outcomes. If on the other hand the assumption is that groups that stand to benefit the most should be considered for the training (i.e., highly dysfunctional groups, groups already in jeopardy, etc.), and if they fully appreciate the potential ramifications of engaging in the process, then the only precondition for conducting the training should be the informed consent of all group members.

At the present point in the development of the training as an applied knowledge construction, I am inclined to take the more conservative approach until more application studies are completed and more is known about the potential ramifications. Once more is known about the potential benefits and risks to groups and individuals, this will allow for more in depth pre-research briefings where the range of possible dangers can be discussed with somewhat more assurity. Once this level of sophistication is reached, I would be inclined to take the more liberatory approach and give prospective participants the opportunity to proceed with the training regardless of their internal cultural conditions.

**Conclusions and Recommendations for Future Research**

This research project was initiated for two purposes. The first, which initiated this project, was to provide participants with a leadership training process effective for supporting their efforts to more intentionally and self-reflexively manage daily events and shape their culture. The second purpose emerged out of the opportunity provided by the first; to inform and sophisticate this training process as a knowledge construction to enhance its transferability within and beyond the original social context. In the course of satisfying the objectives of this project an alternative constructivist-based theory of leadership was developed, a training process was designed on the basis of this theory, and participants engaged in a process of local theory building which involved customizing the theory to their specific cultural context. A praxis-oriented inquiry was conducted concurrently with the training process to evaluate its effectiveness and explore its ramifications.

On the basis of the data and interpretations presented in this chapter, I propose that the dual objectives of this inquiry were realized: the training
process successfully facilitated the participants efforts to develop a local theory of leadership and culture management, and the training process became a more informed and sophisticated applied knowledge construction. In this regard, this study has increased understanding of the potential impact of the training, and awareness of the conditions that should be in place to minimize the likelihood of negative outcomes for participants and/or collectives.

In concrete terms, it seems evident that while the LCCT training process has the potential to be a highly empowering leadership and culture development initiative, is not a to be entered into lightly. Even if future groups were not to experience the training process as stressful and collectively destabilizing as did the present group, the fact that these risks occurred makes it clear that there are very real risks involved. Given this, these potentialities must be prepared for in advance with an extensive preassessment and thorough preparatory briefings with all prospective participants. Once underway, it is essential to have built-in safety protocols for people to rely on if the process becomes overly threatening or stressful. In addition, it is vital to have a facilitator with the capabilities necessary to support the participants as they move through the training process, and to provide support for dealing with any distress and/or collective destabilization that may emerge.

Turning now to the prospects and agendas for future research, this study has provided a foundation of tentative inferences relating to the structure of the training process and its potential meaningfulness, utility, and impact. These inferences set the agenda for the conduct of initiatives both within and external to BMHC.

To begin with, one of the most fruitful avenues for expanding the LCCT training knowledge base would likely be to conduct studies in organizations with fundamentally different foundational realities from that of the BMHC management team. This approach is particularly important for achieving greater understanding of the prospects for, and implications of, developing local leadership theories intended to facilitate the empowerment of groups to achieve very different cultural objectives. As I have suggested, it would prove highly informative to observe a group with a fundamentally different ontological
system, incorporate the LCCT and customize it to facilitate their specific cultural ideal. Of course it is also entirely possible that such a group would reject the reality that the LCCT offers, in which case we would still gain extremely valuable information about the training’s potential transferability.

With respect to future research at BMHC, the next step that seems warranted is a follow-up evaluation and exploration with the senior management team to assess the longer-term impact of the training. The participants emphasized the importance of reengaging the training process at regular intervals to foster reflexivity in their event and culture management process. Thus, the next phase of data collection would likely coincide with a second formal culture audit initiated to review the team’s status with respect to the approximation of their cultural ideal. In all likelihood, this would lead to revisions to their Event Management Protocol so that it would reflect cultural transformations and incorporate new objectives. The results generated through this follow-up study would not only provide essential information about the enduring utility of the training in this setting, but would also be available as a foundation for the development of the training initiative with the agency’s mid-level managers which was postponed until the ramifications of this training initiative were more thoroughly understood.

In contrast to the largely intragroup focus of data generation in the present initiative, in an initiative involving team supervisors, attention would have to be directed to the intragroup, intergroup, and overall organizational impact of the training. In this regard, consistent with the notion of leadership and culture as collective processes, this initiative might eventually incorporate training with the actual treatment teams. This is the logical extension of the focus of this research where the training concentrated primarily on the participants as an organizing collective.

This highlights a fundamental difference between the LCCT approach and that of traditional theories. That is, the ideal objective for LCCT training initiatives is to train teams to intentionally and self-reflexively manage events and shape their culture while respecting their established normative order -- including their existing arrangement of roles, power differentials, and status
hierarchies. Conversely, the objective of mainstream theories is to train people who perform the role of leader to unilaterally manage other people. This approach implicitly fosters a specific normative arrangement of roles, power differentials, and status hierarchies.

On this note, I wish to emphasize that I do not take the position that there is something necessarily wrong with the traditional hierarchical structure utilized by most Western teams and organizations. Indeed, the quintessential example of this system of organizing is the military, and I would not advocate that the military change its structure as this system of organizing is highly refined and effective for supporting its purposes. Rather, I take the position that traditional leadership training programs unself-reflexively impose one type of organizing strategy, and therefore inhibit the possibility of creating equally valid alternative arrangements of collective organizing. In this regard, the LCCT training process was designed to facilitate cultural choice, and in this initiative there is evidence to suggest that participants used it as a framework for accomplishing this end.
END NOTES

Chapter 1: Introduction

1 Hunt (1991) and Misumi (1985) draw conceptually similar distinctions in their respective constructions of leadership.

2 Graen’s (1975) vertical dyadic linkage model is a noteworthy exception.

3 No better example of this system of causal logic is found in the title and advertising write-up for Bernard Bass’ (Bass & Avolio, 1993) most recent book, *Improving Organizational Effectiveness Through Transformational Leadership* (Bass’ Transformational Leadership Model is currently one of the most popular mainstream theories of leadership). In the autumn 1993 product list for Sage Publications the advertisement of this book states:

   How can managers bring about optimum performance from the individuals in their organizations? What leadership techniques produce the most effective organizations? *Improving Organizational Effectiveness Through Transformational Leadership* explains the theory and practice of this dynamic and innovative leadership style which challenges and motivates an entire organization -- top to bottom.... The result is individual, group, and organizational achievement beyond expectations.

4 The uncritical adoption of these assumptions by mainstream organizational/industrial psychologists represents a collusion with Western management (a central source of research funding) in the construction of a reality which operates to preserve the existing power dynamics (Danziger, 1990; Gergen & Basseches, 1980; Sullivan, 1984) and effectively remove much of the responsibility for work outcomes from the follower. This unilateral control-based reality has resulted in situations where, in many organizations, the worker is accountable to the power structure for complying with the dictates of those who compose that power structure, rather than being responsible for the product or outcome of his or her efforts. Given this, it is not surprising that a central focus of study within the field of industrial/organizational psychology in the latter half of this century has been the alienation of the worker from his or her work.

5 For instance, it is common practice within some circles of the military to hold a local commander responsible for the achievements or productivity of his or her unit, while at the same time severely limiting that commander’s range of authority.
6 In accordance with the earlier critique of positivist leadership theory and its persistent reliance on bi-dimensional models (i.e., instrumental and social maintenance dimensions), the phase of Coordinated Activity should not be equated with instrumental, or "task," focused activity. Coordinated Activity is indeed meant to describe the condition of the group process in which group members are interacting in ways which facilitate the group objectives, or fulfill its purposes. However, the group "objective" or "purpose" referred to here is meant to be taken in a broader sense than typically understood in Western culture. For instance, in addition to the possibility that the group purpose is instrumental in nature (e.g., to make a profit, or to provide a service), it could equally be of social maintenance in nature (e.g., group continuance as an end in itself). Thus, the phase of Coordinated Activity is intended to represent a condition of the group process within which group members are coordinating their activities in a manner consistent with the achievement of the group's objectives, regardless of whether those objectives would be considered instrumental or social maintenance in nature.

7 A central tenet of the social construction of meaning is that actions, once removed from their social context, do not communicate a universal message. Identical actions have different meanings in different situations and cultures, while highly dissimilar actions in different situations and cultures can convey very similar meanings. Therefore, it is not reasonable to assume that a particular sequence of activities will hold the same meaning across a selection of diverse groups, organizations or societies (Bruner, 1990; Cherners, 1984; Dachler, 1988; Gergen, 1984; Krippendorff, 1984; Misumi, 1985; Pfeffer, 1978; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Smith & Peterson, 1988; Smith, Misumi, Teyeb, Peterson, & Bond, 1989; Stam, 1990b; Stryker & Statham, 1985; Silverman, 1971; Sullivan, 1984).


9 At the same time the meaning and significance of these manifestations can only be fully understood and appreciated with reference to the elements of the foundational level of culture.
Smith and Peterson (1988) provide an example which illustrates the way in which a foundational reality is manifested in the symbolic and material world. Let us take as an example the ideological belief that it is right and proper to regulate the growth or decline of organizations on the basis of a cash economy. The consequences which flow from this consensus are that certain artifacts, such as balance sheets, are treated as real, objective or the 'bottom-line'. This in turn leads to a wide variety of actions, individual or collective, which are seen as contributing to the economic health of the organization. These include investment decisions, hireings, firings and many other management actions. Now suppose that in that same large cultural group there exists no consensus that all individuals have a preordained right to a happy life. The consequences of this lack of consensus would be that each individual who values happiness would need to explore their own ways of accomplishing it. To organizations, such actions would be individualistic and subjective. The organization would need to make provision for the management of these actions in so far as they threatened the accomplishment of their 'real' goals. (p. 124)

Groups and even individuals within them can vary with respect to the degree of self-reflexiveness they demonstrate over time. Those demonstrating a high degree of reflexiveness are likely to be more aware, more often, of the values and assumptions which serve as a foundation for interpreting reality. Those who demonstrate a low degree are likely to be unaware, most of the time, of the values and assumptions which compose their foundational reality.

When it is the case that not all values and assumptions, or manifestations of the values and assumptions, are necessarily conscious and observable then it becomes easier for incongruity and conflict to co-exist among various elements of culture. In particular, when the foundational level of culture is largely implicit there will often be conflicting or at least contradictory values and assumptions (Clampitt, 1991).

It is worth noting that, in practice, there is invaluable information in the identification of contradictions between various manifestations of culture. Such insights can indicate a culture which is, to one degree or another, fractionated and perhaps in conflict over fundamental objectives, how to accomplish the objectives, who should define reality, etc..

As much as the process of culture facilitates the group process, it can also inhibit group adaptation. Culturally programmed interpretations of situations and events which have become rigid and/or preconscious can create
collective blindness to alternative interpretations and can give rise to serious distortions of data and dangerous misattributions of causation and/or intent (Sederberg, 1984; Schein, 1985; Weick, 1985). Given this, it might be said that the central benefit of the cultural process is that it is enacted habitually, and the central danger of the cultural process is also that it is enacted habitually.

14 Theorists have seldom dealt with both concepts at the same time. Smith and Peterson (1988), Hunt (1991), and Morgan (1993) are notable exceptions, and they all cluster in the constructivist leadership camp. The positivist world view inhibits such a theoretical connection due in large part to the assumptions that leadership is a property of individuals while culture is a property of an organized collective. Consequently, there are two distinct bodies of literature, each with its own circle of theorists who seldom make the leap from one theoretical discourse to the other.

15 While the space-time continuum is constructed as a four dimensional continuum (three dimensions of space plus time), the leadership-culture continuum is constructed as a two dimensional continuum. This should not be confused with a one dimensional continuum which is a linear representation of the relationship between two polar opposites (i.e., where the presence or occurrence of one implies the absence or non-occurrence of the other). Rather, the process of leadership and culture unfold together (albeit to different degrees), constantly influencing and supporting one another in a dialectical fashion.

16 "Consciousness-reframing" is used here as an alternative to the more common term “consciousness-raising.” Consciousness-raising typically implies that there is a “true consciousness” that is merely obscured from view by one's existing “false consciousness.” From the constructionist perspective, there are no realities that can be regarded as inherently more true than others. In a related vein, implicit in the word “raising” is the notion of a hierarchy of consciousnesses. Conversely, consciousness-reframing represents a process of looking at personal and social phenomena from multiple perspectives; none of which lie above or below the current normative perspective. Each reframing is merely a different way of making sense of the phenomenon in question, and each carries with it unique insights, opportunities, and limitations (Hollway, 1989).

As importantly, consciousness-raising is often regarded as something that one with a more enlightened or accurate view of reality bestows upon the passive unenlightened (which is frequently expected to induce the newly enlightened to action). This makes it an externally imposed, unilateral process based on an unequal distribution of power. In contrast, consciousness-reframing is meant to connote a process that an individual or collective actively undertakes. If an individual who is external to the collective (e.g., a consultant
or trainer) is involved in facilitating a process of consciousness-reframing then they arrive without a preestablished alternative interpretation that they expect others to adopt. Further, while they will certainly have input into the process, their input will not be privileged over that of any other participant. This makes consciousness-reframing a more intentional, dialectical, and egalitarian process (Lather, 1991). Most importantly, the objective of consciousness-reframing is to increase insight and facilitate opportunities for intentional choice from among newly generated alternatives. This contrasts sharply with the traditional objective of consciousness-raising which is typically to induce particular forms of social action toward a particular and predefined (by the "enlightened") objective.
Chapter 2: Training Process

Given the dialectical links between leadership and culture that I have suggested, the theorist/practitioner who imposes a particular approach to leadership without serious regard for the existing foundational reality can do a serious disservice, and even unintended damage, to the cultural fabric of a group. While indeed well intentioned, such interventions are potentially devastating when the expert-asserted reality of how leaders ought to lead calls into question and/or disrupts the very tenets upon which all of group life is based.

Moreover, without the awareness that what works to create and sustain coordinated activity within one setting will not necessarily work in another, the theorist/practitioner runs the risk of blaming the group members themselves for failing to perform up to the expectations of the theory, rather than scrutinizing the theory in order to identify its limits of application. In this regard, Smith and Peterson (1988) advocate the development of specialized leadership training programs which are designed through an analysis of a given group's cultural process. They contend that such an approach is essential because leadership effectiveness depends more on cultural consistency than on any externally imposed criteria.
Chapter 3: Methodology

1 Lincoln and Guba's (1985) Naturalistic Inquiry is based on a conscious rejection of the objectives, tenets, values, and established criteria of the logical-positivist research paradigm, and draws heavily on critical ethnography for its structure and process. In so constructing it, these authors endeavoured to maintain the logic, internal consistency and rigour characteristic of any credible and meaningful system of inquiry. Toward this end they relied on two sets of guiding principles: a foundation of constructivist values and assumptions, and a specific notion of what constitutes "disciplined inquiry." On this latter point they used as their criteria Cronbach and Suppes' (1969) definition which contends that what is common to all forms of disciplined inquiry is "a texture that displays the raw materials entering the argument and the logical processes by which they were compressed and rearranged to make the conclusion credible" (cited in Lincoln, 1990, p. 75-76).

2 It is important to underscore two notions implicit in the preceding discussion. The first pertains to the objectives of theorizing, the second to the process of theory evaluation.

First, the objective of constructivist theorizing is not to replace existing theoretical constructions with a "superior truth," but rather to enhance overall insight into the subject in question toward the facilitation of social action. While it is quite possible that definitions of reality can be regarded as antagonistic (particularly when the underlying ontological assumption is that there is only one reality), it is equally possible to frame different constructions as alternative avenues for making sense of and interacting with (or within) the social phenomenon in question -- each with its own unique contribution to offer (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). A useful metaphor in this regard is the contrast between a competitive and cooperative relationship among a group of game players. From the positivist perspective, constructions addressing the same social phenomenon are viewed as individual competitors engaged in a contest for objective truth. Conversely, from this constructivist perspective, different constructions are viewed as cooperators in a quest for greater insight and understanding.

The second underlying notion is that the voices of the users of a construction are fundamental to the evaluative process. That is, within the positivist paradigm, a construction is evaluated in terms of its truth value, and consequently, evaluation must be the exclusive domain of the social scientist who possesses methods for the discovery of truth. However, from the constructivist perspective, reality constructions are intended to be of pragmatic value to those they are intended to assist. Evaluation is therefore viewed as a collaborative effort between the scientist and that group or segment of society who use the construction.
For reasons of confidentiality, I have used a pseudonym in place of the actual name of the agency within which the research took place.

Participants consented in all instances where permission was sought. Training and Application Sessions 2 through 12 were video taped. Permission was not sought to tape Session 1 as it consisted primarily of viewing and discussing a video tape on reality construction. In addition, the two final member check sessions were recorded on video tape. It was jointly determined in advance that the final eight coaching sessions (Sessions 13 to 20), which coincided with regular management meetings, would not be recorded.

It is noteworthy that these decisions led to the emergence of a research theme focusing on the potential transferability of the training to other organizational contexts. This theme was mutually created in the sense that participants often speculated on and discussed the issue of transferability without my prompts to do so. In essence then, they defined it as an issue in need of consideration. In turn, I incorporated this theme into the interview protocols to pursue the issue with each individual.
Chapter 4: Results and Discussion

1 To maintain the anonymity of the participants and their organization, I have assigned unisex pseudonyms and have alternated the gender of all third person pronouns. In addition, I have made modifications to the reported anecdotes. I have substituted details of like-kind so that while the specific event is concealed, the essential meaning and implications are preserved.

2 The single most powerful avenue for the generation of these insights was the culture audit (Sessions 2 through 4). As I have discussed, through this reflexive process participants engaged in an emotionally laden exploration and critique of their collective foundational reality (i.e., explicit and implicit group values and assumptions).

3 The term "issues" figures prominently throughout the remainder of this chapter. It is a common form of clinical jargon used by the participants to refer to unresolved intrapsychic tensions which, in a habitual fashion, cause people to interpret and respond to specific types of events or situation in inappropriate ways. While a person may or may not be consciously aware of her/his own issues, a defining feature of issues is that they control the person unconsciously or preconsciously, and are difficult to keep in check even when the person is conscious of their functioning. Thus, one might explain an event where another's affect (or the intensity of their affect) was inappropriate to the situation in terms of "his issues were operating."

4 In retrospect this is not surprising given that the theory itself represents an intentional effort to blur the boundaries between, and integrate, the processes of leadership and culture.

5 This is not meant to suggest that personal issues between members must necessarily be dealt with in the group context. Participants in this study identified issues in group meetings and worked to resolve them in private one-on-one sessions at a later point in time. In addition, on one occasion, two participants chose to leave the group for a short time to deal with a pending issue that they felt needed to be resolved before the entire group proceeded.

6 This interpretation is consistent with the perspective Schein (1987b) advances on "clinical fieldwork." It is his contention that in organizational research designed to have a meaningful impact for participants (or organizational interventions designed to have research value) one needs the overlapping and divergent skills of both the ethnographer and the clinician.
Appendix A

Data Codes
Data Codes

The following coding systems were employed for purposes of maintaining participant confidentiality and establishing a dependability and confirmability audit trail.

Interview Data: Units of Data

A participant’s name followed by a slash and number indicates a data unit drawn from a specific portion of an interview with that individual. Thus, in the case of “Lee/1.4-7” the interview was conducted with Lee; the number after the slash designates which of the two interview series the data comes from (i.e., Interview Series 1); the number after the decimal represents the position of the interview in the overall sequence of that series (i.e., Interview 4); and the number after the hyphen indicates the specific unit of data referenced (i.e., Data Unit 7).

Interview Data: Data Categories

Each emergent category has been assigned a specific reference code which reflects its position within the overall taxonomy of themes (see Appendix X: Master Category List). The three a priori research agenda for this study (i.e., Evaluation, Exploration, and Adequacy Criteria) have been designated “A” through “C”. Superordinate themes are designated by Roman numerals (I, II, & III), and each theme is numbered sequentially thereafter. Each category code is therefore a composite of these descending codes. Accordingly, category “All.3.2” indicates research agenda A (Evaluation), superordinate theme II (Practical Utility), theme 3 (Unanticipated Utilizations), category 2 (Intentional Change).

Reflexive Journal Data

There are two types of references to Reflexive Journal Data: Entry references which refer to a portion of text from a particular date, and thematic references which refer to a collection of entries extracted from the journal on the basis of a common topic. The thematic categories were used to trace the emergence of various interpretations (e.g., on the incorporation of the concept of self), or to document the achievement of certain adequacy criteria (e.g., dependability). Codes for both forms of journal entries use the prefix “RJ”.

The codes for specific entries follow the RJ prefix with a numeric date (month/day/year). The number following the date, separated by a hyphen, refers to the specific entry made on that date. Thus, for the code “RJ.01.14.94-3,” the entry was from January 14, 1994 and was the third entry made on that day. The codes for Reflexive Journal Categories follow the RJ prefix with a hyphen and a number. Thus, “RJ-5” refers to the extracted set of journal entries which have been designated category number five.

Member Check Data

Code references to either of the two formal member checks conducted in this study are based on the same coding system as that used for the reflexive journal categories. Thus, references to member checks use the prefix “MC” and are followed by a hyphen and a number. The code “MC-2” therefore designates the second member check conducted.
Appendix B

On Reality and Reality Construction

Preamble

The following handout was utilized during the training to illustrate that the concepts of subjective reality and reality construction are longstanding and wide ranging within Western culture, even though they do not represent the dominant perspective. I provided it to participants early in the training as an introduction to our discussions focusing on reality and its socially constructed nature.
On Reality and Reality Construction

Men are disturbed not by things but by the views they take of them.
Epictetus, 50-120 AD
Stoic Philosopher

...for there is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so...
Hamlet
Act II, Scene II
Hamlet, Prince of Denmark
William Shakespeare

We are shaped and fashioned by what we love.
Goethe

Truths are illusions of which one has forgotten that they are illusions.
Frederick Nietzsche
On Truth & Falsity in Their Extramoral Sense

We don’t see things as they are, we see things as we are.
D. Zindell

We are what we think.
James Burke, 1985
The Day the Universe Changed

It is not what we do that matters; it is what they think we do that matters.
Automotive Plant Middle Manager
May, 1993

Words and symbols bear to the world of reality the same relationship as a map to the territory which it represents....We live by a perceptual “map” which is never reality itself.
Carl Rogers, 1951

Reality Defined

"Reality" is what we take to be true. What we take to be true is what we believe. What we believe is based upon our perceptions. What we perceive depends on what we look for. What we look for depends upon what we think. What we think depends upon what we perceive. What we perceive determines what we believe. What we believe determines what we take to be true. What we take to be true is our reality.

Gary Zukav, 1979
The Dancing Wu Li Masters:
An Overview of the New Physics
Appendix C

Changing Realities: Demonic Possession, Madness, & Mental Illness

Preamble

The handout contained in this appendix was utilized during the training to illustrate the profound changes in thinking that have characterized treatment of mental health problems over the past two millennia. My intent was to illustrate the dramatic reality shifts that have occurred within the participants’ own field. My objective was to demonstrate the subjective, temporal, and fluid nature of reality over time. In each period, each reality was regarded as the final “true” reality, and all previous realities as “false,” “naive,” or “misguided.” Accordingly, I intended that this provoke critical thinking regarding their own approach to mental health treatment, and more broadly, their past and current convictions regarding the nature of their own organization.
### Changing Realities:

*Demonic Possession, Madness, & Mental Illness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Methods of Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancient World</td>
<td>Trephining, hydrotherapy, rest spas. &amp; dream analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500's</td>
<td>Exorcism of demons, torture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600's</td>
<td>Incarceration in houses of correction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700’s</td>
<td>Cages, chains, purges, bloodletting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800 - 1900</td>
<td>Moral treatment centres with emphasis on physical treatments such as icy water and snake pits to induce shock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860 - 1900</td>
<td>Hospitals for the insane with emphasis on physical treatments such as forced restraint, wrapping in wet bedsheets, forced music, bloodletting (again), etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Electroshock therapy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Major tranquilizers &amp; chemical agents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 - Present</td>
<td>Medications &amp; over 300 forms of psychotherapy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

BMHC From the Perspective of Three Different Knowledge Systems

Preamble

I developed the following handout to illustrate that the participants’ reality regarding their organization and its social function is interpreted in radically different terms by other members of their own society. In this regard, I felt it important to present alternative realities that, while radically different, were nonetheless culturally viable (i.e., within the realm of what someone from this culture could recognize as understandable and logical even if she or he did not agree with the particular view advanced). Accordingly, if this exercise were used within a corporation, for instance, one might draw upon the counter-realities advanced by social activist groups and unions regarding the role that businesses play in society.
BMHC FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THREE DIFFERENT KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS

CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGIST
An intrapsychic and family dynamics reality:
BMHC is a place where children who have not had the opportunity to resolve fundamental psycho-social conflicts can go to receive treatment so that these barriers to healthy psychological development might be overcome. Dysfunctional parents have victimized these children and therefore, these children have in turn become victimizers. Thus, BMHC is a place for healing, growth, and renewed opportunity for the children and families it serves.

The central idea underlying the treatment approach is that unresolved psycho-social conflicts seriously impede the child’s emotional, social, intellectual, moral, and even spiritual development. The key assumption then is that healthy children make healthy adults who, in turn, will raise healthy children. BMHC thus serves the child, the family, and society by attempting to break the cycle of poor parenting and family dysfunction.

CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGIST
A reality based on processes of socialization and deviance:
BMHC is an institution which functions to correct, or make-up for, the flaws in the social structure. That is, for the children who come to BMHC, the socialization process has gone badly astray. Society has victimized these children and so they have been forced to get what they need through socially inappropriate avenues.

This agency is therefore commissioned by society to work to counteract the long-term effects of under-socialization which effectively alienates these children from their own culture. This alienation, in turn, prevents them from successfully integrating into the broader social context. Without such intervention these children will grow into adults who will be marginalized by society throughout their lives. By giving birth to their own children, they will therefore perpetuate the social fringe where society’s alienated and disenfranchised outcasts and failures collect. This fringe accounts for a large part of the anti-social activity that occurs in society, and so it is in the best interests of all concerned to minimize the size of this counter-culture. BMHC plays a key role in this regard.

NEO-MARXIST SOCIOLOGIST
A reality based on the dynamics of social class and oppression:
BMHC is one of many institutional agents of middle class domination. The children of BMHC and their families are victimized and oppressed by the middle class and the state sanctioned agents mandated to undertake this oppression under the guise of “healing.” Madness, dysfunction, deviance, and mental illness are all socially defined concepts, and the capitalists hold the power so they define who is “healthy” and who needs to undergo “treatment.”

Consequently, the real purpose of BMHC, regardless of what the members believe (for they are operating out of a state of false consciousness), is to re-socialize the children and families into the middle class ways of thinking and behaving. However, while middle class morals and values are instilled at BMHC, access to the resources, status, and rewards associated with participation in this strata of society is simultaneously denied. That is, these children are expected to adopt the mainstream view of the world that serves to perpetuate the dominance of the middle class, and therefore to become obedient sources of production to that class, rather than legitimate members with equal opportunities for advancement. Consequently, the primary purpose of BMHC (and all those institutions like it) is to contribute to building and maintaining a well-behaved base of production that can be exploited to maintain the wealth and power of the capitalist elite.
Appendix E

Contrasts between Mainstream Theories of Leadership and the LCCT

Preamble

The table contained in this appendix was developed to underscore the fundamental differences between traditional views of leadership and the LCCT. I used this table at the end of the training session as a point-by-point summation of these critical differences.
### Contrasts Between Mainstream Leadership Theory & The LCCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Theories of Leadership</th>
<th>Leadership-Culture Continuum Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Leadership is a function of a particular set of personal qualities, characteristics, and/or behavioural skills.</td>
<td>- Leadership represents the reality definition patterns that emerge within particular cultural contexts. Reflected in these patterns are characteristics of those who create the given culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leadership is viewed as behaviours applied to isolated events or situations.</td>
<td>- Leadership is viewed as a central aspect of the overall group process and culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leader role focused, with responsibility centralized in the person formally assigned to perform this role.</td>
<td>- Group process focused, re-attributing responsibility for process and outcomes to all members of the collective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A linear process where leadership is regarded as a unidirectional influence process (i.e., one &quot;does leadership&quot; to followers who are viewed as passive recipients).</td>
<td>- A dialectical process where leadership is regarded as a mutual influence process (i.e., followers are active participants in shaping the leadership process).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decontextualized and oblivious to group culture and values and thus, applied uniformly across cultures.</td>
<td>- Context specific so that culture and values are central to steering the theory’s application in each cultural context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is assumed that it is possible to identify a correct answer to all leadership situations (i.e., an objectively &quot;best&quot; way to lead).</td>
<td>- It is assumed that there are no objectively correct answers (i.e., there are many effective and valid ways to achieve leadership objectives).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provides user with a framework of generic prescriptions for application across cultural contexts.</td>
<td>- Provides user with a framework for analysis and decision-making within a specific cultural context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Objective of theory is the maximization of group and/or worker productivity (i.e., group is a machine to be harnessed and fine tuned to optimize output).</td>
<td>- Objective of theory is the facilitation of intentional efforts to coordinate activity and shape group cultural processes (i.e., group is an avenue for organizing our lives and meeting individual and collective needs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Focuses on leadership action intended to produce immediate results.</td>
<td>- Focuses on immediate leadership action with reference to broader cultural implications of that action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Notes on the Dynamics of the LCCT

Preamble

The purpose of this handout was to illustrate several of the core dynamics underlying the LCCT. There are four elements to the handout, two quotes and two illustrations. The first quote (from a film) illustrates two competing Western realities regarding one’s participation in the world. The first reality is based on the assumption that the world is as it is (i.e., a given), while the second assumes the world is a product of our collective making (i.e., a social construction). The second quote (a Chinese Proverb) pertains to the core assumption that social processes unfold whether we participate intentionally in steering their course or not. This introduces the assumption that it is possible to be intentional with respect to steering social processes. The illustration that follows explicates the dialectic relationship between leadership and culture which forms the basis of the LCCT. The final illustration makes explicit the dominate, though typically implicit, cosmology (i.e., view of social order and valuation) of Western society. This can be contrasted with the cosmology of various native North American peoples who place these same elements on a flat plain, with none regarded as more important than any other.
Leadership-Culture Continuum Theory
Notes on the Dynamics of the LCCT

Sènior Hontar: You had no alternative Your Eminence. We must work in the world... The world is thus.

Cardinal: No Sènior Hontar. Thus have we made the world... Thus have I made it.

THE MISSION, 1986

Unless we change direction, we are likely to end up where we are headed.

Chinese Proverb

Continuum Dynamics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>vs. Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation</td>
<td>vs. Re-creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>vs. Habit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hierarchical Reality of Western Culture

God
Man
Woman
Children
Animals
Plants
Inanimate Objects
Appendix G

On the Nature of Culture

Preamble

The following handout was provided to participants in support of a presentation on the socially constructed nature of group and organizational culture. It effectively summarizes the fundamental premises upon which the LCCT’s model of culture was constructed. It ends with suggestions for using this information on a day-to-day basis.
On the Nature of Culture

The thought manifests as the word
The word manifests as the deed
The deed develops into habit
And the habit hardens into character,
So watch the thought
And its ways with care...

**Key Assumptions**

- Nothing is more important, more fundamental, to human beings than reality. **Nothing is more fundamental to one's reality than one's values and assumptions about the world** -- shared values ("how things ought to be") and assumptions ("how things are") form the foundation of culture.

- **Culture is a social process, not a social object.** From this perspective groups "do culture," they do not "have culture." Culture is not, and cannot be separated from those who create and re-create that particular form of social interaction. When we choose to conform to social dictates, we participate in the recreation of culture. When we deviate or challenge these dictates we participate in transforming culture, even if it is to a very small degree.

- **Culture is consistent but always changing.** Indeed, culture is re-created every day, and during this re-creation small variations in the social process are incorporated which contribute to the gradual transformation of culture over time. **Due to the gradual nature of cultural transformation there is virtually no possibility of a cultural “quick fix.”** Culture is made day by day and must be changed day by day. This transformative process is represented by leadership.

- **Culture happens regardless of whether you undertake efforts to intentionally influence its course or not.** The question is, how intentionally do you want to participate in the process of its making, remaking, and transformation?

- **A strong culture is certainly desirable, but like anything else, too much of a good thing is a bad thing.** A culture that is too strongly ingrained and adhered to is one that is monolithic and unadaptable to changing circumstances.

- **Choose your reality, but do not forget that you made a choice.** This acknowledgement will help ensure that you maintain the power to re-evaluate and remake your choices as situations warrant.
Appendix H

Culture Audit and Transformation Process Outline

Preamble

The following summary of the culture audit outlines the intended cyclical nature of the process: assessment of the cultural status quo, identification of a cultural ideal, action planning, and reassessment of the emergent status quo against the group defined cultural ideal. I detail the manner in which these phases can be operationalized in Appendices I, J, and K.
Culture Audit and Transformation
Process Outline

1. Culture Audit
   - what does the culture look like now?
   - formulate a picture of the fundamental values and assumptions upon which collective action is based, paying special attention to consistency and divergence where it is located.
   - how (through what processes and structures) are these values and assumptions sustained?

2. Critique of Cultural Values and Assumptions
   - frame the culture in terms of one which functions for good.
   - reframe the culture in terms of one which functions for ill.
   - what aspects of culture do we wish to maintain?
   - how are these currently maintained?
   - what aspects of culture do we wish to strengthen?
   - how are these currently maintained?
   - what aspects of culture do we wish to reshape?
   - how are these currently distorted?
   - what aspects of culture do we wish to eradicate?
   - what should they be replaced with?

Integration into an Ideal Vision of Culture
   - create an ideal, but realistic vision of the culture.
   - create an undesirable, but realistic vision of the culture.

3. Culture Transformation and Development Planning
   - how might we reinforce those aspects we wish to strengthen?
   - how might we modify those aspects we wish to reshape?
   - how might we replace those aspects we wish to eradicate?

Process Evaluation
   - how will we recognize success?
   - how will we recognize undesirable processes and conditions?
   - how will we acknowledge ourselves for achieving growth/success?

Action Planning
   - who will do what by when? - coordination of activity
   - what reinforcing and reshaping activities will be engaged in?
   - what evaluative activities will be engaged in?

1. Culture Audit (Cycle Repeated)
   - what does the culture look like now? (i.e., in relation to the stated cultural ideal)
   - how are these values and assumptions currently sustained?
Appendix I

Culture Audit Process: Stage 1

Preamble

This process guide outlines four exercises designed to facilitate a collective’s process of identifying their foundational values and assumptions. In the current study I began with exercise three. I did so under the assumption that it was the most innocuous of the four, and hence, the safest place to begin. I was surprised to find that this single exercise was all that was required to generate an almost overwhelming amount of cultural data. The exercise itself was largely forgotten within the first half hour of the first session. The participants’ reflexive discourse on insights from the exercise gave way to a self-sustaining flow of new insights. On the basis of the volume of data generated, no further culture audit exercises were required or conducted in this initiative.
The Culture Audit Process
Stage 1: Identifying Fundamental Values and Assumptions

Exercise Options

1. Critical Incidents Exercise
   ➔ identify what organization members consider collective high and low points and facilitate the identification of the underlying values and assumptions which these events embody.

   • Think of an incident or event that was very special but rare.
   • Who are your heroes? - what makes them special/important?
   • Who are your villains? - what do they symbolize?
   • How is time spent and not spent?
   • What is money spent on and not spent on? -- what would be the last thing cut?
   • How close should people be to one another? -- what are the limits of intimacy?
   • How did we get here? -- what is our story? (i.e., an analogous story)

2. Anti-organization Scenario: “Not BMHC”
   ➔ contrast participants' cultural ways to those of a fictitious organization that is the realistic antithesis of their own culture.
   ➔ borrow “shocking” things about other organizations in constructing this agency.

   • how are decisions made?
   • how are people hired? - fired?
   • how is deviance dealt with?
   • how are staff looked upon and related to?
   • how are children looked upon and related to?
   • what behaviours are rewarded?
   • what behaviours are sanctioned?
   • what does the organizational structure look like?
   • how are meetings conducted?
   • what constitutes a crisis?
   • how are crises resolved?
   • what does the treatment model look like?
   • describe the executive director?
   • on what activities is the majority of energy and resources expended?
   • what does the organization pride itself on?
   • how might you be different if you had to work in this organization?
3. **Looking at BMHC Through the Eyes of a First Time Visitor**

- go on an imaginary “field trip” through the centre and look at it as though it were your first time here.

- what does the lay-out and decor tell you about how these people live & work?
- what symbols do you see? What might they mean?
- what is absent here that exists in other organizations that you have visited?
- how are people interacting with one another?
- describe their expressions and manner.

4. **Contrasting Cultures Approach**

- It is possible to learn about local values and assumptions by examining what is *not* manifested in the culture (e.g., all that which is not present, not practised, and not written or said), particularly in comparison to other groups or organizations which ostensibly perform similar functions. That is, an analysis of what is absent or missing from a given culture can reveal a great deal about what that culture values and assumes. For instance, subjects, topics, and even particular phrases that are normatively avoided, suppressed, and sanctioned can provide insights into the group’s foundational reality. In addition, exploring the boundaries which separate the normative from the non-normative and the merely non-normative from the "unthinkable" and "forbidden" can offer insight into what is valued and assumed about reality. Further insights can be achieved by identifying the forms of information that tend to be absent from the organization, and mistrusted or rejected if introduced.

- What words, phrases or sentences will you never hear here?
- What ideas are "unthinkable"?
- What forms of humour are never heard?
- What types of policies are never considered?
- What have you experienced in another culture which you miss in this one?

**General Questions**

- What would the things we value look like if they got out of hand? i.e., we over emphasized them, they became our pathology?
- Who are your heroes/role-models? What makes them special and important to you? What lessons did they teach? What do they symbolize to you?
- Think of a peer who you look to? What makes them special and important to you? What do they do well that you wish you could do as well?
- Who are/have been the villains? What do they, or did they, do that vilifies them to you?
Appendix J

Culture Audit Process: Stage 2

Preamble

This process guide provides a list of questions a facilitator can use as prompts to help a collective critique its existent culture, and begin to formulate a common vision of their cultural ideal. It ends with reflexive questions intended to focus attention on external social pressures that are currently influencing their culture and the nature of their cultural ideal. It is important to underscore that this guide, like the others in this series was not intended to be followed in a step-by-step fashion. Rather, the facilitator and participants can select questions (or generate others) from this list which best suite their interests and needs. This was the case in the current study. Not all questions were overtly posed, however, the essence of the intended critique was successfully captured in the process.
The Culture Audit Process
Stage 2: Critiquing Fundamental Values and Assumptions

Establishing Initial Priorities for Culture Development Planning

- which values and assumptions do you wish to deal with first?

- frame the culture in terms of one which functions for good.
- reframe the culture in terms of one which functions for ill.
- what aspects of culture do we wish to maintain?
- how are these currently maintained?
- what aspects of culture do we wish to strengthen or reinforce?
- how are these currently maintained?
- what aspects of culture do we wish to reshape?
- how are these currently distorted?
- what aspects of culture do we wish to eradicate?
- what should they be replaced with?

Integration into an Ideal Vision of Culture

- create an ideal, but realistic vision of the culture.
- create an undesirable, but realistic vision of the culture.

External Group Conditions

- What influence have developments in the broader social context and its values and assumptions had on your culture? (e.g., "it is possible to do more with less, and we expect you to do so").
- What impact have such trends had on the shape of your cultural ideal?
Appendix K

Culture Audit Process: Stage 3

Preamble

This final process guide provides a series of questions a facilitator can use to aid a collective in their efforts to develop and implement a strategic culture transformation plan. In the present study the group elected to develop and utilize an "Event Management Protocol" which embodied the cultural transformations the group intended to enact (see Appendices N and Q). In addition, they agreed to work to transform a series of group interaction patterns which they identified as counter to their cultural ideal (see Appendix P).
The Culture Audit Process
Stage 3: Culture Transformation and Development Planning

Strategy Development

• how might we reinforce those aspects of culture we wish to strengthen?
• how might we modify those aspects we wish to reshape?
• how might we replace those aspects we consider undesirable?

Process Evaluation

• how will we recognize success?
• how will we recognize undesirable processes and conditions?
• how will we acknowledge ourselves for achieving growth/success?

Action Planning

• who will do what by when? - coordination of activity
• what reinforcing and reshaping activities will be undertaken?
• what evaluative activities will we put into place?
Appendix L

Record of Training Sessions
# Record of Training Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS OF DISCUSSION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 THEORY TRAINING: Introduction to Reality &amp; its Social Construction</td>
<td>06 April 94</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 THEORY TRAINING &amp; AUDIT: Introduction to Culture &amp; its Creation</td>
<td>08 April 94</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CULTURE AUDIT: Culture, its Creation, and Transformation</td>
<td>13 April 94</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CULTURE AUDIT: Culture, its Creation, and Transformation</td>
<td>20 April 94</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 THEORY TRAINING: The Dynamics of the LCCT</td>
<td>27 April 94</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 THEORY APPLICATION: Application of the LCCT 1</td>
<td>09 May 94</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 THEORY APPLICATION: Application of the LCCT 2</td>
<td>30 May 94</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 THEORY APPLICATION: Application of the LCCT 3</td>
<td>06 June 94</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 THEORY APPLICATION: Application of the LCCT 4</td>
<td>10 June 94</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 THEORY APPLICATION: Application of the LCCT 5 (Phase II)</td>
<td>10 Aug 94</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 THEORY APPLICATION: Application of the LCCT 6 (Phase II)</td>
<td>15 Aug 94</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 THEORY APPLICATION: Application of the LCCT 7 (Phase II)</td>
<td>22 Aug 94</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Hrs.</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 THEORY APPLICATION: Coaching Session 1 (Phase II)</td>
<td>29 Aug 94</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 THEORY APPLICATION: Coaching Session 2 (Phase II)</td>
<td>12 Sept 94</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 THEORY APPLICATION: Coaching Session 3 (Phase II)</td>
<td>19 Sept 94</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 THEORY APPLICATION: Coaching Session 4 (Phase II)</td>
<td>23 Sept 94</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 THEORY APPLICATION: Coaching Session 5 (Phase II)</td>
<td>26 Sept 94</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 THEORY APPLICATION: Coaching Session 6 (Phase II)</td>
<td>03 Oct 94</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 THEORY APPLICATION: Coaching Session 7 (Phase II)</td>
<td>17 Oct 94</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 THEORY APPLICATION: Coaching Session 8 (Phase II)</td>
<td>24 Oct 94</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coaching Hrs.</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Hours</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix M

Event Management Protocol 1.0
BMHC Management Team
Event Management Protocol
A Practical Guide to the Utilization of the LCCT in Team and Organizational Contexts

Version 1.0

Basic Assumptions of the LCCT

Social Reality Construction
- Nothing is more important or fundamental to human beings than reality. Nothing is more fundamental to one's reality than one's values and assumptions about the world -- shared values ("how things ought to be") and assumptions ("how things are") form the foundation of culture (Figure 4: The Content & Structure of Culture).
- The point of social organization is to achieve and re-achieve conditions of "Coordinated Activity." The process of culture facilitates coordinated activity when situations and events are within the realm of the anticipated, normative, or "unequivocal." The process of leadership facilitates the achievement of coordinated activity when situations and events are surprising, non-normative, or "equivocal" (Figure 7: Leadership-Culture Process Phase Model).
- People make sense of our actions whether or not they are given explicit information regarding our intent. That is, people will interpret events on the basis of the information available to them. If we fail to provide an interpretation for their assessment, they will formulate their own interpretations which often have little to do with our own interpretation of our actions.
- The strongest realities -- those most resistant to change and impervious to self-reflective efforts -- are those which are stated and enacted most often by most people.
- There are four fundamental questions involved in the construction of social reality:
  - What is happening?
  - What does it mean for us?
  - What does it mean for relevant others?
  - What should we do about it?
- According to the LCCT, for each instance of reality construction one is advised to consider both the immediate and potential long-term implications of any reality asserted, as well as the local and global impact that this approach to the management of the event is likely to have on culture. Thus, the merit of any reality needs to be gauged in relation to cultural time (immediate and long-term implications) and cultural space (individual and/or team and organization-wide impact).
Culture and its Management

- Culture is not a social object. Rather, it is considered an accumulation of the repeatedly enacted processes (i.e., social habits) that function to bring stability and predictability to a group or organization. From this perspective, groups "do culture," they do not "have culture." Culture is not, and cannot be separated from those who create and re-create that particular form of social process. When we choose to conform to social dictates, we participate in the recreation of culture. When we deviate or challenge these dictates we participate in transforming culture, even if it is to a very small degree.
- Culture is consistent but always changing. That is, culture is re-created every day, and during this re-creation small variations in the social process are incorporated which contribute to the gradual transformation of culture over time. Due to the gradual nature of culture transformation there is almost no possibility of a cultural "quick fix." Culture is made day-to-day and must be changed gradually day-to-day. This transformative process is represented by leadership. We cannot control the culture of a group or organization, but we can engage in intentional and strategic efforts to shape the nature of the processes which constitute culture.
- Culture develops regardless of whether we undertake efforts to intentionally influence its course or not. The question is, how intentionally do we want to participate in the process of its making, remaking, and transformation?
- A strong culture is certainly desirable, but like anything else, too much of a good thing is a bad thing. A culture that is too strongly ingrained and adhered to is one that is monolithic and unadaptive to changing circumstances.
- There is only social process. "Outcomes" are constructions of our own making -- a way for us to impose some order on, and make sense out of, the continuous process of being. Given this, the process is the outcome. That is, healthy processes facilitate further healthy processes while dysfunctional processes foster further dysfunctional processes.
- It is assumed that self-reflexiveness and other-reflexiveness are fundamental to intentionally steering the course of a group or organizational culture.

The Nature of Problems

- Problems are not real. Rather, problems are reflections of an incongruence between what we have decided is important and what we perceive to be happening around us which conflicts with what we value. The more people who experience a situation or event as a problem, the more compelling the definition of the situation as problematic. That is, the more people share a common culture, the more likely it is that they will define the same circumstances and events as problematic.
- In analyzing problems it is important to explicitly identify which central values and assumption have, or might be compromised or threatened. Answering this question makes explicit our underlying interests in the situation. In so doing, we
are clearer about what proposed solutions or courses of action are consistent with the objectives we wish to achieve. This is only useful if we have self-reflexively explored our culture and therefore have a conscious understanding of the culture as it is currently enacted, and as we wish it be be enacted into the future.

**Existing and/or Imposed Realities Drive Reality Construction**

* The reality of the moment can drive the leadership process. A steady stream of facts, figures, dates, and places can be so compelling or so fixate us, that we are prevented from exploring and evaluating the latent content of the issue (i.e., fundamental values and assumptions). In effect, a powerful dominant reality can hide or obscure other equally valid ways of defining situations or events.
* In this regard it is vital to give oneself latitude to "reject the question." The formulation of a question necessarily implies a particular assessment and assertion of reality. By too quickly accepting a question, one becomes locked into a stream of thought which inhibits the recognition of other equally valid or even superior constructions of reality.

**Example 1**

Q. *Would you rather be a big fish in a little pond, or little fish in a big pond?*

A1. Neither. I prefer being a big fish in a big pond.
A2. I want to live my life in many ponds, some big, some small, and I want to be different sizes in each.
A3. I don't like ponds. I just want to be.

**Example 2**

Q. *Would you risk the lives of ten people in order to save one person? Or sacrifice the one to protect the ten?*

A. I reject the question. I refuse to reduce matters of life and death to mere numbers. I would attempt to save the one and do so in such a way as to minimize risk to the others.
LCCT Application Protocol:
A Guide to Situation Assessment, Evaluation, & Planning for Coordinated Activity

Three Fundamental Questions of Individual Reality Construction

⇒ What it is?
⇒ What does it mean for me?
⇒ What should I do about it?

Four Fundamental Questions of the LCCT

⇒ What it is?
⇒ What does it mean for us?
⇒ What does it mean for others?
⇒ What should we do about it?

1. Become clear about your global vision while remaining open to its transformation. To do so, maintain an investment in values and assumptions rather than in a particular concrete solution or set of conditions. Make explicit the specific values and assumptions underlying your vision which you intend to communicate for others evaluation.

2. Identify your counter-ideal and know those arguments against its rationale. What are some of the central counter values and assumptions you are likely to encounter and what is your position on these?

3. Evaluate those positions which you have not yet considered as they are introduced by others. The question to pose to such positions is whether they might compliment, enhance, co-exist with, hamper, or cripple your cultural ideal.

4. What message do you most want to communicate and how might that message most effectively be communicated and understood given the existing cultural context?

5. On the basis of your cultural ideal, what are those actions which are out of the question for you, and which therefore, you must confront and challenge should others raise and/or demonstrate them?

6. Keep in mind that incomplete information regarding the realities of stakeholders to an event can easily lead to the construction of uninformed, unsophisticated, and frequently counter-productive or damaging definitions of reality.

7. Choose your reality, but do not forget that you made a choice. This acknowledgement will help ensure that you maintain the power to re-evaluate and remake your choices as the situation warrants.
Situation Assessment and Reality Assertion
(Figure 1: Leadership Process Phase Model)

**Initial Assessment: Level of Reality**
- Primary Level of Reality Construction? (i.e., Group Formation or Redefinition)
  - Why should the group exist? What are its purposes?
  - What actions should be taken in order to accomplish group goals?
- Secondary Level of Reality Construction? (i.e., Day-to-day Functioning)
  - What does the situation mean for the group?
  - What action should be taken in light of this meaning?

**Self-Reflexive Analysis**
- What appears to be happening?
- What does it mean for us?
  - is it a problem or an opportunity?
  - which of our fundamental values and assumptions are involved or operating?
  - what are the alternative ways of interpreting this set of conditions? (e.g., an opportunity that could be disadvantages; a problem which could be an opportunity, etc.).

**Other-Reflexive Analysis**
- Who are the stakeholders? (i.e., internal and external individuals, teams, subgroups, clients, etc., who have an interest in the way this event unfolds or problem is dealt with? This includes any individual or group of individuals who are the focus of the issue or problem).
- What are the primary interests of each of the stakeholders in this event?
- What are the current realities of each of the stakeholders regarding this event?

**Political-Reflexive Analysis**
- What forms of power does each of the stakeholders to this event possess?
- Which stakeholders wield the greatest power?
  - over our group?
  - over other stakeholders’ beliefs and/or actions?
- Which stakeholders wield the least power?
- Whose interests do we need to protect or advocate on behalf of?
- Whose interests currently oppose our own?
- Whose interests currently support our own?
Reality Evaluation

**Action Plan Assessment**

* If this definition of reality and plan for coordinated activity where adopted, what are the likely implications with regards to:
  - The immediate resolution or management of the situation? (i.e., Is this course of action likely to create more problems than it solves in the short-run?)
  - The long-term resolution or management of the situation? (i.e., Is this course of action likely to create more problems than it solves in the long-run?)

**Cultural Impact Assessment**

* If this definition of reality and plan for coordinated activity where adopted, what are the likely implications with regards to:
  - The action plan communicating, reinforcing, or contradicting the form of culture we are trying to foster? (e.g., What message is this sending/reinforcing regarding what is assumed and what is valued?)
  - The meaning people directly involved in the event (e.g., team members) will derive from this action plan?
  - The meaning people removed from direct involvement (e.g., other teams) will derive from this action plan?

**Political Impact Assessment**

* If this definition of reality and plan for coordinated activity where adopted, what are the likely implications with respect to shaping the reality of stakeholders external to the group/organization?
  - What definitions of reality are likely to be meaningful to all stakeholders? (e.g., are they likely to fit with their experience and interpretation of events?)
  - What lines of reasoning are likely to persuade these stakeholders to view the situation in the terms that we wish? (i.e., not necessarily how we see the situation, but how we wish them to see and relate to the situation).
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Event Management Protocol 1.3.1
BMHC Management Team
Event Management Protocol

Version 1.3.1
SITUATION ASSESSMENT & REALITY ASSERTION

A. Event Definition (& Maybe, Rejection)
   - 1. What is the question?
   - 2. Is this a self-defined event, or was it defined for us as a problem?
   - 3. Are we being hyper-vigilant by framing this as an issue/problem?
   - 4a. Which core values & assumptions are involved or have been breached?
   - 4b. How are we feeling about this breach?
   - 5. What is/are the question(s) now?
   - 6. How much time do we have before a course of action must be selected?

B. Stakeholder Analysis
   - 1. Who are the stakeholders?
   - 2. What are their current realities and primary interests?
   - 3. Could we be projecting with respect to our reality of their realities?

C. Political Analysis
   - 1. Which stakeholders wield the greatest power over us or others involved?
   - 2. Whose interests do we need to protect or advocate on behalf of?
   - 3a. Whose interests currently conflict with our own?
   - 3b. Whose interests are currently compatible with our own?
Reflections on the Event Management Process

D. Reflections on the Team Process

1. Is the process overly directed by the first presented definition of reality?

2. Have any of our issues been engaged?
   - drive to closure
   - self-effacing
   - taking too much responsibility
   - trying to be too healthy
   - avoiding group conflict
   - vow of poverty
   - making too much work
   - failing to take care of ourselves
   - acting out of anger or self-righteousness
   - avoiding agency conflicts

3. Is this direction respectful of the people who will be affected? Are we:
   - setting up “tests”?
   - encouraging people to buy into our issues?

4. Are we over-relying on “normative” leadership and excluding “radical” options?

E. Reflections on My Participation in the Team Process

1. How am I feeling as this process unfolds?

2. Have any of my personal issues been engaged?

3. Might it be helpful to bring a stop to the discussion and re-examine it later?
REALITY EVALUATION

F. Team Process & Objectives
   1. Have we reached closure because we think the plan is effective? Or have we:
      - given in to our drive for closure?
      - become bored with the topic?
      - done so to avoid conflict?

   2. Will this plan both resolve the immediate issue and strategically shape culture?

   3. Does this reality require any team members to take on more than their share?

   4. Is this reality one that we can all live with?

   5. Should we give ourselves a week to reflect on this reality?

G. Anticipated Impact on Stakeholders
   1. Are stakeholders likely to be supportive, or will we have to manage their issues?

H. Communication of Values
   1. Are we communicating that we value people who are invested in:
      - growth and the struggle to be healthy?
      - doing their share but no more than their share?
      - developing sensitivity and competence?
      - being purposeful and self-directed?
      - introspection and self-evaluation?
      - being team players?
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Principles and Assumptions of the LCCT
Principles and Assumptions of the Leadership-Culture Continuum Theory

Social Reality Construction

- Nothing is more important or fundamental to human beings than reality. Nothing is more fundamental to one’s reality than one’s values and assumptions about the world -- shared values (“how things ought to be”) and assumptions (“how things are”) form the foundation of culture (Figure 4: The Content & Structure of Culture).
- The point of social organization is to achieve and re-achieve conditions of Coordinated Activity. The process of culture facilitates coordinated activity when situations and events are within the realm of the anticipated, normative, or unequivocal. The process of leadership facilitates the achievement of coordinated activity when situations and events are surprising, non-normative, or equivocal (Figure 7: Leadership-Culture Process Phase Model).
- Others make sense of our actions whether or not they are given explicit information regarding our intent. That is, we all interpret events on the basis of the information available to us. If I fail to provide you with an interpretation of my actions for your assessment, you will formulate their own interpretations which frequently have little to do with your own understanding of your actions. This stems from the observation that most people have difficulty suspending judgments for long periods of time. Constantly considering alternative interpretations requires a great deal of energy, and our drive to make sense out of our experience pushes us all to pass judgment or draw conclusions on whatever information we have generated. Consequently, what start out as speculations tend to be transformed into beliefs (i.e., “realities”) about who did what for what reason.
- The strongest realities -- those most resistant to change and impervious to self-reflective efforts -- are those which are stated and enacted most often by most people. For instance, our society fosters a negative stereotype of management (e.g., “all managers are unfair/lazy/self-serving/incompetent, etc.”). Given the force of and constant support for this definition of reality, you as managers recognize the need to be extremely vigilant if this normative perception is to be avoided within this organization. Thus, there is a conscious acknowledgement that any action or event which can be interpreted as consistent with the broader societal view is more easily embraced than an interpretation that is counter to this stereotype (e.g., “when are they going to show their true colours?”).
- There are four fundamental questions involved in the construction of social reality:

  ➔ What is happening?
  ➔ What does it mean for us?
  ➔ What does it mean for relevant others?
  ➔ What should we do about it?
According to the LCCT, for each instance of reality construction one is advised to consider both the immediate and potential long-term implications of any reality asserted, as well as the local and global impact that this approach to the management of the event is likely to have on culture. Thus, the merit of any reality needs to be gauged in relation to cultural time (immediate and long-term implications) and cultural space (individual and/or team and organization-wide impact).

**Culture and its Management**

- Culture is not a social object. Rather, it is considered an accumulation of the repeatedly enacted processes (i.e., social habits) that function to bring stability and predictability to a group or organization. From this perspective groups "do culture," they do not "have culture." Culture is not, and cannot be separated from those who create and re-create that particular form of social process. When we choose to conform to social dictates, we participate in the recreation of culture. When we deviate or challenge these dictates we participate in transforming culture, even if it is to a very small degree.

- Culture is consistent but always changing. That is, culture is re-created every day, and during this re-creation small variations in the social process are incorporated which contribute to the gradual transformation of culture over time. Due to the gradual nature of culture transformation there is almost no possibility of a cultural "quick fix." Culture is made day-to-day and must be changed gradually day-to-day. This transformative process is represented by leadership. We cannot control the culture of a group or organization, but we can engage in intentional and strategic efforts to shape the nature of the processes which constitute culture.

- Culture develops regardless of whether we undertake efforts to intentionally influence its course or not. The question is, how intentionally do we want to participate in the process of its making, remaking, and transformation?

- A strong culture is certainly desirable, but like anything else, too much of a good thing is a bad thing. A culture that is too strongly ingrained and adhered to is one that is monolithic and unadaptive to changing circumstances.

- There is only social process. "Outcomes" are constructions of our own making -- a way for us to impose some order on, and make sense out of, the continuous process of being. Given this, the process is the outcome. That is, healthy processes facilitate further healthy processes while dysfunctional processes foster further dysfunctional processes.

- It is assumed that self-reflexiveness and other-reflexiveness are fundamental to intentionally steering the course of a group or organizational culture.
The Nature of Problems

- Problems are not real. Rather, problems are reflections of an incongruence between what we have decided is important and what we perceive to be happening around us which conflicts with what we value. The more people who experience a situation or event as a problem, the more compelling the definition of the situation as problematic. That is, the more people share a common culture, the more likely it is that they will define the same circumstances and events as problematic.
- In analyzing problems it is important to explicitly identify which central values and assumption have, or might be compromised or threatened. Answering this question makes explicit our underlying interests in the situation. In so doing, we are clearer about what proposed solutions or courses of action are consistent with the objectives we wish to achieve. This is only useful if we have self-reflexively explored our culture and therefore have a conscious understanding of the culture as it is currently enacted, and as we wish it be be enacted into the future.

Existing &/or Imposed Realities Drive Reality Construction

- The reality of the moment can drive the leadership process. A steady stream of facts, figures, dates, and places can be so compelling or so fixate us, that we are prevented from exploring and evaluating the latent content of the issue (i.e., fundamental values and assumptions). In effect, a powerful dominant reality can hide or obscure other equally valid ways of defining situations or events.
- In this regard it is vital to give oneself latitude to "reject the question." The formulation of a question necessarily implies a particular assessment and assertion of reality. By too quickly accepting a question, one becomes locked into a stream of thought which inhibits the recognition of equally valid or even superior constructions of reality.

Example 1

Q. Would you rather be a big fish in a little pond, or little fish in a big pond?
A1. Neither. I prefer being a big fish in a big pond.
A2. I want to live my life in many ponds, some big, some small, and I want to be different sizes in each.
A3. I don't like ponds. I just want to be.

Example 2

Q. Would you risk the lives of ten people in order to save one person? Or sacrifice the one to protect the ten?
A1 I reject the question. I refuse to reduce matters of life and death to mere numbers.
A2. Neither. I would find a way to save the one without putting the ten in danger.
Inability to Formulate Plans for Coordinated Activity

- The ideal result of engaging in this process of reality construction is the construction of a definition of the situation which leads to a plan for achieving coordinated activity. When this is not possible (e.g., due to a lack of information or inability to achieve consensus), the next best result is a definition of the situation which explicates how group members will go about coordinating their activity to reach a common definition of reality. This means developing an assertion of reality which states, “we don’t know what we will do about the issue, but we know how we are going to figure out what to do.” (Figure 2: Reality Definition Model)

LCCT Application Rationale

The intentional management of any event involves four overlapping processes:

- a thorough assessment of the event including analysis of stakeholder realities.
- construction of a reality based on your assessment of the situation.
- action planning on the basis of the reality you have constructed.
- a self-reflexive analysis of the event, the management process, & action plan.

The objective in the intentional management of events is two-fold: To manage the event in such a way as to generate a plan to manage the event (or bring closure to the issue) and in so doing, to intentionally shape the culture. To do this, one must ensure that the reality constructed and the plan ultimately generated, are consistent with the cultural ideal.

This becomes challenging when it is acknowledged that every leadership event (in fact everything a manager does) is taken as a cultural statement. Consequently, every action conveys a message -- even inaction speaks loudly. Generally speaking, regardless of one’s intent, actions convey one of three forms of culturally meaningful messages:

- those which challenge, compromise or erode the cultural status quo.
- those which support or reinforce the cultural status quo.
- those which transform peoples’ perceptions of the cultural status quo.

In essence, the meaning people assign to actions today significantly shapes the nature of the culture they enact tomorrow. At the same time, the view of culture they have today shapes how they will interpret what they witness today.
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Team Culture Transformation Plans
Team Culture Transformation Plans: Developing Event Management Habits

Over the course of the LCCT training the team has designed several event management practices which you have indicated a desire to introduce as aspects of your team culture.

1. **Wait-a-Week.** It was observed that the best management decisions have typically been those for which reflection time has been allotted. Given the tendency in this group to push for closure and then act as soon as possible, it was suggested that there is a need for those less invested in the situation to support the process of having those most invested wait for one week (whenever reasonable) before acting on a group constructed definition of reality and action plan.

2. **Freedom to Change Team Defined Plans.** Acknowledging the importance of relationships to the culture of BMHC led to the recognition that any management team member designated to take action on a team defined event management plan needs to be encouraged and supported for altering original action plans in the face of new information. That is, individual members should not feel accountable to the group for enacting the action plans which no longer fit with their immediate experience of the situation.

3. **State the Obvious.** It was observed that team members have to push themselves to say what they are thinking, particularly with respect to what is regarded as “the obvious.” Stating what is apparently self-evident often proves that it was not so to others. This is particularly the case with staff members beyond the management team who are not as enculturated as veteran employees. People make sense of things whether they are given information or not. Clear statements of rationales, values, processes, and intents facilitate the intentional management of meaning by working against misinterpretations.

4. **Situation Assessment.** It has been noted that in those instances where a thorough analysis of a given situation was conducted, potential problems have been identified and successfully avoided. It was suggested that, whenever reasonable, adequate time be allotted to conduct such analyses. This practice would serve to counter-balance the drive to closure tendencies of the team which tend to push for early problem definition, solution and action.

5. **Common Definition of Reality.** It is evident that there is an intent to be somewhat more intentional with respect to ensuring that all management group members are, as much as possible, operating out of a common definition of reality (e.g., with respect to organizational visions, definitions of particular events, expectations for staff performance, etc.).

6. **Team Issues.** There is agreement that the best decisions the team typically makes are those which are not filtered through cultural issues. It is evident that there is a commitment to intentionally working to ensure that management realities and decisions are steered more by vision and goals, than by the function of the issues common to the members of this team.
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Reality Check
Reality Check
"Keeping in mind what we value, keeps us mooing closer to our ideal"

☐ 1. Has this decision in any way been driven by personal or team issues?

☐ 2. Could this course of action alienate any stakeholders and/or damage relationships?

☐ 3. Will this plan both resolve the immediate issue and send the right cultural message?

☐ 4. Are those to whom I'm accountable likely to support this course of action?

☐ 5. Should we give ourselves (or I give myself) a week to reflect on it?

(Version 1.1)
Appendix R

Research Consent Form
Research on The Leadership-Culture Continuum Theory
Research Participant Consent Form
PARTICIPANT COPY

Researcher:
E. M. (Ted) Vokes, M.A.
103-211 Crawford Avenue
Windsor, Ontario
N9A 5C3

Research Supervisor:
Durhane Wong-Rieger, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
University of Windsor
N9B 3P4

519-256-0484
519-253-4232 Ext. 2248

Training is being offered to you in a new theory of group leadership and culture -- the Leadership-Culture Continuum Theory or "LCCT" for short. This training is being offered to Managers and Middle Managers as part of my Ph.D. dissertation research. If you choose to participate in the training you are also invited to participate in the research aspect of the project. Both participation in the training and participation in the research is strictly voluntary. That is, you need not participate in either the training or research, but you are welcome to participate in the training with no obligation to participate in the research.

The purpose of the training is to provide you with a practical framework for facilitating your role as a leader at BMHC, and in so doing, aid you in your efforts to intentionally influence the culture of your team(s) and the overall organization. The purpose of the research is to explore and evaluate the LCCT in a real world setting. Please be assured that regardless of whether you choose to participate in the research aspect of this project, the training and support you will receive will be identical to those who choose to serve as research participants.

Overview of the Research Project

Should you choose to participate in the research at no time will you or your team be subjected to any form of evaluation or testing. Rather, at various times while you learn about and begin to use the theory you will be asked (in the context of a group or one-on-one interview) to share with me your questions, thoughts, feelings, and experiences using the theory (e.g., how you found you could and/or could not make use of the theory, what you found helpful and/or not helpful about it, etc.). You might say then that as a participant you will be asked to "test drive" the theory and tell me what you think. All information provided by participants will be used to assess the training process and theory's usefulness as a practical framework for leadership and culture development.

Pending unanimous consent of participants, it is my intent to video tape all training and group interview sessions that are conducted as part of this research. Therefore, prior to the commencement of all group sessions each parti-
participant will be provided with an anonymous form upon which they may indicate their willingness or unwillingness to have that session recorded. Should a single participant indicate through this anonymous medium that they prefer that the session not be recorded, only hand-written notes will be taken for that session.

Pending your permission, it is my desire to audio tape any one-on-one interview sessions. Hence, before the commencement of an individual interview you will be given the option of granting or denying permission to tape.

In either a one-on-one or group session, consent to have the session recorded is not necessary for your participation in the research. Further, should you consent to having the session recorded, please understand that I will respect, without question, any request to temporarily or permanently stop the recording at any point. Moreover, if you should change your mind about the recording after the session, the tape will be erased immediately and without question.

This training and research initiative is designed to be flexible to your needs and time constraints. Thus, those who choose to participate in the training will, in large measure, determine the process and length of the training program (e.g., you will decide how much training and coaching you wish to receive). Consequently, it is not possible for me to specify in advance the exact duration of the research. However, given that much of the research data will be generated through the training process itself -- that is, at the same time as the training is taking place -- your participation in the research aspect of this initiative will require minimal time beyond your participation in the actual training process. My best liberal estimate at this point would be approximately two to two and a half hours of your time spread out over the course of the entire training period -- which, itself, could be spread out over the course of between one to three months. In any event, I will make every effort to be efficient in data gathering and minimize demands on your time.

With respect to the research process please be assured of the following:

- I will be pleased to answer questions regarding this research at any time before, during, or after the study has been completed.

- no deception regarding any aspect of this study will be used under any circumstance.

- at no time will you be expected to provide any information that you are uncomfortable sharing.

- the focus of the data gathering is on the theory and training -- not on you, your team, or the organization.
• as a research participant, you will maintain the right to withdraw from the study at any point without providing justification and without prejudice. Should you choose to withdraw from the research at any point you are still eligible to participate in the training if you so desire.

• as a research participant you own the data that you provide (e.g., comments, observations, feelings about the theory and your experiences using it, etc.). Therefore, you have the right to review this data and have all or any part of it returned to you and excluded from the study.

• the confidentiality of all data will be strictly maintained. Access to the data will be restricted to those who need to see it -- specifically, my dissertation chairperson, my committee members (four university professors), and my peer reviewer (a fellow Ph.D. candidate for whom I serve in a similar capacity in his research). No participant in the study will have access to information another participant provided.

• all data collected will be stored away from BMHC in a secure location, and will be transcribed on a computer with a code number replacing participants' names so that raw data can not be linked to any individual.

• any of the results of this study that are fed back to the organization to facilitate training, or that are included in the final report, will be in the form of summarized trends from groups of individuals. This will ensure that no individual can be identified by their comments.

• in the event that it would be useful to use a direct quote to illustrate a particular finding, this will occur only if the person who originally provided the information has reviewed the quote and has given written permission.

• all participants will be provided with an opportunity to review the results of the study prior to its completion, and have their comments regarding the interpretations it contains and conclusions it draws included in the final version.

• if at any point you have a complaint regarding the research it is your right to lodge your complaint with University of Windsor's Psychology Department Ethics Committee. You may contact the Departmental Ethics Committee Chairperson, Dr. R. Frisch, at 253-4232, Ext. 7012.
As a researcher it is my responsibility to inform you of any potential risks that participation in this training and research might involve. In this regard:

• the LCCT is based on a rather new way of looking at the social world commonly referred to as "social constructivism" or "postmodernism." In order for the theory to make sense and be useful it will be necessary for anyone who is as yet unfamiliar with this viewpoint to learn something about it. While many who learn about postmodernism find it intrinsically fascinating and exciting, others have found it to be a somewhat distressing perspective. For instance, some see it as counter to the way they typically view the social world and find this uncomfortable or objectionable.

• the LCCT asks the user to engage in self-reflexive activities. That is, in using the theory one is asked to reflect on her or his team and participation in that team in ways that are often uncommon in everyday life. This form of reflection can give way to new insights which are exciting and useful. It is possible, however, that one could gain insights which are somewhat uncomfortable or disturbing.

• research records have no privileged status by law, and therefore, I am unable to guarantee absolute anonymity in the unlikely event that a case emerge and the data is subpoenaed. At the present time I know of no such cases.

• should any further risks become apparent as the research process progresses, I will inform all participants of the risk so that they may make an informed choice regarding their continued participation in the study.

If you have any questions regarding this research please do not hesitate to address them to me prior to making your decision. If you are willing to serve as a participant in this research please read the paragraph below. When finished please print your name and today's date, and sign your name in the provided spaces on both the Participant and Researcher copies of this consent form. If you wish to participate in the LCCT training only, you need do nothing more.
Consent to Participate in the Research Component of LCCT Project

I agree to participate in this research on the LCCT. I have read the preceding outline of the study and am aware of its purpose, the role I have been asked to play, and the intended benefits and potential risks that are involved. I grant this consent with the understanding that at any time during the study I may choose to withdraw my participation and/or any data that I have provided without explanation or prejudice.

NAME:________________________________________

DATE:________________________

SIGNATURE:_________________________________

PARTICIPANT COPY
Appendix S

Interview Protocol 1.1
Open-ended Interview Protocol
Interview Series 1.1

• If you could, free associate for me: What comes to mind first when you reflect on the training we have done so far?
  - reactions?
  - feelings?
  - thoughts?

• Tell me about your experience of the training process as it unfolded. How did you feel at various points in the process? (e.g., reality construction, culture audit, leadership training). What impact has it had, if any, on your activities as a manager? Beyond your role as manager?

• Have you had any new insights as a result of the training?
• Have any of these insights been useful or detrimental to you or others in any way?
• Have your predominant values and assumptions (i.e., your “reality”) changed in any way through this process? Are these changes more for the better or worse?

• To this point, what if any impact or effect do you perceive this training to have had on the team?
  - functioning?
  - decision making?
  - dynamics?
  - reality/culture?

• Has the training created or given rise to any unanticipated problems or difficulties?

• Is the training process responsive to your needs? How could it be modified to be more responsive?

• What is most valuable to you about the training?
• Where do you struggle most with this training?

• What is it that you most wish to get out of the training process as it unfolds?

• What might you say to someone from another organization who was considering this training for their organization?
- what words of advice might you offer?
  - what words of warning?
  - what would you suggest they stand to gain or lose?

* To this point, what if any impact or effect has this training had on you?
  - thoughts?
  - feelings?
  - actions?
  - decisions? - decision making process?
  - view of your role?
  - view of the team/agency?
  - view of others - or other teams/agencies?

* How might this training be improved?
  - examples?
  - exercises?
  - films?
  - models?

**REFLECTIONS ON ADEQUACY CRITERIA**

**Authenticity Criteria**

*Fairness:*

  * in what ways have I solicited the involvement of the participants in establishing the future course of the research process?

  - do you feel that you have been adequately involved in setting the course for the training process?

*Ontological Authenticity:*

  * do participants appear to be expanding their own constructions of leadership and culture?

  - have your views of leadership and culture changed in any way over the course of the training?

*Educative Authenticity:*

  * do participants appear to be achieving a greater understanding of and appreciation for other's (e.g., superiors, peers, subordinates, clients, etc.) interpretations of the cultural fields and/or ways of participating in leadership processes?
- has this training process had any impact on the way you view the realities of other members of the agency?

_Catalytic Authenticity:_
• has the training (e.g., acquired knowledge of and/or use of the theory) in any way stimulated and/or facilitated intentional action on the part of the participants?

- at this stage, has the training or use of the theory in any way stimulated and/or facilitated intentional action that would not have occurred otherwise?

_Tactical Authenticity:_
• has the training (e.g., acquired knowledge of and/or use of the theory) in any way empowered participants to act in ways meaningful to themselves and the organization?

- has the training or use of the theory enabled you to initiate any intentional changes in the team or organization?

• Is there anything I haven’t asked you about that has been on your mind, or that you think would be useful for me to know?
Appendix T

Interview Protocol 1.5
Open-ended Interview Protocol
Interview Series 1.5

* If you could, free associate for me: What comes to mind first when you reflect on the training we have done so far? (1.1)
  - reactions?
  - feelings?
  - thoughts?

* Tell me about your experience of the training process as it has unfolded. How did you feel at various points in the process? (e.g., reality construction, culture audit, leadership training) What impact has it had, if any, on your activities as a manager? Beyond your role as manager? (1.1)

* Have you had any new insights as a result of the training? (1.0)
* Have any of these insights been useful or detrimental to you in any way? (1.0)
* Have your predominant values and assumptions (i.e., your "reality") changed in any way through this process? Are these changes more for the better or worse? (1.0)

* Has this training process had any impact on your view of the world at large? led to any struggles, insights, problems, breakthroughs, etc.? (1.3)

* To this point, what if any impact or effect do you perceive this training to have had on the team? (1.1)
  - functioning?
  - decision making?
  - dynamics?
  - reality/culture?

* Has the training created or given rise to any unanticipated problems or difficulties? (1.1)

* Is the training process responsive to your needs? How could it be modified to be more responsive? (1.1)

* Have there been times where you felt you or anyone else was abandoned, unsupported, or “at risk”? Did I in anyway contribute to putting you or that person into that position? (1.2) (1.3 expanded) (1.4 contracted)
• Have there been times where you felt you or anyone else was prematurely rescued by my actions, or where I intervened in such a way as to inhibit the process? (1.4 created out of above question)

• Should I be doing more to make these sessions safer for people? (1.3)
  - What could I do to make them safer? (1.3)

• Do you feel you were appropriately cautioned about the potential risks of the study prior to agreeing to participate? What about along the way? (1.3)

• What is most valuable to you about the training? (1.0)
• Where do you struggle most with this training? (1.1)

• What is it that you most wish to get out of the training process as it unfolds? (1.1)

• What might you say to someone from another organization who was considering this training for their organization? (1.1)
  - What words of advice might you offer?
  - What words of warning?
  - What would you suggest they stand to gain or lose?

• To this point, what if any impact or effect has this training had on you? (1.1)
  - Thoughts?
  - Feelings?
  - Actions?
  - Decisions? - Decision making process?
  - View of your role?
  - View of the team/agency?
  - View of others - or other teams/agencies?

• Comment on elements of the training process for me: (1.1)
  - Examples?
  - Exercises?
  - Films?
  - Models?
  - Pace of training: too fast? too slow? (1.2)

• If you have experienced formal training in other theories of leadership, please compare and contrast your experiences with both. (1.5)
REFLECTIONS ON ADEQUACY CRITERIA

Authenticity Criteria

Fairness:
in what ways have I solicited the involvement of the participants in establishing the future course of the research process?

- Do you feel that you have been adequately involved in setting the course for the training process? (1.1)

- Have you at any point felt that I have, intentionally or not, withheld information from you or mislead you in any way? (1.2)

Ontological Authenticity:
Do participants appear to be expanding their own constructions of leadership and culture?

- have your views of leadership and culture changed in any way over the course of the training? (1.1)

- Has your view of the management team culture and/or your program’s culture changed in anyway over the course of the training? (1.2)

Educative Authenticity:
Do participants appear to be achieving a greater understanding of and appreciation for other’s (e.g., superiors, peers, subordinates, clients, etc.) interpretations of the cultural fields and/or ways of participating in leadership processes?

- has this training process had any impact on the way you view the realities of other members of the team or agency? (1.1)

Catalytic Authenticity:
Has the training (e.g., acquired knowledge of and/or use of the theory) in any way stimulated and/or facilitated intentional action on the part of the participants?

- at this stage, has the training or use of the theory in any way stimulated and/or facilitated decisions and/or intentional action that would not have occurred otherwise? (1.1)
Tactical Authenticity:
Has the training (e.g., acquired knowledge of and/or use of the theory) in any way empowered participants to act in ways meaningful to themselves and the organization?

- as far as you are able to predict at this point, are the ideas we are discussing likely to be meaningful and useful to you after the training and culture facilitation has been completed? (i.e., is this something you anticipate using day-to-day?) (1.2)

In Conclusion:

- Is there anything I haven't asked you about that has been on your mind, or that you think would be useful for me to know? (1.1)

- What do you think about this interview process? (1.3) (1.4 modified)

---------------------------------------------

Key

(1.0) -- Indicates those questions from the original version of the protocol but not directly addressed in Interview 1.1.

(1.1) -- Indicates those questions from the original version of the protocol which were addressed in Interview 1.1.

(1.2) -- Indicates those questions added as a result of issues raised in, or which emerged from reflections generated from, Interview 1.1.

(1.3) -- Indicates those questions added as a result of issues raised in, or which emerged from reflections generated from, Interview 1.2.

(1.4) -- Indicates those questions added as a result of issues raised in, or which emerged from reflections generated from, Interview 1.3.

(1.5) -- Indicates those questions added as a result of issues raised in, or which emerged from reflections generated from, Interview 1.4.
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Interview Protocol 2.1
Semi-Structured Interview Protocol
Interview Series 2.1

Preamble

You are aware, and have consented to having this session taped?  
At this stage in the process, what I am trying to do is learn as much as I can about the meaningfulness and usefulness of the training process. This is to both help me further develop both the theory and process by which people come to use it. Thus, I'm interested in any and all evaluations you've made with respect to your experience of working with the theory.  
I want to emphasize that you should feel free to decline responding to any of these questions at any point in the interview.

Opening

• If you could free associate for me for a minute; what comes to mind first when you reflect on your experience of the training? -- your thoughts, feelings, reactions?

Meaningfulness

• Have your views of leadership and culture changed in any way over the course of the training?

• Has the training process had any impact on your predominant values and assumptions (i.e., your “reality”)? Are these changes more for the better or worse?

• Has the training impacted upon your own understanding of the team? Yourself as a team member?

• Has the training impacted upon your understanding of the realities of others on the team?

• Has the training impacted upon your understanding of the realities of others (groups or individuals) beyond the team?
Utility

• At this stage in the process, do you feel like you are in any way making use of the training? (How? How not? Why? Why not?)

• Has the training been of detriment to you or the team in any way?

  Culture Process
  • At this stage does culture seem re-stabilized?

• Has the training experience had any impact on how you experience or feel within or about the team? The organization?

• At this stage, are you aware of undertaking intentional efforts to shape your team culture?

• Has the team culture changed in any way with respect to the team’s self-identified issues? (Refer to Event Management Protocol Summary Page)
  • Hyper-vigilance
  • Drive to closure
  • Vow of poverty
  • Self-effacing
  • Defining almost everything as work
  • Taking too much responsibility
  • Failing to take care of ourselves
  • Acting out of anger or self-righteousness
  • Avoiding internal group conflict
  • Avoiding agency conflicts
  • First definition driving the group problem solving process
  • Setting up “tests”
  • Sending messages that encouraging staff to buy into our issues
  • Over-reliance on “normative” Idsp to the exclusion of “radical” options
  • Not giving ourselves adequate time to reflect on decisions

• Do you think that the training has in any way better equipped you to reflect on, critique, and transform your culture into the future?

  Leadership Process
  • Has the training in any way better equipped you to analyze and intentionally influence the course of events as they unfold? To manage culture simultaneously?
General

- At this point, has the training or use of the theory in any way stimulated and/or facilitated decisions and/or intentional action that is not likely to have occurred otherwise?

- In your view, has the value of the training reward the patience that it demands?

- What is most valuable to you about the training? Least valuable?

- What would you have liked the training to help you with, but found it didn't?

- Has the training effected you in any way beyond your role as team member and manager?

Closing

- Is there anything I haven't asked you about that has been on your mind, or that you think would be useful for me to know?
Appendix V

Interview Protocol 2.5
Semi-Structured Interview Protocol
Interview Series 2.5

Preamble

You are aware, and have consented to having this session taped?

At this stage in the process, what I am trying to do is learn as much as I can about the meaningfulness and usefulness of the training process. This is to both help me further develop both the theory and process by which people come to use it. Thus, I'm interested in any and all evaluations you've made with respect to your experience of working with the theory.

I'd want to emphasize that you should feel free to decline responding to any of these questions at any point in the interview.

Opening

• If you could free associate for me for a minute; what comes to mind first when you reflect on your experience of the training? -- your thoughts, feelings, reactions?

Meaningfulness

• Have your views of leadership and culture changed in any way over the course of the training?
  • (Omitted 2.3)

• Over the course of the process, has this had any impact on your own sense of self or identity?
  (2.3, 2.5 Modified)

• Has the training impacted upon your understanding of the realities of others on the team?

• Has the training impacted upon your understanding of the realities of others (groups or individuals) beyond the team?
Utility

Culture Process
- Tell me about the Culture Audit process as you look back at it. If it ever was destabilized, has team culture restabilized? *(2.3 Addition; 2.5 Modified)*

- Is there anything different about the team? *(2.2 & 2.3 Modified)*
  - *(2.2 Omitted)*
  - *(2.2 Omitted)*

- Has the team culture changed in any way with respect to the team's self-identified issues? *(Refer to Event Management Protocol Summary Page)*
  - Hyper-vigilance; defining almost everything as work
  - Taking too much responsibility
  - Failing to take care of ourselves
  - Self-effacing
  - Vow of poverty
  - Avoiding internal group conflict
  - Avoiding agency conflicts

- Drive to closure *(2.2 Items Re-organized)*
- Not giving ourselves adequate time to reflect on decisions

- Acting out of anger or self-righteousness
- Setting up "tests"
- Sending messages that encourage staff to buy into our issues
- Over-reliance on "normative" Idsp to the exclusion of "radical" options
- First definition driving the group problem solving process

- Do you think that the training has in any way better equipped you to reflect on, critique, and transform your culture into the future?

Leadership Process
- Has anything changed with respect to how you approach the events you manage? *(2.3 Modified)*
- Has the training in any way better equipped you to analyze and intentionally influence the course of events as they unfold? To manage culture simultaneously?

  **General**

  - Has the training had any detrimental effects for you or the team? *(2.2 Moved & Modified)*

  - *(2.3 Omitted)*
  - *(2.3 Moved to 3.0)*

  - What is most valuable to you about the training? Least valuable?

  - In what ways has the training come up short of your hopes, expectations, or needs? *(2.3 Modified)*

  - Has the training effected you in any way beyond your role as team member and manager?

---

**Closing**

- Is there anything I haven’t asked you about that has been on your mind, or that you think would be useful for me to know?
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Granting/Denying Permission to Video Tape
Granting/Denying Permission to Video Tape

I am seeking your permission to record this group session on video tape for the purposes of a leadership training and research project being conducted here at BMHC. Please respond to this request by placing a check mark in the space that corresponds to your wishes.

Should any member of this group express the preference that this session not be recorded, only notes will be taken. As always, regardless of your choice, your identity in relation to the data you provide will be kept strictly confidential.

Should you consent to having this session recorded, please understand that I will respect, without question, any request to temporarily or permanently stop the recording at any point. Further, if any participant changes his or her mind about the recording after the session, the tape will be erased immediately and without question.

Sincerely, Ted Vokes

I am comfortable having this session video taped

I prefer that this session not be video taped

Date
Appendix X

Master Category List
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDAS</th>
<th>THEMES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>AI. Meaningfulness</td>
<td>AI.1.1 Exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda A</td>
<td>AI.1 Training Content</td>
<td>AI.1.2 Films</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AI.1.3 Meaningfulness of Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AI.1.4 Personal Relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AI.2 Consciousness-Reframing Group-Reflexiveness</td>
<td>AI.2.1 Cultural Awareness (Individual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AI.2.2 Cultural Awareness (Collective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AI.2.3 Intra-Team (Individual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AI.2.4 Therapy Analogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other-Reflexiveness</td>
<td>AI.2.5 Extra-Team (Individual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AI.2.6 Extra-Team (Collective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual Reframing</td>
<td>AI.2.7 Power Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AI.2.8 Reframing (Individual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AI.2.9 Reframing (Collective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All. Practical Utility</td>
<td>All.1 Utilization of the Event Management Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All.1.1 Training Utilization (Collective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All.1.2 Cultural Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All.1.3 Event Management Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All.2 Utility of the Event Management Process</td>
<td>All.2.1 Organizing Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All.2.2 Intentional/Proactive Event Mgt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All.2.3 Time Intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All.3 Unanticipated Utilizations</td>
<td>All.3.1 Training Utilization (Individual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All.3.2 Intentional Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All.3.3 Extra-Team Utilizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory</td>
<td>BI. Process Impact</td>
<td>BI.1 Individual Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda B</td>
<td></td>
<td>BI.1.1 Alienation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BI.1.2 Openness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BI.1.3 Stress/AT Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BI.1.4 Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BI.1.5 General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI.2 Impact of the Culture Audit</td>
<td>BI.2.1 Damage Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BI.2.2 Establish Safety Protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BI.2.3 New Member Enactment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BI.2.4 Team Destabilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BI.2.5 Team Restabilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BI.2.6 Divergent Viewpoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BI.2.7 Generate Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI. Application Insights</td>
<td>BI.1 Leader Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BI.2 Necessity of Safety Protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BI.3 Negotiating Informed Consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BI.4 Prolonged Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BI.5 Leadership/Self Dialectic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BI.6 Leadership/Culture/Self Dialectic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BI.7 Culture/Self Dialectic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy</td>
<td>CI. Trustworthiness</td>
<td>CI.1 Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria C</td>
<td></td>
<td>CI.2 Ethical Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CI. Authenticity</td>
<td>CI.1 Fairness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CI. Transferability</td>
<td>CI.1 Degree of Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CI.2 Readiness Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CI.3 Readiness Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CI.4 Timing of Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CI.5 Training Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CI.6 Trainer Role and Skill Set</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Member Check Protocols
Member Check Protocol  
Interview Series 3.1

Preamble

- Three things I want to do over the course of the next two weeks:
  1. Review the training process with you and collect information on your experiences as this process has unfolded.
  2. Follow-up on some lose ends (outstanding issues) that I still have some questions about.
  3. Conduct a final “member check.”

- It is possible that some of the things I will ask about will seem redundant. This is because I want to minimize assuming that I understand your answers. If you feel that the question has already been addressed and have nothing to add, please feel free to say so, as that is important information as well.

- As always, I want to emphasize that you should feel free to request that recording be temporarily halted or terminated.

1. Training Process Review

- Can you reflect for me on the process as it has unfolded?
  - High and low points?
  - Particularly impactful or dull points?
  - Turning or transition points?
  - First point at which you realized you where incorporating elements of the training into your activities as a manager?

2. Outstanding Issues

Contrast with Mainstream Theories

- Can you contrast the training we have done with your recollections of other leadership training you have received or theories you have been exposed to?
Event Management Protocol
• Are you using it?
• If so, when do you find you are referring to it? What are you using it for?
• How might we improve it?

Practice Effects and Theory Utilization
• As your familiarity with using the LCCT increases, are you finding as we hypothesized that time spent processing events and situations is any less attention and time demanding?

Future Applications
• In principle, have you got all that you want from the training or should we continue the training and culture audit process in some form into the future? If so, what would be of most use in this regard?
  • Integrating LCCT with Type Theory?
  • LCCT training on the level of supervisors, social workers, team level?

Role of Research Participant
• Can you comment on your experiences performing the role of "research participant" for this study?

Closing
• Is there anything I haven’t I asked about you think would be useful for me to know?

Adequacy Criteria
  Adequacy Criteria: Credibility
  • the insider/outside (protagonist/antagonist) role was successfully balanced.
  • trainer worked with, but largely avoided being coopted by the agendas of the participants.

  Adequacy Criteria: Fairness
  • research/training process was responsive to aspirations and objectives of participants.
  • participants had opportunity to participate equally in steering the course of the process.
  • at one point during the culture audit participants expressed a desire for more direction from trainer.

  Adequacy Criteria: Transferability: Readiness Assessment
  • an LCCT training initiative is potentially damaging to individuals and groups not ready to undertake such an intensive and personal process. Thus, there is
a very real need for a thorough assessment of organizational readiness. Among other things, this would involve a process of informing the prospective participants, in detailed terms, about the potential dangers of engaging in the process.

- requires a willingness and capacity to be "self-reflexive" and "other-reflexive."
- requires a level of interpersonal skills and a preexisting environment of respect among prospective participants.
- requires individuals sufficiently secure to deal with the challenges of a relativistic world view.

Adequacy Criteria: Transferability: Training Adaptation

- it is possible that scaled down, less intensive and self-reflexive, training programs might be designed and implemented for organizations close to or approaching readiness. This might lead to the development of graduated approaches to LCCT training.
- one approach might be to focus on the theoretical aspects of the training and emphasize the concept of "other-reflexiveness," to the exclusion of a heavy emphasis on self-reflexiveness.

Application Insights

Application Insight: Cautions

- due to the potentially damaging effects of the training process, extensive and detailed cautions must be made to any prospective group. Pains must be taken to ensure that prospective participants do not dismiss such cautions as routine professional protocol.
- cautions should include a discussion of the potential impact on group processes and culture, interpersonal relationships, and individuals’ own sense of self and their relationship to the group. It is even conceivable that the training can have an impact on the lives of individuals beyond the group context.

Application Insight: Degree of Investment

- due to the intensity and the rather lengthy duration of training, a training initiative can only be successful if participants are highly invested in the group and the relationships through which it is enacted.
- individuals or groups expecting and/or desiring fast and simple answers to organizational problems (i.e., a cook-book type approach) are likely to be disappointed by this approach. There must be an investment in personal and group development.

Application Insight: Leader Preparation

- given that those with the greatest degree of investment in a group are likely to find the process the most intensive and demanding, during the initial design
stage of an intervention, serious consideration should be given to a phased introduction to the group/organization. Such a process would begin with the senior most member(s) or person(s) of greatest responsibility and proceed through the organizational levels as deemed appropriate and desirable.

**Application Insight: Potential Drawbacks**

- the new awarenesses generated through the process may become overwhelming at various points in the process.
- analysis of situations may become so in depth as to complicate a situation and hinder timely action. In addition, people may lose interest in using the process if it is experienced as overly tedious.
- introduction of a relativistic world view can prove mildly to severely disturbing to some individuals, even producing a backlash against such a perspective.
- awareness can be generated into what some consider their own mistakes or shortcomings. This can be disheartening, anxiety provoking, and perhaps, immobilizing.

**Application Insight: Potential Benefits**

- areas of misunderstanding or unknown disagreement can be revealed and dealt with at an earlier stage in the event management process. Therefore, it facilitates opportunities for the development of consensus on central issues which in turn fosters consistency in approaches.
- intense analysis can function proactively to help avert event management approaches which generate larger problems than they are originally intended to address.
- a relativistic world view can be freeing to people in a number of respects. It can enhance one's ability to be attentive to and tolerant of alternative interpretations of reality. That is, defensiveness may be reduced and therefore, understanding enhanced. Self-acceptance of, and confidence in, one’s own interpretations of reality maybe easier in situations where one faces opposition to one’s reality. Finally, it can expand the range of possibilities or options available to an individual or group for dealing with novel situations and circumstances, or intentionally transforming group or organizational culture. In essence, flexibility and adaptability can be enhanced by thinking in these terms.

**Application Insight: Safety Protocols**

- regardless of the functionality of a group, safety protocols for the LCCT training process must be established, agreed upon by all participants, and continually reinforced.
- one approach is to overtly sanction the practice of debriefing after sessions either with the facilitator, or between individuals with whom outstanding issues or questions remain.
- another is to give permission for any individual to call a halt to a process should they experience it as inappropriately intrusive or a subject which they
are as yet unprepared to deal in the group context (if at all). Debriefings between individuals may be an option for dealing with such subjects that are heady in the group context.

- It may proved useful, particularly for less sophisticated and/or less trusting groups, to overtly define the range and nature of subjects that are currently open for discussion and/or debate.
- A training monitoring process should be implemented which allows for the facilitator(s) to conduct individual interviews/debriefings with participants at regularly scheduled intervals to provide opportunities to participants to express their views on, and aspirations for, the process beyond the inevitable constraints of the group context.

**Application Insight: Skilled Facilitator**

- Given the sensitive and potentially dangerous nature of engaging in an LCCT training initiative, prospective facilitators require skills which extend beyond a solid understanding of the theory. To begin with, all that is required of the participants is required of the trainer/facilitator. In addition, a strong foundation of interpersonal, group facilitation, and basic clinical skills are deemed essential. Further, a foundation in ethnographic techniques is necessary to support the facilitator’s efforts to gain an in depth and sympathetic understanding of a group culture, while simultaneously maintaining a sufficient distance to avoid becoming enculturated and colluding with participants.

---

**Individual Impact**

**Individual Impact: Meaningfulness**

- Participants report that the theory and process makes intuitive sense to them, or, “it fits” with what they already believe and experience.
- Participants have used the framework offered in the training to reinterpret past and analyze current events.
- Individuals own sense of the concepts of culture and leadership have changed through the training (MP3). Culture is seen as more fluid and transforming, leadership is approached with a greater reverence for the power one holds to define reality for others.
- Participants have related the concepts covered in the training to theories and experiences beyond the agency.

**Individual Impact: Other-Reflexiveness: Extra-Team**

- Enlightened awareness of the day-to-day experiences and realities of other occupational groups within the agency.
- Increased empathy for those functioning in frontline roles. (MP1, MP3, MP4)
- Enhanced awareness that others often have radically different realities regarding events and actions which are as firmly believed in as one’s own
sense of what is real or self-evident. (MP1, MP3)
• increased appreciation for the need to communicate a clearly defined and consistent reality for others, but also an understanding of the pragmatic limitations to doing so in some instances. (MP2, MP3, MP4)
• individual efforts to remember to be aware of, and take into account, the realities of others in decision making. (MP3, MP4)

**Individual Impact: Other-Reflexiveness: Intra-Team**

• insights into how decisions made by one team member impact on another member of the team. (MP1 re: MP2)
• increased awareness of the potential liabilities of having a team that is largely homogeneous in their thinking styles and values. Share the same blind spots, and tend to only allow entry to other like-minded individuals -- leads to “groupthink” or “in-breeding.” (MP3)
• awareness that the team members are somewhat less aware of the realities of others in the group than anticipated, resulting in surprising differences in approaches that various managers have taken to the same issue (e.g., re-defining the role of supervisor; managing meaning of opening of new program) and that there are divergent opinions on several key issues (e.g., awareness of MP5 becoming program manager; value of new program). (MP5, MP2)
• increased awareness of role as a factor in how others must view situations. (MP5 re: MP1)
• provided a structure for generating increased insight into team dynamics and definition of team issues (e.g., repeated errors based on unresolved issues such as a drive to premature closure on items; a strong tendency to over-personalize leading to avoidance open dialogue on some issues; failing to take the time to manage meaning; forgetting past decisions and commitments leading to inconsistencies in the eyes of staff). (MP2)
Preamble
Conduct a final “member check.” -- to confirm, correct, modify, expand my interpretations of your experiences.

• It is possible that some of the things I will ask about will seem redundant. This is because I want to minimize assuming that I understand your answers. If you feel that the question has already been addressed and have nothing to add, please feel free to say so as that is important information as well.

1. Outstanding Issues

Future Applications
• In principle, have you got all that you want from the training or should we continue the training and culture audit process in some form into the future? If so, what would be of most use in this regard?
  • Integrating LCCT with Type Theory?
  • LCCT training on the level of supervisors, social workers, team level?

Role of Research Participant
• Can you comment on your experiences performing the role of "research participant" for this study?

Closing
• Is there anything I haven't I asked about you think would be useful for me to know?

2. Member Check

Individual Impact: Leadership Activity/Event Management*
• MP3: reports being more careful to ensure his/her communications are not misconstrued by subordinates or interpreted in a different light than her/his intent.
• efforts undertaken to be more intentional with respect to the cultural messages communicated to staff.
• increased attention to generating insights into stakeholder perspectives on
events and issues, and managing reality on the basis of other’s realities in
conjunction with their own reality.
• on critical issues or events, individuals are more aware of the range of
interpretations, and therefore, choices that can be generated.
• MP4: reports engaging in efforts to make that which is preconscious,
conscious so as to be more intentional in managing events.
• MP4: reports undertaking efforts to manage events more proactively in an
effort to avert creating new issues to manage out of efforts to be expedient.
• some have begun training their own supervisory staff in basic concepts of the
theory (especially "Other-Reflexiveness"). (MP3, MP4)

Individual Impact: Meaningfulness
• participants report that the theory and process makes intuitive sense to them,
or, "it fits" with what they already believe and experience.
• participants have used the framework offered in the training to reinterpret past
and analyze current events.
• individuals own sense of the concepts of culture and leadership have changed
through the training (MP3). Culture is seen as more fluid and transforming,
leadership is approached with a greater reverence for the power one holds to
define reality for others.
• participants have related the concepts covered in the training to theories and
experiences beyond the agency.

Individual Impact: Other-Reflexiveness: Extra-Team
• heightened awareness of the day-to-day experiences and realities of other
occupational groups within the agency.
• increased empathy for those functioning in frontline roles. (MP1, MP3, MP4)
• enhanced awareness that others often have radically different realities
regarding events and actions which are as firmly believed in as one’s own
sense of what is real or self-evident. (MP1, MP3)
• increased appreciation for the need to communicate a clearly defined and
consistent reality for others, but also an understanding of the pragmatic
limitations to doing so in some instances. (MP2, MP3, MP4)
• individual efforts to remember to be aware of, and take into account, the
realities of others in decision making. (MP3, MP4)

Individual Impact: Other-Reflexiveness: Intra-Team
• insights into how decisions made by one team member impact on another
member of the team. (MP1 re: MP2)
• increased awareness of the potential liabilities of having a team that is largely
homogeneous in their thinking styles and values. Share the same blind spots,
and tend to only allow entry to other like-minded individuals -- leads to "group-
think" or "in-breeding." (MP3)
• awareness that the team members are somewhat less aware of the realities of others in the group than anticipated, resulting in surprising differences in approaches that various managers have taken to the same issue (e.g., re-defining the role of supervisor; managing meaning of opening of new program) and that there are divergent opinions on several key issues (e.g., awareness of MP5 becoming program manager; value of new program). (MP5, MP2)
• increased awareness of role as a factor in how others must view situations. (MP5 re: MP1)
• provided a structure for generating increased insight into team dynamics and definition of team issues (e.g., repeated errors based on unresolved issues such as a drive to premature closure on items; a strong tendency to over-personalize leading to avoidance open dialogue on some issues; failing to take the time to manage meaning; forgetting past decisions and commitments leading to inconsistencies in the eyes of staff). (MP2)

**Evaluation of the Training Process**

A primary objective of the current research is to evaluate the training process in terms of its *meaningfulness* and *utility* to the participants. This section summarizes the central interpretations generated through explorations of these evaluation themes.

**Meaningfulness of the LCCT Training**

1. *Intelligibility*: Does the content of the training (i.e., the concepts upon which the LCCT is constructed) make sense, in at least an abstract or conceptual sense, to participants?

2. *Relevance*: To what degree are participants able to interpret their present, and reinterpret their past experiences of group life and events through the conceptual framework provided by the training?

3. *Consciousness-Reframing*: To what degree does the training assist participants in generating new insights into the group process which they recognize as beyond those they generated previous to the training? That is, does the training enable them to re-structure their analysis and interpretation of their own group's cultural and leadership processes in such a way that they are able to generate original insights into these processes?
Practical Utility of the LCCT Training

1. Culture Management Processes: To what degree do participants experience the training as a useful process for enabling them to participate more intentionally in influencing (e.g., sustaining, altering, or changing) the group’s foundational reality and associated processes (i.e., cultural processes)?

2. Event Management Processes: To what degree do participants experience the training as a useful process for enabling them to participate more intentionally in influencing the course of the immediate group reality construction processes (i.e., leadership processes)?

3. Processes of Social Organizing: To what degree do participants experience the training as a useful process for enabling them to participate more intentionally in influencing both the group leadership and cultural processes simultaneously?

Utility and event management processes. Participants uniformly reported that the training process had a strong positive impact on their event management activities -- first within the management team, and later in the process, within their own treatment teams.

In concrete terms, the most extensive intentional changes participants have made over the course of the training pertain to their own normative processes for the management of events -- and thereby, their own group and organizational cultures. Integrating the central elements of the theory with the results of their own culture audit, they have gradually re-constructed their approach to analyzing and coordinating their activity around novel events with increased attention to the cultural messages their decisions and actions are likely to transmit.

EMP
- The EMP effectively integrated the theory with the group’s specific cultural objectives and played a key role in theory application in and beyond our earlier facilitation sessions.

Integration of the concept of “Other-Reflexiveness.”
On the basis of participant reactions during training sessions and reports during interviews, it is evident that there is uniform agreement regarding the utility of other-reflexive exercises as avenues for consciousness reframing (e.g., identification of all stakeholders, construction of realities regarding the realities
of these individuals and/or groups, and development of action plans for the management of the realities of these groups). Indeed, it is evident from the data that the insights participants have generated through such activities have had a profound influence on the course of event management sessions. Consequently, this is one of the first and most consistently used concepts participants have incorporated into their leadership activities beyond formal training and facilitation sessions (i.e., with their treatment teams). On the basis of this interpretation then, it seems essential to more explicitly incorporate this concept into the LCCT and associated training process.

**Authenticity Criteria**

**Ontological authenticity.** Ontological authenticity refers to (1) the extent to which the participants’ own constructions are expanded, improved, elaborated, and enriched through the training process, and (2) the degree to which participants have become more sophisticated in their use.

**Educative authenticity.** This criterion builds on the previous one and refers to the degree to which the participants’ reach greater understandings of, and appreciation for, the competing constructions offered by others.

**Catalytic authenticity.** Catalytic authenticity is intended to evaluate the extent to which the inquiry stimulates and facilitates action.

**Tactical authenticity.** This criterion builds on the previous action agenda and refers to the extent to which the inquiry process goes beyond stimulating action, to assess the degree to which it empowers participants to act in meaningful ways.
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