2007

Can Organizations Meet theTest of Transforming Leadership?

Gill Robinson Hickman

University of Richmond, ghickman@richmond.edu

Recommended Citation

Hickman, Gil. "Can Organizations Meet the Test of Transforming Leadership?" In *Reflections on Leadership* edited by Richard A. Couto, 119-132. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc., 2007.

CHAPTER 11
CAN ORGANIZATIONS MEET THE TEST OF TRANSFORM-
ING LEADERSHIP?[1]
Gill Robinson Hickman

By coincidence or fate, *Leadership* appeared as I completed my PhD in public administration. In one of my conceptual papers, I raised the question, "What kind of organization will be best suited for a highly turbulent environment?" The literature, at the time, portrayed organizational environments of the future as highly turbulent with self-perpetuating changes. So I began writing papers about a new conceptual framework for organization, which I termed "transformistic organizations," to answer my question. Bennis and Slater (1968), Schon (1971), and Emery and Trist (1971) influenced my work then.

I envisioned that transformistic organizations would succeed their bureaucratic and organic predecessors. I explained that the environmental context of each of the previous two organizational types had changed from stable, to changing, to turbulent and that a new form of organization would emerge. I developed the characteristics of transformistic organizations in relation to a turbulent environmental context and then identified the administrative behaviors that would facilitate the development and functioning of such organizations in that environment. As with other graduate papers, little happened with mine until the early 1990s, when Jim, now my faculty colleague, encouraged me to return to my work on transformistic organizations.

> When I joined Jim as a faculty member of the Jepson School of Leadership Studies, I read his book, *Leadership*. There was an immediate and obvious linkage between my earlier work and his concept of transforming leadership.

My subsequent writing in this area takes his definition of transforming leadership from the political context and applies it to formal organizations. Transforming organizational leaders shape collective purpose and developmental

---

[1] Portions of this chapter may also be found in "Leadership and the Social Imperative of Organizations in the 21st Century" (Hickman 1998:559-71).

processes within the organization that adapt to some social changes and promote others. Though leadership scholars have previously adapted Burns's concept and incorporated it in leader-follower relationships (Bass 1985; Bennis and Nanus 1985; Tichy and Devanna 1986; Bass, Avolio, and Goodheim 1987; Bass, Waldman, Avolio, and Bebb 1987), my work attempts to infuse organizations with Burns's imperative to link leadership with "collective purpose and social change" (Burns 1978:3).

Concepts from Public Administration in Leadership

Burns uses a static portrayal of organizations as bureaucracies in his discussion of "Bureaucracy Versus Leadership" and in his chapter on "Executive Leadership." Borrowing from classics in public administration, he suggests that bureaucracies prohibit the type of leadership that brings about real, intended social change. His vision of the characteristics of bureaucratic organizations and their inherent flaws describes bureaucracy as the world of explicitly formulated goals, rules, and procedures that define and regulate the place of its "members," a world of specialization and expertise, in which the roles of individuals are minutely specified and differentiated. In other words, bureaucratic organizations discourage the kind of power that is generated by tapping motivational bases among employees and marshaling personal, as opposed to organizational, resources. Furthermore, they swallow up individuals in the machine, leaving them separated from tools, alienated from work, and ultimately, as Thorstein Veblen contended, trained into incapacity— the organization, anti-human, anti-individualistic, anti-their own real nature, man and woman (Burns 1978:295-98).

Max Weber acknowledged the inherent anomalies of a fully developed bureaucratic organization, and Vincent Ostrom described the limits on leadership imposed by the bureaucratic search for order. "The bureaucratic machine will place the professional bureaucrat in chains, will transform citizens into dependent masses, and will make impotent 'dilettantes' of their 'masters'" (Ostrom 1973:33). These views of organizations as bureaucracies support Burns's contention that formal organizations are not compatible with the goals and purpose of transforming leadership.

Burns overlooks, however, that not all formal organizations are bureaucratic. The apparent shortcomings in bureaucratic organizations facilitated the development of a different organization type, organic. *Leadership* did not include the scholarship on these organic organizations (Burns and Stalker 1961; Katz and Kahn 1966; and Schon 1971) that occur primarily in a "disturbed reactive" environment that requires organizational adaptation to conditions of change. The environment is no longer stable, and the organization must compete with numerous similar organizations. In this environmental context, organizations face unique and unfamiliar problems, which cannot be broken down and distributed among specialists in the hierarchy (Burns and Stalker 1961). There is a continuous redefinition of responsibilities, functions, methods, and power generated through interaction with others participating in common tasks or problems. Individuals do their jobs with the overall knowledge of the organization's

purpose and circumstances. Communications in the organization consist of lateral consultation in contrast to vertical command. The boss at the top is no longer all-powerful.

Like the bureaucratic structure, the organic organizational type also contained certain anomalies. This model assumed that growth and change would occur in the environment in a relatively linear pattern. The organic model anticipated changes in operations among "similar others" or competitors. Among others, Emery and Trist (1973) foretold of a new turbulent, uncertain environmental context comprised of dynamic processes arising from the field itself and creating significant variances from the component systems. These fields are so complex, so richly textured, that it is difficult to see how individual systems can, by their own efforts, successfully adapt to them.

These dynamic properties of the environment led me to ask what happens when the rate and forms of change increase to create a turbulent environment. I began to think that in these environments, organizations must adapt and transform on individual, organizational, and societal levels if they are to preserve core values and ethics, remain viable, and improve the overall well-being of society. The theory later incorporated many of the ideas associated with Burns's transforming leadership and fundamentally realigned the roles, missions, and functioning of organizations in volatile environmental contexts (Hickman 1993).

Leadership and followership in transformistic organizations are predicated less on positional authority and more on interdependent work relationships centered on common purposes. Participants are active, multifaceted contributors. Their involvement is based on shared, flexible roles. Leadership and followership are different activities but often played by the same people at different times (Kelley 1988; 1995). Individuals who assume leadership roles have the desire and willingness to lead. They possess sound visioning, interpersonal communications, and organizational skills and abilities. Effective followers form the other equally important component of the equation and are distinguished by their capacities for self-management, strong commitment, and courage.

Each of the three organizational types—bureaucratic, organic, and transformistic—requires a different form of leadership. Table 1 provides a comparison of these organizational types and identifies their accompanying environmental contexts, leadership structures, management and member behavior, and organizational characteristics.

A Social Imperative Emanating from the Environmental Context

Leadership scholars concern themselves with "good" leadership or with what leadership ought to be as opposed to what it really is, as Barbara Kellerman in Chapter 1 so accurately observes. I strongly believe that leadership scholars should concern themselves with both the ideal and what actually is, although I concentrate on a normative perspective for organizational leadership in the context of very real turbulent environments. My conceptual points of departure with Burns combine normative responses and real changes into the social imperative of transformistic organizational leadership.

Table 11-1
Environmental Contexts, Organizational Structures, and Leadership Forms of Organizations

	Bureaucratic	Organic	*Transformistic*
Environmental Contexts	Stable environment. "Placid Clustered": Goals and challenges distributed in somewhat predictable form. Strategies and tactics to reach goals.	Changing environment. "Disturbed Reactive": Interaction of organizations with similar goals. Organization employs operations to deter other organizations or, when necessary, come to terms with competitors.	Uncertain. "Turbulent, Dynamic": Interconnectedness to promote mutually beneficial interactions between and within organizations. Use of ethics and values frameworks for organizational and external participants as aligning mechanisms. Creation of organizational matrices.
Leadership Form	**Authoritarian**	**Transactional**	**Transforming**
Management and Member Behavior	Impersonal and functional	Humanistic and reciprocal	Contributive and substantive
Organizational Characteristics	Hierarchical, well-defined chain of command. System of procedures and rules for dealing with all contingencies relating to work activities. Division of labor based on specialization. Promotion and selection based on technical competence.	Network structure of authority. Broad operational procedures and rules with consensual guidelines being developed within work units. Functional units composed of multiple specializations. Work assignments based on contributive knowledge and specializations.	Shifting, collaborative, leadership structures and authority with inter- and intra-organizational linkages. Decision making and action based on vision, purpose and core values. Shifting goals, priorities, and methods of operation. Transforming or temporary units of participants with multiple skills. Work assignments based on capacity to contribute to team or ability to transform skills for new purposes.

The environment that characterizes these organizations includes intense global concern and competition; intra-organizational relationships and collaboration; a focus on democracy, substantive justice, civic virtues, and the common good; values orientation; empowerment and trust; consensus-oriented policy-making processes; diversity and pluralism in structure and participation; critical dialogue, qualitative language and methodologies; collectivized rewards; and market alignments (Kuhnert 1993; Rost 1991; Clegg 1990; Toffler 1980; Emery

and Trist 1973; Bennis and Slater 1968). These elements link people and organizations globally in an environmental context of turbulence, unpredictability, and change. Environments with such dynamic properties foster interdependencies.

The social imperative for organizations is to understand interdependency in this new environment and to link purposely their own efforts for success to the survival and well-being of society. Can organizations be reconfigured so that social change and collective purpose serve profitability and productivity? There are increasing numbers of private-sector organizations that are attempting to pursue these seemingly contradictory requirements of balancing the functions for which they exist and assuming responsibility for working on the problems and the challenges of society. Drucker (1994) describes organizations of the twenty-first century as new, integrating mechanisms. He indicates that public and private organizations form the capacity essential in determining how to balance two apparently contradictory requirements, the primary functions for which specific organizations exist and the social responsibility each has to work on the problems and challenges of the community as a whole. This, Drucker contends, needs to be the joint work of both public and private organizations that are capable of social-sector work. The ability to collaborate with organizations domestically and globally is becoming a new indicator of success in highly dynamic environments. Society not only expects this form of success to produce profitability for those organizations involved, but also expects those organizations to demonstrate responsibility and contribute to the collective good of the society in which they function.

The Give and Take of Business

Several organizational initiatives illustrate this commitment to a dual mission that advances purpose and social change. For example, the Timberland Company, maker of rugged outdoor footwear and clothing, won the Corporate Conscience Award given each year by the Council on Economic Priorities. Timberland injects social commitment into its mission statement, "Each individual can, and must, make a difference in the way we experience life on this planet," by providing its employees with thirty-two hours of paid time off and five company-sponsored events that allow them to volunteer their services to make a difference in society (Will 1995:18). The company committed five years of services and funding to the City Year urban "peace corps." The youth corps members teach children to read, clean up trash-strewn lots, and interact with different segments of the community. Timberland shares its private-sector expertise with City Year, and the youth corps provides Timberland employees with opportunities to do community service. Beyond its social commitment in the United States, the company also has international guidelines for choosing business partners based on its Standards for Social Responsibility.

In South Africa, a group of white male business entrepreneurs joined together at a "walkabout" to create a new nonprofit organization aimed at identifying and developing emerging leaders in black South African communities. Simultaneously, one of the entrepreneurs initiated an institute within his enterprise

to develop the capacity of black South African small-business owners to sustain their survival.

Why are such unusual affiliations occurring? Because corporations are coming to understand that their interests and the fates of previously "separate" people are inextricably linked. One popular journal indicates that a number of U.S. entrepreneurs whose companies are both profitable and socially active have been moved to action by several unsettling trends, including "the sharp rise in juvenile crime, the dearth of quality child care, and the plight of unskilled workers who can't get jobs" (Lord 1994:103). These are not issues that immediately affect the bottom-line, but they do stand to affect the future availability of workers, the location of businesses, and the quality of life in urban areas.

A major retirement system offers its contributors the opportunity to invest their retirement earnings in a fund called "social choice." The companies in this fund practice social and/or environmental responsibility in their business actions and choices. Investors have actively embraced this fund and have also received economic returns comparable to other market investments. These examples are representative of organizations that are embracing social imperatives in their mission, while meeting their organizational purpose of profit.

As organizations continue to incorporate these dual missions and capacity-building roles, they encounter challenges. They face the difficulties inherent in building appropriate infrastructures and capacity substantial enough to generate and sustain the ambitious pursuit of organizational purpose, economic viability, and social change. Encountering challenges and even setbacks in these areas does not mean that the pursuit should be abandoned or that it is imprudent. It means that pioneering efforts into this new arena require organizational learning, concerted analysis, refinement, and corrections.

Can such efforts be prudent in a time of fierce global competition, downsizing, layoffs, outsourcing, and lean-and-mean strategizing? Apparently so. A survey of 1,005 corporations, which had recently participated in downsizing, found that only one-third of the companies reported that profits increased as much as they expected after layoffs, and less than one-half said the cuts reduced expenses over time. In fact, four out of five organizations rehired the laid-off managers, and a small minority reported a satisfactory increase in shareholders' return on investment (Downs 1995:11-12). Instead of serving as responses, much less as solutions, to larger, more fundamental changes in a postindustrial environmental context, these tactics turn out to be temporary reactions and are often detrimental to long-term success. Organizations with a social imperative linking their survival to the well-being of society may be better positioned in the long run to maintain their human and economic viability.

We live in an era that demands the pursuit of more enduring visions, purposes, and roles for organizations. The essential element is leadership, the type of leadership that assumes elevated sights and dimensions beyond those set in previous eras. Transformistic organizations require leadership by activists who work internally and externally to bring about human and economic metamorphosis. Within the organization, these agents of change generate visions, mission, goals, and a culture that gives individuals, groups, and the organization

itself the capacity to practice its values, serve its purpose, maintain strong economic viability, and serve societal needs.

Externally, transforming leaders are both organizational and "social entrepreneurs" (Waddock and Post 1991) who build interconnectedness for business and societal purposes. Frequently, these leaders are business executives, such as those involved in Cleveland Tomorrow, Hands across America, or the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, who recognize crisis-level social problems characterized by multiplicity and extreme levels of complexity and who mobilize interdependent organizations and individuals to begin working toward new solutions. These highly credible leaders generate the sort of follower commitment that fosters a sense of organizational and collective purpose.

How can organizational leaders develop the type of context that maximizes human capabilities for personal, organizational, and societal good? Organizations first will need to develop an ability to generate and expand human capacity at individual, group, organizational, and societal levels and then forge interconnectedness among these levels.

The Conceptual Framework

The four interdependent transformistic organization elements, in their emergent and idealized form, entail: a dynamic and turbulent environment; the organization as a context for capacity building; transforming leadership that mobilizes, facilitates, and elevates human and organizational developmental processes; and outcomes characterized by maximized human and organizational capabilities and contributions for the individual, organization, and society. Though the elements incorporated in the transformistic framework are interdependent and mutually reinforcing, we discuss them separately for purposes of analysis.

Dynamic and Turbulent Environments. The effects of larger societal challenges, such as new markets in new democracies, changes in family structures, cultural and ethnic diversity, decline in urban environments, and environmental sustainability are becoming intermeshed purposefully and often unexpectedly with organizational functioning. In order to build capacity in organizations, leaders are required to be as attentive to the changes and needs in their external and internal environments. As leaders, they must help determine the relationship between the external environment and the human and structural capacities of their own organization.

> A turbulent field environment has dynamic processes created by changes emanating from the environment. Fairly simple examples of this may be seen in fishing and lumbering, where competitive strategies, based on an assumption that the environment is static, may—through overfishing and overcutting—set off disastrous dynamic processes in the fish and plant population, with the consequent destruction of all the competing social systems. It is easy to see how even more complex dynamic processes are triggered in human populations (Emery and Trist 1973:52-53).

Implications for organizations suggest that traditional methods of forecast-

ing, planning, and strategizing will be less effective, making consequences of
the organization's actions or those of its competitors more unpredictable. Col-
lective strategies among multiple organizations linked by their recognition of
"significant values" can provide a coping mechanism in this context. Emery and
Trist discuss significant values as methods of reducing complexity. They sug-
gest that "values are neither strategies nor tactics and cannot be reduced to
them." As Lewin has pointed out, values have the conceptual character of
"'power fields' and act as guides to behavior" (Emery and Trist 1973:69).

In introducing the use of values, Emery and Trist immediately recognize the
problems of determining which values will be used in organizations and how
they will be used. They suggest that a means for dealing with the complex issue
of values is contained in the design of the social organization. Transformistic
organizations link with like, but competitive, others and develop "some relation-
ship between dissimilar organizations whose fates are basically (and) positively
correlated: that is, relationships that will maximize cooperation while still rec-
ognizing that no one organization could take over the role of the other" (Emery
and Trist 1973:76).

The results of Emery and Trist's design principle become a responsive, self-
regulating system with core values and a unifying purpose as the inherent self-
regulating device. The creation of such organizational contexts allows coopera-
tive linkages with similar and dissimilar organizations in a dynamic environ-
mental field. Existence within this environmental context, therefore, requires
changes in concepts of the nature, purpose, and design of organizations; organ-
izational leadership; relationships within and between organizations; expecta-
tions concerning human capabilities and contributions in organizations; and in-
herent outcomes.

Organizational Capacity Building. Within the transformistic framework, or-
ganizations are recognized as "contexts" for capacity building. As such, they
focus on human purposes and values as the driving force of the institution. Gains
in economic resources become instruments for concerted human activity. This
organizational focus does not mean that significant service and products cannot
result or that bottom line economic considerations and productivity are mini-
mized. It simply means that organizations become human entities with economic
interests as components of human requirements.

Building the context for organizations, which Wheatley (1994) refers to as
"fields," creates an internal setting that shapes its dynamics.

> The field must reach all corners of the organization, involve everyone, and be
> available everywhere. Vision statements move off the walls and into the corri-
> dors, seeking out every employee and every recess of the organization. We
> need all of us out there, stating, clarifying, discussing, modeling, and filling all
> of the space with the messages we care about. If we do that, fields develop, and
> with them, their wondrous capacity to bring energy into form (Wheatley
> 1994:55-56).

Creation of such a context develops the organization's capacity for "resil-
ience" and "self-transcendence" (Carey 1993), so that the human potential that is

unleashed may be realized beyond the organization for societal transformations in the external environment. When these factors are established, the organization can be positioned to create value and purpose alignments with others in the environment whose fates, in the words of Emery and Trist, are "positively correlated."

Several pragmatic challenges arise for organizations moving toward such contexts: (1) how to create contexts that facilitate the liberation of human potential to maximize personal, organizational, and societal capabilities; (2) how to prepare individuals for and engage them in these new challenges; (3) how to identify, develop, and sustain core values and unifying purposes; and (4) how to align organizational values and purposes with others in the environment and/or meet emergent needs in the environment. There are no simple responses to these challenges. However, the ability to meet them seems to rest more with a process and a set of responsibilities, which is leadership.

Mobilizing and Elevating Organizational Processes of Human Development. Changing and reframing organizations to meet the challenges of a new era require innovative leadership structures. Rost (1991) indicates that there is a definite trend toward shared or collaborative leadership. Collaborative leadership, particularly at today's executive levels, entails the redistribution and sharing of power, authority, and position, all of which have been relatively untested in contemporary organizations. In addition to the executive-leadership-team configurations, leadership might function in arrangements such as dyads, triads, representative team leaders, and many other constructs. The leadership structure, like the organizational structure, will need to be developed by stakeholders to fit the purpose, needs, and values of the enterprise.

Transforming leadership is particularly useful for these needs. When Burns's concept of transforming leadership is employed in the transformistic organizational context, it is imperative that three factors maintain prominence: the focus on leadership as a process; the powerful and mutually reinforcing roles and impact of leaders and followers on one another; and the responsibility of leaders and followers to engage in collective purpose to effect social change while implementing the organization's purpose and remaining economically viable.

When viewed from Emery and Trist's perspective, transforming leadership serves to align human, organizational, and environmental values, capabilities, purposes, and needs. This form of leadership influences participants in the process to remain open to new information and inputs and to move themselves and others toward the capacity for self-transcendence (Carey 1992). It involves advancing beyond self-serving, egocentric purposes to focus on a larger perspective or greater good and to serve genuine human needs.

Vital to the concept of transformistic organizations is the role of transforming leadership in establishing external connectedness with similar and dissimilar others in the environment. John Gardner (1990) identified five skills critical to leaders trying to develop interconnectedness as agreement building, networking, exercising non-jurisdictional power, institution building, and flexibility. As pre-

viously indicated, Waddock and Post (1991) would add the skills of social en-
trepreneurs who bring together social alliances of multiple actors, on multiple
levels and by multiple means, to solve extremely complex societal problems.
Given the complexity of this dynamic environmental field and its accelerated
rate of change, leaders must use the collective sense of organizational values,
identity, purpose, and capabilities as their guide in determining with whom to
connect, for what purposes, and to what end. Collaboration and cooperation
among organizations globally and domestically are becoming new indicators of
success. Society expects this form of success not only to produce profitability
for those involved, but also to prove an organization's ability to exercise social
responsibility in the process.

Maximized Human and Organizational Capabilities and Contributions. The
output of transformistic organizations exceeds products, services, or profits,
though these should indeed result. The real outcomes are qualitative changes in
the well-being of society. Transformation of human capabilities within organiza-
tions that change society at large could be tantamount to a new social movement
for the twenty-first century. The comment by Edward Simon, president of Her-
man Miller, that "business is the only institution that has a chance. . . to funda-
mentally improve the injustice that exists in the world" may generally apply
more directly to interconnected organizations in the next century. Though I be-
lieve these capabilities exist within the organizations of various sectors now,
Simon's point illustrates a progression to the new thinking among organizational
leaders, the kind of thinking that will make the transition to transformistic or-
ganizations a viable possibility in the twenty-first century.

One of the major roles of leadership in transformistic organizations is to
engage participants in the work of identifying, developing, and employing val-
ues. Values serve as the organization's essence, stability, and guide for action.
Still, the question is, which values should be used for the work of organizations
and their alignment with others? In an attempt to develop the beginning of a
global set of values, Kidder (1994) sought the perspectives of twenty-four di-
verse leaders and influential individuals from around the world. The values iden-
tified included love, truthfulness, fairness/justice, freedom, unity, tolerance, re-
sponsibility, and respect for life. Even in the unlikely event that these values
become accepted universally, only the reality of their implementation will give
them real meaning.

Heifetz (1994) provides several significant insights concerning the imple-
mentation of values. First, he indicates that leadership mobilizes people to do the
"adaptive work" required to address or lessen the gap between value conflicts
among individuals. Second, values are shaped and refined when people must
deploy them in the face of real problems. Third, success is influenced by the
openness of participants to diverse and even competing value perspectives, as
well as their willingness to use creative tensions and conflict to generate new
knowledge, approaches, and outcomes. He urges that leadership tackle the tough
problems by allowing values to evolve without an imperialistic perspective, but
rather by engaging participants in the examination and incorporation of values

from different cultures and organizations.

Collective values provide a foundation for forming the organization's unifying purpose, which represents the substance to which organizational participants are willing to commit. This purpose provides meaning for the organization and in the lives of its participants (Wheatley 1994). The pursuit of unifying or collective purposes requires an elevation of motives and values. Burns asserts that in the pursuit of collective purposes, "whatever the separate interests persons might hold, they are presently or potentially united in the pursuit of 'higher' goals, the realization of which is tested by the achievement of significant change that represents the collective or pooled interests of leaders and followers" (Burns 1978:425-26).

Using foundational values and a unifying purpose, leaders and organizational participants can derive a shared formulation of organizational vision, culture, change efforts, relationships, and external interactions. These factors constitute the identity of an organization and position it to relate and contribute to its environment.

Liberating Human Potential and Increasing Capacity

In transformistic organizations, engagement of the full person involves liberating human potential and his or her capabilities to change. Transforming leadership facilitates this capacity by promoting personal and emotional stability and maturity among organizational participants. Promotion of human development stems from the establishment of a culture, context, or field that supports advancement of self-knowledge, enhanced self-esteem, and emotional and physical wellness. In addition, the development of whole-person relationships is encouraged to include recognition and regard for the uniqueness and diversity of individuals and the interrelated personal, professional, and relational aspects of their lives. In accordance with this is another of transforming leadership's facilitations: the development of the culture and resources for continual learning that empowers individuals to grow, create, and change themselves, their organization, and the environment.

The existence of these interrelated conditions provides organizational participants with the capabilities to respond to complex issues and the needs that arise in rapidly changing dynamic environments. The process that organizations must employ to gain this capacity, this adeptness to learning, has been described in terms of organizational participants, who "must become able not only to transform our institutions in response to changing situations and requirements, but must invent and develop institutions which are 'learning systems' or systems capable of bringing about their own continuous transformations" (Schon 1971:30).

Senge (1990) later refers to this process as generative learning, which enhances the capacity of organizational participants to create. He states that five essential elements must develop as an ensemble to create a fundamental learning organization:

• Personal mastery: continually clarifying and deepening personal vision, focus-

ing energies, developing patience, and seeing reality objectively.
- Mental models: changing ingrained assumptions, generalizations, pictures and images of how the world works.
- Shared vision: unearthing shared "pictures of the future" that foster genuine commitment.
- Team learning: aligning and developing the capacity of a team to create the results its members truly desire.
- Systems thinking: integrating all the elements by fusing them into a coherent body of theory and practice (Senge 1990).

Heifetz (1994) offers another dimension of generative learning with his own work on adaptive work as collective learning that is stimulated during the process of leaders and followers working through hard problems together.

The forms of learning described by Schon, Senge, and Heifetz require organizational participants to undergo continual examination, synthesis, and integration from various disciplines, perspectives, and cultures, a concept that is conceptually sound but difficult to practice. These processes must be built into the organization through deliberately planned opportunities for dialogue, technology used to enhance creativity and problem solving (Passmore 1988), and diligence exercised by leaders and participants in the organization.

Conclusion

The dynamic properties of the environment have delivered us a challenging social imperative, which is to prepare and position our organizations to generate unprecedented advances for society and to resolve highly complex human and environmental problems. The transformistic-organization framework can serve to stimulate organizational movement toward the liberation of human potential in an effort to meet these unprecedented challenges. In this context, transforming leadership itself evolves and becomes multifaceted. In doing so, its shifts are based on several factors: the influences of changes and requirements from the environment; the quality of adaptive work engaged in by followers with leaders; the level, quality and complexity of collaboration within and across organizational boundaries; the ability to use technological capabilities to link participants and change environmental circumstances; and the deployment of economic and material resources for collective purposes.

References

Bass, B. M. 1985. *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations.* New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., B. J. Avolio, and L. Goodheim. 1987. "Biography and the Assessment of Transformational Leadership at the World-Class Level." *Journal of Management* 13, 7-19.

Bass, B. M., D. A. Waldman, B. J. Avolio, and M. Bebb 1987. "Transformational Leadership and the Falling Dominoes Effect." *Group & Organization Studies* 12, 73-87.

Bennis, W. and B. Nanus, 1985. *Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge.* New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc.

Bennis, W. and P. Slater. 1968. *The Temporary Society*. New York: Harper Colophon.

Burns. J. M. 1978. *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.

Burns, T. and G.M. Stalker. 1961. *The Management of Innovation*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books.

Carey, M.R. 1992. "Transformational Leadership and the Fundamental Option for Self-Transcendence. *Leadership Quarterly* 3(3), 217-36.

Clegg, S.R. 1990. *Modern Organizations: Organizational Studies in the Postmodern World*. London: Sage Publishers.

Downs, A. 1995. *Corporate Executives: The Ugly Truth about Layoffs—How Corporate Greed is Shattering Lives, Companies, and Communities*. New York: AMACOM.

Drucker, P.F. 1994. "The Age of Social Transformation." *The Atlantic Monthly* 274, 3, 53-56ff.

Emery, F. E. and E. L. Trist. 1973. *Towards a Social Ecology*. New York: Plenum.

Gardner, J. W. 1990. *On Leadership*. New York: Free Press.

Heifetz, R. A. 1994. *Leadership Without Easy Answers*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press.

Hickman, G. R. 1993. "Toward Transformistic Organizations." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.

----. Ed. 1998. *Leading Organizations: Perspectives for a New Era*. Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage Publications.

Katz, D. and R. I. Kahn. 1966. *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. New York: Wiley.

Kelley, R. 1988. "In Praise of Followers." *Harvard Business Review*, 66(6), 141-48.

----. 1995. "In Praise of Followers." In J.T. Wren (Ed.), *The Leader's Companion: Insight into Leadership Through the Ages*, pp. 193-204. New York: Free Press.

Kidder, R.M. 1994. *Shared Values for a Troubled World: Conversations with Men and Women of Conscience*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kuhnert, K. W. 1993. "Leadership Theory in Postmodern Organizations." In R. T. Golembiewski (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Behavior*, pp. 189-202. New York: Marcel Decker.

Lord, M. 1994. "Making a Difference and Money Too: Entrepreneurs are Finding Rewarding Remedies for Social Ills." *U.S. News & World Report* (October 31).

Ostrom, V. 1973. *The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration*. University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press.

Passmore, W. A. 1988. *Designing Effective Organizations: The Sociotechnical Systems Perspective*. New York: Wiley Publishers.

Rost, J. C. 1991. *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Schon, D. A. 1971. *Beyond the Stable State*. New York: Norton Publishers.

Senge, P. M. 1990. *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday/Currency.

Tichy, N. and Devanna, M. 1986. *Transformational Leadership*. New York: John Wiley Publishers.

Toffler, A. 1980. *The Third Wave*. New York: William Morrow.

Waddock, S.A. and Post, J.E. 1991. "Social Entrepreneurs and Catalytic Change." *Public Administration Review* 51, 393-401.

Wheatley, M. J. 1994. *Leadership and the New Science: Learning about Organizations from an Orderly Universe*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Will, R. 1995. "Corporations with a Conscience." *Business and Society Review* 95, 17-20.