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The purpose of this project is to determine what relationships, if any, exist between Zen Buddhism and modern conceptualizations of leadership. In a review of existing literature, no analysis was found that examined the relationship between concepts associated with leadership theory and Zen principles. Hence, in order to explore these issues, I employed the following basic procedure. First I identified a modern representation of theories of leadership. This step involved an examination of existing theories of leadership, and a survey in which the faculty at the Jepson School of Leadership Studies at the University of Richmond ranked a set of theories in terms of their contributions to contemporary leadership theory. From the results of this survey, I chose the top three theories for closer examination. The next step involved an examination of literature related to Zen. Before I attempted this portion of the project, I consulted Dr. Miranda Shaw, professor of religion at the University of Richmond, to obtain her assistance in summarizing the many principles of Zen philosophy into a parsimonious set. This resulted in the identification of five basic principles of Zen indicative of the philosophy as a whole, yet pertinent to leadership studies as well. Subsequently, I systematically applied each of the five principles of Zen philosophy to each of the three "modern" theories of leadership that were identified by the Jepson School faculty. The implications of this analysis are presented in the conclusion section of this paper. The sections that follow elaborate on each of the stages outlined above.

Identifying "Modern" Conceptualizations of Leadership
In order to identify a manageable number of modern theories of leadership, I examined a variety of textbooks that explore leadership issues used in the Jepson School. These included Gary Yukl's (1994) *Leadership in Organizations*, Hughes, Ginnet, and Curphy's (1993) *Leadership: Enhancing the Lessons of Experience*, and Wren's (1995) *Leader's Companion*. This analysis resulted in a compilation of ten theories that were frequently a focus of attention across sources. These included charismatic, servant, situational, trait, social exchange, transformational, transforming, participative, behavior, and group theories of leadership. A questionnaire was then constructed asking faculty (experts) in the Jepson School to rate each theory in terms of its impact or influence of modern conceptualizations of leadership (see appendix 1). Results of the data provided by respondents indicated that transforming leadership, group leadership, and situational leadership theories were considered by the faculty to be the most modern representation of concepts of leadership (see appendix 2). Each of the theories is reviewed below in order to extract their respective basic principles, constructs, etc. so that their assumptions can be compared and contrasted with principles associated with Zen

**Transforming Leadership**

Burn's defines transforming leadership as the process in which "leaders and followers raise one another to a higher level of morality and motivation" (Yukl, 1994, p. 350). "These leaders seek to raise the conscience of followers by appealing to higher ideals and moral values such as liberty, justice, equality, peace and humanitarianism, not to baser emotions such as fear, greed, jealousy, or hatred" (Yukl, 1994, p.351). Burns notes that transforming leadership involves every day aspects of any working environment,
but is rather uncommon. Since this phenomenon of leadership is rather obscure, little substantive literature beyond theoretical perspectives has been produced concerning its core elements.

Bass' theory of transformational leadership is closely related to Burns' theory, with the exceptions that Burns limits transforming leadership to enlightened leaders who "appeal to positive moral values" (Yuki, 1994, p. 353). Bass states that transformational leaders transform followers in such a fashion that the direction of influence is one way. (Wren, 1995, p. 104) Burns, on the other hand argues that the direction of influence is two-way, or interactive. Transformational leadership purports that "leaders may expand a follower's portfolio of needs; may transform a follower's self interest; and may elevate a follower's need to a higher Maslow level. In addition, leaders may increase the confidence of followers; elevate follower's expectations of success; and elevate the value of the leader's intended outcomes for the follower." (Wren, 1995, p. 104) Transforming leadership encompasses these same elements, but includes a higher level of understand among followers. A good example of the difference between the two is that Bass would not exclude Hitler or Stalin as good leaders, where Burn would. Since the two are similar in their objective, and Bass' theory has been well documented in studies, an examination of studies conducted on the area of transformational leadership will help to outline all of the components of transforming leadership with the exception of moral elevation of followers. Bass has outlined specific components and behaviors that are associated with transformational leadership. Charisma is important to help arouse strong emotions in followers and invoke identification with the leader. Intellectual stimulation increases
follower awareness of problems and helps to break down constricting frames. Individual consideration is a leader behavior aimed at providing support, encouragement, and developmental experiences to followers. The last behavior associated with transforming leadership is inspiration, meaning that the leader communicates an appealing vision, uses symbols, and models appropriate behavior (Yukl, 1994, p. 352).

In relation to the individual leader, Burns speaks of moral transformational leadership (transforming leadership) as "seeming to take on significant and collective proportions historically, but at the time and point of action leadership is intensely individual and personal. Leadership becomes a matter of all-to-human motivation and goals, of conflict and competition that seem to be dominated by the petty quest for esteem and prestige" (Burns, 1978, p. 33). In this statement, Burns speaks directly to the individual leader who transforms followers to a higher level of moral understanding. In order to complete such a task the leader must be "enlightened" in such a way this his or her action and speech will focus on the specific values and beliefs associated with "positive moral values." The faculty survey reflects this notion of developing a broad and all-inclusive perspective in education to ensure future leaders employ a transforming style of leadership in their individual endeavors.

Bass and Avolio (1995) speak to the contextual framework that transformational leadership is applied to. They choose to study the leadership behavior of individual consideration, part of Bass' transformational leadership theory, and applied it to organizations in a multi-level framework. The began with the individual, moved to the team environment, and finally to the organizational culture as a whole. The results indicate that
at three different levels of analysis, including the individual, team, and organizational culture, individual consideration emerged to become part of the greater whole while originating in an individual leadership behavior. It is possible to deduce that transforming leadership is thus proven to exist without situational constraints. If the specific core actions associated with transforming leadership start at a micro level, they will infect other levels causing a chain reaction (Bass and Avolio, 1995). Burns recognizes the capabilities of transforming leadership to affect many individuals, but also acknowledges the modes through which this is achieved. Leaders "take various roles, sometimes acting directly for their followers, sometimes bargaining with others, sometimes overriding certain motives of followers and summoning others into play" (Burns, 1978, p. 39). But the moral aspect of transforming leadership lies within "a choice among real alternatives. Hence leadership assumes competition and conflict, and brute power denies it" (Burns, 1978, p. 36). This quote signifies leader behaviors that are engaged when morality is addressed. Moral leadership prescribes that an individual consider all courses of action and chose the one the is most appropriate and extends the moral needs of followers.

Transforming leadership is the only theory of the three identified by the survey of Jepson faculty that incorporates morality in leadership. The highest stage of moral development guides persons by near universal ethical principles of justice such as equality of human rights and respect for individual integrity (Burns, 1978, p. 42). Transforming leadership, according to Burns, operates at need and value levels higher than those of the potential follower (Burns, 1978, p. 42). It is also the "kind of leadership that can exploit conflict and tension within persons' value structures" (Burns, 1978, p. 44). "The ultimate
test of moral leadership is its capacity to transcend the claims of the multiplicity of
everyday wants and needs and expectations, to respond to the higher levels of moral
development, and to relate leadership behavior- its roles, choices, style, commitments- to
a set of reasoned, relatively explicit, conscious values" (Burns, 1978, p. 46).

**Group Leadership**

Group leadership, represented in the survey of faculty by recent work on self
managed teams, was chosen by the Jepson faculty as one of the most influential models
for a modern concept of leadership for good reason. The most obvious reason might be
because a group has the capability to accomplish more than the individual, and the faculty
might view progress in the modern era as achieving goals efficiently. Leadership within
groups has been studied extensively, and offers many insights into the process groups
engage in when attempting to accomplish goals. Considering the individual in a group,
Souza and Klien (1995) acknowledge the two main leadership influences in group
processes. First is the formal leader. A person designated to be a leader is directly
responsible for the achievement of goals, but this situation doesn’t always provide the best
context for effectively achieving them. A group without a designated leader will perform
more effectively if a leader emerges (Souza and Klien, 1995). Individual task ability and
commitment to the assigned group goals were positively associated with leader emergence
in the groups Souza and Klien studied. Emergent leader’s individual goals were more
influential in determining the self-set group goals. This seems to logically follow the notion
of high individual task ability and commitment of a leader because these two factors are
indicative of an emerging leader in the context of a group setting.
Stewart and Manz (1995) examine self-managing work teams and determine empowered leadership, or leadership which motivates followers to take full responsibility of a project, to be most effective. They cite socio-technical systems theory as the logic from which self-directed work teams are established. By focusing on these two elements, individuals are organized into teams based on the natural divisions in the work flow process (Stewart and Manz, 1995, p. 748). For the purpose of their study, they focus on groups with formally established leadership roles. In an attempt to answer the question, "How does one lead others who are supposed to lead themselves?" Stewart and Manz examine leader behaviors. Empowered leadership calls for a leader to exhibit the behaviors of modeling, boundary spanning, and assisting. Modeling presents a "living model of self regulation" which in turn "promotes continued learning and development" (Stewart and Manz, 1995, p. 755). Boundary spanning helps to place the team within the context of a larger organization. In this way the leader "regulates environmental influences and mediates relationships with other organizational units" (Stewart and Manz, 1995, p. 755). In empowered teams a leader is passive and democratic in action as a result of the characteristics of the leader and the setting as well as the leader's own perceptions (Stewart and Manz, 1995, p. 759). A formal education, extensive leadership experience, and a low need for power and high need for affiliation were traits found to be consistent among leaders in such groups. The setting characteristics found in empowered leadership are: a secure position of the leader, focus on long term performance, subunit autonomy, and developed and mature teams. All of these elements in place, the empowering leader will perceive team structure as benign-positive, high self-efficacy, and teams having a
positive effect on the self and the organization as a whole (Stewart and Manz, 1995, p. 759). The benign-positive structure of empowered teams helps individuals to regulate their own roles within the group, thus the effect is beneficial to team goal achievements. High self-efficacy also results from members' ability to designate which individuals perform certain tasks more effectively than others. Thus the team as a whole has a positive effect on the organization as a whole, and individuals are able to derive a sense of self-worth from being part of the group's accomplishments.

All theories of group leadership include some analysis of the existence of a leader whether it is formal or emergent. There is also a contextual element that these theories address, mainly concerned with the group members' individual task ability, or knowledge. Other contextual elements include the psychological maturity of followers, and whether or not a leader is formally established. The nature of groups entails some kind of relationship among its members since a group is comprised of more than one person. A group is also established for some specific reason to achieve certain tasks or goals. In some cases this is determined before the group is formed while in others, the group determines its own goals or tasks. While the individuals all contribute to a specific end, the group provides them with some form of self fulfillment, either emotionally, intellectually, or physically. In the literature reviewed concerning group leadership theory, the only aspect that is not addressed directly is ethics, though self managed work teams imply a sense of ethical behavior within themselves, if not outwardly to the larger community. This is deduced from the notions of high self-efficacy and a benign-positive group structure.

Situational Leadership
The last general theory Jepson faculty members identified as being influential in developing a modern conceptualization of leadership is situational leadership theory. As developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1969, 1977, 1982), situational leadership provides scholars with a model that includes task behaviors and relationship behaviors exhibited by a leader as well as consideration for the level of maturity of the follower (Yukl, 1994, p. 396-7). Since every follower has a different level of maturity with regards to particular situations, the prescribed leader behavior will be different. The theory specifically addresses the role of the individual as both leader and follower. The leader is concerned with either task or relationship behaviors. What is meant by task behaviors refers to the intellect of the leader, or how much he or she spells out responsibilities to followers. Relationship behavior involves the level of supportive communication a leader engages with followers (Yukl, 1994, p. 396). Consideration of the maturity level of followers indicates that a leader must be aware of the context in which an event is to occur. If followers have little knowledge of a task, a leader will need to address the lack of "job maturity" with more task oriented behaviors. A follower with a lower "psychological maturity" level will require more relationship behaviors from a leader to accomplish a task. Hersey and Blanchard's model of situational leadership theory works to address the same issues that both transforming and group leadership theories do- only in a modified way. The one issue that is not directly addressed in this model involves a level of ethical behaviors. Yukl identifies this theory as appealing to students and practitioners because of its "commonsense approach" (Yukl, 1994, p. 399). It may be implied that one who thinks rationally (i.e. one who is educated) will act according to a certain set of agreeable moral
standards, but history has proven this otherwise.

Another model of situational leadership provides a slightly different perspective, but still the locus of investigation is with the leader's capacity to work within the followers abilities. Fiedler's contingency model of leadership (1967) attempts to address some of the same issues associated with situational leadership theory but maintains that leaders are relatively inflexible in their behaviors. The goal is to either to select the right leader, or change the situation to fit a particular leader's style (Hughes et al., 1993, p.402). The Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) scale is designed to indicate "something about the leader not the specific individual the leader evaluated" (Hughes et al., 1993, p.402). The scores identify the leaders motivation hierarchy. Low LPC scorers are motivated by the task whereas high LPC scorers are motivated by relationships. According to the theory, if the primary motivation is satisfied (i.e. a high LPC leader has good relationships with followers) the leader will move to the secondary level of motivation. Fiedler accounts for situational favorability as the determinant of what type of leader, meaning one who is either task or relationship oriented, will work most effectively. Favorability is determined by a series of subsets in the categories of leader-follower relations, task structure, and position power of the leader. Broadly, leader-follower relations are either good or bad. Under each heading the task is either structured or unstructured, and as a further subset, each task structure contains an element of high or low position power. The resulting table presents a series of eight possible outcomes.

From the information provided by the situation it is possible, according to Fiedler, to determine which leader will perform best. An examination of the constructs of Fiedler's
contingency model of leadership suggests that it follows the same guidelines of the situational leadership theory. There is consideration of the individual leader in regards to the LPC score. Tasks are either clear or unclear while position power, or the context of leadership, is defined. The overall goal of the model is to predict what types of relationships will work best for any given leadership situation. Though ethical considerations are not given, the model seems to work toward eliminating value and belief conflict between leaders and followers. By providing a leader who best fits a situation, or changing a situation to fit a leader, sound ethical constructs such as equality, justice, and consideration for humanity should become inherent qualities of the group because these higher level goals are strived for only after lower level needs are fulfilled. Ayman, Chemers, and Fiedler (1995) applaud this model for being multi-level and multi-source in its design. Feedback and analysis are strengthened with this interpretation according to this study. The leader’s motivational orientation (LPC scale) is an individual measure, whereas effectiveness and performance is measured on a group level by subordinates (Ayman, Chemers, Fiedler, 1995). This supports the validity of application found in situational leadership theories.

In sum, while situational theories stress it the most, the three theoretical models reviewed in this section recognize the importance of looking at the interaction of the leader, follower, and context in understanding leadership process.

Identifying Basic Principles of Zen Philosophy

Subsequent to reviewing the above noted texts and related works on Zen, I reviewed the conclusions of my analysis of Zen principles with Dr. Miranda Shaw, an expert on Zen teaching and professor in the University of Richmond religion department. Our discussion led to distilling the many principles of Zen to five which we agreed were
representative of Zen and pertinent to leadership. The five categories of consideration include: individual intellect, relationships, action, environments, or spheres of influence, and ethics/virtues. Realizing that I was creating artificial isolation of principles that often overlap, I decided to divide Zen philosophy into separate categories so that I might be able to apply each separately and completely to the modern views of leadership discussed earlier. Each principle is briefly reviewed below.

**The Five Principles of Zen Buddhism**

Buddhism was introduced to Japan around the sixth century A.D. and has developed into a large number of sects and sub-sects, one of which is Zen (Hendry, 1995, p. 119). The doctrines of Buddhism originated in India and latter spread to China where Japanese travellers first came into contact with the philosophy. Dogen is the philosopher credited with the founding of Japanese Soto Zen (Abe, 1985, p. 3). "Zen Buddhism isn't primarily a philosophy; it certainly qualifies more as a spiritual or religious way of life. Studying about Zen should never be confused with practicing Zen, just as studying aesthetics should never be confused with being an artist. The point is that Zen Buddhism, like other religions, incorporates at least an implicit philosophical standpoint- a standpoint that can be described and analyzed in its own terms" (Kasulis, 1981, p. x).

**Intellect**

Most leadership theories are fundamentally grounded in the notion that human beings are able to intellectually rationalize and comprehend information. D. T. Suzuki once
said that, "If the Greeks taught us how to reason, and Christianity what to believe, it is Zen that teaches us to go beyond logic and not to tarry even when we come up against "the things which are not seen" (Abe, 1985, p. 73). Zen has been a part of Eastern culture for many centuries. Information was passed from one generation to the next by Zen masters. Zen masters are wiser than the average in many subjects aside from philosophy (Chang, 1959, p. 116). Traditionally, they engaged in higher learning activities, including, but not limited to art, science, and medicine. As a philosophy, Zen rejects and accepts the notion of intellect. "What Zen objects to is not intellection or conceptual knowledge as such, but clinging to intellection or to conceptualization within the clinging pattern" (Chang, 1959, p. 117). This means that individuals should not limit themselves to facts and logical explanations, rather that they should seek to push themselves beyond these patterns of intellectual behaviors associated with the dualism found in notions like good and evil and right and wrong. "The Zen point of view is to find an absolute point where no dualism in whatever form resides" (Abe, 1985, p.73). Accepting this notion is one of the fundamental steps in the process of enlightenment. Yet while Zen rejects the notion of intellectual thought, the process of enlightenment must also accept it. Zen masters teach students by asking questions that compel disciples to retreat beyond habitual thinking processes in order to find the correct answer (Chang, 1959, p. 118). While the answer does not lie in the intellect, the process does. A disciple must understand this notion before an answer is even possible. Thus the true "wisdom eye" is opened when this is achieved by the disciple. When a disciple enters into the study of Zen he must possess a certain amount of intellectual knowledge of what he enters into, but this notion should not be confused
with the direct realization of Zen truth (Chang, 1959, p. 116).

In bringing individuals to enlightenment, Zen is practical, not obscure (Chang, 1959, p. 119). The master asks questions that force the disciple to engage in mindless meditation, that is without rational or conceptual thinking, to reveal the truthful answer that is sought. These questions may seem impractical to an outside observer, but within the context of Zen study these questions are the most direct means of leading an individual to enlightenment because it forces him/her to release him/herself of a preconceived set of mind frames. A Zen master can not tell a student what to do, rather the student must experience it for himself; the Zen master can only provide the context in which to experience this. The "realization of Zen" comes through "understanding Zen." Intellectualization and conceptual knowledge are embraced as part of "Supreme Buddhahood." The abandonment of conceptual knowledge is only temporary, being a practical means, not an end.

Relationships

Zen philosophy is a unique context in which to examine the notion of relationships. There is a definite relationship between the Zen master and the disciple. This student-teacher relationship is universal to all cultures in which knowledge is passed on through a process of enculturation. Communication in this specific relationship is unique in that it is direct in the purest form. Zen teaching is to live, always in reality, in its exact sense, meaning that it always occurs in the present, never in the past or future. The Zen master does not tell the student what to do, rather the Zen master does (Suzuki, 1994, p. 89). He acts as a role model. Any communication is straight forward and without subjectivity
Being straightforward in the Zen sense is quite different from being straight in a Western sense because it implies a higher level of truth that applies to all things rather than to a specific situation. When a student and teacher engage in communication, comprehension can be difficult, especially in the realm of Zen studies. To facilitate comprehension, the Zen master relies on the notion of shared experience (Chang, 1974, p. 3). This common ground helps the student to interpret, and the master to teach. The common ground discussed here refers to the Zen notion of "no-mind" where duality is non-existent. The process that both the Zen master and the disciple engage in is unorthodox when compared to a Western standard. The teacher does not tell the student how to think and act, but rather shows him. The notion of direct experience is fundamental to the process of learning in Zen. Both parties involved in any given exchange are actively involved in the process of interaction in its purest form of direct experience.

**Action**

Action is fundamental to Zen and constitutes work towards enlightenment. Action in the Zen sense includes meditation and reflection as well as physical movements. Dogen, a Zen philosopher, said, "Dharma is amply present in every person, but unless one practices, it is not manifested" (Lafleur, 1985, p. 102). Continuous action, or any action at all, implies continual refinement in process. In the developing stages, Zen practice is fundamental, just as practice is necessary to all success. The first action in Zen is 'Awakening,' or Satori. This occurs beyond all the limitations of time and space. It occurs immediately without meditation or practice as a condition, but does not continually exist beyond the limitations of time and space (Lafleur, 1985, p. 101).
action introduced. One begins the process of enlightenment instantaneously, but this beginning requires fostering. I speak of enlightenment as a process only for practical terms. In reality 'Awakening' has already occurred in all of us even before we come into physical existence. In this way each individual already inherently possesses "Buddha Nature," or the ability to become a Buddha. Practice, or action, is what brings us to realize the existence of "Buddha Nature" within each of us. Hence, there is no beginning or end to this 'process,' only practice and action.

Action physically defined within Zen is limited by time and space. Individuals meditate at certain time of any given day and in certain places. These elements are a necessary part of enlightenment. The (mental) action, or work, that a student engages in when practicing Zen seeks to cast off all possible idealization, conceptualization and objectification of practice and attainment (Lafleur, 1985, p. 102). While there exist physical limitations on action and work, there is also the absence of such limitations at the same time. Action happens constantly in Zen and is recognized as important. Everything that constitutes life is action. While 'Awakening' and practice seem to exist separately, through his own experience, Dagen realized that they are not two, but one, and constitute a dynamic whole in which practice and attainment are inseparably united. The point where the two exist together (they always do) is where "Buddha Nature" lies (Lafleur, 1985, p. 104). In Zen emphasis is not placed on becoming a Buddha, rather it concerns the attainment and practice of "Buddha Nature" (Lafleur, 1985, p. 105). From this notion it is possible to discern how action is regarded with such extreme importance to the Zen philosophy and its teachers. As Dogen notes:
"In the Buddha Dharma, practice and realization are identical. Because one's present practice is practice in realization, one's initial negotiation of the way in itself is practice in realization... As it is already realization in practice realization is endless as it is practice in realization, practice is beginningless." (Lafleur, 1985, p. 107)

Kasulis interprets action in Zen from a slightly different but equally valid point of view in his book, Zen Action/ Zen Person. "The person does not perform an action, rather the action performs the person" (Kasulis, 1981, p. 139.) In this perspective experience exists before the individual; it is constituted of its own accord, and there is no consciously willed direction from a self standing outside of it (Kasulis, 1981, p. 139). This notion reinforces the concept of direct experience in Zen and begins to tie action to intellectualization and relationships. A student (of art) must first learn technique in order to transcend technique (Kasulis, 1981, p. 140). The student is conditioned by cumulative experience to perform certain acts in a certain way- this learning in turn opens up possibilities of response through actions different than those initially prescribes (Kasulis, 1981, p. 140). The responses that are generated are egoless and relative only to the present, and thus facilitate the development of freedom, creativity, compassion, and wisdom (Kasulis, 1981, p. 141). Each action should be regarded as the first action. The important notions to draw out of Zen concerning work are that it encompasses everything that we as human beings do. There is a purpose and reason for everything. Work exists both within and out of this context, but it is necessary for continual development and progress toward any finite or broader scope goal.
Environments

Zen philosophy does not ignore the presence of things outside the self as they interact and relate to the self and each other. The element of different realms, or spheres of influence, attempts to frame other elements such as action and relationships within a broad scope by acknowledging the existence of many smaller environmental contexts together. A simple object has many realms that coexist within one another (Chang, 1974, p. 18) "A cup of water is seen by ordinary people as merely a liquid with which to quench one's thirst; it is seen by a chemist as a compound of hydrogen and oxygen; by a physicist as a complex result of electronic relationships; by a philosopher as something expressing relationship or causation, by a Buddha as the manifestation or outflow of divine Buddhahood" (Chang, 1974, p. 18). All of these realms, or contexts, live each in its own sphere without creating a hinderance to each other. In Zen there is truth in simultaneous arising, or "Non-obstruction" (Chang, 1974, p. 19). This notion of Non-obstruction means that different contexts do not interfere with one another, rather they coexist harmoniously. When constraining contextual and environmental frames are relieved, the process is one of expansion and inclusion, not a tearing down of new boundaries (Chang, 1974, p. 20). Each individual in the world has a place; that is, they occupy a certain realm. This place, or realm, is defined by one's interrelatedness, or betweenness, to others and components of society, and thus gives an individual identity (Kasulis, 1981, p. 40). Meaning as a person is derived from a context beyond the bounds of one's egocentricism (Kasulis, 1981, p. 9). Action by the individual takes place within different contexts. "Lack of energy in our present activity is a barrier to effective change not an aid. One important prerequisite to
change is an acute sensitivity to what is happening now. If I truly see what shapes events, the nature of present disappointments and functioning and accept that now, the change can take place" (Brandon, 1976, p. 73). Every action must consider the context before it can take place.

Ethics

Zen appropriately addresses the notion of ethics, but does so in relation to the elements of spheres of influence, action, relationships, and the self. Speaking to the concept of morality, Lafleur states that "the authentic self (that which is 'obtained' through enlightenment) is relational by nature, and must be acutely aware of its "family" or community life in the broadest sense (Lafleur, 1985, p. 144). By being aware of everything around an individual, the self is inclined to act with good moral judgement towards those entities. He further refines his statement as follows: "If the self of continuity (continuity in action) and that of shared nature (in relationships with others) were mere abstract ideas, than the sense of relationality (to different environmental contexts) would not necessarily result in a commitment to eliminate injustice, bondage, and suffering. This is evident in the fact that these things persist despite our sense of belonging to a single species, tribe, race, or religion. More important than the mere experiencing of other beings as the self, though, is the act of feeling their feelings" (Lafleur, 1985, p. 145).

Although ethics is outwardly portrayed through action, it originates in the intellect and emotion while maintaining contextual, or environmental considerations. "The greatest good is the realization of the self. It is the greatest good because all other goods, such as ethical behavior and a humane, civilized culture in all its aspects are impossible without
As individuals we are incapable of ethical behavior without first knowing and understand what we are. Since Zen focuses so much in the present, this self-knowledge is all that is ever possible at any single point in time. Our "Buddha Nature" does not allow us to retrieve past historical experience as relative to the present. In this way Zen morality is unique. The is no consideration of previous events or feelings. Dogen makes two points: good, like evil, is relative; one can simply speak of performance instead of performance of good deeds, in so far as performance makes no distinction between good and evil. In any situation to be morally responsible is to be responsive in the Zen doctrine (Kasulis, 1981, p. 95-7). "Zen adopts the capacity to respond prereflectively to be compassionate, selfless, and spontaneously moral" (Kasulis, 1981, p. 99). It may seem that morality in Zen is situational, but in fact it is always present. Since there is no distinction between one situation or another, it can not be situational. Virtue lies in being virtuous across all 'boundaries'. When in confrontation with a great power, morality lies in truth; the same is true when in confrontation with a weaker power (Aitken, 1995, p. 41-2). "Evil doing arises from existential ignorance of our oneness with all that is other, from the deluded experience of separateness, of alienation" (Jones, 1989, p. 154). Jones describes moral motivation as "derived from a mix of authentic fellow-feeling, the "Buddha Nature," and at the same time an alienating self-need, the latter diminishing as we become more aware of it" (Jones, 1989, p. 156). Lao Tzu addresses this notion of self-need in the Tao Te Ching.

Superior virtue is not intentionally virtuous,

and thus is virtue.
Inferior virtue will not let go of being virtuous, and thus is not virtue.

Brandon emphasizes this notion of morality by stating that it lies in "being good," not "doing good" (Brandon, 1976, p. 50). "The moral personality emerges through the ripening of wisdom/compassion. The ripening takes place through a system of spiritual training which includes the practice of morality as a part of mindful awareness" (Jones, 1989, p. 158). By recognizing the Buddha Nature in our relations with others we perceive the superficiality of positions of moral superiority" (Brandon, 1976, p. 59). As part of our individual Buddha Nature we know when good helping takes place. It is in the lack of self-consciousness or judgement in Buddha Nature that ethics lies.

The section that follows describes the methodology used compare and contrast principles of Zen with constructs associated with modern leadership theory.

**Method For Comparing Zen To Leadership Theories**

After identifying the major constructs of each of the three leadership theories, I then extracted the main points and organized them into an outline (appendix 3). Zen philosophy was formulated into an outline format with characteristics listed under each of the five principles (appendix 4). The next step involved a systematic application of each of the five principles beginning with intellect and ending with ethics to transforming leadership. The same process was then repeated with group leadership and situational leadership theories.
Results

Initially it should be noted that prior to conducting an in-depth analysis of the relationships between Zen and modern leadership concepts, a general analysis was conducted to ascertain the value of proceeding with a more extensive analysis. Results of this cursory analysis revealed that the five Zen principles and the leadership conceptualizations reviewed above did overlap in meaningful ways. For example, the action category in Zen includes leadership elements such as decision making, task management, relationship oriented behaviors, delegation, and implementation of a vision. The environments/ spheres of influence category relates to the concepts of roles, frames, and contextual constraints associated with leadership. In turn, the ethics and virtues found in Zen relate to leadership from a philosophical viewpoint of right and wrong in relation to the three elements of leader, follower, and context, or culture.

Having established some basic relationships between the foundations of Zen philosophy and modern concepts of leadership, the relation between the two was analyzed in greater detail. In particular, in the pages that follow, the five principles of Zen (intellect and self, relationships, action, environments, and ethics) are considered in terms of their relationship to each of the "modern" theories of leadership: transforming, group, and situational leadership.

Transforming Leadership

While there are very few documented cases of transforming leadership, (i.e. empirical accounts,) the Jepson School faculty still chose this theory as being most
representative of a modern conceptualization of leadership; as a consequence it deserves a close examination in relation to Zen philosophy. Transforming leadership begins to occur when the leader and followers arrive at mutually accepted levels of morality and motivation. Somewhere in the intellectual process, both the leader and followers leave behind their initial frames of thinking. This process is similar to the Zen notion of rejecting logic and conceptual knowledge. Both Zen philosophy and transforming leadership contain the element of "breaking frames." Frames are mental perception tools used in conflict resolution, vision formation, and decision making. More often than not, we adopt a certain frame to achieve a specific goal and tend to stick to it. When confronted with different perspectives we often reject them as incorrect, or inefficient. Human nature, especially in American culture, has a tendency to adopt the notion that 'my way is the best way'.

Zen differs drastically from transforming leadership in that it rejects the notion of process, while transforming leadership is inherently based on it. The very word 'transforming' is the adjective form of the verb 'to transform.' The action implied here suggests the existence of a process. Transforming leadership begins when a leader sees the potential for motivating followers by appealing to higher levels of moral motivation in followers that have yet to be realized. It ends when specific, final goals are achieved, or if the case may be, when the leader is no longer able to inspire followers. Kasulis' interpretation of Zen action juxtaposes this notion of a process proposed by Burns because Zen's rejection of dualistic notions opposes the notion that there is a definite beginning and end to the leadership process. Kasulis' statement, "the action performs the person" embodies this concept.
In transforming leadership, a leader has to establish a vision that includes consideration of follower needs and values. In this way the leader is able to develop a context in which this type of leadership can occur. This event contains similarities with the notion of the Zen master providing the disciple with questions that force him or her to experience "mindlessness" in order to retrieve the correct answer. Both situations are manipulated by the leader, or in the case of Zen, the teacher, to achieve certain desired outcomes. The student-teacher relationship in Zen also involves a great amount of trust and truth. In any such relationship between two or more individuals, the student is inclined to believe in what the teacher communicates. Transforming leadership is no exception, only that the followers are more inclined to believe in a leader that speaks directly to their moral concerns. In this way followers become super-motivated because they see that a leader is sharing their individual as well as collective concerns. There is a great opportunity for followers to seize and accomplish goals that were never materialized before the arrival of a leader. In terms of leadership, action is translated into work towards a goal. Leadership is possible by any individual but is not manifested unless continuous work is undertaken to practice it. The same principle is evident in Zen in relation to each individual's "Buddha Nature." Zen purports that Buddha Nature exists without the practice of meditation and is beyond the limits of time and space. The same is true of leadership on a philosophical level. Since no theory has been developed to predict who, how, when, or why a particular individual becomes a leader we can only assume that it is possible in each individual. Schools like the Jepson School for Leadership studies facilitate the emergence of leadership skills in individuals, but do not guarantee them. The real potential
lies in the individual's drive to manifest leadership.

Relative to the Zen notion of environments, transforming leadership permeates multiple levels of an organization when originating in individual leader behaviors. While barriers between these different levels of an organization are present, transforming leadership seeks not to break down or take away individual characteristic of each environment, but rather it, like Zen, seeks to permeate and assimilate into these different contexts. Any business organization might have a personnel and accounting department, and while unrelated on one level, both might successfully accommodate transforming leadership. Transforming leadership reflects a leader's sensitivity to follower's needs and values. Zen philosophy acknowledges that an individual must maintain an acute sensitivity to what is happening in the present context. Effective transforming leadership need not take this statement literally, but it is important to be aware of the feelings and beliefs of those around you before taking decisive action that could affect followers dedication toward a particular vision.

Transforming leadership is based upon the notion of raising followers to a higher level of morality. Zen philosophy provides a practical method of achieving this state. Beginning with the individual, Zen emphasizes a lack of self consciousness and judgement to practice ethical behavior. When individuals are conscious of their oneness, or singularity, they might be tempted through ignorance to act amorally. Here Zen is addressing the practice of transforming leadership. Transforming leadership's major goal is to transcend the individual wants of people. Getting past these wants, a leader brings followers to higher levels of moral development.
Group Leadership

Group leadership in the broadest terms was determined to be the second most important theory to offer contributions to a modern conceptualization of leadership according to the Jepson School faculty surveyed. Studies of groups, such as self managed work teams, focus on the individual as a leader, and point to the informal leader as being particularly successful. Zen adopts the principle that the individual (the leader in relation to the group) relieves him or herself of previously developed logic or conceptual knowledge. When an informal leader arises out of a group context that individual exerts more influence in determining the group's self-set goals. Zen philosophy does not agree with emergent leaders that occur in group setting because it is more than likely that the informal leader comes with previous knowledge of the particular subject matter that the group is concerned with. In this way the leader is clinging to patterns of preconceived conceptual knowledge.

Again referring to the student-teacher relationship in Zen philosophy, group leaders often show similar behaviors even though most learning in groups is part of a shared experience. A leader, designated or informal, uses role modeling to effectively communicate how a group should or should not function. Role modeling in Zen is found in the notion of always living in the present. By acting according to this philosophy, the leader engages followers in a shared experience, and thus achieves a pure form of communication whereby both parties involved come together with the same levels of comprehension of a particular situation.

Since groups are a collection of separate individuals it is possible that any particular
individual might rise to the take on the role of a leader, even if there is a single person designated as "leader." Leadership in groups stems from action taken by one member. The dynamics of empowered work teams allow individuals to temporarily rise above other members and act as a leader when they possess certain technical knowledge that others might not. If there is a problem with a particular machine on an assembly line that the individual working it cannot fix, he or she may act as a leader and employ other members of the assembly line to aid in repairs. While this particular individual, or the others helping him, work to solve a problem, that is take action, they are all engaged in the process of leadership. Being in a group requires that one be willing to play the role of both leader and follower in order for the group to maintain cohesiveness and effectiveness. Zen philosophy supports this notion in that it prescribes constant involvement of the individual towards obtaining "Buddha Nature." Where it differs is in the fundamental notion of casting off all idealization, conceptualization, and objectification. Individuals involved in groups must remain aware of their separate roles in particular situations so that all action or work undertaken by them will occur in harmony with others. Group theories of leadership have not been able to cast off the concept of roles existing separately from one another, thus the theories rely on coordination between parties for leadership to occur. Having realized this, it is possible to see how Zen notions of environments can potentially fit with group leadership theory.

Zen philosophy does not acknowledge differences, rather it puts differences in a broader context of an infinitely large whole. Individuals acting in different roles do not do so in an isolated fashion. In groups everyone must work together in a relatively
harmonious environment to achieve a common, desired result. The concept of "Non-obstruction" can even exist between two totally unrelated groups operating within the same context. Referring back to the example of the accounting and personnel departments of an organization, the two seem totally unrelated in their tasks, yet both are dependant upon the function of the other. Accounting would have no one to perform the work if personnel did not hire them, and personnel wouldn't ever get paid if accounting didn't do its job. As individuals and members of larger groups, it remains fundamentally important to acknowledge the existence of parts, but more importantly to view those part as a larger whole. Group theories of leadership have yet to include this notion into constructs.

An application of Zen philosophy to theories of group leadership focuses on ethics within teams, not necessarily the outward ramifications team members or their projects might have on the community at large, though it might be argued that a team with members that act in manner that is conscious of morality will impact communities in the same fashion. Zen supports awareness of one's environment, including others and their feelings and emotions. This does not constitute morality by any means, but it is a good start. Without realization of the self one cannot begin to act morally towards others. In group situations individuals have only one thing which they can rely on, and this is the self since it is the only thing present in the "nowness" of reality. Relating to the notion of environments in Zen, leaders must be aware of others both in relation to the self, and as a whole at the same time. Groups impart ethical behavior towards one another because of this. All individuals have a sense of what their cultures accept as morally right and wrong. As group members interact it is in their unconscious intentions to treat each other,
and ultimately, those outside the group who are affected by their actions, in a morally responsible manner.

**Situational Leadership**

Situational leadership was selected as the third most important theory to contribute to modern conceptualizations of leadership. Zen principle of intellect rejects the leadership behaviors associated with the intellect in situational theories. A leader must use his or her knowledge to spell out task behaviors for followers. These behaviors are inherently based on preconceived methods concerning logic and concepts. When a leader analyzes certain situations and prepares a leadership style that is appropriate, he or she must make distinctions, thus acknowledging the existence of dualities in contexts. According to one theory, Task behaviors, as with relationship behaviors, demonstrated by a leader are in relation to follower levels of maturity in these areas. This is where Zen has difficulty in application. In Zen it is assumed that all individuals possess a great deal of maturity. The emphasis is not on having all the necessary skills to solve a problem, but on having the capabilities to do so without being told how. They are also expected to have psychological maturity in the sense that they are able to interact with others in the Zen sense of "nowness", that is, being totally aware of the present while they themselves remain a part of it.

Relationships in situational leadership focus primarily on the leader. There is not a clean fit between the Zen and situational theories with respect to this issue. Relationships between leader and follower are either based on task or relationship behaviors initiated by the leader according to this model. Zen rejects the possibility that
there can be two entirely separate sets of interaction. Zen purports that the leader and follower (teacher and student) engage in a direct, shared experience when communication takes place. This may very well occur within those two realms of task and relationship behaviors discussed earlier, but there is no evidence to support this.

Action also presents a problem in relating Zen philosophy to situational leadership. Since there is no beginning and end to action or practice in Zen, leaders are unable to switch gears in dealing with psychological and task maturity in followers. If one were to see these two as equivalents then it would be possible. Situational theories prescribe either one or the other as necessary for the leader to engage in. Again, Zen confronts situational theories as possessing, or adhering to a notion of duality within its context. The only area of Zen that seeks to accommodate this occurrence is in environments.

Situational theories of leadership, obviously examine the different aspect of each situation and determine what types of leader will succeed. According to Zen this practice is a good one because it takes all of the smaller aspects of a situation, or environment, and puts them together to form a greater whole. According to leadership theory, the leader must take each follower, and his or her level of task and psychological maturity, and measure them individually, and only then can the leader prescribe certain actions to achieve desired goals. The perception that occurs is correct within the context of Zen philosophy, because while there may exist many smaller realms of being within a single object or individual, a leader needs to be able to see how they all fit together and exist harmoniously. Every action must consider the context before it can take place in accordance with situational theories of leadership.
As with group theories of leadership, situational theories imply ethical behavior within its existing context, rather than focusing ethical considerations on its impact to the community at large. An individual who is always aware of his or herself in relation to the present (i.e. the leader) will undoubtedly be aware of environmental contexts. In Zen, without realizing the self it is impossible for an individual to act in an ethically responsible manner towards others. A leader in situation theories is aware of follower needs by definition. Since he or she is not thinking only about the experience of separateness and alienation, it is possible, even unavoidable to act unethically; this assumes that human beings are inherently good in their intentions to create a better way of life for humanity.

Summary

The section below highlights the important relationships established between Zen and modern conceptualizations of leadership.

Transforming Leadership

An interpretation of a comparison between Zen philosophy and transforming leadership helps to highlight some of the most fundamental and important aspects of the process transforming leadership subscribes to. Breaking down frames is a notion fundamental to both Zen and transforming leadership. Problem solving and decision making are things that individuals partake of every day. Decision making and problem solving are the leadership competencies that make the most use of frame breaking. There have been many attempts to formulate a process for each these competencies, but it is
interesting that two philosophies a world apart address the same notions in a similar
fashion. The Zen principle concerning environments provides the leader with a script for
the existence of transforming leadership within an organizational context. Transforming
leadership behaviors, such as individual consideration, are not constrained by
organizational boundaries or hierarchies. Since human interaction is inevitable, these
behaviors are communicated across boundaries by individuals in a non verbal fashion.
Since Zen philosophy supports the existence of all environmental contexts as one,
communication is able to occur regardless of superficial constraints. The organizational
structure is flattened when individuals incorporate transforming behaviors into the
leadership process. Zen's prescription for morality, helps the leader transform followers
by providing a practical framework of consideration. It stresses the importance of
maintaining relationships with those individuals the leader has potential influence over. In
this way the leader will be aware of follower needs and values so that he or she will be
able to raise them to higher levels of motivation based on moral consideration, and this is
what transforming leadership is based upon. The one area that transforming leadership
theory has trouble incorporating Zen philosophy into is the intellect. Since leadership is
a process, and a process has been determined to have a definite beginning and eventual
end, there exists a conceptualization of duality with in transforming leadership. Zen rejects
the existence of such dualities. For a Western practitioner, this may seem to be superficial,
but there isn't enough information available to determine what the cross cultural implication
of applying transforming leadership might be.

Group Leadership
Group theories of leadership rely heavily on conceptualizations, especially in the areas of the leader’s intellect and environments, or roles within a group. In group situations where a leader emerges, it has been established that the leader usually arises as a result of some preconceived knowledge of a specific task. Zen rejects these conceptualizations of preconceived knowledge. This phenomenon may occur in group theories of leadership because Westerners rely on the notion that some people are better than others when performing, or having knowledge of a specific task. In Japan, a place where Zen is a part of everyday life, followers expect the leader to have all the answers. This is part of a formal hierarchal tradition that has endured many centuries in Japanese culture. Closely related to this issue of intellectual conceptualization is the concept of environments. Roles exist as separate entities with in groups. Thus within the context of self-managing teams they are different environments coordinating as one greater whole. The problem presented here again refers to conceptualization. Each role is specific and totally unrelated to the other roles when out of the context of a group setting. This is because each carries with it a specific conceptualization of which duties and what knowledge is associated with it. Since Zen rejects the dual notions of in- and out-, these roles cannot coexist within the group setting. Coordination is the essential ingredient for leadership in group theories. Where group theories of leadership abandon conceptualizations is in the area of relationships and ethics. Relationships between leader and follower are based on role modeling. Role modeling is a means of teaching. Zen uses the same strategy to help individuals achieve "enlightenment." Ethical considerations in Zen focus on remaining aware of the individuals surrounding the self. This helps maintain ethical behavior within groups. Group leadership
theories concerning self managed teams do not establish any formal means of ethical considerations within groups, but subscribing to the Zen's principle of ethical consideration could easily fill this gap.

**Situational Leadership**

Situational leadership asserts that followers are evaluated according to two separate scales by the leader. These scales of task and relationship maturity demonstrate the dualism that is purported to exist in the leader's mind. Zen philosophy does not support the existence of dual notions, and therefore finds difficulty in lending itself to a favorable interpretation of situational leadership models. This same concept of dualism between relationship behaviors and task behaviors is found in the principle of action and relationships. The only areas that Zen supports a situational model of leadership is in the areas of environments and ethics. A leader must evaluate each follower on both task and relationship scales at one time before deciding to take action. This process is analogous to that which is found in Zen. Zen requires the individual to acknowledge the existence of many contexts at one time. Because a leader is aware of follower needs, the focus of attention is outside the self. This is the only condition that Zen sets forward for ethical behavior.

**Conclusion**

Generally, leadership theories and Zen philosophy overlap in meaningful ways, although each reflects on some of the same basic principles with different perspectives.
The differences found in applying Zen theory to leadership are most likely the cause of cultural differences in perceptions, and there is a lot that Western leadership scholars and theorists can learn from studying Zen. As we move into the twenty-first century, it becomes increasingly important to be global in our outlook. Many of the leadership theories in existence today are uniquely Western in their cultural perspectives. In order to develop theories that will apply holistically to different cultures, scholars need to maintain an understanding of the constructs unique to each culture.

Transforming, group, and situational theories of leadership are excellent representations of modern conceptualizations of leadership. Transforming leadership theory seems to focus on the individual leader as the source of energy in the leadership process. Group theories focus on follower interaction and role definitions, whereas, situational theories, focus on the context in which leadership occurs. These three elements, the leader, followers, and the situation, are equally important weight factors in the process of leadership.

As an application of Zen philosophy to transforming leadership progressed to group and finally situational theories, there was less of a relationship between modern conceptualizations of leadership and Zen. Transforming leadership showed the highest correlation with four of the five Zen principles overlapping with the constructs of the theory. Group leadership had about half of its constructs correlate with Zen philosophy. The last theory, situational leadership, related to only two of the five principles. It is worth noting that the order of correlation also reflects the order in which the Jepson School faculty ranked the theories as having influence on a modern conceptualization of leadership. All
leadership theories related to the principle of environments in Zen, though they did so in slightly differing ways. For example, transforming leadership was found to have the potential to affect different environments simultaneously, while situational leadership emphasized the importance of being aware of the existence of different follower needs. Ethics was the only other principle of Zen that contained consistencies with all of the theories of leadership. Though transforming leadership was the only theory to incorporate ethical behavior as a precedent for leadership, the other two theories implied ethical behavior through some of the other principles associated with Zen philosophy. Both group and situational theories use the Zen principle of environments to remain aware of the needs, values, and beliefs of others. Group leaders also use role modeling as a means of communicating ethics to followers. It is easy to deduce that a leader who is morally responsible, will promote the development of the same behaviors in followers. The single area that was found to be unapplicable to any of the three leadership theories was action, but this was mainly as a result of some of the smaller details in each theory. Transforming leadership as a process does not coincide with the Zen principle of action because there is no beginning/ end duality that "process" suggests found in Zen. Group leadership theory doesn't subscribe to action because each individual within the group specializes in specific skills, and thus fills a particular role. Situational leadership confronts this same dilemma. The leader is forced to act within two defined sets of behaviors- task or relationship behaviors. Zen philosophy does not allow for the type of separation that these two models depend upon.

When scholars impose idealogies with dualistic oppositions, it seems fair to suggest
that these limitations are placed only on a specific set of individuals with which the scholar has had intensive interaction. It is natural for humans to have in inclination to draw from previous experience. In the West we call this learning, but when attempting to develop theories of leadership that will hold for future generations and their global exploits, this rationalizing behavior will create huge limitations. Although people all have different ways of doing things, there is still something that we all have in common. Though I am not certain as to what it is, I propose that a sound conceptualization of modern leadership theory begins with it. Zen is just one area of consideration, and there are many more to be studied.

**Limitations**

I believe that Zen does have something to offer leadership students, but I found it extremely difficult to apply Zen to modern theories because the two maintain drastically different perspectives. Without any previous knowledge of Zen, I still feel uncomfortable with my grasp of the philosophy. Perhaps this is because Zen is not something to be studied intellectually, but something tells me that this isn't the case. Perhaps a project with this topic in mind might have been better approached from a philosophical standpoint, rather than attempting to break each discipline apart before rebuilding them together. Even the way that this project is organized is biased against a true understanding of Zen. The methods employed suggest a scientific study, but really Zen needs to be understood in a different way. It might be my own intuition telling me that there is something substantive
in the relationship between Zen and leadership that I haven't uncovered, or it might be a case of self-fulfilling prophecy. Either way this project has undertaken an attempt to entice leadership scholars to look at their studies through a different lens.

The limitations of this project lie mainly in the subjective bias of the researcher. Since most of the information comes from textual sources, I attempted to counteract this potential bias by cross-referencing fundamental assumptions with scholars in the fields of leadership and religious studies. Determining what principles of Zen are related to leadership while being indicative of the philosophy as it exists in a larger context, was difficult, and required knowledge beyond my reach. I employed the help of Dr. Miranda Shaw, professor of religion at the University of Richmond, to determine appropriate categories of analysis. Another problem concerns the cross-cultural implications of a theory of leadership. Since most of the scientific research that is readily available comes from American scholars, I can not assume that the implications found in them are applicable to peoples of other cultures. I did not use a quantitative method for analysis of the literature reviewed in this study. My approach was based upon synthesis of the qualitative elements found in specific textual accounts through subjective interpretation. A certain amount of bias was expected since I was the only individual analyzing the documents and extracting information. By covering five principles of Zen I wanted this project to carry a balance of breadth and depth in content. The approach that I have taken was inductive and meant to stimulate new thinking on the topic.
Appendix 1

Survey given to Jepson School Faculty

Please rate each of the following theories of leadership in terms of the extent to which it has impacted, or influenced the most modern concepts of leadership. (10- more representative, 1- less representative)

Charismatic leadership: based on follower perceptions of exemplaray characteristics of a leader.

Servant leadership: based on concept of leader committing selfless act to aid followers.

Situational leadership: leader actions based upon factors of follower intelligence, personality traits, values, preferences, and technical competence.

Trait theory: based on specific common traits found in leaders

Social Exchange Theory: based upon the process of influence and counter influence between a leader and follower. (transactional leadership)

Transformational leadership: based on leader actions to raise followers to a higher level of understanding.

Participative leadership: based on power and behavior concepts associated with leadership.

Behavior theory: based on behaviors that are unique to leaders

Transforming Leadership: based on leader actions to raise followers to a higher level of moral understanding.

Group leadership: based on the concept of self managing teams. (self-leadership)

Other: ___________________________________________________________
Appendix 2

Results of Faculty Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Type</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>10 7 4 6 8 8 8 4</td>
<td>6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>7 8 7 8 6 9 5 3</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td>9 6 5 8 10 10 7 6</td>
<td><strong>7.63</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td>5 5 1 4 3 3 8 2</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social exchange</td>
<td>8 6 5 5 10 6 8 3</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>7 8 10 6 8 8 5 3</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>6 8 9 8 7 8 6 6</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>6 5 8 6 5 6 6 5</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transforming</td>
<td>9 7 10 8 10 9 5 5</td>
<td><strong>7.88</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>6 8 9 7 7 8 8 9</td>
<td><strong>7.75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transforming, group and situational theories of leadership were found to be grouped as the three most representative of a modern conceptualization of leadership. The cut-off point used in this study was an average score of 7.5. All three of these theories had score higher than this first cut-off.
Appendix 3

Summary of Zen Characteristics

Intellect:
- Zen rejects the notion of "clinging to patterns" of intellectual thought and conceptualization, not intellection or conceptual knowledge.
- Zen rejects the existence of dualism.
- The process of "enlightenment" is intellectual (question/answer format in Zen).
- Zen meditation encourages an individual to release him or herself of mind frames.

Relationships:
- Master/disciple, student/teacher.
- Relationships are engaged always in the present, reality of direct experience that is shared by two people.
- Zen master as a role model.

Action:
- Thinking in Zen is action.
- The Zen mind exists beyond all limitations of time and space, but actual practice of meditation does not. There are physical limitations to this.
- Action performs the individual, not the other way around. The individual is conditioned through previous experience to perform certain actions in a certain way.

Environments:
- Smaller environments exist together in a harmonious whole focused on the concept of Non-obstruction.
- Individual must be aware of these environmental constructs existing at once before action is possible. The individual is always present in reality.
- Identity is fundamental to placement within this reality.

Ethics:
- One must be aware of the self first and then different environments before ethical behavior is possible. Realization of the self is the greatest good.
- Each instance of ethical behavior is restricted to judgement on the present reality, not past experiences.
- "Zen adopts the capacity to respond prereflectively to be compassionate, selfless, and spontaneously moral."
- Ethics is in the lack of self consciousness and judgment.
Appendix 4

Summary for Leadership Theory Characteristics

Transforming Leadership:
- Transforming leadership is closely related to transformational with the following exceptions:
  1) Direction of influence in transforming leadership is two way.
  2) Leader raises followers to a higher level of moral motivation.
- Intellectual stimulation helps individuals break down frames of perception.
- Leadership is a process with a definite beginning and end.
- Action in transforming leadership is intensely personal at the moment when a leader takes initiative (dominated by petty quest for esteem and prestige.) Leadership is the continual practice of action.
- Leader models behavior to communicate vision (relationships and use of symbols)
- Individual consideration is a leader behavior, and has been found to expand beyond single environments, thus being able to be incorporated in a greater whole. (analogous with Zen concept of environments)
- Morality in transformational leadership lies in the leader's ability to transcend individual wants and needs of followers so as to raise them to higher levels of moral consideration.

Group Leadership:
- There are two main contexts for group leadership: 1) there is a designated leader, and 2) an informal leader emerges
- Emerging leaders occur as a result of high individual task ability and individual commitment to a project and are generally more effective
- Leader behaviors in groups consist of role modeling, boundary spanning, and assisting. (relationships)
- Empowered work teams have autonomy in their actions, though all of these actions are limited by the concepts of time and space. Each person has a specific role in the group's productivity even though these roles may change. Thus there is a conceptualization in the coordination of these roles.
- Group leadership theories do not incorporate ethics into models, rather the focus is on behaviors and environmental factors.

Situational Leadership:
- Focus on both leader behaviors within the context of follower maturity.
  1) Task behaviors refers to leader's intellectual understand of the task at hand.
  2) Relationship behaviors are communicative with followers.
- There are two separate means of addressing individuals and developing
relationships with followers. (Task and Relationship behaviors)
- Action is defined in either the realm of relationship or task behaviors.
- Situational theories begin with an examination of smaller parts so that the leader is able to develop a picture of the larger whole.
- Little consideration is given to ethics, although the theory does work to eliminate conflict in value and belief systems between the leader and followers.
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