

The Jossey-Bass Educational Series
Published by
JOSSEY-BASS

A Wiley Company
989 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94103-1741

www.josseybass

Copyright 2000 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Jossey-Bass is a registered trademark of John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise, except as permitted under Sections 107 or 108 of the 1976 United States Copyright Act, without either the prior written permission of the Publisher or authorization through payment of the appropriate per-copy fee to the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, (978) 750-8400, fax (978) 750-4744. Requests to the Publisher for permission should be addressed to the Permissions Department, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158-0012, (212-) 850-6011, fax (212) 850-6008, e-mail: permreq@wiley.com.

Jossey-Bass books and products are available through most bookstores. To contact Jossey-Bass directly, call (888) 378-z537, fax to (800) 605z665, or visit our website at www.josseybass.com.

Substantial discounts on bulk quantities of Jossey-Bass books are available to corporations, professional associations, and other organizations. For details and discount information, contact the special sales department at Jossey-Bass.

Credits are on PP. 419-421

We at Jossey-Bass strive to use the most environmentally sensitive paper stocks available to us. Our publications are printed on acid-free recycled stock whenever possible, and our paper always meets or exceeds minimum GPO and EPA requirements.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership.

p. cm. - (The Jossey-Bass education series)

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0-7879-52.8x-8

I. Educational leadership -United States. 2.School management and organization-United States. 1. Jossey-Bass Inc. 11. Series.

LB28o6 4597 2000

371.1'00973-dc21

99-050967

FIRST EDITION

PB Printing to 9 8 7 6 5 4

PART FOUR

MORAL LEADERSHIP

BOOKS ON MORAL LEADERSHIP have sold very well in recent years, acknowledging what many see as a crisis of violence and cruelty in the schools. These authors discuss the need for learning more than just facts and figures in the classroom; moral leadership helps set standards of conduct and care that members of school communities abide by to function. Part Four gives some practical advice on

how to make a strong and virtuous school in the chapter by Kevin Ryan and Karen E. Bohlin; transformational insight into moral leadership, stewardship, followership, and leading by example is discussed in chapters by Thomas J. Sergiovanni and by Robert Evans - LEADERSHIP AS STEWARDSHIP "WHO'S SERVING WHO?"

Thomas J. Sergiovanni

MANY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS are practicing a form of leadership that is based on moral authority, but often this practice is not acknowledged as leadership. The reason for this problem is that moral authority is underplayed and that the management values undergirding this authority are largely unofficial. When I asked Larry Norwood, principal of Capital High School, Olympia, Washington, to participate in one of my studies on leadership, he responded, "I have wrestled with this-and finally decided to pass. First, because I am so late in responding and, second, I can think of nothing of literary significance that I have achieved (in the way of leadership) in the past twenty-two years. My style is to delegate and empower, and my successes have been through other people. If I have a strength it is as a facilitator - that doesn't make good copy. Sorry." Larry Norwood is a successful school administrator. Although he does not think of himself as a leader, he is one.

I suspect that one of the reasons for Norwood's success may be that he implicitly rejects leadership, as we now understand it. The official values of management lead us to believe that leaders are characters who single-handedly pull and push organizational members forward by the force of personality, bureaucratic clout, and political know-how. Leaders must be decisive. Leaders must be forceful. Leaders must have vision. Leaders must successfully manipulate events and people, so that vision becomes reality. Leaders, in other words, must *lead*.

From time to time, there may be a place for this kind of direct leadership. But it is only part of the story. The leadership that counts, in the end, is the kind that touches people differently. It taps their emotions, appeals to their values, and responds to their connections with other people. It is a morally-based leadership - a form of stewardship. Greenfield (1991) found this to be the case in his study of an urban elementary school. The moral orientation of its teachers was central in fixing their relationship with the principal and with each other. Greenfield comments, "Their persistence in searching out strategies to increase their colleagues' or their personal effectiveness in serving the needs of the school's children was motivated not by bureaucratic mandate or directives from superiors, but by moral commitment to children, rooted in their awareness of the needs of these children and their beliefs about the significance of their roles, as teachers, in these children's lives. Much of the principal's efforts to foster leadership among the teachers ... was directed to further developing and sustaining this moral orientation among teachers" (P. 3). To those teachers, shared ideals and beliefs became duties to which they willingly responded. These findings parallel those of Johnson (1990). Morally based leadership is important in its own right, but it is also important because it taps what is important to people and what motivates them.

Stewardship in Practice

Implicit in traditional conceptions of leadership is the idea that schools cannot be improved from within: school communities have neither the wit nor the will to lead themselves; instead, principals and teachers are considered pawns, awaiting the play of a master or the game plan of an expert to provide solutions for school problems. In his chronicle of Madeline Cartwright, principal of Blaine School, Philadelphia, Richard Louv (:1990) points out that too many teachers and administrators doubt the power of determination and the ability of schools themselves to make a difference. "It just won't work," they maintain, or "The central office won't let us," or "We can't do that because. . . ." Madeline Cartwright is one principal who thinks differently. For her, being a school administrator is a form of stewardship, and the responsibilities of stewardship simply require that obligations and commitments be met, regardless of obstacles. "I tell my staff, don't tell me what I can and can't do. I can do something if I want to. It can happen. It's like people say to me, 'You cannot wash this child's clothes, put 'em in the washing machine and give him some clean clothes to put on.' I can do that" (p. 75).

Shortly after becoming principal at Blaine, Cartwright organized a raffle to buy a washer and dryer for the school. They are used every morning, to launder the clothes of many of the children. Cartwright often does the washing personally, believing that this is the only way many of the children know what it is like to have clean clothes. In her words, "This is one of the things you can do to bring about a change. My kids look good" (p. 63). When Cartwright arrived at Blaine, she found a school that was "black as soot." She told the parents, "This place is dirty! How can your kids go to school in a place like this? We're going to clean this building this summer. Raise your hands if I can depend on you. Keep your hands up! Somebody get their names!" Eighteen parents showed up and began the work. "We cleaned it, and cleaned it good. I made these parents know that you don't accept anything less than that which is right because you live in North Philadelphia!" (p. 66).

Parental involvement at Blaine is high. Parents help supervise the yard in the morning and the hallway during the day. They work in classrooms, help prepare food, and decorate the school. "Everybody is involved in the washing" (p. 67).

What kind of leader is Madeline Cartwright? She is one who will do whatever it takes to make Blaine work and work well: "If a child isn't coming to school, I'll go into a home and bring kids out" (P. 74). On one such venture, Cartwright and a friend walked into an apartment she describes as follows: "This place was cruddy. I mean, beyond anything I could ever imagine for little children to live in. The kitchen was a hotplate sitting on a drain board. I saw no refrigerator. There was no running water and no electricity. There were dirty dishes, food caked in piles. The bathroom had a bedspread wrapped around the bottom of the toilet and the toilet was full to the brim with human waste. To the brim. And the little girl had one foot on one side of the toilet, and one foot on the other and she squatted over this toilet while she used it, and it was seeping over the sides." She sent one of the persons in the apartment off to get a snake. Then, using a plastic container and buckets from the school, "we dug this mess out.... While we were in the apartment, we scrubbed the floors, took all the dirty clothes out, all the sheets off the beds, brought them back to the school, washed them up. And we left food for dinner from our school lunch. The mother came home to a clean house and clean children. This lady had gotten so far behind the eight ball she didn't even know where to go to get out" (P. 74).

Some experts on the principalship might comment, "All well and good, but what about Cartwright's being an instructional leader? What about her paying attention to teaching and learning, to charting, facilitating, and monitoring the school's educational program?" Cartwright does that, all right, and with a flair. As Louv points out, Cartwright maintains there are two types of principals, "office principals" and "classroom principals," and she is clearly the latter. She is in and out of classrooms regularly, often taking over the teaching of classes. She not only communicates high expectations but also demands performance from her staff. She is a no-nonsense disciplinarian, as well as a devoted and loving one. But all this "instructional leadership" just is not enough to make this school work. What makes Blaine work is that Cartwright practices leadership by washing clothes, scrubbing the building, and, yes, cleaning toilets (one of the chores that Mahatma Gandhi cheerfully claimed for himself as part of his leadership in the Indian independence movement). Both Cartwright and Gandhi were practicing something called *servant leadership*. In the end, it is servant leadership, based on a deep commitment to values and emerging from a groundswell of moral authority, that makes the critical difference in the lives of Blaine's students and their families. As Louv explains (P. 74), "Maybe Madeline Cartwright's dreams are naive, maybe not. But they do make a kind of mathematical sense: one safe and clean school, one set of clean clothes, one clean toilet, one safe house-and then another safe school ... and another ... and another. 'I'm tellin' you, there's things you can do!'"

The Many Forms of Leadership

The practices of Madeline Cartwright and Larry Norwood demonstrate one of the themes of this book: leadership takes many forms. Further, as has been argued, today's crisis stems in part from the view that some of these forms are legitimate and others are not. For example, a vast literature expounds the importance of practicing command leadership and instructional leadership. Both kinds provide images of direct leadership, with the principal clearly in control-setting goals, organizing the

work, outlining performance standards, assigning people to work, directing and monitoring the work, and evaluating. This kind of direct leadership is typically accompanied by a human relations style designed to motivate and keep morale up.

Command and instructional leadership have their place. Heavy doses of both may be necessary in schools where teachers are incompetent, indifferent, or just disabled by the circumstances they face. But if command and instructional leadership are practiced as dominant strategies, rather than supporting ones, they can breed dependency in teachers and cast them in roles as subordinates. Subordinates do what they are supposed to, but little else. They rely on others to manage them, rather than acting as self-managers. This is hardly a recipe for building good schools.

Command leaders and instructional leaders alike are being challenged by the view that school administrators should strive to become leaders of leaders. As leaders of leaders, they work hard to build up the capacities of teachers and others, so that direct leadership will no longer be needed. This is achieved through team building, leadership development, shared decision making, and striving to **establish the value of collegiality**. The leader of leaders represents a powerful conception of leadership, one that deserves more emphasis than it now receives in the literature on school administration, and more attention from policy makers who seek to reform schools. Successful leaders of leaders combine the most progressive elements of psychological authority with aspects of professional and moral authority.

Servant Leadership

Virtually missing from the mainstream conversation on leadership is the concept of servant leadership. The leadership so nobly practiced by Madelyn Cartwright, Larry Norwood, and many other principals. Greenleaf (1977) believes that "a new moral principle is emerging which holds that the only authority deserving one's allegiance is that which is freely and knowingly granted by the led to the leader in response to, and in proportion to, the clearly evident servant stature of the leader" (p. 10). He developed the concept of servant leadership after reading Herman Hesse's *journey to the East*. As Greenleaf explains (P. 7),

In this story we see a band of men on a mythical journey... The central figure of the story is Leo, who accompanies the party as the servant who does their menial chores, but who also sustains them with his spirit and his song. He is a person of extraordinary presence. All goes well until Leo disappears. Then the group falls into disarray and the journey is abandoned. They cannot make it without the servant Leo. The narrator, one of the party, after some years of wandering, finds Leo and is taken into the Order that had sponsored the journey. There he discovers that Leo, whom he had known first as servant, was in fact the titular head of the Order, its guiding spirit, a great and noble *leader* (P. 71).

For Greenleaf, the great leader is a servant first.

Servant leadership is the means by which leaders can get the necessary legitimacy to lead. Servant leadership provides legitimacy partly because one of the responsibilities of leadership is to give a sense of direction, to establish an overarching purpose. Doing so, Greenleaf explains, "gives certainty and purpose to others who may have difficulty in achieving it for themselves. But being successful in providing purpose requires the trust of others" (p. 15). For trust to be forthcoming, the led must have confidence in the leader's competence and values. Further, people's confidence is strengthened by their belief that the leader makes judgments on the basis of competence and values, rather than self-interest.

When practicing servant leadership, the leader is often tempted by personal enthusiasm and commitment to define the needs of those to be served. There is, of course, a place for this approach in schools; sometimes students, parents, and teachers are not ready or able to define their own needs. But, over the long haul, as Greenleaf maintains, it is best to **let** those who will be served define their own needs in their own way. Servant leadership is more easily provided if the leader understands that serving others is important but that the most important thing is to serve the values and ideas that help shape the school as a covenantal community. In this sense, all the members of a community share the burden of servant leadership.

Schools should not be viewed as ordinary communities but as communities of learners. Barth (1990) points out that, within such communities, it is assumed that schools have the capacity to improve themselves; that, under the right conditions, adults and students alike learn, and learning by one contributes to the learning of others; that a key leverage point in creating a learning community is improving the school's culture; and that school-improvement efforts that count, whether originating in the school or outside, seek to determine and provide the conditions that enable Students and adults to promote and sustain learning for themselves. "Taking these assumptions seriously," Barth argues (PP. 45-46), "leads to fresh thinking about the culture of schools and about what people do in them. For instance, the principal need no longer be the 'headmaster'. or 'instructional leader,' pretending to know all, one who consumes lists from above and transmits them to those below. The more crucial role of the principal is as head learner, engaging in the most important enterprise of the schoolhouse -experiencing, displaying, modeling, and celebrating what it is hoped and. expected that teachers and pupils will do." The school as learning community provides an ideal setting for joining the practice of the "leader of leaders" to servant leadership.

Command and instructional leadership, "leader of leaders" leadership, and servant leadership can be viewed developmentally, as if each were built on the others. As the emphasis shifts from one level to the next, leadership increasingly becomes a form of virtue, and each of the preceding levels becomes less important to the operation of a successful school. For example, teachers become less dependent on administrators, are better able to manage themselves, and share the burdens of leadership more fully.

The developmental view is useful conceptually, but it may be too idealistic to account for what happens in practice. A more realistic perspective is to view the expressions of leadership as being practiced together. Initially (and because of the circumstances faced) the command and instructional features of the leadership pattern may be more prominent. In time, however (and with deliberate effort), they yield more and more to the "leader of leaders" style and to servant leadership, with the results just described.

The idea of servant leadership may seem weak. After all, since childhood, we have been conditioned to view leadership in a much tougher, more direct light. The media portray leaders as strong, mysterious, aloof, wise, and all-powerful. Lawrence Miller (1984) explains:

Problems were always solved the same way. The Lone Ranger and his faithful Indian companion (read servant of a somewhat darker complexion and lesser intelligence) come riding into town. The Lone Ranger, with his mask and mysterious identity, background, and life style, never becomes intimate with those whom he will help. His power is partly in his mystique. Within ten minutes the Lone Ranger has understood the problem, identified who the bad guys are, and has set out to catch them. He quickly outwits the bad guys, draws his gun, and has them behind bars. And then there was always that wonderful scene at the end. The helpless victims are standing in front of their ranch or in the town square marveling at how wonderful it is now that they have been saved, you hear hoofbeats, then the *William Tell Overture*, and one person turns to another and asks, "But who was that masked man?" And the other replies, "Why, that was the Lone Ranger!" We see Silver rear up and with a hearty "Hi-yo Silver," the Lone Ranger and his companion ride away.

It was wonderful. Truth, justice, and the American Way protected once again.

What did we learn from this cultural hero? Among the lessons that are now acted out daily by managers are the following: There is always a problem down on the ranch [the school] and someone is responsible.

- Those who got themselves into the difficulty are incapable of getting themselves out of it. "I'll have to go down or send someone down to fix it."
- In order to have the mystical powers needed to solve problems, you must stay behind the mask. Don't let the ordinary folks get too close to you or your powers may be lost.

- Problems get solved within discrete periodic time units and we have every right to expect them to be solved decisively.

These myths are no laughing matter. Anyone who has lived within or close to our corporations [or schools] knows that these myths are powerful forces in daily life. Unfortunately, none of them bears much resemblance to the real world (pp. 54-55)

One way in which the servant leader serves others is by becoming an advocate on their behalf. Mary Helen Rodriguez, principal of San Antonio's De Zavala School, provides an example:

A teacher came to Mrs. Rodriguez to discuss problems she had been having in arranging a field trip for her grade level. The teacher, in reality, had begun planning too late to get the bus and sack lunch requests conveniently through the district bureaucracy for the planned day of the trip. Mrs. Rodriguez first asked the teacher how important the field trip was for the students. After a bit of discussion, Mrs. Rodriguez and the teacher decided that a trip to the zoo was indeed important, given what students were studying in class at the time. Mrs. Rodriguez then immediately set about making the necessary preparations. Although it took a bit of cajoling over the telephone, sack lunches and busses were secured, and the teacher was most appreciative.

The remarkable thing about this episode is the extra effort Mrs. Rodriguez put in, even though it would have been perfectly reasonable to say, "No, I'm sorry. It's just too late." In a situation where another principal might have saved her powder and not fought the system, Mrs. Rodriguez proved to be a successful advocate for the teacher and her students [Albritton, 1991 p. 8].

Such ideas as servant leadership bring with them a different kind of strength—one based on moral authority. When one places one's leadership practice in service to ideas, and to others who also seek to serve these ideas, issues of leadership role and of leadership style become far less important. It matters less who is providing the leadership, and it matters even less whether the style of leadership is directive or not, involves others or not, and so on. These are issues of process; what matter are issues of substance. What are we about? Why? Are students being served? Is the school as learning community being served? What are our obligations to this community? With these questions in mind, how can we best get the job done?

Practicing Servant Leadership

Summarized in the following sections are practices that, taken together, show how servant leadership works and how the burden of leadership can be shared with other members of the school community.

Purposing

Vaill (1984) defines purposing as "that continuous stream of actions by an organization's formal leadership which has the effect of inducing clarity, consensus and commitment regarding the organization's basic purposes" (p. gii). The purpose of purposing is to build within the school a center of shared values that transforms it from a mere organization into a covenantal community.

Empowerment

Empowerment derives its full strength from being linked to purposing: everyone is free to do what makes sense, as long as people's decisions embody the values shared by the school community. When empowerment is understood in this light, the emphasis shifts away from discretion needed to function and toward one's responsibility to the community. Empowerment cannot be practiced successfully apart from enablement (efforts by the school to provide support and remove obstacles).

Leadership by Outrage

It is the teacher's responsibility to be outraged when empowerment is abused and when purposes are ignored. Moreover, all members of the school are obliged to show outrage when the standard falls. Leadership by outrage, and the practice of kindling outrage in others challenge the conventional wisdom that leaders should be poker-faced, to the chest, avoid emotion, and otherwise hide play their cards close what they believe and feel. When the source of leadership authority is moral, and when covenants of shared values become the driving force for the school's norm system, it seems natural to react with outrage to shortcomings in what we do and impediments to what we want to do.

Madeline Cartwright regularly practiced leadership by outrage. In one instance, she was having trouble with teachers' attendance. She learned of another principal who solved this problem by answering the phone personally, and she decided to follow suit: "I started answering the phone. I say, 'Good morning, this is the Blaine School, this is Madeline Cartwright.' They hang right up. Two, three minutes later, phone rings again. Good morning, this is Blaine School and still Madeline Cartwright.' Hang right up. Next time the phone rang I said: 'Good morning, this is Mrs. Cartwright. If you're going to take off today, you have to talk to me. You either talk to me or you come to school, simple - as that'" (Louv, 1990 p. 64). The school is the only thing that the kids can depend on, Cartwright maintains, and for this reason it is important to make sure that the teachers will show up. She tells the teachers, "As old as I am, you haven't had any disease I haven't had, so you come to school, no matter what."

Some administrators who practice the art of leadership by outrage do it by fighting off bureaucratic interference. Paperwork is often the villain. Other administrators capitulate and spend much of their time and effort handling this paperwork. As a result, little is left for dealing with other, more important matters. Jules Linden, a junior high school principal in New York City, and Linda Martinez, principal of San Juan Day School, San Juan Pueblo, New Mexico, belong in the first group.

In Linden's words, "The only thing the bureaucracy hasn't tried to solve by memo is cancer.... My rule of thumb is, when people can't see me because of the paperwork demands, I dump [the paperwork]-and most of it is not missed" (Mustain, 1980, p. 14). Martinez has devised a unique filing system to handle the onslaught of memos, rules, directives, and the like, which she receives from above: "I decided to 'bag it.' Every Friday I would clear my desk. Everything would be tossed in a garbage bag, dated and labeled weekly." Should Martinez be contacted about something filed (and that is not often the case), the proper bag is opened and dumped on the floor, and the item is retrieved for further consideration. Linda Martinez remarks, "I had never really considered my 'filing system' of garbage bags to be associated with leadership. I've been told it borders on lunacy." In a redefined leadership, what first appears to be lunacy may not be, and vice versa.

Not all schools share the dire conditions of Blaine School, and not all are deluged with a mountain of paperwork. But every school stands for something, and this something can be the basis of practicing leadership by outrage. Many administrators and teachers believe that students do not have the right to fail-that, for example, it should not be up to students to decide whether to do assigned work. Unless this belief rests on the practice of leadership by outrage, however, it is likely to be an academic abstraction rather than a heartfelt value, a slogan rather than a solution.

How is failure to complete assigned work handled in most schools? Typically, by giving zeros - often cheerfully, and without emotion. It is at most as if we are saying to students, "Look, here is the deadline. This is what you have to do. If you don't meet the deadline, these are the consequences. it's up to you. You decide whether you want to do the assignments and pass, or not do the assignments and fail." Adopting a "no zero" policy and enforcing it to the limit is one expression of leadership by outrage. It can transform the belief that children have no right to fail from an abstraction to an operational value. When work is not done by Friday, for example, no zeros are recorded. Instead, the student is phoned Friday night, and perhaps the principal or the teacher visits the student at home after brunch on Sunday to collect the work or press the new Monday deadline. If the student complains that she or he does not have a place to do homework, homework centers are established in the school, in the neighborhood, and so on.

Just remember Madeline Cartwright, and follow her lead. Granted, not all students will respond, but I believe that most will, and those who finally do wind up with zeros will get them with teachers'

reluctance. Even if the school does not "win them all," it demonstrates that it stands for something. The stakes are elevated when the problem is transformed from something technical to something moral.

As important as leadership by outrage is, its intent is to kindle outrage in others. When it is successful, every member of the school community is encouraged to display outrage whenever the standard falls. An empowered school community, bonded together by shared commitments and values, is a prerequisite for kindling outrage in others.

Power Over and Power To

It is true that many teachers and parents do not always respond to opportunities to be involved, to be self-managed, to accept responsibility, and to practice leadership by outrage. In most cases, however, this lack of interest is not inherent but learned. Many teachers, for example, have become jaded as a result of bad experiences with involvement. Louise E. Coleman, principal of Taft Elementary School, Joliet, Illinois, believes that trust and integrity have to be reestablished after such bad experiences. When she arrived at Taft as a new principal, the school was required to submit to the central office a three-year school-improvement plan, designed to increase student achievement:

Teachers were disgruntled at first. They were not really interested in developing a school-improvement plan. They had been through similar exercises in shared decision making before, and that's exactly what they *were-exercises*. Taft had had three principals in three years. The staff assumed that I would go as others had in the past. After writing a three-year plan based on the staffs perceptions, influencing teachers by involving them in decision making, helping them to take ownership in school improvement, [we have] made some-progress. Trust and integrity have been established. Most of the staff now has confidence in me. We have implemented new programs based on students' needs. The staff now volunteers to meet, to share ideas. Minority students are now considered students. Communication is ongoing. Minority parents are more involved. Positive rewards are given for student recognition. The overall school climate has changed to reflect a positive impact on learning.

Coleman was able to build trust and integrity by gently but firmly allowing others to assume leadership roles. She did not feel too threatened to relinquish some of her power and authority. Power can be understood in two ways-as power *over*, and as power to. Coleman knows the difference. Power *over* emphasizes controlling what people do, when they do it, and how they do it. Power to views power as a source of energy for achieving shared goals and purposes. Indeed, when empowerment is successfully practiced, administrators exchange power *over* for power to. Power *over* is rule-bound, but power to is goal-bound. Only those with hierarchically authorized authority can practice power *over*; anyone who is committed to shared goals and purposes can practice power to.

The empowerment rule (that everyone is free to do whatever makes sense, as long as decisions embody shared values), and an understanding of power as the power to, are liberating to administrators as well as teachers. Principals, too, are free to lead, without worrying about being viewed as autocratic. Further, principals can worry less about whether they are using the right style and less about other process-based concerns; their leadership rests on the substance of their ideas and values. Contrary to the laws of human relations, which remind us always to involve people and say that it is autocratic for designated leaders to propose ideas for implementation, we have here a game that resembles football: everyone gets a chance to be quarterback and is free to call the play; if it is a good call, then the team runs with it.

Wayne K. Myers, a principal in Madison, Georgia, welcomes teachers to the role of quarterback, but he is not afraid to call some plays himself. In the spring of 1989, he declared one week in August as International Week, having organized the major activities on his own. He contacted parents for volunteers, asked foreign students from the University of Georgia to come to the campus and make presentations, arranged an exhibit from UNICEF, and even asked the lunchroom to serve meals from the cuisines of different countries:

In describing this week, I keep [saying] "I" because the major activities were completed by me, but the real success of the week came from the teachers. It was based on a general understanding I had gained from working with these teachers: that they felt the true spirit of schooling had been lost, and that we were committed to recovering it. I shared my idea with them only one month before the start-up date. But, within that month, each grade organized a fantastic array of activities for students. The media specialist located all the materials she had on foreign countries. The hallways were full of displays of items, made by the students, that represented other countries.

Since each homeroom would have a visitor with information about another country, each teacher centered activities on that country. The real significance was that the general theme of the week may not have been [the teachers'] idea, but the response was unbelievable. They were, of course, free to take the idea and run with it. It became a learning experience for everyone- administrators, teachers, students, and the community. All were involved, and all enjoyed themselves.... I am not sure what type of leadership this is. All I know is that the results have been very positive. I do not believe in telling people what to do or how to do it, but I do believe that sometimes we all have ideas that need to be proposed, sometimes unilaterally.

Myers does not have to worry about leadership-that is, about who does what, or whether he is being too pushy or if he is passing the ball off to teachers. But he would have to worry if trust, integrity, and shared values were not already established in the school. Moreover, Myers understands the difference between charting a direction and giving people maps, between providing a theme and giving teachers a script. Finally, although human relations remain important, Myers is confident that if he acts from the standpoint of what is right and good for the school, human relationships will have a way of taking care of themselves.

The Female Style

It is difficult to talk about power to and servant leadership without also addressing the issue of gender. Power to, for example, is an idea close to the feminist tradition, as are such ideas as servant leadership and community. By contrast, the more traditional conceptions of leadership seem decidedly more male-oriented. Modern management, for example, is a male creation that replaced emphasis on family and community with emphasis on individual ambition and other personal considerations. As Debra R. Kaufman and Barbara L. Richardson (1982.) explain, "Most contemporary social science models [of which modern school management is one]-the set of concepts that help social scientists select problems, organize information, and pursue inquiries-are based on the lives men lead." They go on to say, "In general, social science models of human behavior have focused on rather narrow and male-specific criteria regarding the relationships of ability, ambition, personality, achievement, and worldly success" (p. xiii).

Joyce Hampel (1988) argues that the concept of servant leadership is not likely to be valued in male-dominated institutions or professions. Relying on the research of Carol Gilligan (1982), Joyce Miller (1986), and Charol Shakeshaft (1987), as well as on her own experiences in schools, Hampel points out that men and women generally have different goals when it comes to psychological fulfillment. Men tend to emphasize individual relationships, individual achievement, power as a source for controlling events and people, independence, authority, and set procedures. Women, by contrast, tend to emphasize successful relationships, affiliation, power as the means to achieve shared goals, connectedness, authenticity, and personal creativity. For most men, achievement has to do with the accomplishment of goals; for most women, achievement has to do with the building of connections between and among people. Hampel quotes Miller as follows: "In our culture 'serving others' is for losers, it is low-level stuff. Yet serving others is a basic principle around which women's lives are organized; it is far from such for men" (p. 18).

Shakeshaft (1987), in her groundbreaking research on the topic, characterizes the female world of schooling as follows:

(1) Relationships with Others Are Central to All Actions of Women Administrators. Women

spend more time with people, communicate more, care more about individual differences, are concerned more with teachers and marginal students, and motivate more. Not surprisingly, staffs of women administrators rate women higher, are more productive, and have higher morale. Students in schools with women principals also have higher morale and are more involved with student affairs. Further, parents are more favorable toward schools and districts run by women and thus are more involved in school life. This focus on relationships and connections echoes Gilligan's (1982) ethic of care.

(2) *Teaching and Learning Are the Major Foci of Women Administrators.* Women administrators are more instrumental in instructional learning than men and they exhibit greater knowledge of teaching methods and techniques. Women administrators not only emphasize achievement, they coordinate instructional programs and evaluate student progress. In these schools and districts, women administrators know their teachers and they know the academic progress of their students. Women are more likely to help new teachers and to supervise all teachers directly. Women also create a school climate more conducive to learning, one that is more orderly, safer, and quieter. Not surprisingly, academic achievement is higher in schools and districts in which women are administrators.

(3) *Building Community Is an Essential Part of a Woman Administrator's Style.* From speech patterns to decision-making styles, women exhibit a more democratic, participatory style that encourages inclusiveness rather than exclusiveness -in schools. Women involve themselves more with staff and students, ask for and get higher participation, and maintain more closely knit 'organizations. Staffs of women principals have higher job satisfaction and are more engaged in their work than those of male administrators. These staffs are also more aware of and committed to the goals of learning, and the members of the staffs have more shared professional goals. These are schools and districts in which teachers receive a great deal of support from their female administrators. They are also districts and schools where achievement is emphasized. Selma Greenberg (1985, P- 4) describes this female school world: "Whatever its failures, it is more cooperative than competitive, it is more experiential than abstract, it takes a broad view of the curriculum and has always addressed 'the whole child.'"

The female perspective on school leadership is important, for a number of reasons. The teaching force is predominantly female, and this raises moral questions about giving full legitimacy to management conceptions and leadership practice that take women's lived experience into account. Female principals need to feel free to be themselves, rather than have to follow the principles and practices of traditional management theory. The record of success for female principals is impressive. Women are underrepresented in the principalship but over represented among principals of successful schools. Giving legitimacy to the female perspective would also give license to men who are inclined toward similar practice. The good news is that such ideas as value-based leadership, building covenantal communities, practicing empowerment and collegiality, adopting the stance of servant leaders, and practicing leadership by outrage are gaining in acceptance among male and female administrators alike.

Servant Leadership and Moral Authority

The link between servant leadership and moral authority-is a tight one. Moral authority relies heavily on persuasion. At the root of persuasion are ideas, values, substance, and content, which together define group purposes and core values. Servant leadership is practiced by serving others, but its ultimate purpose is to place oneself, and others for whom one has responsibility, in the service of ideals.

Serving others and serving ideals is not an either-or proposition. Chula Boyle, assistant principal of Lee High School, San Antonio, Texas, for example, can often be seen walking the halls of the school with a young child in arm or tow. Student mothers at Lee depend on extended family to care for their children while they are in school. When care arrangements run into problems that might

otherwise bar student mothers from attending class, Boyle urges them to bring the children to school. By babysitting, Boyle is serving students but, more important, she reflects an emerging set of ideals at Lee. Lee wants to be a community, and this transformation requires that a new ethic of caring take hold. Lee High School Principal Bill Fish believes that this type of caring is reciprocal. The more the school cares about students, the more students care about matters of schooling. When asked about the practice of babysitting at Lee, he modestly responds, "From time to time kids get in a bind. We are not officially doing it [babysitting] but unofficially we do what we can." His vision is to establish a day-care center in the school for children of students and teachers.

Administrators ought not to choose among psychological, bureaucratic, and moral authority, instead, the approach should be additive. To be additive, however, moral authority must be viewed as legitimate. Further, with servant leadership as the model, moral authority should become the cornerstone of one's overall leadership practice.

Stewardship

The "leader of leaders" and servant leadership styles bring stewardship responsibilities to the heart of the administrator's role. When this happens, the rights and prerogatives inherent in the administrator's position move to the periphery, and attention is focused on duties and responsibilities-to others as persons and, more important, to the school itself.

Stewardship represents primarily an act of trust whereby people and institutions entrust a leader with certain obligations and duties to fulfill and perform on their behalf. For example, the public entrusts the schools to the school board. The school board entrusts each school to its principal. Parents entrust their children to teachers. Stewardship also involves the leader's personal responsibility to manage her or his life and affairs with proper regard for the rights of other people and for the common welfare. Finally, stewardship involves placing oneself in service to ideas and ideals and to others who are committed to their fulfillment.

The concept of stewardship furnishes an attractive image of leadership, for it embraces all the members of the school as community and all those who are served by the community. Parents, teachers, and administrators share stewardship responsibility for students. Students join the others in stewardship responsibility for the school as learning community. Mary Giella, assistant superintendent for instruction in the Pasco County (Florida) Schools, captures the spirit of stewardship as follows: "My role is one of facilitator. I listened to those who taught the children and those who were school leaders. I helped plan what they saw was a need. I coordinated the plan until those participating could independently conduct their own plans."

The organizational theorist Louis Pondy (1978, p. 94) has noted that leadership is invariably defined as behavioral: The 'good' leader is one who can get his subordinates to do something. What happens if we force ourselves away from this marriage to behavioral concepts? What kind of insights can we get if we say that the effectiveness of a leader lies in his ability to make activity meaningful for those in his role set - not to change behavior but to give others a sense of understanding what they are doing, and especially to articulate it so that they can communicate about the meaning of their behavior?

Shifting emphasis from behavior to meaning can help us recapture leadership as a powerful force for school improvement. Giving legitimacy to the moral dimension of leadership, and understanding leadership as the acceptance and embodiment of one's stewardship responsibilities, are important steps in this direction.

REFERENCES

- Albritton, M. *De Zavala Elementary School. A Committed Community*. Case study, Department of Education, Trinity University, 1991.
- Barth, R. *Improving Schools from Within*. San Francisco: Bass-Bass, 1990.
- Gilligan, C. *In a Different Voice*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Greenberg, S. "So You Want to Talk Theory?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, 1985
- Greenfield, W. "The Micropolitics of Leadership in an Urban Elementary School." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1991.
- Greenleaf, R. K. *Servant Leadership*. New York: Paulist Press, 1977.
- Hampel, J. "The Administrator as Servant: A Model for Leadership Development." Unpublished manuscript, Department of Education, San Diego State University, 1988.
- Johnson, S. M. *Teachers at Work: Achieving Success in Our Schools*. New York: Basic Books, 1990.
- Kaufman, D. R., and Richardson, B. L. *Achievement and Women: Challenging the Assumptions*. New York: Free Press, 1982.
- Louv, R. "Hope in Hell's Classroom." *New York Times Magazine*, Nov- 15, 1990, PP- 30-33, 63-67, and 74-75.
- Miller, J. B. *Toward a New Psychology of Women*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1986.
- Miller, L. M. *American Spirit: Visions of a New Corporate Culture*. New York: Morrow, 1984
- Mustain, G. "Bottom-Drawer Bureau." *Washington Monthly*, Sept. 11990, P. 14.
- Pondy, L. R. "Leadership Is a Language Game." In M. W. McCall, Jr., and M. M. Lombardo (eds.), *Leadership: Where Else Can We Go?* Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1978.
- Shakeshaft, C. *Women in Educational Administration*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage, 1987.
- Vaill, P. "The Purposing of High-Performance Systems." In T. J. Sergiovanni and J. E. Corbally (eds.), *Leadership and Organizational Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984.

Chapter 19 - THE AUTHENTIC LEADER

Robert Evans

The true force that attracts others is the force of the heart.

-James Kouzes and Barry Posner (1987)

TRANSFORMATION BEGINS with trust. Trust is the essential link between leader and led, vital to people's job satisfaction and loyalty, vital to followership. It is doubly important when organizations are seeking rapid improvement, which requires exceptional effort and competence, and doubly again to organizations like schools that offer few extrinsic motivators (money, status, power). And it is as fragile as it is precious; once damaged, it is nearly impossible to repair. When we have come to distrust people, either because they have lied to us or deceived us or let us down too often, we tend to stay suspicious of them, resisting their influence and discounting efforts they may make to reform themselves. In work groups, the more people doubt one another, the more they "ignore, disguise, and distort facts, ideas, conclusions, and feelings that [might] increase their vulnerability to others" (Kouzes and Posner, p. 147), increasing the likelihood of misunderstanding. Imagine two schools that are virtual clones, identical in faculty, administration, student body, community, budget, and physical plant, identical even in their problems and in the improvements they are undertaking. Now introduce a single difference: the principal in the first school is distrusted by the faculty. An abyss opens. Despite their resemblance, they are disparate institutions, different in climate, morale, energy level, and responsiveness to innovation. The contrast in the scope and complexity of the tasks confronting their two principals is vast.

Clearly, then, school leaders seeking change need to begin by thinking of what will inspire trust among their constituents. The answer is direct: we admire leaders who are honest, fair, competent, and forward-looking. Although these qualities seem so obvious that they are easy to gloss over, they are the basis of trust (Kouzes and Posner, pp. 16, 21). (Imagine how our national cynicism about politics would change if we found our elected officials to be honest, fair, and competent, not to mention forward looking.) For "honest" we may read "consistent." Consistency is the lifeblood of trust. People who do what they say they will do-meet their commitments, keep their promises-are trustworthy; those who don't, aren't. Most of us prefer to be led by someone we can count on, even when we, disagree -with him, than someone we agree with but who frequently shifts his position (Bennis, 1985, p.21).

Innovation can't live without trust, but it needs more- than trust-it needs confidence. We cannot have confidence in those we distrust, but we do not necessarily have confidence in all those we trust. Some people whose sincerity and honesty are beyond reproach lack the capacity to translate their goals into reality. They may have lofty ideals, and even fulfill them in their personal lives, but be unable to communicate clearly to others or be inept at handling daily events. Their heart, as we say, is in the right place, but they lack something that makes us follow them. To transform schools, principals and superintendents must inspire such confidence along with trust.

The key to both is authenticity. Leaders who are followed are authentic; that is, they are distinguished not by their techniques or styles but by their integrity and their savvy. Integrity is a fundamental consistency between personal beliefs, organizational aims, and working behavior. It is increasingly clear that leadership rests on values, that commitment among constituents can only be mobilized by leaders who themselves have strong commitments, who preach what they believe and practice what they preach.' But they must also know what they're doing. Savvy is practical competence, a hard-to-quantify cluster of qualities that includes craft knowledge, life experience, native intelligence, common sense, intuition, courage, and the capacity to "handle things." Most of us seek in a leader this combination of genuineness and effectiveness. It makes him authentic, a credible resource who inspires trust and confidence, someone worth following into the uncertainties of change.

This chapter explores the concept of authentic leadership, its roots and its implications for practice. It sketches authenticity's essentials - integrity and savvy-and describes a process for discovering one's own authentic core, a process that highlights the personal, idiosyncratic nature of leadership. From this flow three consequences: that there are many ways to excel as a leader; that we must recast our notions of vision and strategy; and, most important of all, that effective leadership rests on a set of strategic biases that simplify leadership and make transformation possible.

Integrity: Character in Action

Integrity is a fundamental consistency between one's values, goals, and actions. At the simplest level it means standing for something, having a significant commitment and exemplifying this commitment in your behavior. Leaders who have no strong values and no aspirations for their school may provide a dull consistency, but this is not something we would confuse with integrity. Even if they manage daily details adequately, they inspire no special motivation or attachment that enhances performance or makes being part of the school valuable. They are, at best, maintaining, not leading. Followership is not just impossible under their administration, it is irrelevant.

In a different way, leaders who do claim to stand for something but whose goals and actions are not aligned with their stated values also lack integrity. Those who profess aspirations that do not truly matter to them are easily seen through. When a principal dutifully introduces a district priority that she herself does not share, the discrepancy between her announced aims and her underlying beliefs will be apparent to all who know her well, even if she tries to muster up sincerity. Her falseness will ultimately be as evident as if she were adopting a style that is not her own. Similarly, when leaders do not model the values they assert or the goals they proclaim-when a superintendent announces "respect for others" as a district goal but treats staff disrespectfully- they breed cynicism and resistance. The problem of inconsistency is so widespread that it needs little elaboration, except to note that it can occur unconsciously. A leader may be sincere about his goal and unaware that his behavior is contradictory. In such cases, the leader may seem "out of it" and incompetent more than cynical or manipulative, but he will still invite disrespect and resistance instead of followership.

Integrity can take many forms. Let us begin with two examples:

Jane Carroll, principal of Worthington High School, is a -strong believer in "challenge." A triathlon competitor and ardent chess player, she values self-discipline and perseverance. She is overt about rewarding students and faculty who demonstrate these qualities:

"Effort matters far more than talent-for teachers as well as students. Success comes from striving. As Aristotle said, 'Excellence is not an act, but a habit.'" Jane leads the school with a firm hand and engages herself in aspects of curriculum, assessment, and staff development that in many schools have more teacher involvement and control. Some faculty find her "cold," others "elitist and controlling," but she enjoys wide support, even among most of these critics, because her commitments are so clear, because she holds herself to them as firmly as she holds others to them, and because they have come to embody the school's pursuit of excellence. "She drives everyone hard," says a teacher, "but she sets the example, and we all feel the end result is an exceptional school."

Tom Russell, the principal of Jackson Elementary School, believes in individual development. He reveres Thoreau and sees school as a place where everyone, child and adult, should grow at their own pace through rich opportunities and the freedom to explore, not through pressure to produce. Jackson has comparatively few rules and requirements. Tom rarely issues an order, he tolerates others disagreeing with him, and he gives the faculty wide latitude to decide policy, even if this involves heated arguments. He is unhurried in his style but unwavering in his focus. Each year he meets with each student and each staff member (including custodians and secretaries) to talk about their growth, interests, and ideas for the school. Some teachers have found Jackson too "chaotic" and left; some who have remained find Tom too "unstructured." But most agree with the teacher who says, "This guy lives what he believes: growth, support, respect. Because of him, Jackson really nurtures people."

Few of the principals I know would want to be Jane or Tom. They might endorse qualities of each but would find both at least a bit extreme. I cite Jane and Tom here as exemplars not of the perfect principal but of integrity. For both of them, values, goals, and actions are congruent.

(Before going further, an important note: it is impossible to address the ethical dimensions of leadership that are a primary focus of this chapter without using terms that have been poisoned by

politics. In the 1990s in America, *values* and *basic values* are among a constellation of terms that have been appropriated by various political groups and reduced to code words for particular viewpoints. But all of us see certain values - fairness, for example-as "basic," even if we define these values differently. There is no other way to describe them. I use all such phrases and all such words as moral in this primary, generic way, not to refer to a particular political or religious agenda.)

Values and personal integrity come first. At the deepest level, the values of authentic leaders are characterized by three things: personal ethics, vision, and belief in others (Badaracco and Ellsworth, p. 100). A firm set of personal ethical standards is a hallmark of most successful leaders. Over and over in the research literature, portraits of exceptional leaders describe people with unusually high standards, commitments they keep with a self-discipline that can seem excessive, even fanatical: "Outstanding leaders have sources of inner direction." They may not be terribly religious, but their beliefs give them a sturdy guide for their long-range planning and their routine problem solving (p. 100). Whatever the specific content of their views, honesty and fairness tend to be among their chief tenets. It is not that authentic leaders necessarily preach honesty and fairness as specific virtues, but they demonstrate them through the sincerity of their commitments. This is the basis of trust and loyalty in any group.

Leaders with strong values translate these into organizational vision. Like Jane and Tom, they typically hold the same standards for their school as for themselves. "Challenge and Excellence" might well serve as the motto both for Jane and for Worthington, "Freedom to grow" for Tom and Jackson. Such commitments are important; they are crucial to followership because they provide the larger purpose that gives work direction and meaning. Leaders like Jane and Tom are able to communicate very clearly a definite notion of their school and its potential.

Leaders with values and vision tend to believe that other people have the potential to be motivated by the same commitments, not just by narrow self-interest (financial gain, personal power). Though their beliefs are different, neither Jane nor Tom base their leadership on maneuvering or manipulating people through special incentives, political trade-offs, and the like. They have faith that everyone can respond, can benefit from the opportunity the school provides, can fulfill the vision in their own personal ways. This faith may take many forms-Tom offers a chance to blossom, Jane a challenge to excel-but in one way or another it conveys a confidence in the potential of people.

These same three qualities -ethics, vision, belief in others-that are central in the personal beliefs of authentic leaders are reflected in their organizational goals. By "goals" I mean both the kind of institution the leader seeks to build and the improvements he seeks to implement. Leaders with strong personal ethics who exemplify honesty and fairness generally reflect these in a meritocratic approach to management; they want competence to be rewarded. They expect high ethical standards to prevail throughout and believe that when in doubt about a decision or a problem, everyone should behave in accordance with the school's fundamental values. They acknowledge those who observe and fulfill these values, basing recognition on "what you do, not on who you are or who you know," as Jane says. At the same time, they expect members of the organization to come to share the same basic values and goals, and they are usually unambiguous and unembarrassed about this. Authentic school leaders do not necessarily champion a "my way or the highway" philosophy, but they are unwilling to sacrifice their priorities and goals, and when necessary they will challenge those who can't or won't come along. This can sometimes seem harsh and unfeeling, but for many leaders with integrity this approach is simply axiomatic: "buying in" is ultimately a basic condition of organizational membership. A case in point is this high school principal:

Last year we pushed our restructuring up a big notch: we converted to a block schedule, four go-minute periods per day, so we could really start implementing an integrated curriculum and in-depth teaching. We'd spent a full year debating it and most people were on board, but six were still strongly opposed. They were angry and terrified at having to face kids for that long and at having to change the curriculum they'd taught for twenty years and start collaborating with other teachers. I met with each. I made it clear that we needed absolutely everyone to be truly committed, that we had finally reached the rock and the hard place; it was "in or out." They were going to be miserable if they stayed. Thanks to a special agreement with the union, we had the option of transferring people. I offered to find each

their first choice of another high school in the city if they wished. No hard feelings, no shame, no blame. Four chose to leave. I worked like a maniac, and I got all of them the schools they wanted. It wasn't all happy, but they are happier, and we've made much more progress.

In a similar way, authentic leaders embrace programs or projects that reflect their values and institutional goals. They concentrate on what matters to them, again without embarrassment. They have definite notions of what is important, and they pay attention to these targets. The principal above is committed to the essential schools philosophy, which to him means "real depth learning," and the conviction that "nothing is more important than making our classrooms places where kids and teachers deeply explore challenging, important ideas. Everything else is subordinate to that."

As this principal's example indicates, integrity requires action, behavior that embodies values. Indeed, it is chiefly through consistent beliefs and goals expressed in consistent actions that we perceive a leader's integrity. The importance of setting the example, of leaders' modeling what they value, is one of the most frequently repeated themes in leadership writing. Authentic leaders translate their beliefs and values into concrete actions at a fundamental level:

Anthony Cortez became a superintendent reluctantly. After years as a teacher and then principal at Clayville Middle School, he filled in as acting superintendent and was offered the permanent position because he was so universally admired. His hesitation was simple: "I like kids. I like being around them. Everything a school does depends on community, which means that kids know they are known: they're missed when they're absent, they're appreciated for their uniqueness, they're helped when they need it, and they're held accountable to do their part. That can't happen unless the adults like the kids and are with the kids." He delegates large amounts of his "paper and policy work" and usually averages at least three school visits—"a real visit, not a sail through"—per week (he sometimes reads to children in the elementary schools). When he urges Clayville teachers to "reach out to kids, invest in them, know them," his credibility is absolute; his actions have always spoken for him.

When the late Henry Scattergood retired as headmaster at the Germantown Friends School in Philadelphia, a colleague wrote, "His virtues are as simple and uncomplicated as they are rare. They originate in the quality of creating in others a loyalty and affection, and even sometimes a goodness, by being himself, a man of perfect honesty, integrity, and goodness. He does not merely advise virtue, he creates it in others by offering its example and practice. . . . It is the simple yet exceptional use of character in action" (Nicholson, 1995, citing Sharpless). Whether it is challenging thoroughly resistant staff or staying close to students or spending large amounts of time on the job—or exemplifying virtue—authentic leaders embody character in action: they don't just say, they do.

Savvy

In discussing integrity, I have already been referring to "authentic leaders"; but although integrity is the chief defining characteristic of authenticity, it is not the only one. Authenticity also demands savvy, a practical, problem-solving wisdom that enables leaders to make things happen. Savvy subsumes an array of qualities, ranging from knowledge of one's field to having a good "nose" for institutional problems. It includes intangibles like knowing what constitutes a good solution to a dilemma, knowing "what to do and when to do it" (Sergiovanni, :199z, P. 15). These and related qualities are sometimes called "craft knowledge" and are in good part a product of professional experience, learned skills that come with years of practice. But to me, savvy also includes native strengths, basic aspects of temperament, personality, and intelligence that are reflected in qualities like common sense and empathic sensitivity (being able to "read" people), courage and assertiveness, and resilience. These, coupled with craft knowledge, establish a leader's bona fides. In my experience, educators will rarely follow leaders unless they seem to "know their stuff not the tricks of leadership but the realities of school life.

Educators want leaders who know education, who are current and well versed without falling victim to fads, but they especially want leaders who are "one of us," who can still see education from a teacher's point of view and are attuned to the real world of classrooms, students, and parents. And

they also want leaders who offer proof or promise of being able to “make things happen,” whether this means fixing problems, finding resources, or handling people. These traits build a basic platform without which a leader lacks presence and clout and is not taken seriously:

Jim Colby became a superintendent after a brief stint as a math teacher and then many years as a district business manager (he was never a principal). A devout convert to Total Quality Management, he failed to make it work in two different districts. In both, principals and teachers felt that his goals were formulaic and empty and his expectations unrealistic, that he didn't really understand teaching itself or the running of a school, and that he couldn't manage people. Principals especially felt that he never grasped the daily dilemmas of school life, the intricacies and politics of translating ideas into action. In the words of one, "Jim was a hard worker, but basically out of it. He just didn't have it, and he just didn't get it. You couldn't respect him."

If Jim had been charismatic, one of his districts might have made a temporary exception for him. There are gifted visionaries who can truly inspire others by the power of their ideas, the force of their eloquence, and the depth of their conviction, even though they have little practical aptitude and little grasp of the nitty-gritty. People will sometimes exempt such a leader from the "savvy requirement" (especially if there is a good second-in-command who handles the details), but they will not do so indefinitely and especially not as innovation proceeds from early optimism to actual implementation, with its inevitable obstacles.

Becoming Authentic

Let us say, then, that authenticity is ideal. How does one achieve it? The question is paradoxical. Just as genuineness can't be artificially manufactured—it simply is—neither can authenticity: it can't be generated; it can only be discovered. (A person cannot act authentic.) Still, one may fairly ask, "How do I get there?" The answer leads us again, as did our discussion of charisma in the preceding chapter, to the personal nature and roots of leadership.

It also leads first to a blunt truth: not everyone can. Despite the popularity of technical notions of leadership, most of us believe that good leaders must have the "right stuff," the right personal qualities to lead, and that these, like savvy or charisma, are to some extent innate: you either have what it takes or you don't. Most of us react to leaders in this way in our daily experience. But this view is not just folk wisdom—experience and research confirm that leadership requires a definite aptitude (Drucker, 1986, p. 159). For example, a study of identical twins who were raised apart concluded that leadership is a trait "strongly determined by heredity" (Goleman, 1986, pp. C1-C2). A study of leaders who achieved significant change in their organizations highlighted the importance of temperament and predisposition and suggested that the impulse and capacity to lead stem largely from innate talents and early childhood experience (Gibbons, 1986). Other research emphasizes that successful leaders tend to be psychologically hardy (Evans, 1996, ch. 7). They are resourceful and resilient. Compared to less successful peers in equally stressful jobs, they are more resistant to illness and experience both a greater sense of control over events and of positive challenge in their work (Maddi and Kobasa, 1984, p. 31). Unmistakably, they have what it takes.

The right stuff, like charisma, is a concept that might seem to suggest that there is little point in trying to teach leadership (a notion widely deplored by those who see leadership as a matter of technique and therefore teachable). But it leads to three less extreme and very practical implications. The first is that some central aspects of leadership are innate and unteachable and that not everyone has all the necessary potential, which means that some people will always lead better than others and that some are simply ill-suited for the task. As ordinary as this seems, it is routinely ignored in discussions of preparing school administrators to lead change. To expect that every leader can become authentic or transformational is foolish. The second is to underscore the importance of hardiness: to be effective, leaders must demonstrate and foster it. We don't follow the timid, the indecisive, and those who avoid problems, and we rarely stay committed to causes that distress us (Kouzes and Posner, p. 68).

The third and most important implication is that leadership begins at one's center: *authentic leaders build their practice outward from their core commitments rather than inward from a management text*. In addition to their craft knowledge, all administrators have basic philosophies of leading, of school functioning, and of human nature, philosophies that are deeply rooted in their personal history and professional experience. These philosophies guide their behavior, but they usually remain tacit. They are the true source of their integrity. They include basic assumptions about human nature, group behavior, and the roots of excellence. "Like a geological deposit," they accumulate during years of experience in life and work. Although few leaders pause to spell out their philosophies explicitly, "these deep assumptions influence almost everything they do" (Badaracco and Ellsworth, P. 7). Sergioivanni echoes this view when he speaks of an administrator's "known and unknown theories of practice ... bundles of beliefs and assumptions about how schools and school systems work, authority, leadership, the purposes of schooling, the role of competition, the nature of human nature, and other issues and concerns." These constitute what he calls -"mindscapes," frames of reference that, though rarely thought about, are powerful forces that drive one's practice (199 1, pp. 10 - 12).

A leader's philosophy remains tacit in part because none of us can be fully in touch with the entire range of our knowledge, perception, feeling, and skill. At any given moment, our reservoir of expertise is larger than we can encompass, our wellspring of inspiration deeper than we can fully tap. But it also stays hidden-even unconscious -because it is buried and discouraged by formal leadership theory taught in graduate administration courses. and disseminated in leadership books. The received wisdom in the field, which emphasizes techniques and styles, encourages school leaders to overlook their personal philosophies and the "hard-earned insights" of their craft knowledge, with the result that they end up drawing upon a tiny portion of their potential (Bolman and Deal, P. 37). Uncovering this wisdom is the key to becoming authentic.

The Testimonial: What Do You Stand For?

There may be many routes to accomplishing that uncovering of wisdom. I prefer to begin this way: Imagine that your colleagues and friends have decided to honor you at a testimonial dinner, simply because they respect and love you so much. The meal is over, you have already been "roasted" and toasted, and speakers have lavishly praised your skills. Now, your closest colleague, who knows you best, is to offer the final tribute. This person will move the focus away from your competence to your commitment, summarizing what you stand for: the essential principle or core value, the fundamental belief deep inside you that drives your work as an educator and a leader. What will he or she say? (Note: it cannot be something like "He likes people" or "She has always stood for change," unless just liking people or change for its own sake is truly your highest value, the thing you care about most-in which case it would not have earned you a testimonial! The goal is to find out what lies below these kinds of characteristics.)

The task is simple but not necessarily easy. It usually involves talking about values that are at once ordinary and complex, plain and profound. In taking several thousand educators through this exercise, I have found that many tend to begin at a relatively superficial level, describing skills, attributes, or very general beliefs. But when they are encouraged to persevere and to talk to each other in greater depth, their answers gravitate toward values that are much deeper and often disarmingly simple, what one principal called "apple pie and motherhood" values. "I feel corny and sentimental saying this stuff," he said, "but it's all true."

The kinds of "stuff " superintendents and principals and teachers say can lead in many directions. (At one seminar, a principal whose core belief was "everything you do in life should be fun" was seated next to a colleague whose deepest commitment was to "live in the light of Christ.") But frequently the answers cluster around two broad headings, which I summarize as "equity" and "excellence." Most educators share a heartfelt commitment to students and to the development of their full potential, but they differ in their emphasis. Some, like Tom Russell, stress the importance of opportunity, fairness, diversity, and community. They are likely to believe that "all children can learn," which often means to them a commitment to special outreach and compensatory opportunities

for children who are disadvantaged. Others, like Jane Carroll, emphasize goals, challenge, responsibility, and striving. They are more likely to speak of "excellence" and "standards," of bringing out the best in children by measuring them against high benchmarks. Most educators share both values to some degree, although differences of emphasis can lead to significant differences in the kinds of schools they develop.

"What do you stand for?" is an excellent point of departure for exploring one's own philosophy of schooling and school leadership, but there are three other questions that I have also found to be useful:

1. *How do I define my role as a leader?* Am I at heart a mover, someone who redesigns and reshapes, who tolerates-even enjoys-the friction that change can cause? Or am I a maintainer, someone who prefers to keep things running smoothly, who may occasionally modify or enhance things but who is by nature more inclined to accept things as they are? One's preference will of course be affected by the specific situation a new principal at a school will see his task differently if he finds its programs and teachers weak than if he finds them strong-but by philosophy and temperament every administrator is more drawn in one direction than the other. As they reflect on their conception of their role, some see themselves as active promoters of change, others don't (Fullan, 1991, p. 167). It is important to be clear about this.

2. *What inspires the best in staff?* Is performance enhanced when a leader actively shapes the work of staff members, or is it best when they are given wide latitude? Should they be free to work as individual artisans, or should they be linked in close collaborative groups? There is a famous distinction in human resource theory between three views of human motivation and performance. Theory X holds that people are basically lazy and unambitious, that they need and want to be led; managers must direct and control their work (as with Taylorism and the "expect and inspect" model of management). Theory Y holds that people can be relied upon to show motivation, self-control, and self-direction, provided that essential human needs for safety, independence, and status are met by the workplace (McGregor, 1960, PP. 35-36). Theory Z places maximum emphasis on human potential, calling for higher levels of trust and for egalitarian work relationships and participatory decision making involving stakeholders at all levels (Ouchi). Here again, though local conditions will influence one's preference, each individual school leader will have a primary predisposition.

3. *What are my strengths?* An excellent way to clarify one's basic philosophy is to identify one's particular skills and abilities and the parts of one's role that are most rewarding. A tremendous amount of leadership training and school improvement work concentrates on correcting defects. Indeed, ruminating about problems and trying to overcome them consumes vast quantities of educators' time and energy. But a person trying to discover her core beliefs and values does far better to start with her strengths, the parts of herself that she feels best about in the exercise of her profession. It is there that the essence of what matters to her is to be found. Trying to articulate this essence is not only informative, it can be hugely satisfying. I love to see superintendents and principals as they describe where in their work they feel most competent and alive; their faces light up, their enthusiasm is infectious. "When I think about what I love about my work and what I do best, it's helping kids learn important lessons about life," said one principal. "And I realize that this is actually a commitment: nurturing them into healthy growth. I feel it's sacred, and it's also something I really know I can do."

There are a range of related inquiries that can help a leader flesh out the details of his personal leadership landscape. Among them are, How well do I understand the school and its community? How solid is my relationship with my constituents? Where do I think the school ought to be headed? How should the school be governed? How prepared am I to handle the school's problems? How can I improve my ability to advance the school? If he dares, he can even ask himself, Am I the right one to be leading right now?

Where Does It Come From?

The corollary to these "What do you stand for?" questions is, "Where does it come from?" Whatever the answer to the first question, whether it points to equity or excellence or some other set of beliefs, its origin is almost always personal—deeply personal, both in how strongly it is believed and in how old it is. At heart people's philosophies tend to be 'dogmatic,' in the original sense of the term, notes Nisbet: "The springs of human action, will, -and ambition lie for the most part in beliefs about universe, world, society, and man which defy rational calculations and differ greatly from. . . instincts. These springs *lie* in what *we* call dogmas.

That word comes from Greek roots with the literal meaning of 'seems good.'" As Cardinal Newman said, "Men will die for a dogma who will not even stir for a conclusion" (1980, pp. 8-9). I don't ask educators whether they will die for what they stand for, but there is little doubt of the depth of their conviction when they speak of the "seems-goods" that matter most to them.

When I ask about the origins of their philosophy, people invariably point to their experience—their experience as an adult, as an educator, and as a student, and primarily to their early experience growing up. Few think of their courses in graduate school. In fact, the actual behavior of administrators has relatively little to do with their formal training. "They [bring] *themselves* with them to graduate school ... and they [take] themselves back to their schools ... knowing some new things, perhaps, but still basically themselves (Blumberg). The study of management contributes to what they know (and to their espoused values) but has a modest impact on how they act. Administration, after all, mostly involves not the application of theory and data but the "idiosyncratic use of the self in interactive work situations" (p. 183), and people start learning about using themselves in such situations early on in life. Basic ways of thinking, feeling, and behaving that shape one's approach to problems and one's perspective on the world begin early in childhood in the framework of the family, and they are firmly established long before one becomes an administrator. "The philosophy which is so important in each of us," as William James said, "is not a technical matter."

I am used to hearing teachers, principals, and superintendents confirm the nontechnical nature of their philosophy. Their stories are often quite wonderful, providing fascinating glimpses into the personal roots of leadership. One such account was offered by Lawrence Briggs, a high school principal, who explained his philosophy this way:

I can tell you why equity is so important to me. Up through fourth grade our schools were segregated. In fifth grade we all got to go to what had been the white school. On the first day the teacher asked who wanted to perform for the class on the flutophone. All the white children raised their hands—they had all had flutophone lessons and music classes; we hadn't had either. I made up my mind I was going to learn to play. I found a woman to teach me and was \$17 in debt to her before my parents even knew I was taking lessons. After Christmas, when the teacher asked again, I raised my hand and kept it up until she finally called on me. I stood up and played my song. Nobody is going to tell me that a kid in my school can't do something.

Lawrence is a man of imposing personal presence: big, outgoing, articulate, witty, confident. He would not, I think, claim to be the least directive, most participatory of leaders. But he enjoyed strong support among his faculty, students, and parents—in good part, I believe, because of his authenticity. Lawrence's unmistakable commitment to students—his belief in their potential and in the importance of giving them the opportunity to succeed—makes what we might call "graduate school sense": it is intellectually sound; it would readily find professional, theoretical, and research support. But its roots are far deeper, far more personal; his commitment is in his bones, and it reaches people at a level that is both immediate and fundamental.

Many Ways to Excel

Lawrence Briggs's example, and those of Jane Carroll and Tom Russell, all illustrate that authentic leadership is highly personal and therefore can take many forms, depending upon the specific

commitments of particular school leaders. "Personal" here does not mean arbitrary or whimsical but individual. All leaders whose practice is rooted in deep values and strong beliefs will resemble each other in some important ways, no matter how different their philosophies. But they will also differ according to the content of their beliefs and their preferred ways of operating. Authenticity helps to reveal a wonderful, liberating fact of leadership life: there are many ways to excel.

Most leadership research has been conducted in "low-performing systems"- organizations in trouble. It generally attributes their problems in motivation, morale, communication, trust, and performance to the way a leader is working and assumes that a change in approach or style will correct things (Vaill, 1984). But when we look at high-performing systems -successful organizations, we find that leadership style is rarely a determining factor in their performance; in fact, we find a wide range of styles among their leaders: "There are tyrants whose almost maniacal commitment to achieving the system's purposes makes one think that they'd be locked up.... There are warm, laid-back parent figures who hardly seem to be doing anything at all, until one looks a little more closely. There are technocrats ... and dreamers.... Some are rah-rah optimists and others are dour critics who express their love for the system by enumerating its imperfections".

I know thriving, vital, high-achieving schools that are led by easygoing, democratic authority delegators and by demanding, strict perfectionists; by creative, roll-with-the-punches improvisers and by obsessive, keep-me posted worriers; by eloquent, expansive preachers and by quiet, modest doers. Research has shown that principals who were successful change agents all fulfilled four key roles (resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, visible presence) but did so in very different ways. Some were "strong, aggressive, fearless," others "quiet, nurturing, supportive" (Fullan, 1991, p. 158). In stark contrast to situational leaders and practitioners of styles, the most successful leaders "are not human chameleons, but ... people of distinctive personalities who behave consistently in accordance with that personality" (Badaracco and Ellsworth, P. 208). Their greatest assets are "their own passions for the organization and its mission and their own common sense when it comes to getting the most out of the people they have. Their unwillingness to turn themselves inside out to conform to some behavioral scientist's theory is remarkable" (Vaill, 1989, p. 19).

The corollary of "many ways to excel" is "everyway has its weakness." Authentic leaders have shortcomings; they are usually aware of them, but they tend to emphasize their strengths and to find sufficient nourishment in their sense of themselves. One of the greatest flaws in style-based leadership theories is the assumption that one might somehow acquire and apply only the strengths of each particular style, that one might become a composite of stylistic virtues. In fact, every way of leading, like every way of being, has deficits as well as advantages, and these are inextricably linked. Principals with a genuine commitment to a participatory process can show remarkable patience and sensitivity but be poor at asserting themselves, at setting limits on those who abuse the process, and at taking firm action in a crisis. Superintendents with a take-charge capacity and an ability to tolerate conflict can demonstrate impressive courage and perseverance but ride roughshod over people, make enemies where they don't need to, and be ineffective at compromising when it is necessary. As I have already suggested, authentic leaders tend to be unapologetic about the inevitable downsides of being true to themselves. A superintendent I have known for years sometimes says, with both pride and resignation, "Like Popeye in the old cartoons, 'I am what I am.' I know what I want and what I'm good at. I also know what I'm not so good at, and I try to stick with my strengths." The authentic leader who is aware of her basic inclinations, including her limitations, is already better equipped to compensate for the latter but is unlikely to dwell on them.

Philosophy, Vision, and Strategy: What Do I Want?

To see authenticity as profoundly personal is to recast many of the premises that have come to be taken for granted about leadership and organizations, chief among them vision and strategy. In scarcely more than a decade these concepts have become ubiquitous in leadership theory, practice, and parlance. Like mission, culture, and change, they have become buzzwords. They are widely and correctly trumpeted as vital to leading innovation and are almost as widely misunderstood. Vision is seen as a product of rational planning, as deriving from a careful appraisal of the external environment (a company does a market survey, a school does a needs assessment). In fact, successful change agents rarely operate in this way. Largely overlooked in all the enthusiasm for vision is that it

typically derives from "a personal and imaginative creativity that [transcends] analysis" (Badaracco and Ellsworth, p. 101). In charting an organizational course, successful leaders rely on processes that are more intuitive and holistic than ordered and intellectual, more qualitative than quantitative (Mintzberg, P. 5 z). Though they are typically adept at gauging needs and identifying markets, the way they meet needs and approach markets is their own: they construct their vision out of their own philosophy and commitment, their own experience and judgment, their own interests and strengths. In education, such leaders have a mental model of what they want for their school, and they trust their own assessment of the school against that model.

To misunderstand this personal source of vision is to misunderstand the origins of strategy. When, as it all too often does, strategic planning begins by identifying external goals and then moves on to analyzing internal strengths, it puts the cart before the horse. To capture its core mission-how it will relate to its environment-a group must first understand its own strengths (Schein, 1985, P. 55). Over my years of consulting in schools I have been repeatedly struck by how often successful new programs grow out of the conviction or interest of an individual principal or a small group of leaders rather than out of a formal planned change process.

The highly personal nature of vision is central to its success. The value of a vision is not just to clarify goals and plot a strategy but to inspire followers. To change, people must be "moved." This requires not just an idea but an advocate. Change begins not just with a goal but with a leader who communicates it, enlisting the organization's members in the pursuit of a compelling agenda. The leader's own commitment to the agenda is crucial to its adoption by followers:

The greatest inhibitor to enlisting others in a common vision is lack of personal conviction. There is absolutely no way that you can, over the long term, convince others to share a dream if you are not convinced of it yourself.... The most inspirational moments are marked by genuineness. Somehow we all are able to spot a lack of sincerity in others. We detect it in their voices, we observe it in their eyes, we notice it in their posture. We each have a sixth sense for deceit.... So there is a very fundamental question that a leader must ask before attempting to enlist others: "What do I want?" [Kouzes and Posner, pp. 124-125]

A fundamental question, indeed. Character in action is always vital to leadership, but it is especially vital when innovation is under way: the leader must change first-or at least very early. The leader, that is, must not just advocate but exemplify the change before asking staff to do so. Why should anyone take an initiative seriously if the leader doesn't? Yet it is astonishing how often innovation is imposed on schools without administrators' support and how rarely administrators are accorded-or take-the time and freedom to think through what they want, to identify their own commitment or at least develop a commitment in response to an external priority forced upon them.

This lapse could not be more counterproductive, because although the need for leaders to commit themselves to change applies universally, it is critical in schools, where veteran teachers have seen many highly touted reforms fizzle and have watched many administrators depart before their priorities reached fruition. These teachers are naturally suspicious, sensitive to signs of hypocrisy, and inclined to hold back, waiting for proof that for once the administration means what it says and will really persevere. This proof is most crucially needed from the principal.

Principals are widely seen as indispensable to innovation. No reform effort, however worthy, survives a principal's indifference or opposition. He is the leader closest to the action, the operational chief of the unit that must accomplish the change. His involvement legitimates the effort, giving it an official imprimatur that carries symbolic weight and confirms that staff should take it seriously. And he is often best suited to secure the whole array of supports, from the material to the spiritual, that implementation demands. Research on the principal's role generally finds that schools where innovation succeeds are led by principals who are true Renaissance people: they do everything well. They demonstrate strong knowledge of and commitment to the innovation, but they approach faculty in a collaborative spirit, fostering open communication. They demand high standards, but they offer high levels of emotional support. They hold staff accountable, but they provide strong assistance.

They run good meetings, but they reduce the burden of administrative details. The only problem is that there are apparently so few of them.

This should come as -no surprise. Most principals are untrained for leading change. They have been socialized to be maintainers, not encouraged to be what I call authentic. Risk taking, despite the theoretical vogue it enjoys among academics who write about school reform, has always been-and remains-rare in schools. Almost everything one learns as a principal reinforces the old congressional saw: to get along, go along. After all, principals face the classic double dilemma of middle managers everywhere: they are given more responsibility than authority (even without reform initiatives, they are assigned more than they can accomplish), and their success requires maintaining positive connections not just with their superiors but also with their staff (they have little to gain from challenging people too sharply).

And when they are asked to lead projects they did not choose or develop and may not fully grasp or endorse, they are likely to be ambivalent, especially when these projects require them to change their own roles and become active in areas, such as pedagogy, where previous improvement schemes have met with little success (Fullan, P. 152).

All of which underscores the necessity for principals to be able to work through their concerns and doubts, to make change meaningful to themselves, to clarify their own commitments. This means that those above principals- superintendents, school boards, state officials-must remember the importance of allowing time for a district's whole administrative team, especially its principals, to thrash out questions of values and goals as these relate to specific programmatic changes. (It also means that teachers who press for reform on their own must realize the importance of bringing the principal along early and, if this fails, the unlikelihood of achieving school-wide success.) And what is true for principals is true for other key leaders. All those who have responsibility for an innovation need a chance to get on board before it is adopted, to ask themselves "what do I (or we) want," and then to stay on board, to revisit their answers periodically during its implementation. These steps take time, to be sure, but to skip them is a false economy that reduces "vision" and "strategy" to empty shells and leaders to deceivers of their constituents.

Authenticity in Action: Strategic Biases for Change

Thus far I have concentrated on leadership's overarching concerns and underlying beliefs. But making change in a school is not just a matter of the high and the deep. What about the daily dilemmas of transition, the issues small and large where policy turns into action and change must actually be accomplished? Authenticity would be little more than a nice ideal if it offered no help with these. Clarifying one's philosophy does not automatically make one savvy any more than it makes one charismatic; it does not create the wisdom that comes from experience, say, or provide the gift of empathic sensitivity. But it does wonderfully enrich one's ability to make decisions and solve problems: it makes one, in the best sense of the word, biased. Spelling out their basic assumptions and discovering their authentic core helps leaders develop strategic biases for action to guide their work and shape the implementation of change.

This notion of bias I take from Badaracco and Ellsworth, who suggest that leaders are far more likely to excel if they approach problems with certain prejudices, that is, "with preconceived biases toward handling them in certain ways" (PP. 3-4). As used here, bias refers to a general way of thinking and acting, a predisposition that guides decision making and problem solving. It is the natural outgrowth of authenticity: a reliance on biases represents not bigotry or small-mindedness but "a quest for integrity, an effort that is at once moral, philosophical, and practical," one that seeks coherence among a [leader's] daily actions, personal values, and [organizational] aims" (PP. 3 - 4). Its advantage is that it simplifies leadership, accents its essentials. Instead of long lists of "cookie-cutter approaches devised to fit all situations," which overlook the complexity and disorder of real life (p. 8), the concept of bias leads to a small set of guiding principles that help a school leader direct change according to the larger purposes that motivate his work (and do so in a way that maximizes followership by modeling consistency).

Which guiding principles? Having a philosophy does not by itself guarantee effectiveness. Not all biases are equally apt. We need to know which action orientations on the part of a leader foster change. From the organizational research literature and from my own work with schools that are implementing significant reform, four stand out as essential: clarity and focus, participation without paralysis, recognition, and confrontation. None of them is novel, and none is an arcane orient only to the gifted. They represent a new look at old truths, a reemphasizing of basics about human nature and school life that we have always known but have too often strayed from. But, as the following chapters will show, when viewed through the lens of authenticity, each of these biases acquires a new and practical emphasis.

NOTES

- I. The centrality of integrity to leadership has been explored by a number of writers, notably Kouzes and Posner and, with exceptional clarity, Badaracco and Ellsworth. This chapter and several that follow draw on both, but especially Badaracco and Ellsworth's excellent book *Leadership and the Quest for Integrity*
2. Arthur Blumberg (1989, PP. 55 - 69) offers a good summary of what it means for a school leader to have a good "nose" for the job.
3. For example, many leadership trainers have adopted Argyris's well-known distinction (1976) between "espoused theories," the premises leaders profess to hold and to use as guides for their practice, and "theories-in-use," the real beliefs and assumptions they actually rely on. It is common for the two to be quite discrepant but for people to be unaware of this discrepancy. Argyris proposed that leaders should be taught to modify their theories-in use to make them more congruent with their espoused values, a proposal widely accepted in leadership training programs. Recently, strategic theorists, led prominently by Vaill, have begun challenging this view. Vaill argues that there are "many subtle modes and mixes of competency" in leaders' actual practice and that their private, personal theories contain much more wisdom than academics realize (1989, P-35)
4. These questions are adapted from Kouzes and Posner, pp. 298-7.99.
5. Badaracco and Ellsworth use *prejudice* instead of *bias*. Several of the biases I advocate (notably "confrontation ") correspond closely to theirs and owe a debt to them, but they also draw upon different sources (including, among others, Bolman and Deal) and focus on schools and innovation, not, as Badaracco and Ellsworth's do, on corporations and general leadership.

REFERENCES

- Badaracco, J. L., and Ellsworth, R. *Leadership and the Quest for Integrity*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1989.
- Bennis, W., and Nanus, B. *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge*. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.
- Blumberg, A. *School Administration as a Craft*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1989.
- Bolman, L. G., and Deal, T. E. *Reframing Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1991
- Drucker, P. F. *The Practice of Management*. New York: Harper & Row, 1986.
- Evans, R. *The Human Side of School Change*. San Francisco: Bass-Bass, 1996. Fullan, M., with Stiegelbauer, S. *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. New York: Teachers College Press 1991
- Gibbons, T. "Revisiting the Question of Born vs. Made: Toward a Theory of Development of Transformational Leaders." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Fielding Institute, 1986.
- Goleman, D. "Major Personality Study Finds That Traits Are Mostly Inherited." *New York Times*, Dec. 2, 1986, pp. C1-C2.
- Kouzes, J. M., and Posner, B. Z. *The Leadership Challenge: How to Keep Getting Extraordinary Things*

- Done in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1987.
- Maddi, S. R., and Kobasa, S. *The Hardy Executive*. Chicago: Dow Jones-Irwin, 1984.
- McGregor, D. *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Mintzberg, H. "Planning on the Left Side, Managing on the Right." In H. Mintzberg, *Mintzberg on Management*. New York: Free Press, 1989.
- Nicholson, C. "Henry Scattergood." *Germantown Friends School Alumni Bulletin*, 1995, 36(2),113
- Nisbet, R. *The History of the Idea of Progress*. New York: Basic Books, 1980.
- Ouchi, W. Z. *Theory Z*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1981.
- Schein, E. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985
- Sergiovanni, T. J. *The Principalship: A Reflective Practice Perspective*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1991
- Sergiovanni, T. J. *Moral Leadership: Getting to the Heart of School Reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.
- Vaill, P. B. "The Purposing of High-performing Systems." In T. J. Sergiovanni and J. E. Cobally (eds.), *Leadership and Organizational Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984.
- Vaill, P. B. *Managing as a Performing Art: New Ideas for a World of Chaotic Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989.