Management for Professionals

Gilbert W. Fairholm

Overcoming Workplace Pathologies

Principles of Spirit-Based Leadership

Springer

Management for Professionals

More information about this series at http://www.springer.com/series/10101

Gilbert W. Fairholm

Overcoming Workplace Pathologies

Principles of Spirit-Based Leadership

Springer

Gilbert W. Fairholm
Virginia Commonwealth University
Midlothian, VA, USA

ISSN 2192-8096 ISSN 2192-810X (electronic)
Management for Professionals
ISBN 978-3-319-17153-1 ISBN 978-3-319-17154-8 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-17154-8

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015935276

Springer Cham Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer International Publishing AG Switzerland is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Acknowledgments

Like many others, I have spent my professional life either doing leadership or of being a follower of another leader—or doing both alternatively. Leadership is a part of all organized human interaction—and of some lower life forms as well. It is fully pervasive in work situations. Research done in the decades of the twenty-first century has coalesced around a model of leadership called spiritual leadership. Spiritual leadership centers on the leader's core spiritual values—those values that succinctly define his or her character. I am grateful for the few core values and principles that inform my perspective on what doing leadership is.

Among those to which I owe an insurmountable debt are all of the leaders of our founding who loved and supported the values of freedom, independence, and liberty. These people worked, fought, and died to make my life rich. They made it possible for me to be here, free physically, spiritually, and intellectually. The values they espoused have given me—all Americans—the chance to share in the bounty and blessings that America provides. The example and the lessons they taught me have been internalized completely in my life—perhaps in all of our lives. They are reflected in all I say and do as I live my life as a free, independent—sometimes, even, a little rebellious—citizen in the longest-lasting democratic republic the world has known. While I cannot duplicate their commitment and dedication, I can—and do—honor it. And I feel my obligation to sustain our freedom in every public—and the many private—leadership decisions I make.

Many people share in any activity of any magnitude. In this case, I am indebted to the many, many authors of other books and articles—and to practitioners I have worked with and observed—whose ideas and insights have found their way into this book. Many of the ideas have become so much a part of my thinking that they are reflected throughout this book, whether or not they received direct citation. I am indebted to them for their wisdom and recognize their leadership in my life. Not the least of these leaders that merit recognition and a part in anything others find commendable in this book are the members of my family. For me, they are the best examples of leadership in my life. They are and have always been models of the best of leadership and of all else good.

Thank you all.

December, 2014 Gilbert W. Fairholm

Contents

Introduction 1

Culture is cool!

Culture is crucial. Culture sets the moral and ethical tone for the work—any—community and determines its attitudinal character. In any group of people gathered together for any appreciable time a culture forms. It then is! This culture defines the work community and validates its values, goals, and methods. Leaders use the work community culture to set and then measure both workers and their work community performance. They use the work culture to measure their own leadership success. They also use it to benchmark the success of coworkers in meeting the leaders preset goals and ways of doing assigned work, It is also used—differently sometimes—by workers to judge their level of satisfaction as well as the level they want other workers to attain. In short, culture creation is a pivotal leadership task crucial in building and maintaining any organized group—even short-lived ones. It is equally crucial in forming a coherent, focused, and cooperative work community. And, by the same token, a culture can be formed and nurtured that have the opposite and negative effect of thwarting work group success. To the extent that cultures are created that limit accomplishment of individual worker's needs on the job or that hamper work community goals attainment and/or undermine the leader's work, that culture becomes pathological. Such cultures are toxic to workers, leaders, and to the idea of organization itself. For after all, unless workers come together around one set of work values and coordinate their various skills to produce agreed-upon goals, the leader and that work team cannot be said to be fully successful.

For generations, managers shaped their business environment via procedures, systems, and policies designed to secure needed work from their subordinates. Leaders do not have subordinates. They foster volunteers who must cooperate to form a values-loaded relationship culture characterized by cooperation, unity, and trust. Doing leadership well asks leaders to appeal to their volunteer coworkers' character-defining spirit selves in creating a culture that can release individual worker creativity, independent thought, loyalty, and commitment. Only in such a culture can coworkers release their whole self in cooperative work to attain agreed-upon goals. On the other hand, managers rely on control for success. Leaders use

G.W. Fairholm, *Overcoming Workplace Pathologies*,
Management for Professionals, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-17154-8_1

the strength of shared meanings to build a relationship culture that lets creativity, freedom of action and commitment inspire both leader and those led.

Of course others can usurp the leadership task. When that happens it means that the leader has lost his role, and returns to the workforce. Or he or she becomes supernumerary to the work community or leaves it. Any of these events signifies a transfer of leadership, and importantly moves culture creation to others and away from the nominal leader. It can go to another worker, a factional cohort of workers, or to an outside professional expert or group. It can also transfer to another entirely different organization or leader. When the culture changes from that created by the nominative head and shifts this task to others—the shift commonly is toward ambient cultures, or to exaggerated iterations of present cultural forms. Or, it can take the form of a conglomeration of work community cultural standards, each operating more or less simultaneously and independently redundant of any other.

In this latter situation there is little real attempt to unify or harmonize the various cultural standards. This risks waste of both human and material and time resources. These overlapping cultural forms surely will be different from the values standards the putative leader originally set. Working in such a cluster of different, often completing cultural standards is unproductive for workers, for the leader, and for the chance of overall group success. Obviously attaining a standardized product or service using differing core values, ways of doing work, and expectations about what is acceptable work is severely hampered in a situation as just described. Neither is it possible to build unity, harmony, uniformity, or to introduce creativity, or engender, loyalty, enthusiasm, or build cooperative, productive work relationships. When more than one cultural standard with more than one cultural formula interact without top-level mitigating influence or direction, disaster follows in the form of waste, confusion, and corruption. Yet it is in this explicit cultural morass that too many twenty-first century leaders are being asked—no, often forced—to work their professional magic.

Of course Americans have always led in complex work situations characterized by complicated, confusing, and sometimes contradictory values constructs. All workers throughout time have brought with them to their work their own unique values constructs and endeavor—legitimately—to try to interject them into work community practices. This interactive dynamic is ingrained in the American socio-economic workplace. It is a key facilitator of organizational growth and change and is needed if done in an orderly—often relatively slow—way. When the speed of work-related cultural changes is appropriate better values or methods or goals can be integrated into the dynamics of interactive interrelationships. Sensitive leaders accept these new ideas and in the process all parts of the work community grows and strengthens. Indeed, this is a key part of the definition of doing leadership.

Obviously, it is and has never really ever been easy to be a leader. Sadly features of America's contemporary work cultures now complicate this task to the point of threatening the very ability of leaders to lead. Hence this book, the tasks of which are two:

- First: to briefly remind readers of the main tenets of modern spirit-based value-leadership theory and practice, place them in their proper context, describe and define its major tasks. Doing leadership from the platform of the leader's personal

spirit—their true, authentic—self is influencing workers to align their [worker] personal values with those of the leader's.
- Second: to catalogue the main cultural impediments—pathologies—present in today's work communities that hinder full and successful application of leadership ideas and techniques on the job—problems faced by anyone who tries to lead from the basis of their core spirit values—the only way one can truly lead in twenty-first century complex workplaces.

The following chapter will identify and examine in some detail modern spirit-based values leadership. Others will examine crucial cultural "pathologies" that tend to destroy organization per se and hinder the successful application of leadership. The contemporary work community is faced with a variety of new cultural forces—often unrelated to doing leadership—that hinder, sometimes to the point of killing, the leader's ability to lead. They are imposed often on the leader by their coworkers, the force of the ambient social culture and others—functional specialists or professional societies, and customers, clients, and even lay citizens. Many of these people and groups are external to the work community and bring agendas that seek to change its operating tasks, goals, methods, and processes. This book will describe how leaders can counter these "dark side" impeding cultural forces. It will also draw conclusions about what leaders can do to mitigate the challenges of a complex, fully informed, technologically sophisticated contemporary workplace, a workplace peopled by workers who are intelligent, demanding, and self-aware.

The need for powerful and effective and comprehensive leadership in our work communities is, of course, enormous. The price of leadership failure is steep, requiring great struggle to recover. Given the social and economic transitions America is experiencing currently, we are at a crossroads. Technology both frees and imposes restrictions on individual freedom more powerful than any traditional managerial dictum. Instant communications across the world have made the transfer of information and ideas as immediate to Americans as a smart phone. At the same time these tools tie workers with electronic chains to a system too complex to fully understand or easily bend to their work needs. Increasingly today workers and their leaders live in a workplace that has stripped them of openness and the freedom to act beyond detailed job descriptions. Today the mantra is: as America has progressed, so too must our socioeconomic systems. The work community must conform to cultural norms, some totally antithetical to doing effective work or to leadership of workers. To counter this some analysts advocate for a return to tight managerial control and increased regulation of corporate enterprise down to the smallest task. A few advocate retention of the values and principles of freedom, liberty, individualism, and entrepreneurialism that provided the foundation for America's economic and industrial success since its founding (Monaughan 2000). Adherents on both sides argue persuasively. However, increasingly we see in today's workplace the need for fundamental change. Ryan (2000) argues that the crisis in the workplace is a crisis in leadership. And, for him the heart of leadership is the moral challenge for executives to see their stakeholders as colleagues and collaborators not mere cogs in the industrial machine.

1.1 Overcoming Cultural Opposition

The leader is a values-setter, motivator, and a model for coworkers. Leaders are positive, creative, horizon thinking people whose guiding purpose was and remains to influence workers to do the work community's work and like it. Definitional characteristics of this essential organization role includes focusing coworkers on the organization's present mission and future goals and to inspire them to willingly and enthusiastically expend spiritual, emotional, and physical energy in a concerted action to attain both preset goals using agreed-upon methods of doing work. Leadership is a task of influencing willing, volunteer workers. Leadership success is centered in helping workers realize that in doing the work-community's work they can simultaneously realize their own purposes for joining in group work.

Living and working in any work community is living and working in an arena of opposition. No matter the venue, membership in a work community places the worker in a matrix of competing values, goals, and approaches. Opposition is part of this matrix of action and always has been. Sometimes the conflict is an individual's inner conflict about alternative personal goals. Or, it manifests as a similar tension between an individual's goals for the group and those set by the work community itself. Because seldom are they congruently absent in a leader. Indeed, the task of the leader is to focus coworkers on one set of goals and specific ways to go about achieving them. Similarly, it is every worker's task to counter any opposition in order to effectively meet desired future goals—either—both—the individual's or those of the work community.

Even in a harmonious work setting, individual workers differ on, for example, why they come to work. People come to work owning all of their human qualities, not just the few skills, knowledge, and abilities needed at a given time by the employing corporation (Fairholm 2004). Workers today, and perhaps, always, come to work armed with and ready to use their total life experience. And their experience is different—sometimes radically different—from each of their coworkers. Still, each worker wants to use and contribute all of their skills (McGregor 1960) at work—because developing as an individual and a professional is a common personal reason for working—or doing anything else. And individuals will expend effort to attain their personal goals even at the expense of the work community goals. No one I know comes to work fundamentally to serve the work community. They work to satisfy personal needs for association, friendship, to get resources, to feed their need for creativity, for personal growth—or to earn the money to do those things off the job.

No longer is the workplace encouraging Americans to be free to start anything—a business, a job, a new way to do a task, and just go from there in any direction and as far as their commitment, talent, and drive lets them. Opposition is present at every juncture—from, perhaps, corrupted and self-serving persons in-charge of our workplaces to competing values about what work should add to individuals' lives. Conflict is rampant both internally or from outside in almost every organization. Add to this the real and dangerous threat of terrorism, disaster, corruption, incompetence, and major conflicts between cultural, ethnic, and religious groups worldwide and we see that almost anything the individual contemplates doing has its

opposing counterpart. Surely something more than managerial best-practice is needed. Traditional actions touted as "best practices" have exacerbated both internal and external opposition. They have added to the crisis in integrated, united action we now face in our work communities.

Several aspects of present-day work cultures actively militate against the leaderships needed to produce success. Among them are the following:

- *Allowing Multiple Work Community Cultures*: The primary task of leadership is to create one work culture that is congruent with the leaders particular set of values and goals that is unified. This is the first responsibility of leadership. This task is impeded today by a rapidly changing cultural milieu that works against coworker unity. Rather today's community culture is best described as a compound of many complex convoluted and competitive cultures. The result is that this situation pits subgroup against subgroup and worker against worker as to which cultural values and ways of doing things will predominate. This situation thwarts cooperation. It actively promotes rules, customs, and language that, while ostensibly honoring each culture impedes clear, unambiguous understanding and cooperation. Present multiple work cultures typically hinder coordinated work effort. They encourage workers and worker subgroups to seek competing goals and in so doing obstruct the leader's effort to seek interpersonal harmony and one agreed-upon future for the work community. In a word, the American workplace today is defined by multiple and often contradictory cultural values that culminate in a work community that hampers leadership by changing the underlying unifying features defining organization itself. This situation at work today destroys the leader's ability to build cohesive, unified, work communities where both work community and worker's individual goals can be met simultaneously by doing the work-community's work.

  Until a harmonious work culture ideal is a reality, leaders have to deal with growingly complex work communities characterized by multiple subcultural individuals and/or groups each vying to have their unique values, laws, and language accepted equally—or be superior to—all others. Building a harmonious work community in this mixed cultural climate exceeds the skill of the best leaders.
- *Allowing Intentionally Biased Language*: The raw materials of communication are words. Words code the leader's ideas in symbols. And symbols serve as a medium through which to transfer the leader's intentions into understandable concepts, orders, and instructions. Words are the main component of community interreactions. That is another way to say that culture is a result of the work community engaging in powerful interactive, even life-affirming values-laden words to clearly communicate with coworkers. Such communication, along with the direct act of doing desired work to demonstrate specific things, the communicated words connote, provide a sure method of interaction from leader to worker and verse versa. Interoffice communication, of course, makes allowance for specialized local jargon to develop. All small groups—like a work community—create or modify language to fit special needs and are adopted into the leader's lexicon. And they change with time. Some of the characters of current language are reducing understanding and imposing different definitions of some of the

most powerful and popular words in common use at work. These changes redefine new and even routine words commonly used in inter- and intra-unit communication (Benhabib 2002). This phenomenon complicates building leader-created cultures.

The leader's job is to effectively establish the proper context for language use on the job. Their task is to communicate a clear, unambiguous message free from connotations that limit, hamper, or harm coworkers and/or customer understanding. They undertake to do this task in a competitive world and with coworkers that increasingly argue for consideration of their points of view. Submitting to language usage imposed by individuals or small worker groups—or none-work groups—that are predisposed toward some workers' unique needs and not directly associated with the work-community's work is markedly unproductive. While the work culture is ultimately shaped and molded by its leader, workers also impact the character of the work cultures they share. Until the leader's values are promulgated broadly, multiple, competing standards and values can be rampant. Interposing special language and contrived connotations into the routine language of business discourse serves only to confuse, not clarify, the leader–worker relationship. Add to this the fact that the workforce generally is characterized by people who are smart and not so smart, experienced and beginners, honest and dishonest, disciplined and chaotic, diverse and homogeneous, organized and impulsive, driven and lackadaisical, powerful and powerless even normal communication is difficult. When contrived language is introduced understanding is jeopardized to the point of stifling coherent conversation.

As one example: modern American society is preoccupied with the idea of tolerance, yet, simultaneously is actually less tolerant. Workplace tolerance has been redefined to mean a limited tolerance for a few values and intolerance for anything else. Being tolerant no longer means any worker can express disagreement with a present work community's cultural view and expect to be put up with by their coworkers. It is increasingly rare that a different viewpoint from the prevailing conventional wisdom is acceptable in the workplace. Over time there has been a subtle, and sometimes not-so-subtle shift in the word's meaning. Today's version of tolerance takes two outcomes. One accepts one viewpoint and is intolerant of all differing perceptions. Or, one is asked to accept the plausibility of all differing views—a natural outcome of the postmodern philosophy that denies the singular nature of truth. To question these postmodern work community axioms are by definition "intolerant." Tolerance rules today with one important caveat. There can be no tolerance for people who do not agree with the work community's contemporary usage of the term. A work culture member that sees words like tolerance in the latter way impedes the leader's capacity to lead others toward one shared goal.

- *Lying*: Textbooks, teachers, or bosses do not warn that organized work life might include association with liars. They didn't caution that some bosses and some coworkers would be dishonest about their personal and or professional life or about what they do at work. Of course hearing—even telling on occasion—white lies is common and most often able to be overlooked. But when colleagues say

they've started projects they haven't begun or they call in sick when in fact they want a day off or coworkers extol their job and at the same time circulate their resume; such behavior risks the internal integrity of the work community and inhibits the leader's ability to lead. Unfortunately, leaders are not immune to this pathological behavior. Lying is common and is unvaryingly negative to both individuals and to their work community no matter whom the culprit. Lying negatively changes the interpersonal dynamic—often permanently. Uncontrolled lying complicates to the point of destruction the task of leadership since it destroys the leader–follower relationship. Of course liars have always been part of work life. The growing acceptance of lying has coarsened the work community and threatens to morph into pathology.

- *Deception*: Lying is a prime ingredient in a larger pattern of workplace behavior subsumed under the rubric, deception. Both leaders and workers are sometimes guilty of deceiving other members of the work community. They sometimes cause others to have a false belief about coworkers or an aspect of joint work. Intentional deception, like prevaricating, is toxic. But so is denying or rationalizing the relevance or significance of opposing evidence or logical argument in relationships. Whenever a person tries to convince another that a statement or condition is something other than what it actually is, that person is engaging in deception. Whether the deception is directed at self or another, the effect is to confuse, misdirect, or obfuscate and hampers the leader's success in leading the work community. Deception destroys the foundation of trust essential to any group action. It breaks down organization structures and can frustrate essential intercommunications essential to cooperative and coordinated group activity. Only truth lets workers work together without reservation, share new ideas, and give pride of place to others. Today's postmodern culture introduces too many pathological behaviors into the work community to let leaders fully lead until they are remediated.
- *Being Either Too Open or Closed-Minded*: Preparation for work—for leaders and for workers—neither today nor in the past, warn students about work community colleagues that are pathologically closed-minded to any change whether perceived as good or bad for the work community. Nor does it caution us about working with people who are too open minded. While some coworkers are closed to anything new, others are unreservedly accepting of every idea or proposal others introduce. Both kinds of coworkers introduce a culture of uncriticality into the workplace. When coworkers are not discerning, or are gullible there is a danger that the work community or its members will have no firm convictions, that they grant plausibility to any and everything. In countering a closed mind, leaders necessarily revert to management control mechanisms to ensure needed work is done rather than leading them through the force of the leader's values. And a too open-mind coworker is equally bad for other individuals and the group as is being closed-minded. In neither case is the work community enhanced.
- *Fear, Hate, and Evil*: Most of us have had to associate with people who hated us for whatever reason. Similarly readers have felt the emotion of fear or of being feared. And, rarely, have had to associate with persons that seem to be evil.

These experiences and these people are part of almost everyone's work-life experience. Leaders have to deal with them. It is a common aspect of the dark side of work. They work within the culture they have when they begin their leadership and build a new, altered culture that reflects their values. Leadership success is attained when coworkers come to accept the leader's values also as their own. Along the way they cope with lairs, fear, evil, hate, unfocused people, biased, and intolerant colleagues and all of the other kinds of workers, any work community produces along with hardworking, talented, and creative coworkers.

- *Pride*: Even leading talented people can be problematical. In this situation personal pride—hubris—is often part of this dynamic. Pride is the unwarranted attraction of honor or esteem to oneself at the expense of others or of the full truth. Proud people are not teachable. They define themselves in grandiose terms and assume credit beyond that legitimately earned. Proud people resist being part of any community. Indeed they isolate themselves from it and live and work by other standards than group-set guidelines. This behavior and personality trait often engenders distrust. Untrustworthiness is any behavior that causes colleagues to withhold information or ideas from coworkers because they cannot be sure how this information will be used by them. Creativity is reduced when trust is absent. Similarly, change is impossibly hard without imposition of tight controls. Lacking trust, prideful coworkers resist efforts to be taught new work processes or to see a future differing from their own experience.

Evidence is amassing—especially in European socioeconomic sectors—that nations once fully supportive of multicultural and politically appropriate cultural techniques now are denouncing these techniques and practices as dysfunctional. They say they waste human and material resources (Bordas 2007). They divide loyalties about which "coequal" cultural outcomes have priority of place over leader-created, historically consistent outcomes. Almost unanimously the experiences of other nations who have adopted these socioeconomic techniques have now abandoned them. The key reason is that they have expanded beyond the economic and social capacity to pay for them. They so constrain free and open communication as to garble such routine tasks as ensuring grammar and syntax rules are common and do not aggravate situations to the extent of making otherwise simple sentences confusing, convoluted, and complex. In European work communities these techniques encompass the national economic system and threaten to also emasculate business, government, and social systems and the work communities charged to execute in policy, social standards, and cultural expectations. Thus they threaten the historical character—even continence—of the nation in its former guise (Benhabib 2002).

The local and worldwide implications of this are enormous. They pose at least a caution sign if not a full stop sign for American social and cultural theorists (William and Clifton 2001). Serious experts need to seriously consider the growth and expansion of corporate policies, governmental regulations, and societal standards, that have failed to enhance and clarify the language of economic, political, and work. The leader is confronted by many individuals and groups that seek to change cultural customs, the connotation of words like freedom, independence,

equality and tolerance, and allow harmful emotional responses to masquerade as legitimate behavior.

Doing leadership is made unnecessarily more difficult when leaders have to counter present pathologies in the ambient culture before they can build a work culture conducive to accomplishing their horizon goals. The American workplace is also undergoing a radical reorientation of its work communities (Henderson 1994; Laroche 2002; Naylor 1997). Without commenting on the profitability of these changes for society as a whole it is clear that they are tending to reduce and dilute the practice of effective leadership. That is, leadership based on a unified and focused work community is under siege. This situation asks leaders to become expert in several tasks that help prepare work-community members to work in harmony. Application of these skills will also allow the work community to be effective over time in achieving mutual goals in ways that enhance both individual workers and the work community as an institution. They are essential if oftentimes difficult of accomplishment. But they collectively define the leadership task in the twenty-first century. Among them are:

- Establishing a spirit-focus values foundation for the work community culture.
- Encouraging individual worker self-control in living their core-shared, spirit-based values.
- Continuous worker training about values and rules to counter pathological externally imposed cultural changes that hamper work, workers, and leadership.
- Creating an effective work-community trust relationship in which members trust each other enough to risk themselves in doing their work in the ways they think best suited to success.
- Empowering coworkers in ways that maximize their individual talents, skills, and expertise.
- Fostering a service orientation among all stakeholders.
- Fostering change.
- Finding personal and group meaning in the work, methods, and goals set for the work community.
- Highlighting personal and coworker ethical behavior.
- Nurturing individual workers' personal needs to counter the overfocus on ambient cultural standards which can be pathological in their implications for work.

Today's work requires a prioritized loyalty to the organization and to the job. This kind of commitment is a gift we give ourselves, not the boss (Capelli 1999). Today's worker needs to exercise more freedom than some may prefer. While risky, freedom of action gives workers the chance to individually excel and take personal responsibility for their own success (Gibb and Gibb 1969) and that of the work community. They need to attack the job the best way they can and develop their ability to improvise (Capelli 1999). Features of the larger social culture are changing for the worse. Other values are fostered that at best ignore work group needs and at worst are actively anti-coordination. The results are pathological to the work community and its leaders. These values are opposed to those of the nominal leader. They threaten to destroy both worker commitment and organizational health.

References

Benhabib, S. (2002). *The claims of culture: Equality and diversity in the global era*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bordas, J. (2007). *Salsa, soul, and spirit: Leadership for a multicultural age*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Capelli, P. (1999). *The new deal at work: Managing the market driven workforce*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Fairholm, M. R. (2004). A new sciences outline for leadership development. *The Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, 25*(4), 369–383.

Gibb, J. R., & Gibb, L. M. (1969). Role of freedom in a tori group. In A. Burton (Ed.), *Encounter*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Henderson, G. (1994). *Cultural diversity in the workplace: Issues and strategies*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Laroche, L. (2002). *Managing cultural diversity in technical professions*. Oxford, PA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Monaughan, S. E. (2000). Capturing the entrepreneurial: a study to identify the personality characteristics of entrepreneurs (Doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology—Los Angeles, 2000). *Dissertation Information Service* (UMI No. 9964387).

Naylor, L. (Ed.). (1997). *Cultural diversity in the United States*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.

Ryan, L. V. (2000). Moral aspects of executive leadership: Searching for a new leadership paradigm. *International Journal of Value-Based Management, 13*, 109–122.

William, M. A., & Clifton, D. O. (2001). *The 10 lenses: Your guide to living and working in a multicultural world*. Sterling, VA: Capital Books.

Part I

Spiritual Leadership Today

Our values are our most powerful inducements to action. And our personal core, character-defining values are the most significant to each of us. It is via these core values that leadership takes place. Leaders build their work community and inspire coworkers to share those values and the methods and goals the leader sets for the work group. This is doing leadership. It asks leaders to identify their personal spiritual and professional values and transfer some of them to followers because everybody has values and our individual, personal values trigger our behavior more powerfully than do institutionally issued orders, policies, or procedures. Our core values define our character and permeate all that we do. Leaders who do not reflect their core spiritual values are seen as inauthentic and will not draw volunteers to them to help build an effective working relationship. Unless both leader and led value the same goals and ways of arriving at desired outcomes, they work at cross purposes and effective work relationships cannot be created. Achieving values congruence is the seminal task of leadership. And this is the only way to lead workers in the modern world.

Most textbooks still reflect a century-old mind-set that places science, order, predictability, and control at the heart of most definitions of leadership. So powerful is this mind-set that many still link leadership with management. Fortunately, research is moving away from this archaic thinking and toward the powerful force of the leader's personal set of core values. Even cursory observation of the contemporary workplace reveals a stark situation one that portends confusion, likely dissolution of the workplace as we know it, and leadership failure. We see business enterprise without morality, science without conscience, knowledge without character, worship without sacrifice, pleasure without responsibility, politics without principle, and wealth without works. We see a society that allows individuals to adhere to diverse customs and values, become isolated into small subgroups, and the language to be constrained to the extent that clear concise understanding is impossible.

This Part defines in operational terms spirit-based values leadership as the primary leadership theory. This theory serves as the benchmark model of good leadership used by twenty-first century leaders. It identifies the elements of successful leadership practice and relates these practices to the values culture that supports and validates their use.

What Is Leadership?

2

The accepted model of leadership today is spiritual-based values leadership (Fairholm and Fairholm 2000; Fry 2003; Malmberg 1999). Leaders become leaders as they define a set of core spiritual values that define their core character—whatever its nature. The leadership task is to attach a socially valuable meaning to doing work, to the way the work is to be done, and to the outcome intended. Armed with this understanding about the work the work community will be asked, " do leaders then educate coworkers about work values and their social utility in the work community." As the leaders ideas are seen as acceptable coworkers will adopt them as their own. The end-product is a culture that lets workers and the leader combine in voluntary interrelationship around an agreed-upon work culture that becomes both legitimate and mutually desirable. The culture, values, and goals become commonly-held expectations that the leader and all stakeholders voluntarily accept as their own for this work unit. Then the leader's job becomes a task of continually educating stakeholders about shared values and their power to trump past ideas, values, or work experiences. Workers come to reorient their past work values and even existing work community policies when they see that they might be incompatible with these standards. Together they coalesce around a culture of free volunteer acceptance that defines the leader–follower relationship.

This attitude of mind is fostered by the work culture that inspires coworkers to follow where the leader points because they come to accept the leader's values, methods, and goals as legitimate. Workers come to expect that the leader's decisions are informed, trusted, wise, and timely and thus acceptable to them both on the job, and importantly, personally. For the fact is, workers come to work to satisfy their personal needs, not necessarily or even secondarily those of their bosses. They work because they want to grow professionally, acquire new skills, find an outlet to act freely, to be creative, to extend their relationships, and to grow and develop in ways that may help the work community but surely helps them. They work for work communities that honor their humanity, provide resources, and attention not only to do the group's work but also let workers attain some of the results they want that will

G.W. Fairholm, *Overcoming Workplace Pathologies*,
Management for Professionals, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-17154-8_2

make them more whole, fully functioning people. An important element here is that leaders reserve enough attention, time, and material resources to enable workers to be successful in their work and also in their family, religious, and recreational pursuits—to help coworkers satisfy important—to them—personal goals not necessarily directly related to the work community agenda.

The crisis precipitating this book comes from forces both within the work community and outside it that are imposing changes in the values undergirding the work culture that makes these goals possible. These impingements honor difference, not harmony. They redirect communications by introducing language with its concomitant customs, rules, regulations, laws, and idioms that redefine key work-related word meanings. They coin new language, misunderstand syntax, and garble grammar. They cloud and distort connotations sometimes enough to changing the meaning of the message trying to be delivered—thus ignoring the need for clear, authentic, and accurate communications. Often the new message is diametrically opposite of the original intent of the leader-inspired culture and its accepted relationships. As this workplace language becomes generalized they communicate a message that trivializes the leader's goal of doing work effectively if indeed they consider it at all.

2.1 The Evolution of Modern Spirit-Based Values Leadership

The workplace in twenty-first century America has changed to the point that only a unified, harmonious work community can build mutually interactive trust at sufficient levels that worker's will trust others enough to work cooperatively together. Sadly such cultures are declining in today's multidifferentiated workplace. Things have deteriorated to the point of becoming pathologically threatening to the practice of spirit-based leadership—or to any other contemporary or historical model. Indeed, a side effect is that this change in workplace culture is destroying unity, harming structural cohesion, and developmental potential. And it is introducing risk, reticence to innovate, and waste in worker performance.

Managers control subordinates—and the economic environment—with techniques originating both inside and outside the immediate work community—i.e. through overarching cultural procedures, systems, and policies. These are designed to secure needed work from their subordinates regardless of their individual desires. On the other hand, leaders do not have subordinates. They make volunteers and colleagues of the people who come to work for them. Leaders intend their coworkers to work together in a values-loaded relationship—a culture—of cooperation and trust. They do this by appealing to their "volunteer" coworkers' character-defining spirit selves. It is the leader's spirit that inspires workers to be creative and to take independent action to attain common goals. It is not the exercise of external control. It is the leader's spiritual authenticity—character—more than any program or policy that builds the loyalty and commitment that releases the whole self of each coworker in the work community. Leaders who are conscious of and use their personal power use the strength of shared values to build both relationships and a

culture that releases coworkers' innate talents and frees them to willingly commit to the shared work—because their newly found shared values make doing needed work what they come to *want* to do for themselves.

Spiritual (sometimes called whole soul) leadership focuses on the core, character-defining innate nature of both leader and led. The leader's spiritual-self defines who he or she is, not just what his or her morals or ethics are. This kind of leadership integrates the components of work and self into a comprehensive system fostering continuous growth and self-awareness. Spiritual leaders see each worker holistically with multiple skills, knowledge, and abilities that exceed the narrow confines of job descriptions. Elements of this spiritual perspective include concern for each coworker as a person. It asks leaders to enhance their workers' self-awareness and find meaning in work life. It focuses values that define one's character and not simply facts about personality or situation. Spiritual leaders deal with coworkers from the base of the workers' intimate values, They realize that a clear sense of the spiritual dimension of all group members has a transformational effect on organizational forms, structures, processes, and coworker-behavior and attitudes. No overarching policy can do that—or even come close. Doing leadership from their spirit core is a task of changing coworkers' values to be compatible with the leaders. Failing this leadership is impossible and they have to revert to management—which is control of subordinates—to get work done. Workers come to work armed with not only job-related skill sets but also with their character, that is, their spiritual self. It is in this sense that the idea of someone's spiritual needs find appropriate place in discussion of leadership theory and practice in the workplace. Defining leadership theory to encompass the idea of the individual's whole soul or spiritual side is new to *theory*. It is and always has been characteristic of the *practice* of leadership. Everyone leads others on the basis of their core character, on the basis of who they authentically are. For, after all, no one likes or respects—or follows willingly—an in-authentic person.

Over time interest in leadership—what it is and how to do it—has ranged beyond textbooks definitions. Researchers have examined recent and ancient history (Kaltman 1998). They have sought understanding by examining the leadership principles of leaders of America's revolution (Fairholm 2013). They have perused literature (Clemens and Mayer 1999) and films (Dunphy and Aupperle 2000) in their search for the real meaning of leadership. The current coalescence of definition around the leader's spirit core is central to defining the individual whether leader or worker. It is the most solid and enduring ideas about people in relationship in work and all other sectors of life. It is a key part of every work group. It fixes our definition of success. Indeed, the spirit essence of our individual lives and the utility of the small- and large-scale work groups in which we have a relationship depend upon its effective presence and use. Leadership shapes our present, determines our future, delineates our actions, and determines our place among our peers. Unless it incorporates the powerful human force of personal spiritual values, the nature of our leadership will be mediocre or ineffectual (see Ashar and Lane-Maher 2002; Lips-Wiersma and Mills 2002; Fairholm and Fairholm 2000; Mitroff and Denton 1999; Fairholm 1997; Hodgkinson 1983; Rokeach 1979).

In whatever way leadership is made evident in the past or in present-day work life, the careful observer can detect a unifying values bond linking leader and follower action. This model is philosophical in that it proposes a kind of leadership rooted in a vital truth of human nature and conduct: that everyone has values and that our values trigger our behavior. Values become the bridge that links the individual (and groups of individuals) with the work community tasks they share and are expected to perform. The leader's values—accepted by each coworker—integrate what otherwise would be a nonhomogeneous bunch of people into a work community capable of effective, cooperative action. In this sense, leaders are teachers with the unique capacity to identify the values that energize both the group and each individual member and communicate them broadly and powerfully (Tichy 1997).

Broadly, values can be equated with desires, preferences, likings, or satisfaction. They express fundamental and enduring needs. They are the criteria by which people determine desirability. They are important determinants of social behavior, the criteria for selecting actions, goals, and methods. Values are more basic constructs than rules or procedures. They determine a group's conventions and order them. They trigger some behavior and constrain behavior that contravenes preset values. A work community's values are sometimes codified in vision statements or codes of ethics. These statements provide frameworks for transmitting to and implementing specific behavior within the work community toward specific results. They are the standards leaders and all people employ across time and in various situations to guide actions taken, to evaluate self and others, and to take considered positions. Written or orally transferred, they are, therefore, powerful in shaping worker behavior and in validating institutional policy (Mitroff and Denton 1999).

Values differentiate one person or group from others. They are concurrently components of psychological processes, social interaction, and cultural patterning. Rokeach (1979) says values form the basis of individual action. They are learned. They define acceptable action, resolve conflicts, determine sanctions systems employed, and are integral to reward systems. Thus they are powerful in shaping worker behavior and in validating the work community's policy and mission. For Rokeach they define the desirable and acceptable for the individual and the group. Values control how people behave by expressing what is expected of individual workers in the group (Hodgkinson 1983). The leader's challenge is to examine their own and the organization's values and secure consensus among stakeholders about which values are important. For, as Burns (1978) notes, the leader's key tasks are as values clarifiers and values communicators to the work community. As leaders set core group values they induce coworker change. A worker's value priorities change in response to several factors in their immediate cultural surround. These modes of change in values and beliefs include the following:

- When they result from a creative insight.
- As a result of sudden loss of emotional support or destruction of a priori assumptions.
- Following loss of commitment to a routine pattern of work—other—behavior.
- When an existing value is extended to other referents, objects or to work experiences.

- When, though experience, education or training a present value takes on increased drama or added intellectual or emotional support for a behavior.
- When a value is applied in different contexts.
- When a value is limited by interaction with other values that constrain its former application.
- When a value becomes the center of life.
- When a presently held value is recognized to be in conflict with other highly prized values.

2.2 The Spiritual Focus of Leadership

Some values are more powerful than others we hold in shaping our behavior. Fairholm (1997) called these spiritual values (see also Fry 2003; Malmberg 1999). "Spiritual values" is a nonreligious coined phrase that is receiving present acceptance by leadership researchers. It refers to the few personally powerful values we hold that define our core character. They define the authentic self of each of us. It is these values that authentic leaders use to get others to follow them. Unless we lead from our authentic, core self, others will not willingly follow. It is true that some of our values—for some people—come from their religion whatever it is. It is also true that our values emanate from many nonreligious sources. Values are present in every person whether religious or not. They emanate from our traditions and our experiences—our family culture, our readings, our work associates, our heroes, our enemies, and other factors specific to the individual—e.g., school, family, friends, life experiences, philosophy, science, etcetera. Doing leadership well asks leaders to identify these personal spiritual and professional values and transfer some of them—appropriate to the task at hand—to coworkers. Unless both value the same goals and ways of arriving at desired outcomes, they work at cross purposes. When the workers and the leader's values are incongruent it introduces waste into the dynamic, and effective leader–follower relationships cannot be created. When one's leadership is authentic it changes the lives of both leader and led at the core values level. This is the level of human life that forms the pattern of motives that trigger individual voluntary behavior.

Spiritual leadership can trace its origins to a reaction to the influence of the industrial age that dominated the Western world for more than a century. This era was characterized by reductionist thinking—e.g., the whole is equal to *just* the sum of the parts—and the idea that truth can only be discovered through scientific methods. The mantra of the time was rationality—the mind is the ultimate creator and justifier of our actions. Spiritual leadership provides a counterpoint as it recognizes that our personal, often idiosyncratic values define who and what we are. This knowledge is particularly important in today's work community because many work communities have made the commitment to and are engaged in transforming themselves into customer-driven, person-conscious organizations (Bandura 2006). Leadership focusing on the spirit is required if organizations truly want to do work from this platform.

The spiritual part of human life is the animating or life-giving principle within a human being or event or something. It is that part of the person we associate with the feelings as distinguished from the physical body. Spirit refers to the crucial human values from around the world and across time that teach us how we fit within the greater scheme of circumstance and how we can realize harmony in life and work (Heerman 1995). One's spirit is the vital, energizing force or principle in the person. It is the core of the energized self. It is inseparable from the individual. It is the fertile, invisible arena that is the source of each person's morality and creativity. It lies at the heart of all things. It is a part of all we do. It provides meaning and motivates individual action. It expresses itself in one's aesthetic sense. It is central in defining and delimiting peoples' relationships with others and with themselves (Jacobs 1994). A person's spirituality defines the inner self, separate from the body and including both the physical and intellectual self—the whole person. It includes the way people think and feel. It is largely responsible for the individual's overall concept of the world. It deals with the person's inner or private being, the kernel of being. It is the name given that human dimension that separates the human race from all other creatures.

Applying holistic, spiritual leadership is no longer a choice. It is a requirement in today's work world (Pinchot and Pinchot 1993). The workplace is a community in which most people live most of their waking hours. We all need to know what we can about how to make this community productive in all spheres of life, including what some assume are merely narrow task assignments. A growing body of research confirms that spirituality is at the heart of values-based leadership (Fairholm 2011; Senge 1998). The leader's spiritual proclivities are central to any authentic theory that attempts to be descriptive and predictive of leadership action. Each person is the sum of their life experiences—physical, mental, emotional, spiritual. To try to deny our spiritual self and focus only on a complex of disparate external relationships is to invite stress, tension, and dysfunction. Such a partitioned life results in the social maladies characteristic of contemporary American work life. Successful leaders use their own core spiritual values to help guarantee that the values of the organization are integrated and holistic in nature. Such an all-inclusive approach includes services and programs that address both the professional and personal lives of stakeholders (Autry 1992).

The goals of the spiritual leader are first to define the common values and customs and second to integrate and acculturate workers into the work community's culture, its value systems, and operating practices. The process is to create a value construct, establish a vision, seek consensus on that vision, and then legitimize the vision within the culture in every action or decision the leader makes. The genuine caring these leaders have for their coworkers is reciprocated in a sense of responsibility coworkers adopt after entry into the work community culture. Community is much stronger than alignment in analyzing group structure. In work communities the worker not only believes in the leader but also wants to help. Community does not mean uniformity, and sometimes will be exactly the opposite. It allows people that care about each other to be able to disagree and to give honest feedback even when it is negative.

2.3 Understanding Spiritual Leadership

Work has become the hallmark of human activity. It is the place where people spend most of their waking time and the source of satisfaction of most human needs. Logically, workers are asking that their work also meet some of their spiritual needs in the same way that they expect it to meet their economic ones. Today's workers and leaders are seeking emotional fulfillment on the job. For after all, life is about living and humans have only one life that manifests itself in both life and livelihood.

Increasingly work provides self-definition, a focus for life, and a measure of personal success. Often it replaces family, friendship circles, church, and other groups as the dominant arena in which life is played out (Brown and Kitchell 2001). Workers go to work with an ulterior motive: they want what *they* want out of our work relationships, not necessarily what the *organization* wants. Anything that interferes with personal, individual need satisfaction will be rejected by group members if resistance is possible—and it invariably is at least partially possible. Of course, the workplace is an economic life center. But work communities are also centers of workers' interactivity with other people (Peter Drucker 1946) not merely the means of economic production. The task is to balance work needs with personal, family, community, and other needs of coworkers (Wohl 1997). Excluding human concerns is toxic in a workplace where analytically based control and measurement techniques ostensibly dominate.

A central part of understanding spiritual leadership is in understanding the nature of culture and its place in the work community. Of course leaders lead workers by direct interaction with them. But they also influence their coworkers as they create a cultural surround within which workers naturally accept some values and not others, find success when they behave in some ways as opposed to others, and seek one set of outcomes by their combined work instead of other alternative futures. Thus understanding leadership requires leaders to build a unique culture focused on inducing workers to think, act, and value things the leader thinks, acts, and values as they pertain to the work at hand.

An essential part of spiritual leadership is culture creation. And the central aspect of this task is displacement of coworkers' work values with those the leader sets. These core spirit values powerfully trigger worker behavior. Work no longer centers exclusively or primarily on money as the prime inducement to do the organization's work—if it really ever did. McGregor's (1960) Theory Y model suggests that workers want to and can take responsibility. They can and do demonstrate imagination and creativity in solving work community problems without the pull of money or increased power as fundamental inducements. These—and similar—values guide workers more surely than rule or, even, company policy. Leadership making use of both intellect and spirit is critically in demand in today's complex workplace (Brown 1996).

For most of the twentieth century the "rational man" view of human beings guided group life. Since the last decade of the twentieth century the idea that people could be measured in other than rational intelligence terms gained prominence

(Goleman 1995). More recently research evidence from psychology, neurology, anthropology, and cognitive science define another measure of the brain, spiritual intelligence (Zohar and Marshall 2000). Needed now are novel kinds of work cultures structured around several innovative ideas including the idea that the work community is (or should become) a knowledge or learning center (Senge 1998). Recognition of the need for sociopsychic support and development systems (Altman 1991) and highlighting a service orientation (Greenleaf 1977), along with the traditional focus on operational systems now dominate thinking (Lee and Zemke 1993). A work culture that recognizes the spiritual essence in leader and led alike is really more than a corporate culture. It is something akin to a corporate soul. And, building corporate soul recognizes that people are idealistic, spiritual, and concerned about both their work relationships and personal development. Leaders need to be both people-centered and context-oriented (Blanchard 1994).

This rapidly expanding body of research details how the worker's spiritual sense helps leaders work in ways that enhance personal satisfaction, increase levels of personal commitment to work community goals, and allow workers maximum freedom to respond to their own spiritual values. The idea of spirit is central to life. Necessarily, it must be central also to any activity like leadership that purports to make useful the human condition. They must deal head-on with the task of creating a work community where the core spiritual values of each are considered and the realization of them is made a part of the group experience.

Many workers today are looking inward to focus on their self and the core values that guide their actions and give meaning and depth to their character. At work they are seeking relationships and a compatible culture intended to satisfy innate cravings for internal continuity and growth. They are looking for a personal focus in an ever-changing and multidirected competitive work culture. They seek workplace communities of like-minded people as a counterpoint to the stifling uninspired strictures of modern business. The fact is that workers come to work as whole people. They bring to their work all of their skills, knowledge, values, past experiences, expectations, ambitions, aspirations, and character. Included among these characteristics is a spiritual dimension that energizes them. Leaders need to understand and use their spiritual essence and that of their followers and craft a culture that includes cooperation, empowerment, and the common good as the basis for their success not just a paradigm of competition, exploitation, and self-interest. This paradigmatic tension is not in the fact that spirit is and always has been in the workplace, but whether it and modern iterations of work life can productively coexist. The key task is to try to meld the individual worker's values with contemporary corporate actions and programs. In a work culture that continues to honor shared values.

Doing leadership from the base of one's spirit whole self involves integrating the following elements of such a culture into the leader's work community culture.

- *Fostering Unity*: Diverse people make up—and have always characterized—the workforce. And diverse people often being with them to their work, their different cultural values and customs. In the past the pressure to change has been on

the new employee coming into the workplace. Now more people are entering the workplace with different cultural backgrounds and the pressure is on the receiving culture to change. The established expectations, customs, and rituals may have to be altered for the new but different workers. While, maybe more complex today than in the past the leadership task is the same: build a culture where the core needs of leader and led are made compatible while still doing the work community's work.

- *Building a Culture of Mutual Trust*: Mutual, interactive trust bonds all members of the effective work community and let them relate to each other smoothly. Workers want to trust their leaders and they rely on the good will of workers to do what is needed. Force, authority, formal structural roles, and sanction systems cannot substitute for relationships based on mutual trust in common values. Trust takes place in relationships that are sensitive to the needs of both the followers and the leader. Trust relationships reduce fear and increase happiness. They encourage interdependence and allow coworkers to rely more fully on each other. They enhance creativity and facilitates introduction of new ideas (Rokeach 1979). We can think of trust as a generalized expectancy that we can rely upon the word, the promise, the verbal or written statement of another person. Trust is belief in the honesty [truth] of a communication, an interaction, or a relationship, not necessarily its correctness.
- *Building a Work Community*: Leaders build the workplace into viable, attractive communities capable of drawing in workers with needed attitudes, skills, and talents. They invigorate members' lives with a sense of purpose (Carson 1987) and a feeling of belonging to doing something worthwhile. A variety of factors affect the character of a given work community including the goal context and the channels of communication used. The ambient corporate culture is also reflected in the behavior of workers as are official documents, and the verbal expression of what ideal behavior should be. Even humorous renderings of the above help determine a work community's character and the degree of its success. The leader's goals, values, and behavior provide crucial clues to both inside and outside observers about what the work community will expect and accept. Often the leader's values and goals are more powerful in shaping group member action than official policies and procedures. This kind of group culture encourages and rewards effective performance throughout the work community.
- *Building Harmonious Relationships*: The key leadership process in the workplace is relationship building. Recent research suggests that leadership can be best understood in the context of the relationship (see Greenleaf 1977; Wheatley 1997; Fairholm 1998). Kouzes and Posner (1995). These and other researchers say that unless we have a relationship (a positive interpersonal connection between leaders and constituents) there is no venue within which to practice leadership. Relationships result from their unique bonding character resulting from mutual acceptance of shared values and behaviors. The character of the relational partnership dictates the strength and the depth of the loyalty participants show to the relationship and thus to the leader.

- *Building Broad Corporate Structures*: Leaders foster cultures that push authority as far down the chain of command as possible. This movement is contingent only upon worker willingness to engage in relationships that foster creativity, independence, and growth. They provide more consideration to individual worker's social and emotional needs. In a word, the twenty-first century workplace culture demands sensitivity to workers. The key to such a structure is personal values (Dolence and Norris 1995).
- *Emphasizing Transformation*: Transforming leadership describes a situation in which the leader chooses a vision grounded on coworkers' strengths and interests (Burns 1978). The result enables leader and led to reach higher levels of accomplishment and self-motivation. Spiritual leaders set people free and enable them to become more than they might have thought possible (Kouzes and Posner 1995).
- *Focusing on Coworker's Individual Spirit*: Kouzes and Posner (1995) found that doing leadership affects both leader and led. It raises the level of human conduct and the ethical aspirations of both (Burns 1978). Leadership is intimate. Understanding leadership depends upon an individual's biases, cultural frame of reference, and stage of psychological development (Fairholm and Fairholm 2000). It is thus intimate and personal for both leader and led. The critical task is to build unity of action from this mix of strong resources.
- *Exercising Spiritual Intelligence*: Spiritual intelligence is that intelligence with which we address and solve problems of meaning and value. It is the intelligence with which individuals can place their actions and lives in a wider, richer, meaning-giving context. It lets people decide which life-path is more meaningful than another (Zohar and Marshall 2000). Studies have shown that leaders use their spiritual intelligence and psychological background to impact the direction and strategy of their work communities (Levinson 1968). Data point to spiritual intelligence as the ultimate intelligence that serves as a necessary foundation for the effective functioning in relationships—and, obviously, leadership of these spiritually intelligent coworkers.
- *Fostering Innovation*: Spiritual leaders work to encourage techniques of innovation among coworkers. They counter the forces in play that restrict innovation: fear, uncertainty, tradition, possessive feelings of "my turf." and the general conservative mind-set present in many control-focused work communities (Carson 1987).

2.4 The Techniques of Leadership

Spiritual leaders adopt a leadership approach and a cultural orientation about work, and especially their personal character. They meld their leadership with their ethics. It is part of their commitment to serving coworkers. Their leadership approach is seen as a teaching role and a capacity to be inspirational. All of these actions flow from the leaders' core values—that coworkers come to share. The following leadership techniques are a central part of meaning-making, goal-setting, prioritizing work, staff selection, and promotion, and all other decisions and actions taken.

- *Leaders Are Ethical*: Virtually every decision leaders make has ethical implications. Setting and then following corporate rules is a part of ethical decision making. Decisions made must consider more-than-routine obedience to rules and include the moral constraints imposed by and/or implicit in those rules. Decisions should presume that the leader and workers are a part of the wok community culture, not just an economic unit and that this unit has a moral character (Ryan 2000). Some currently in-place work cultural features have the effect of supporting norms that are counter to those described as supporting ethical relationships. For example: some work communities and or their leaders over-focus on bottom-line profit as a primary goal. Others overlook the ethical implications of the methods by which profit goals are attained. This kind of end-result-only thinking can lead to acts of bribery, sweetheart contracts, and the like. These or a myriad of similar actions often detract from stakeholder willingness to behave ethically. Also, mishandling of a trust situation can weaken the leader's ability to be effective in subsequent situations (Bonczek 1992). Whether the error in ethics is intentional or an honest mistake, the loss to interactive relationships is the same.
- *Leaders Are* "*in Service*" *to Coworkers*: The quality that sets spirit-based values leaders apart from others is that they see themselves not as a servant of their coworkers but as "in service" to them. Servant leadership is not an oxymoron. Rather it is a reversal of the conventional wisdom that employees serve the leader. Spiritual leadership is a kind of servant leadership. Modern workers want more from their work than just pay, a generous retirement, and time off for vacations. They want to give their full self and have their leaders nourish all of their needs from their work. This leadership model is characterized by a commitment to be of service to all stakeholders (Greenleaf 1977). Servant-leaders meet the real emotional as well as other needs of coworkers—needs that can only be discovered by focused attention on each follower. That means that leaders listen, observe, and engage in conversation and search to know more about their coworkers. Servant leadership is about choosing to serve others and making available resources to them that help in attaining their purposes—purposes that give meaning to the work and to work life beyond economic reward. Workers will freely respond only to individuals who they accept as leaders because they are proven and trusted servants. The measure of spiritual leadership is meeting others' priority needs, facilitating their growth and development, demonstrating concern for follower wellbeing and allowing them self-direction (Greenleaf et al. 1996).
- *Leaders Help Workers to Also Be Leaders*: Spiritual leadership is unique in its emphasis on improving the individual follower's capacity to be leaders themselves. Both the context and processes of this leadership model move workers toward this outcome. In the final analysis, spiritual leadership is a process of making other leaders. It becomes a mutual process of growth and development toward independent action.
- *Leaders Maintain Profitability*: Obviously, the work community and its leaders are not emotional therapists. Generating profits is still the most critical role of

work community leaders. Without profit there literally is no work community and no need for a leader. Effective leaders practice their spiritual values in action in their day-to-day transactions with coworkers and customers. But to do so under the umbrella of bottom-line profitability. They do this also—and in today's work is profitable only—by giving attention to the human needs workers bring with them to their work. These leaders are sensitive to the core values reflected by their coworkers and the need to insure that these workers are also being properly productive. Spiritual leaders pay attention to individuals' needs as they focus on group profitability goals.

- *Leaders Share Information*: Leaders are at the center of the complex information transfer systems in place in all groups. This role is one way to define leadership per se. Leaders are the source of information, knowledge, and are disseminators of information rather than merely givers of directions or discipline. Rather than control data transfer, their task is to provide as much information as possible to as many people as possible about what they and others are about. On another level, it is being adept at using information to understand and relate to people and to act wisely in human relations.
- *Leaders Are Sensitive to Coworkers*: Spiritual leaders are skillful in managing others' emotions and feelings so that they react in ways the leader sees as appropriate. These leaders are expert in assessing what is behind a feeling and in finding ways to handle fears and anxieties, anger, hostility, and sadness. They are experts in motivating others and channeling individual and group emotions in the service of group goals (Goleman 2000). They possess emotional self-control, can delay personal gratification, stifle incidental impulses, and teach their self-control skills to coworkers. In a word, they are empathetic.
- *Leaders Are Teachers*: Teaching is what leaders do (Tichy 1997; Fairholm 2011). Leadership is information transfer *and* expression of their individuality. While the first is obviously a social activity, the second can be, and often is, an intensely private one. This work necessitates close, intimate interaction between the leader and each coworker reiterated for each dyad in the work community. The intent is to enhance them, inspire them to more full use of their special talents in task-related work (Wildavsky 1984). A goal is to induce people to convert their abilities into coordinated effort that serves the leader, coworkers, and the group. All of this is to say the above are aspects of and/or the result of teaching. The primary teaching method used is coaching: observing workers, exciting them, teaching them individually, encouraging them and creating situations that give each worker opportunity to take independent action in accomplishing work community goals. Coaching is a leadership tool based on exciting workers and encouraging them to personal and work community excellence. Coaching involves leaders in drilling followers in basics of their work and committing them to needed work. They sponsor and support coworkers as they experiment with taking charge of their work lives and of the tasks of maturing and developing their skills and acquiring a useful base of information about their work situation. Finally coach leaders protect their coworkers. They secure and maintain a safe workplace, an important part of which includes insuring that the workplace is emotionally safe and comfortable.

- *Leaders Are Inspiring*: Leaders inspire others. They stop doubt and to impel people to change without thinking. Inspiration is a complex capacity (Thompson 2000) leaders use to reenergize followers and to bond them together in the joint enterprise. Simply put, inspiration is using symbols—words, ideas, information, and deeds—to convey feeling of connection, excitement, and commitment to work community goals or methods. Inspiration goes beyond motivation in appealing to a collective human need to be part of and engaged with others in lofty enterprise. It draws on something deep within the individual that strikes a responsive chord (Bass et al. 1987; Burns 1978). Leaders provide this intuitive direction. Inspiration is a particular relationship between an individual leader and a coworker that enlivens both and provides them with new insight, new emotions, and new directions. Inspiration is not so much a quality in the leader (the inspirer) as it is a function of the needs of the inspired that the leader responds to.

2.5 Techniques of Follower Change

Spiritual leadership is developmental. Besides changing themselves they ask individual followers to assume a new role in the work community. In a worker–leadership relationship the leader empowers members, energizes them about their collective work and guides them intrinsically. Workers are encouraged to be creative and to act independently in concert with agreed-upon community values. Typical techniques include:

- *Leaders Empower Followers*: Conger and Kanungo (1988) define empowerment as to enable rather than simply to delegate. Bennis (1984) says it involves helping people feel significant, aiding them in learning, involving them in the group, and making work exciting for them. Witham and Glover (1987) conclude that empowered employees respond with commitment. This is in contrast to the managerial view of workers as cyphers—people who reciprocate with little or no commitment. Empowerment involves releasing the creative capacity in others through collaboration.
- *Leaders Nurture Followers*: The disassociation and isolation many individuals feel at work may be due, in part at least, to the systemic denial of our spiritual whole self in the context of the work community. Leadership fills this deficiency by nurturing each worker's needs, by seeing coworkers in holistic terms as it relates to their work relationships, and responding thereto.
- *Leaders Foster Creativity*: Modern businesses need extraordinarily committed and creative employees if they are to survive and prosper in the present turbulent and competitive workplace. The leader's work in encouraging techniques of innovation is to help follower feel free to discuss change alternatives in a nonthreatening forum. There are many forces in play that restrict innovation: fear, uncertainty (Carson 1987), tradition, possessive feelings of "my turf," and the general conservative mind-set present in many work communities. As access to knowledge becomes almost universal (Davis and Stephenson 2006), we can see the rise of

open-source approaches to knowledge development as work communities, not individuals, become responsible for innovation. Spiritual leaders provide the resources needed to affect change. Innovative work communities are characterized by the presence of "resource slack," that is, surplus assets which most managers would call waste. The value of this resource cannot be overemphasized. Most often leaders strive for economical use of resources and try to eliminate waste and conserve unused resources. But the innovative work community needs just that sort of "duplication and surplus" as the "raw material" for innovation.

- *Leaders Learn Self-control*: A distinguishing characteristic of spiritual leaders is that they have an acute ability to exercise self-control. They understand that only people who genuinely like themselves can undertake to build their own self-esteem and that of their followers without feeling it takes something away from them (Branden 1998). The most widespread addiction in the world is the human ego. The antidote is deceptively simple and enormously difficult. It involves humble self-control, service, caring, listening, and praise. The task is to create a personal broadgaged health maintenance program covering these five dimensions of life (Howe 1992). Spirit-focused leaders understand that effectiveness begins on the inside—at the values level—and moves out (Blanchard 1994) from that base.
- *Leaders Set Meaning for the Group*: Leadership is meaning-making. Leaders employ values to influence both individuals and group purposes. Leadership is earned as leaders provide followers with the socioemotional and spiritual context they need. It is about seeking focus—meaning—for the group. Meaning-making is a decision of the spirit, a core commitment. Leaders try to teach followers this spiritual nucleus and convince them of its truth—utility—for them and for other stakeholders. People are looking for meaning in their work and the opportunity to use more of their full capacities—both mind and feelings—and respond to the animating or life-giving principles within them.
- *Leaders Displace Follower Values*: Creating shared-values workplaces is a task of nurturing some values among coworkers and downplaying others. The spiritual leader's task is to insure that, insofar as possible, all coworkers accept the work community's values, goals, and methods. Therefore, leadership becomes a task of values displacement (Bjerke 1999). Leadership is activated as the leader develops and exercises skill in transferring those values into followers' values sets. Greenleaf et al. (1996) provided an uncomplicated test of leadership when he asks if those served grow as persons, become socially and economically healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, and more likely themselves to become servants [read leaders].

References

Altman, M. (2001). *Worker satisfaction and economic performance*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Ashar, H., & Lane-Maher, M. (2002). Spirituality in the workplace: A measure of success? *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management, 3*(3), 191.

Autry, J. (1992). *Love and profit: The art of caring leadership*. New York: Avon Books.

Bandura, A. (2006). Toward a psychology of human agency. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 1*, 2.
Bass, B. M., Waldman, D. A., Avolio, B. J., & Bebb, M. (1987). Transformational leadership and the falling dominoes effect. *Group and Organization Studies, 12*, 73–87.
Bennis, W. (1984). Where have all the leaders gone? In W. E. R. Rosenbach & R. L. Taylor (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in leadership*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
Bjerke, B. (1999). *Business leadership and culture: National management styles in the global economy*. Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar.
Blanchard, K. H. (1994). The extra minute. *Executive Excellence, 11*(5), 6–8.
Bonczek, S. J. (1992). Ethical decision making: Challenge of the 1990's—A practical approach for local governments. *Public Personnel Management, 21*(3), 75–87.
Branden, N. (1998). *At Work: How Confident People Make Powerful Companies*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers.
Brown, P. D. (1996). *Learning to lead from your spiritual center*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon.
Brown, A., & Kitchell, M. (2001). Identifying meaning and perceived level of satisfaction within the context of work. *Work, 16*(3), 219–226.
Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
Carson, C. (1987). Martin Luther King, Jr. Charismatic leadership in a mass struggle. *Journal of American History, 74*, 448–454.
Clemens, J. K., & Mayer, D. F. (1999). *The classic touch: Lessons on leadership from homer to Hemingway*. Lincolnwood, IL: NTC/Contemporary Books.
Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (Eds.). (1988). *Charismatic leadership: The illusive factor in organizational effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Davis, I., & Stephenson, E. (2006, January) Ten trends to watch in 2006. *McKinsey Quarterly*.
Dolence, M. G., & Norris, D. M. (1995). *Transforming higher education: A vision for learning in the 21st century*. Ann Arbor, MI: The Society for College and University Planning.
Dunphy, S. M., & Aupperle, K. (2000, November 18–21). Using theatrical films to bring management concepts to life: A new pedagogy. *Decision Science Institute 2000 Proceedings* (Vol. 1, pp. 215–217), Orlando, FL.
Fairholm, G. W. (1997). *Capturing the heart of leadership: Spirituality and community in the new American workplace*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
Fairholm, G. W. (1998). *Perspectives on leadership: From the science of management to its spiritual heart*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
Fairholm, M. R., & Fairholm, G. W. (2000). Leadership amid the constraints of trust. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 21*(2), 102–109.
Fairholm, G. W. (2011). *Real leadership: How spiritual values give leadership meaning*. New York: Praeger.
Fairholm, G. W. (2013). *Exceptional leadership: Lessons from the founding leaders*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*(6), 693–727.
Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
Goleman, D. (2000, March–April). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*.
Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journal into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
Greenleaf, R. K., Frick, D. M., & Spears, L. C. (Eds.). (1996). *On becoming a servant leader*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Heerman, B. (1995, March/April). Spiritual core is essential to high performing teams. In J. Renesch (Ed.), *The new leaders*. San Francisco: Sterling and Stone.
Hodgkinson, C. (1983). *The philosophy of leadership*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
Howe, G. S. (1992). Keys to daily rejuvenation. *Executive Excellence, 9*(2), 19–20.
Jacobs, D. (1994, November–December). Quoted in *The New Leaders*. San Francisco: Sterling and Stone.

Kaltman, A. (1998). *Cigars, whiskey and winning: Leadership lessons from Ulysses S. Grant*. Paramus, NJ: Prentice Hall Press.
Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1995). *The leadership challenge: How to keep getting extraordinary things done in organizations* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Lee, C., & Zemke, R. (1993, June). The search for spirit in the workplace. *Training*, 26–41.
Levinson, H. (1968). *The exceptional executive: A psychological conception*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Lips-Wiersma, M., & Mills, C. (2002). Coming out of the closet: Negotiating spiritual expression in the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 17*(3), 183–202.
Malmberg, K. B. (1999). *A vision for the future: The practice of leading in the federal workplace.* Paper presented at the American Society for Public Administration, Orlando, FL.
McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
Mitroff, I., & Denton, E. (1999). *A spiritual audit of corporate America: A hard look at spirituality, religion, and values in the workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Peter, D. (1946). *Concept of the corporation* (2nd ed.). New York: The New American Library.
Pinchot, G., & Pinchot, E. (1993). *The end of bureaucracy and the rise of the intelligent organization*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
Rokeach, M. (1979). *Understanding human values*. New York: The Free Press.
Ryan, L. V. (2000). Moral aspects of executive leadership: Searching for a new leadership paradigm. *International Journal of Value-Based Management, 13*, 109–122.
Senge, P. (1998). Leading learning organizations. In W. E. Rosenbach & R. Taylor (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in leadership* (4th ed., pp. 174–178). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
Thompson, C. M. (2000). *The congruent life: Following the inward path to fulfilling work and inspired leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Tichy, N. M. (1997). The mark of a winner. *Leader to Leader, 6*, 24–29.
Wheatley, M. (1997). Goodbye, command and control. *Leader to Leader, 5*, 21–28.
Wildavsky, A. (1984). *The nursing father: Moses as a political leader*. Birmingham, England: University of Alabama Press.
Witham, D. C., & Glover, J. D. (1987). Recapturing commitment. *Training and Development Journal, 4*(4), 42–45.
Wohl, F. (1997). A panoramic view of work and family. In S. Parasuraman & J. H. Greenhaus (Eds.), *Integrating work and family: Challenges and choices for a changing world*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
Zohar, D., & Marshall, I. (2000). *SQ connecting with our spiritual intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury.

Work Factors That Inhibit Doing Leadership

3

We all have and use leadership in varying degree. And we all lead—when we actually lead and not just manage—from the foundation of our spiritual core values. Our perceived leadership or lack thereof is inextricably linked to our sense of identity. And our values set circumscribe our sense of identity. When leaders—all people—mask their true feelings and core values their coworkers know it. Workers typically respond to this kind of inauthenticity with caution. They become distant. They hold back their commitment. They wait to respond until the leader commits to a specific course of action. They tend to take a reserved attitude toward the leader's leadership. The result is that they withhold creative ideas and wait for instructions rather than take the initiative. As a resource, leadership is like any other—it must be shared if it is to maximize collective effort. Even a cursory review of human history shows the reader that when leadership has been concentrated in the hands of too few people, this concentration of power leads to injustice and conflict—even violence. Conversely it is effective when leaders include coworkers in their leadership activities. The ability to share leadership is a solid indication of effective social and psychological adjustment and institutional morality and health.

While this idea may be easy to grasp, it ignores many of the impediments to successfully practicing leadership present in even the simplest of work groups. Nor does it indicate the sometimes complex workplace relationships dynamics. Being a leader has always asked the leader to work hard to insure that a random collection of individual people making up a work unit are molded into an effective, productive work community. For it is in the work community that most of the talents of each individual can be focused on attaining that community's goals. This is most often accomplished when leaders share their leadership task with coworkers. Sharing leadership is vital as we move fully into the twenty-first century characterized by diversity and divergence in workers, tasks, and work methods. It is an effective part of successful leadership especially when leaders consciously focus on insuring success by creating a set of common work community values both leader and led adopt as their own.

G.W. Fairholm, *Overcoming Workplace Pathologies*,
Management for Professionals, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-17154-8_3

It is even more important as the numbers of educated and trained human beings increase in the workplace and both expands and shrinks our "interactive world." The technological explosion has contracted operational time and space. This is rapidly becoming a fact whether one welcomes it or not. Given dense populations and strong communication ties worldwide, it is especially critical in leading small work groups composed of members representing several cultural, ethnic, or international workers. In this situation working together from a foundation of shared values is essential. And these shared values center on the leader's core character-defining values. Those leaders who learn to get coworkers both to accept their whole, character-defining spiritual values and to share leadership with them will survive. This is critically true in our present multicultural, multinational workplace. Leading from this base is the only way the work community can maintain and strengthen its organizational health and, indeed, survive and prosper. Those work communities that do not move toward shared values as the unifying factor will ultimately fade into significance or, even, disappear.

The challenge facing leaders today is critical. No longer is a healthy, unified work community a given. Workers come into the leader's work community from many countries, ethnic groups, and cultural enclaves. Simply put, our workforce is extremely diverse. The normal situation today is toward a workplace composed of several workplace cultures each with attendant differences in language, work values, customs, and mores and myriad other idiosyncratic features. The expectation is that leaders need to accept the fact of these differences in their new hires and structure systems that recognize and accept each of these differences as legitimate. Advocates of this paradigm expect leaders to function effectively in the absence of unity of values, thought, and direction. While nice in theory, it simply cannot be done. Of course the task for leaders always has been to mold diverse workers into a coherent, unity—into a work community of shared values, methods, and goals. In the past finding unity amid diversity has been facilitated by an ambient culture that practiced integrative tactics to change new hires (and/or new immigrants) into Americans—the "melting pot" idea. While a policy of acceptance favors new hires, it undercuts the ability of leaders to form integrated, unified, and trusting work teams. It threatens the idea of leadership itself. This problem is only exacerbated by the great size and speed of workforce change in the last few decades. Successful leaders will only be healthy and productive when they can create unified work community relationships. Success is keyed to molding a united and productive work relationship from the present complex morass that is present in the American workforce. The leader's success at work will also contribute to the health and vitality of the larger parent organizations of which they are a part.

There is a large and growing body of research relative to organizational cultural issues. Unfortunately there is relatively little discussing the impact of the perceptions that interculturally diverse individual workers hold in making or breaking the success of an organization (Peterson 2003). Leadership is especially vital in highly diverse work groups which until now have been largely unexamined. Using spiritual leadership as the primary leadership perspective present in work communities as a benchmark for evaluating leader success help to fully understand the nature of doing

leadership in these consciously diverse work communities. Effective leaders need to have a means of quantifying and mapping individual idiosyncratic factors—impacting either positively or negatively—on effectiveness (Fairholm and Fairholm 2000). Without these and other analytic tools, attaining success in leading work groups is made immeasurably more difficult.

Among the primary factors inhibiting work community effort to unify present and future capacity are those related to the vast changes in the demographics of America and the world. Globalization has changed the geography of the work. It has also dramatically altered the way people think about self, family, the nature of work, and the various communities of interest they devote energy and attention to. Further, globalization had altered the kinds of work we do, how we do work, who we do it with, when we do it, and how much we value doing that work. It has pushed to the forefront the need for authentic leadership—that leadership that flows out of a clear definition of who leaders and followers really are at the values level of being. The modern workplace has changed the definition of doing leadership by rejecting past managerial control models in favor of tasks more akin to caring, cooperation, coordination, and conciliation in work relationships with coworkers in accomplishing common goals. Attaining success in using this new repertoire of tools and techniques is hampered by many factors. Among them is lack of skill in their use. Additionally—and most critical at this point in time—issues incident to workforce ethnic and gender differences and a push to accept all workers' values unreservedly are critical challenges as leaders work to determine proper methods to use to attain joint goals sought.

The generalization of the spiritual leadership model is impeded by these changes in the nature of these overall work culture within which the leader's work community operates and the impact of that culture on individual work community members. While some cultural factors help others' act to inhibit full application of spiritual leadership principles. These factors facilitate widespread availability of information to all stakeholders. Once control over the dissemination of information was solely in the domain of the leader. Its generalization to the whole work community eliminates a critical leadership resource. Unfortunately, this generalization of unit data also complicates the exercise of influence by the leader to each follower and other stakeholders. Now cooperation is the dominant factor not tight control of information and other critical resources necessary for success.

3.1 Impediments to Leadership Caused by Globalization of Society

A key role leaders assume is handling the dynamics of interpersonal relationships within the new incongruent work community. Advances in communication technology have made our world simultaneously bigger and smaller. For example, we now interact with people thousands of miles distant from us as much or more than we do with our colleagues in the neighboring work unit. And, our circle of intimate coworkers, friends, neighbors, and work community colleagues are no longer

defined solely by proximity. Operating in this new era of globalization however may require a paradigm shift for many since globalization is now more a function of the mind and not merely geography. Lodge (1995) defines this aspect of social living as a process whereby the world's people are becoming increasingly interconnected in all aspects of their lives—cultural, economic, political, technological, and environmental. Globalization divides as much as it unites—the causes of division being identical to those which promote uniformity around the globe (Bauman 1998).

Because of globalization we now live in a worldwide community. The course of history is a sequence of increasingly complex socioeconomic and cultural groupings. The technological and informational revolutions bursting upon us since World War II have climaxed. We have created many "mini-businesses"—small, but influential enclaves of culturally homogeneous workers each tied emotionally and spiritually to a work community that itself is part of a cluster of hierarchical work communities. These subgroups—or sometimes individuals—are most often initially guided by different values and objectives than those espoused by the leader and the rest of the work community. No longer is it given that workers will automatically submit to the leader's instructions and orders. Workers bring with them their own set of values and ideas about what the work is and what their work should produce. The leader's job—as always, but made more complex by the global community—is to bring this chaos of values and ideals into a unity so that the right work can get done the right way and on the leader's preset timetable. Present pressures added by others have complicated and made this task harder and sometimes impossible.

Of course, each of us has always been part of a culture—actually multiple cultures. For example, in a work context, each worker is a member of a work team culture as well as bureau, division, department, corporate, and industry cultures. Simultaneously each worker may hold membership in ethnic, gender, spiritual, social, professional, religious, friendship, and other cultures. The professional literature has done much to illuminate this part of group interrelationships. But little attention has been given to the special aspects of culture present in small work groups composed of members from several different classes of people, ethnicities, or nations. And, almost no research has been reported that considers the special dynamics incident to leadership in these kinds of work group relationships. These relationships cause a wide variety of impediments—from minor irritations to pathological influences. Each challenges leaders trying to successfully lead their work community toward agreed-upon outcomes. Indeed, the cultural complexity of today's workplace threatens the practice of leadership itself.

The complexities leaders face in the context of a diverse workplace is obvious. The nature and scope of interpersonal dynamics available to participants for such use—or even for serious discussion of leadership in this context—is not quite so obvious. Yet, given the global nature of the worlds' economic organizations, understanding how leadership might be shared and the foundations upon which group members respond to the leader's spiritually based leadership, work is vitally important. It represents a new dimension in understanding leadership per se as well as enlarging our perception of how leadership is practiced in the twenty-first century.

Diversity is a fact. While this situation has potential for great good, therein also lay the seeds of disaffection or failure. The task of leadership is to mold a group of people into a productive, profitable work community whose energies are directed to attaining the leader's goals—for, after all, that is what the organization pays leaders to do. Diversity and globalization by their very definitions add to the complexity of this leadership task and can hinder its full expression unless mitigated by the perceptive spiritual leader.

Globalization complicates selecting a value set upon which to find the leader's leadership strategy. Unless it is done well the leader can thus introduce waste and, confusion, and misdirected energy among work community members—all marks of an unhealthy organization. Globalization introduces factors of difference, alternative courses of action, and disagreement on methods and goals in situations where coordination and cooperation are required. It complicates the leader's task of making co-leaders of each work community member. It occurs in work groups when members each have at least some access to needed information necessary to affect work community actions and outcomes. It complicates the mix of human resources leaders need. And it makes more difficult their task of creating a harmonious team focused on the leader's desired outcomes.

Globalization has changed the world so that traditional managerial command and control mechanisms are insufficient to induce workers to coordinate their efforts to get needed work done. Now it requires spiritual leadership that reconciles disparate workers' values—not just behavior—into a harmonizing whole and provides a meaning-making factor to the leader's tasks along with instructions and motivation. Globalization has fostered multiculturalism until it has become a force so powerful that it resembles a tidal wave of change to our traditional work institutions and our unique and prized cultural traditions, customs, and conventional organizational roles. It now threatens the very idea of organizational health and productive work life. It impedes the leader's work to create unified work groups of increasingly disparate clusters of diverse workers and to overcome a growing list of interrelationships pathologies hampering successful leadership. The full result of this change remains to be played out. The negative effects upon spiritual leadership, however, are becoming clearly evident. The global community demands a clear, precise, and comprehensive understanding of what it is to do leadership in a diverse work community and with culturally diverse workers. For example:

- Global changes are so sweeping that older traditional leadership theories cannot sustain this assault. No longer are the parameters of conventional managerial theory essential to success today. Mittleman (1996) says that globalization compresses the time and space aspect of relations until these formerly powerful ideas no longer matter. And, Amin and Thrift (1995) call this process pathological in socioeconomic terms.
- Work group, and often individual workers' cultural values, customs, norms, and patterns of action continually collide. As a result cultural values differences have to be constantly negotiated by the work team and their leaders.

- As globalization increases organizations are putting people with widely varied values sets into working teams. Sensitivity to each other's values is now demanded at all levels of the organization (Schneider and Barsoux 1998) above any other factor. But that very sensitivity threatens to become a pathological feature of today's workplace unless leaders can find a positive balance.
- There is psychological support for the idea that each of us wants to be different, to stand apart, so to speak, against the forces rushing us and our work community into forced alliances. As leaders try to unify the team in values terms, individual work team members resist because of their psychological need for separate identity. These pressures unmitigated define the unhealthy organization (Zwart 2000).
- Henderson (1994) believes globalization contributes to the present disastrous trend for executives to focus on the short-term bottom line. For him, an important cause of the recent great recession and the crises in the financial, automobile, and housing industries can be directly related to this short-sighted practice.
- Globalization with its demographic and behavioral shifts is expanding the pattern of information availability. Unfortunately, much of managerial practice still eschews this need for broad information dissemination to a growing cadre of knowledge workers. Knowledge workers use information as both raw material and the product of their labor. Knowledge creation is and will be critical for future success even survival in the work community (Quigley 1995). Leaders need to rely less on control and more on the power of shared values to build and maintain a healthy and unified workforce.
- Major technological innovations have fathered a surfeit of communications systems and devises. Together they have transformed human life and dramatically altered work—all—relationships. One result is that our capacity to communicate instantly with any point on the globe is shrinking our world operationally and altering our workplaces including leader–worker interrelationships.
- Globalization is no longer an obstacle. But in its place leaders now need to cope with a workforce that is more diverse, more wanting, and more educated and informed than ever before.
- Principal among the environmental factors moving us to a new model of leadership are those that define our organizations in global terms. What we do in our local group potentially impacts all other parts of the world. And, what happens anywhere else on the globe often proscribes much of work community success or failure. Leaders need to cope with this sea change and to resist being subsumed into an amorphous workforce without uniqueness or ability to uniquely contribute creatively to society. The tendency to sameness drives out creativity and eventually real progress. It is destroying individual drive—perhaps to the death of the organization.
- The spread of information across the whole work community asks leaders to continually alter their tendency to make independent decisions in favor of more collegial ones arrived at through negotiation, discussion, and compromise. That is the tendency is toward situations where no one leader is "in-charge."

3.2 Cultural Factors That Impede Leadership

A critical fact coming out of globalization is that work has become the center piece of life for most workers. Workers in the industrial period worked to satisfy the demands of their employers—and to eat. Today workers are demanding that their work meet more of their personal needs than just economic ones. The work community is becoming worker's most significant cultural construct. Excepting perhaps the family, workers now see their job and their career as a center piece of their life. Work defines the "real world" for many people. The work community—is increasingly the place where most people spend most of their waking hours, provides a focus for life, and is the principle measure of their personal success.

Now the cultural–environmental context of leadership is in the interpersonal relationship. And, while the relationship is becoming multicultural, effective leader–led relationships remain most often in one-on-one contacts. The problem is that often in today's workplace individuals and groups each hold a set of values and the leader another—especially in highly diverse groups. And everyone is continually vying for attention and acceptance by other members of the work community of their personal set of values. They measure group performance including their own in terms of their personal values set. And these individual worker values are not necessarily the work community's leader-imposed values set. Leaders need to learn to cope with these complicating effects by redefining what it is to be a leader today. The effects of globalization with its incumbent diversity, the trend toward accepting everyone's cultural standards lead to no other way except through one's spirit. And, given these impeding—often pathological—forces, leading from ones spiritual core is made even more essential—and correspondingly much more difficult.

The forces of homogenization and fragmentation pose a critical problem for leaders. If the leader's work community moves toward unity by adopting a unifying values system that the leader sees as less beneficial, the organization and the leader will suffer. And, if the leader's team does not accept one unifying values set, but rather if individuals adopt separate values sets, the leader has failed again with similar potential dire results. Success asks both workers and their leaders to be tireless advocates of a common mission, an orientation toward results-oriented work, and an uncompromising commitment to customer service. And, today's standard is excellence in all we do (Cound 1987)—a quality value, not a quantity one.

Work has become the arena for nurturing workers. Work should feed the whole person. Leadership is a personal iteration of the leader's values. The workers' need for recognition of their whole-self have an impact on work community performance, productivity improvement, and profitability (Autry 1992). Our leadership models should recognize this and embrace programs, structural forms, and programs to foster a whole-souled concern for all of the worker's needs.

The facts unite to present what on the surface is a complex and confusing panorama of programs, movements, ideologies, theories, and work practices the thrust of which is to place emphasis on the "community" dimension of the work

community. External cultural forces threaten to move the workplace away from the individual leader and worker and place emphasis on generic ideas of compatibility, not individual excellence. These externally imposed programs directly confront the core of leadership theory and jeopardize the leader's ability to lead. They also threaten to redefine the workplace in ways that bode ill for the concepts of unity, trust, and cooperation—ideas that also are at the core of the idea of organization itself. Carried to extreme this situation can lead to destroying the work community and it leadership.

References

Amin, A., & Thrift, N. (Eds.). (1995). *Globalization, institutions, and regional development in Europe*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Autry, J. (1992). *Love and profit: The art of caring leadership*. New York: Avon Books.

Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: The human consequences*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bennis, W. (1989). *On becoming a leader*. New York: Addison Wesley.

Cound, D. M. (1987, March). A call for leadership. *Quality Progress*, 11–14.

Fairholm, M. R., & Fairholm, G. W. (2000). Leadership amid the constraints of trust. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 21*(2), 102–109.

Henderson, G. (1994). *Cultural diversity in the workplace: Issues and strategies*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Lodge, G. C. (1995). *Managing globalization in an age of interdependence*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer.

Mittleman, J. H. (1996). *Globalization: Critical Reflections*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Peterson, S. (2003, July). Tolerance. Beyond intractability. G. Burgess & H. Burgess (Eds.), *Conflict information consortium*. Boulder, CO: University of Colorado, Boulder.

Quigley, M. E. (1995, December). Transformative leadership. *Executive Excellence, 12*(12), 19.

Schneider, S. C., & Barsoux, J. L. (1998). *Managing across cultures*. London: Prentice Hall.

Zwart, G. A. (2000). *The relationship between spirituality and transformational leadership in public, private, and nonprofit sector organizations*. La Verne, CA: University of La Verne.

Part II

Problems and Possible Solutions

Some currently in-place work cultural features have the effect of supporting norms that are counter to those that support the leader's need to create intimate relationships and coordinated integrated work community effort. Many organizations focus on bottom-line profit or maximization of resources use as primary goals and ignore the methods by which those goals are attained. This end-result-only thinking opens the door to waste, unethical behavior, unfocused individual action, and confusion about ultimate work community goals. Leadership in this cultural environment is difficult at best and impossible using antiquated techniques. Mishandling of the leader–follower relationship in socioeconomic venues weakens the leader's ability to be effective and productive on the job.

Today, we rely on technology to fuel the economic engine of American prosperity. But technology cannot cope with the complex concerns of modern society, only morally sensitive leaders—and workers—can. America has a strong history of economic, social, political, and economic success built on two plus centuries of adherence to values and customs evolved from our founding leaders. These values—like happiness, freedom, faith, hard work, justice, best efforts, a desire for a better way of life, love, respect for life and service to one another—are being sacrificed in the name of modernity. Today, leaders are being asked to lead in a society that welcomes and gives deference to workers from a wide variety of cultures, language, or ethnic-specific backgrounds, and broad tolerance for the needs of new citizens—but a tolerance that is unaccepting of any alternative perspectives. They are being asked to work in cultures that accept hate, fear, and evil behavior as part of an open society. These and similar values have been used as the base for civilization in the past and have failed in building strong, productive socioeconomic communities. And there are signs of failure again in American socioeconomic fabric. While difference has always been a part of American economic institutions, the integration of these disparate workers into a unified team—via the "melting pot" idea—was formerly quickly accomplished making workers a unified and focused workforce, today, the effort to integrate people of other cultures is not advocated so much.

The following chapters describe features of our present society and their often negative impact on spiritual leadership—the emerging leadership standard in America and the industrialized world. They identify pathologies present in modern work cultures that impede the full practice of leadership and that constrain work community members in doing the work assigned them.

In this Part, the principal pathological cultural features being introduced into work cultures are identified that threaten organizational health and, indeed, the persistence of organization itself. Chapters in Part II argue that these recently introduced workplace cultural elements have limited the practice of doing leadership well. These impediments often rise to the level of pathology as they threaten the health of the work community and of leaders' ability to lead. Remediating actions leaders can take to mitigate these toxic cultural elements and improve overall leadership are also highlighted.

Leadership and Informal Small Groups

4

At its heart, leadership is a social activity. It takes place in the work community in relationships between a leader and a worker or between a leader and small subgroups of coworkers. It is interactive communication at an intimate—not usually formal—level. And it is continuous. The relationship composed of a leader and a coworker reiterated for each worker in the group becomes the primary environment within which leadership takes place. As such, it partakes of all the characteristics of a small group relationship. As a small group activity, leadership can benefit from insights from small group theory. This theory helps leaders and coworkers understand the relationship context within which leadership takes place. It helps practitioners predict results given specific small group factors. And it is useful in helping leaders cope with cliques or other subgroupings that often form within the work community—groups that can hinder leadership and adds to its complexity.

Research conclusions supporting these findings add new challenges to the work of leaders like (1) fostering personal and worker self-control, (2) understanding the interaction of structure and behavior, (3) recognition of the importance of the work per se, and (4) the power of the informal verses the formal organization (see Lewin 1951; Argyris 1957; McGregor 1960; Blake and Mouton 1964; Bennis 1989). These and other analysts found that individual competence, motivation, and productivity were more a function of the fit between task requirements and worker needs than of just structural and system integration. They conclude that the more we engage the individual worker with leaders in problem solving, the more we can engender commitment, trust, and loyalty (Zand 1972). Obviously cliques can be useful in prioritizing some tasks, or solving problems needing broad expertise. But, as either formal or informal project teams, specialist groups, or informal cliques form, they can present a counter force challenging leaders and their leadership.

Leadership theory centers on both the leader's personal preparation and attitudes and those of coworkers. The theory especially affects the leader's relationships with coworkers. It is a technology of face-to-face leadership. True leadership is many small acts involving the leader and individual workers working in concert in a work

G.W. Fairholm, *Overcoming Workplace Pathologies*,
Management for Professionals, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-17154-8_4

community. Only in the work community it is possible that the leader can know intimate details—professional as well as personal—of the lives of each worker. Here values can be discussed, a common set of values established, and mutual goals articulated and achieved. If it is to become effective, individual work community members must see the leader–led relationships as personal and come to want to model the leader's behavior in their own. They must come to a melding of their personal values with the leader's, as well as their purposes and their methods. The leader's personal preparation technology is essentially preparation to succeed in individual one-on-one relationships with followers. In doing this, leaders see each follower, customer, or client as unique. This kind of leadership requires the leader to adopt a mind-set that values people.

Of course, leadership of large groups is also needed. However even this kind of leadership is understood best as multiple leader–follower work communities with leaders of lower-level work communities also in another work community made up of their counterpart leaders and their common boss reiterated to the highest echelons of the organization. In this conception, each of these work communities commit to a common culture and a common vision of needs in conducting this as well as the corporate-level organizational work. Leadership practiced anywhere in the organization is actually a hierarchical series of intimate relationships involving each leader leading a small, intimate cluster of workers organized into work communities. Group success is possible if each member of the work community share the same values, work methods, and goals. Thus, leadership can be thought of in terms of multiple leaders working intimately with members of their work community and with their immediate supervisor and peer colleague leaders within a common culture.

4.1 Dysfunctions of Work Community Factions

Doing leadership happens in these relatively small work communities (Hemphill 1954). Relationships formed by a leader and those led constitute the venue where effective leadership takes place. Unfortunately the integrity of the work community can sometimes be challenged when small subgroups factions or informal or formal cliques of any kind form in the work community and challenge in some ways the leadership of the putative leader. These factions often can divert group energy away from the leader's preset values, methods, or goals. A subgroup is defined as a distinct cluster of workers within a group. It is a subdivision of the work community. Even if the subgroup is formed by the leader to accomplish a work community goal—for example, a project team—it potentially can develop a culture of its own that differs from that of the parent work community or its leader. Subgroups formed informally almost always detract from leaders' desired focus and are, therefore, a risk to their leadership. These informal groups or cliques can be made up of friends, workers with similar professional credentials, disgruntled workers, lunchtime companions, or for any of a myriad of other reasons.

Compartmentalization into factions is a common way of organizing our lives and thought processes both at work and in other domains of living. Thus, workers compartmentalize their behavior and unconsciously act in different ways when they are in these small-group settings than they do in the larger work community—or when they are alone. Psychology defines compartmentalization as a defense mechanism, or a coping strategy. Put simply, it is how our minds deal simultaneously with conflicting internal values, aspirations, or perspectives—we seek allies. Workers—all people—find moral support for their perspective in the company of like-minded colleagues. Every area of life is hardwired to every other area. It is impossible to perform a task in one sphere and not have it affect—if only in small and/or consequential ways—another. The theory of small groups explains how membership in a group or subgroup impacts decisions, including group purpose, member roles, and assessment and intervention strategies. When we compartmentalize into factions these parts of the work situation can take a significant toll on overall work community effectiveness. When leaders face work community members with loyalties divided between fidelity to them and allegiance to their unique faction or clique both leader and work community goal-attainment suffer. Workers necessarily divide their time and talents and their enthusiasm. And group cohesion is lost. The application of group energy is bifurcated and splits group talent, and the extent and direction of member loyalties (Karau and Hart 1998, pp. 185–191).

Leaders have had to deal with the presence of small subgroups or factions or special interest groups in their work from the beginning. Indeed, one of the most useful of the writings of the founding leaders in America is James Madison's (1787) discussion on factions in Federalist Paper No. 10 (1787). Of course Madison was discussing the negative impacts of factions or other subgroups in the national government, but his advice is equally valuable for today's work community leaders in any locale. He defined a faction as a minority cadre of workers who are united and motivated by a common compulsion or passion, or interests adverse to the rights of other workers, or to the enduring and collective interests of the work community leader. Thus, it is synonymous with clique, or special interest group, or team, or other subgroup. He focused on how to guard against the problems inherent when such factions with special objectives differing from those of workers in the larger work community engage in activity contrary to that agreed upon by other members. Madison identifies the most serious source of faction to be diversity of opinion in the ambient culture within which the work community is a part (Fairholm 2013). This situation transfers to the work community as subgroups vie with the leader over fundamental issues such as what kind of leadership approach should be preferred or which value system should be fostered.

The most common form of faction is over the unequal distribution of resources—defined broadly as pay, the leader's time and attention, technology, or other things, or information useful in getting assigned work done or of bolstering the worker(s). Those who have and those who do not have key resources have always formed groups with interests distinct from the rest of their group. From an organizational perspective we might term a faction as an advocacy or a special

interest group or a professional association or similar groups with limited membership. These worker clusters share interests other than those solely concerned with the specific work objectives of the leader. In No. 10 Madison warns readers against the actions of factions and the dangers they cause. He also discusses how they have been the cause of the destruction of other organizations, governments, and, even, nations.

Of course, leaders also form factions for their purposes. One common kind of subgroups is the work team, A work team is a small cluster of workers working semiautonomously on recurring tasks needed for overall work community success. Some of these work teams include workers from other work communities or from client or other stakeholder groups. Work teams are most useful where job content changes frequently and employees with skill-specific talents are (usually) temporarily set apart to do something the full groups cannot do as well. This kind of teamwork is a dynamic process involving two or more specialists with complementary backgrounds and skills, sharing common goals and exercising concerted physical and mental effort in assessing, planning, or evaluating a part of the work community's overall mission (Xyrichis and Ream 2008, pp. 232–241). Some of the benefits of teamwork include more comprehensive analysis and problem solving, accomplishing needed work faster, enhanced development of close working relationships, and healthy competition within the group and with the parent work community. They also facilitate to individual motivation to do good work.

Several variations of the common work team are seen in the workplace. One is the semiautonomous work team. These teams work more independently of the parent work community and its leader. Semiautonomous work teams are team of workers, assigned to a specific job or project, with a high degree of autonomy over who does what, when, and who is answerable for the team's performance. Other commonly used work teams include those such as employee involvement teams, self-managing teams, and ad hoc committees. However organized and whatever the task or tasks assigned subunit work teams can be an effective structural form to facilitate work community goals accomplishment. They, nevertheless also represent a potential danger to effective leadership when they succumb to the natural tendency to assume more control over their work lives that the leader intended. Taken to its limit, they can destroy the integrity and the effectiveness of the work community and the leader.

4.2 Issues Connected with Leadership of a Work Community with Factions

Leadership is a social activity. It takes place in relationships between people and between people and the groups they are part of and with whom they routinely interact. The work community relationship is the primary environment within which leadership takes place. Several issues associated with leadership of small group factions appear to be significant in leadership success. For example:

4.2.1 Leading Small Groups

Leadership is an intimate relationship between the leader and individual workers (Hemphill 1954). This is the relationship context within which leadership takes place. It helps practitioner and analysts predict results given specific factors unique to factions. Research by Kurt Lewin (1951) and his colleagues described and delineated the relationship between a group's interpersonal structure and individual behavior. As leaders apply social science to their tasks as leaders they find that conscious manipulation of the interpersonal relationships systems in organizations can affect individual worker and work community behavior. Leaders use this knowledge routinely; it is a part of leadership per se. But, importantly, so do all workers in the work community.

One idea is unmistakable. The study of culture is complex. Over the years many writers have studied this social phenomenon from a wide variety of perspectives (Sass 2000). Research over the past generation has raised our consciousness about organizational culture. Peters and Waterman (1982) began the recent resurgence of culture study as it applies to excellence. Schein (1992) suggests that work community culture-creation is essential if a leader is to function effectively. And, Barnard (1968) noted that we pay too little attention to the relationship between formal and informal organizations. Each author has added to understanding of this social artifact. The result is that the literature reflects multiple definitions and definitional elements describing culture. They add to, not reduce leadership complexity. This semantic confusion has carried over into more recent studies of organizational culture making simple, concise definition difficult. More recently, experts see culture as a facet of any organization, whether formal or informal. This research places organizational culture squarely within the realm of leadership. Thus organizational culture includes:

- Bureaucratic dimensions—hierarchical, procedural, and structural aspects of the culture.
- Innovative dimensions—relating to level of freedom members have to be creativity and results-oriented and challenging work environments.
- Supportive dimensions—analyzing teamwork and a people-oriented, friendly, encouraging, trusting work environment.
- Rights dimensions—assigning separate legal rights to groups of workers, granting specific legal protections not available to others.

These and other factors ask leaders to focus attention on organizational culture as another perspective from which to view their work. It is a powerful mechanism leaders can manipulate to attain personal and organizational goals.

4.2.2 The Power of Factions

People are clannish by nature. All of us like to be comfortable and we are most comfortable with those who think like us, agree with us, and like us. Those who are most comfortable together migrate into subgroups of the work community.

Such subgroups or cliques are not likely to be growth oriented or open to change vies-a-vies the work community. Therein lays a leadership problem regarding developing effective work teams and securing productive workplace relationships: How to manage cliques. Factions, or cliques, or other special interest subgroups in the work community often undermine and conflict with the leader's goals. They challenge the leader's ability to lead. The presence of factions has the effect of disturbing unity and coordination in the work community and can frustrate the leader's objectives (Fairholm 2013). Compartmentalization into factions can also narrow coworker thinking so that they don't mix behaviors between compartments or make interconnections helpful to attaining overall preset outcomes. The workers composing the faction can become mentally disconnected with the parent group. That often manifests in worker loyalty and overall effectiveness.

Factions or cliques are part of our secondary social groups, business networks, professional organizations, and—significantly for present purposes—in the workplace. Typically much dysfunctional compartmentalization is unconscious. Of course, some workers consciously try to undermine the leader. But as a function of being human workers unconsciously act differently in different settings. The task for leaders is to find ways to allow the boundaries between factions to be permeable so that their—the leader's—values, goals, and methods guide workers when they act in either role (Gibb 1961). Cliques are, therefore, a concern for leaders because they can impact effective workplace relationships. Specifically cliques:

- Can foster exclusion
- Contribute to jealousy
- Create a "tribal" mentality
- Cause blind spots to develop respecting the leader's vision and value bases
- Typically exclude outsiders

Cliques or factions also limit worker freedom of choice. Worker freedom is better protected if factions do not have the ability to control all member rights in their interactions in the work community. Eliminating factions is a way to ensure workers' freedoms and prevent the oppression and groupthink that factions can foster. Subgroup leaders are often set on gaining their own personal objectives and when work community leaders allow the faction to form eventually they risk that the goals of the subgroup will compete with or perhaps replace those of the parent work community. In some cases small factions have the ability to rule the majority. It is in the nature of human beings to have definite opinions and to seek power. Over time individually powerful coworkers may get greedy and create tension by imposing their will on other workers. Madison's (1781) concern was that factions are ruled typically by a tyranny of the minority thereby denying equal representation for individuals. He cautioned leaders that this risk needs to be addressed and the potential hazard eliminated.

James Madison made the point that it is in the nature of people to strive first for personal gain before considering the impact such action may have on coworkers or on the larger organization itself. He also warned that the temptation to

self-aggrandizement will overtake all human beings regardless of how educated or understanding of current organizational visions and values they may be. He suggests that to preserve liberty all workers must agree to give equal rights to all coworkers. This is, unfortunately, not always feasible in the typical work community. Today's leaders need to find a balance between the needs of the full group and of its several subgroups. Effective leaders strive for a work community diverse enough to gain the advantages of creative thinking and still prevent groupthink. They also need to insure that the group is unified enough around the work community mission to maintain cohesion among the members and all of its potential subgroups.

4.2.3 Informal Groups

Improving the performance of our work communities is never easy. Some of the leader's mechanisms for controlling workers are cumbersome, often by design and for good purpose. They are in business to meet the service needs of a variety of citizens, customers, and stakeholders. In meeting those needs, the leader and the informal groups within these workplaces must learn to honor values beyond efficiency (Barnard 1938). Leaders find ways to teach equality, justice, freedom of action, and workplace democracy. These values compete especially with performance, efficiency, and effectiveness for coworkers' attention. Understandably productivity improvement in any work community is an inherently difficult problem with both physical and leadership implications. It is orders of magnitude more difficult when subgroup factions compartmentalize the work community until it loses its coherence as an integrated and viable workplace. Resources availability, organizational structure, communications systems, and work planning and scheduling are all difficult physical problems. They are even more demanding tasks when placed in pluralistic, multi-goal-directed work cultures made up of sometimes several subgroups with special status within the work community. Leaders, administrators, consumers, professional societies, the media, and workers are all in active dynamic in any organization. When leaders have to deal with these clusters of participants in multiple suborganizations it immeasurably increases the leader's work stress. It threatens overall work community success. Improvement of any kind will be difficult—it not impossible—in this environment. Factions endanger work community existence and unit productivity and tend the group into an unhealthy situation. Attaining excellence given these factors may seem insurmountable until the problem of factions is conquered (Barnard 1938).

4.2.4 Building a Trust Relationship

The work community culture of which individual worker is a member collectively defines their quality contribution and the extent of the individual member's influence. A critical feature of a work community culture is interactive trust. Indeed, we build our personal and professional lives on trust relationships. Our actions imply

trust—or its lack—in everything we do or say. We trust others to obey basic traffic rules. We trust stores to honor our credit card. We trust maintenance people to repair our household appliances. All aspects of the working relationship—our work culture—is based on trust of superiors, peers, coworkers, customers, and other stakeholders. Trust, or its lack, is at the heart of the problems society presents to the thoughtful observer. Much of American culture today is fragmented and conflict ridden. The work community is characteristically riddled with informal subgroups that split worker loyalties and make overall leadership difficult if not impossible.

This general lack of trust (distrust) of our leaders and institutions sometimes cause workers to decide to follow colleagues who have banded together into a subgroup or faction of the work community. This tendency accounts for much of the breakdown in the typical workplace. American workplaces are threatened by this loss of a sense of community that former trust cultures provided. Many of our work communities lack the cohesion that mutual trust provides. One result is that many workers suffer from isolation, anomie, and anxiety. And the organization loses productivity. Unless workers trust not only the leader's motives, but also their ability to lead, they will not follow (Hitt et al. 1994). Factions reduce trust and diminish the willingness of workers to volunteer to follow. Building a trust-based culture is, therefore, a prime leadership task, one that is jeopardized by the presence of factions that can and often do divide the work community. Factions or other subgroups—even formal work teams—can reduce trust and lessen the ability of the leader to lead.

4.2.5 Insuring Clear Communications in the Work Community

Splitting into subgroups of the work community adds to the difficulties in getting clear communications. As leaders consciously divide their workers or allow informal groups to form, they complicate interaction. As long as these teams share common goals and maintain a congruent cultural foundation in their work, a skilled leader can match their visions with the outcomes desired for the larger work community. But it takes clear and consistent intercommunication to attain that outcome. Rather than foster factions, effective leaders find ways to work within the existing infrastructure. Their task is to totally define how the work community does business, and to make the structure and methods jointly developed with coworkers work to the benefit of both. Sans success in this endeavor multiple subgroupings of workers reduce overall effectiveness an endanger leadership.

4.3 Pathologies Leaders Face Leading Subgroups Within the Work Community

Subgroups are powerful forces that, unchecked, workers will use to usurp control. Madison (1787) warned his readers—and by extension workers today—against factions and the negative effects they can have on doing leadership. A central danger is that factions can open the door to external influence and corruption. They can

generate contention that should be discouraged. The following issues constitute pathological aspects of subgroups in the modern workplace that, if present, threaten the viability of effective work communities and the idea of leadership itself.

4.3.1 Cliques Obstruct Worker and Work Community Growth

Subgroups dilute group energy away from the community's main mission. The present priority placed on diversity and the demand that all peoples' values be recognized and honored encourages factional subgroups to form. This has always been a concern of leaders. In the days of our founding as a nation Madison (1787) identified some important concerns that when dealt with most likely saved our nation from early failure. They can also forestall problems today as leaders seek to form unified work teams that take into account individual worker needs and desires as well as work community values and goals. Today's leaders can benefit from the ideas articulated by this founding leader. Workers are still Americans. And Americans are imbued with a desire to directly impact their environment in ways that also benefit them. It is true that elections and voting are seldom part of American business or socioeconomic group operational systems. Yet the desire to impact what and how work is done is nonetheless implicit in the set of values most Americans bring with them to their workplace. Times have changed the way organizations operate. Nevertheless, this simple, yet profound, aspect of what it is to be an American and a worker has survived as strongly as when Madison defended these ideas—albeit couched in political terms like "voting" and "representativeness." Today these enduring American values are imbedded in words and phrases like "participative leadership," "self-governance," "stewardship leadership," and "teamwork." They imply techniques that may help the leader. However, they continue to represent challenges to the leader's integrity as a leader.

While sometimes seen as innocuous and a little juvenile by some, the formation of small, informal cliques in the work community present a situation for the leader that is often a source of some concern. They can constitute a barrier to unconstrained leader action to build unity, foster workplace harmony, and highlight worker effectiveness. Of course, the tendency to join a clique is fully human and natural. They may even offer some benefits to the leader and the work community. Among them are the following:

- People form friendships based on common values and beliefs
- People easily identify with those who are most like them
- Such relationships bring a sense of comfort, cooperation, and consensus
- Compatible relationships are an important source of energy renewal
- Bringing together people with complementary skills and experience can increase overall productivity

A principle downside of membership in an informal clique is that members can come to see the clique as a comfortable box effectively stopping growth, and expansion or the introduction of new ideas. This kind of attitude is a counterpoint to

the prime leader task of displacing worker values to support a new culture focused on hard work, growth, productivity, creativity, and innovation. The leader's task is to encourage his coworkers to develop new workplace relationships so that they continue to build their skills and take advantage of the synergies of shared expertise. Cliques can encourage worker attitudes of complacency and diminish loyalty to the full work community and to their leader's goals. They can contribute to workers becoming sedentary. And informal groups can induce workers to focus on other than work community outcomes thereby adding unneeded stress to the situation and cause waste.

4.3.2 Factions Can Diminish Work Community Communications

Resources availability, organizational structure, communications systems, and work planning and scheduling are all difficult physical problems leaders face in making the work community work. They are even more demanding tasks when placed in a pluralistic, multi-goal-directed culture composed of formal and informal subgroups, cliques, or other fractionation of the work community. And, too, there are multiple actors in the typical work community; each in active dynamics with all others. Improvement of any kind in such a situation becomes more difficult. Attaining excellence in such a complicated organization, given these factors, may seem insurmountable. In any—every—situation leaders have to be superior communicators (Bennis 1989). They are symbol users, whether it is words, diagrams, logos, songs, speech, or something else. Leaders communicate meaning. They create a commonwealth of learning (Bennis 1989). They are persuaders and persuasion implies an interaction between leader and follower by engaging the minds of both. Persuasion, as a form of communication, is different from informing or ordering. It implies equality, caring and respect for the ideas and logical arguments of the other person. Achieving success in persuading coworkers to the leader's outcomes for the work community is made immeasurably more difficult when factions are added to the calculus.

The first leaders in history were tribal chiefs, priests, generals, and kings. These chief people did not manage, they led their followers. They were in charge because they persuaded their followers to believe that they were the strongest, the best fighters, and the smartest. They controlled fire (i.e., essential resources) and wore the fanciest clothes (robes, crowns, etc.). They claimed to have the ear of the Gods, receiving inspiration and visions from above (were the source of information). These same outward symbols of power remain still. They are only changed to conform to the unique needs of a given leader and modern civilization. We see them today in academic gowns, perquisites of office, the wearing of very expensive clothing, fancy office suites, and the fostered illusion that the leader has "the word" and is the center piece in the communication network. Leadership was then and still is a task of creating satisfying patterns of communication. It is setting up and managing reward systems that respond to values as well as needs. It is doing all of the little tasks needing doing to insure all stakeholders in the organization share in the common enterprise.

Allowing factions to divide the work community and to establish separate sets of values, work methods, and outcomes weaken the leader. Factions threaten the integrity of the work community and its capacity to attain its preset goals. It complicates interactive communications and sets up alternate—often competing—communication networks and employs symbols and jargon differences that confuse and disrupt routine operations and intimidates some workers and adds special status to the "in" group members.

4.3.3 Lost Trust

The thrust of leadership always has been and is toward trusting their leaders to be developers, not controllers of coworkers (Fairholm 2013). The trust leadership task is developmental and integrative. The challenge is to mold coworkers into a unified, balanced whole capable of sustained cooperative action. It is in the mutual interactive trust dimension of group interrelationships that leaders can find the solution to many contemporary problems—or the root cause of the failure of leadership. This is especially true in a work community composed of various factional subgroups—each retaining their various cultural values and working customs. Finding reasons to trust coworkers or their leaders in such a situation is difficult at best, impossible in the worst case scenario. This task is made more difficult, even impossible, as factions try to take over, split loyalties, or individual factions focus their collective energies on goals that differ from the leaders or from the rest of their coworkers.

It is the character of Americans to desire freedom to distrust—at least somewhat—their leaders. This Americanism has shaped our national culture. Americans are generally suspicious of the motives of those in authority (Kouwenhoven 1956, p. 25). Especially today many individuals distrust their leaders and their operating systems to deal effectively with our complex and multi-differentiated workplace. This, almost intuitive, distrust of leaders has made leadership in the work community more difficult. When workers begin to distrust their leader or refocus their trust on a few colleagues in an informal group or clique attaining shared goals becomes almost impossible. Reliance on structural form or work flow processes to insure work is done have done something to improve efficiency. However, this focus largely ignores the powerful sociopsychological dimensions of organizational life where interactive mutual trust is a prime component (Hemphill 1954). When workers split their loyalties among the primary work community leader and one of several different informal clique leaders, the likelihood of overall success is diminished.

4.4 Tools Leaders Can Use to Counter Intragroup Factions

Leadership is, in essence, learning to sit in council with all stakeholders to insure understanding and acceptance of common values, work processes, and goals. In the "counciling-with" (a coined word created to shorthand this concept) relationship the leader and follower work together in an equal, sharing relationship.

Both—either—may propose the agenda, contribute ideas and methods to solve group problems, suggest new or altered program plans, or otherwise engage in planning and decision making. *Counciling-with* is democratic and egalitarian. *Counseling*, on the other hand, is unilateral action taken by the counselor toward the other person in the relationship. It is autocratic, no matter what the feelings of the leader. Counseling is telling, Counciling-with is finding out together what is right, proper, needed. Counciling-with in essence asks the leader to be a teacher—more specifically to be a coach. Sitting in council entails frequent association with stakeholders, often at their work sites. Other techniques that support and enhance this central approach include ideas of frequent communication about work and other topics, common courtesy, and the routine exercise of respectful behavior toward employees (Fairholm 1991).

Leaders can apply any of a wide variety of practices to minimize the creation of factional subgroups within their work communities. Among them:

Limit the formation of factional subgroups: James Madison (1787) at America's founding proposed two alternatives to deal with the problems factions can cause, one positive the other negative. One option is a violation of the overall expectation Americans have because it (1) takes away the one thing people want the most: liberty. This alternative is to disallow factions to develop in the first place. The second option may also be un-American unless there are rules set and guidelines to follow, which can function as a moral code for the citizens on what is acceptable. To control the power of informal subgroups leaders could (2) limit the role and scope of factions. They would also need to take responsibility to protect the rights of their workers and provide mechanisms so that fundamental rights cannot be abridged or taken away. There are many ways people can find to abuse other people for their own gain. The leader's role is to decide on plans that will eliminate the problem without taking away people's freedoms. The core of the problem is this: factions are needed, but they need to be governed.

Sharing leadership: One of the leader's objectives is to bring workers to a point where they can take the lead from time to time as their talents and/or knowledge makes it natural for a worker to lead out in a given project or program. Leaders share their leadership with all stakeholders—those in a subgroup and those not—when it is in the worker's and the work community's best interests to do so. Sharing leadership minimizes workers' need to cluster with like-minded others to obtain desired personal objectives.

Building a stewardship community: Leading a value-based work community asks leaders to take responsibility to build an organizational structure to support it. One such structure is the stewardship organization (Block 1993). In a stewardship community both leader and led find opportunities for independent action, growth, and a sense of belonging. That is, workers often act independently of others in doing their part of the work. In doing this modern leaders are referring back to earlier times to resurrect this old—now new—relationship paradigm. According to Marcic (1997)

stewardship leadership forestalls the negatives of factions. A stewardship is a complex of behaviors, attitudes, decisions, and policies that reflect the organization's vital self-defining core essence. This method of true leadership embraces values of trust, responsibility, accountability, and broad empowerment in the workplace. Senge and Carstedt (2001) focus on stewardship from the perspective of sustainability of the overall work community, subgroups, and the ambient work society. This new perspective is a critical influence on the development and practice of exceptional leaders in real world problem solving. This kind of leadership, says Whalen and Samaddar (2001), will serve the growing cadre of knowledge workers. Knowledge workers need to continuously create, discover, reshape, and deploy appropriate knowledge by converting tacit knowledge to explicit knowledge and vice versa. A stewardship structure obviates the need for formation of subgroups of like-minded people to promulgate their views.

At its core steward-leaders see their role in trustee terms. They see that their leadership is a temporary condition susceptible to termination at any time since followers are essentially volunteers and can opt out of the relationship at will (assuming another job is at hand). Leading a stewardship community liberates coworkers to maximize their talents and capacities. Workers come to treat their work community as a stewardship team. They integrate shared values into a compelling work community vision of a future within their collective capacity to create. Steward-leadership involves many ideas, common in other iterations of spiritual leadership theory. But this idea is tinged with ideas and ideals. The leadership task is to assemble and sustain a winning coalition of workers on an issue, while avoiding opposition from factional blocks of coworkers or individuals. The net result of this kind of leadership action is that, as appropriate, leaders make coleaders of their followers. They let coworkers lead in doing some work community tasks. Both the context and processes of this kind of leadership move the follower toward greater loyalty *and* performance improvement. Failing this, the leader must alter or improve either the context (culture) or the process (technology)—or resort to managerial control techniques. Steward leadership becomes a mutual process of growth and development toward independent action.

4.4.1 Other Leadership Techniques in Leading Factions

With some good training techniques leaders can help those in subgroups to get to know their coworkers so that everyone can expand and increase the benefit of good workplace relationships. They can:

- Facilitate discussion to solve work community problems.
- Teach—and provide opportunity—for coworkers to expand their internal network to heighten productivity and personal satisfaction.
- Provide training to teach interpersonal skills.
- Challenge people to step out of their comfort zone.
- Promote teamwork and teaming skills.

The goal is to encouraging coworkers to expand their professional network to improve personal skills, foster teamwork, communication, and productivity in the work community—to make loyalty to the work community the center of their social life in the workplace thereby obviating the human tendency to affiliate with other like-minded people in cliques.

Worker attitudes toward the organization and its managers are a function of their values about the work they are doing and about their feelings for their leader. These values and the attitude they engender are hampered by the presence of factional subgroups within the work community and their relative loyalty toward the work community leader or the consensus of the informal group to which they give allegiance. Motivation is also affected by how well the individual worker feels their leaders respect them vis-à-vis their subgroup's. While management theory touts these human programs, it is doing real leadership on the basis of core character-defining values that have become the critical force helping workers make the fit between personal and organizational self-interest (Covey 1999).

References

Argyris, C. (1957). *Personality and organization: The conflict between system and the individual*. New York: Harper and Row.

Barnard, C. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bennis, W. (1989). *On becoming a leader*. New York: Addison Wesley.

Blake, Robert P. and Mouton, Jane S. (1964). The Managerial Grid. (Houston: Gulf Publishing Co.

Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship. Choosing service over self-interest*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Covey, S. R. (1999). Success on the far side of failure. *Executive Excellence, 16*(1), 3–5.

Fairholm, G. W. (1991). *Values leadership: Toward a new philosophy of leadership*. New York: Prarger.

Fairholm, G. W. (2013). *Exceptional leadership: Lessons from the founding leaders*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Gibb, J. R. (1961). Defense level and influence potential in small groups. In L. Petrillo & B. M. Bass (Eds.), *Leadership and interpersonal behavior*. New York: Holt Rineheart & Winston.

Hemphill, J. (1954). *A proposed theory of leadership in small groups*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.

Hitt, M. A., Keats, B. W., Harback, H. F., & Nixon, R. D. (1994, Autumn). Rightsizing: Building and maintaining strategic leadership and long-term competitiveness. *Organizational Dynamics, 23*(2), 18–32.

Karau, S. J., & Hart, J. W. (1998). Group cohesiveness and social loafing: Effects of a social interaction manipulation on individual motivation within groups. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 2*(3), 185–191.

Kouwenhoven, J. A. (1956). *Harper's Magazine* (p. 25). New York: The Harper Magazine Foundation.

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers*. New York: Harper.

Madison, J. (1787, November 22). (Pseudonym: Publius). Federalist 10—The size and variety of the union as a check on faction. *Daily Advertiser,* New York.

Marcic, D. (1997). *Managing with the wisdom of love*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Peters, T., & Waterman, R. (1982). *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies*. New York: Warner Books.

Sass, J. (2000). Characterizing organization spirituality: An organizational communication culture approach. *Communication Studies, 51*(3), 195–217.

Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Senge, P., & Carstedt, G. (2001, Winter). Innovating our way to the next industrial revolution. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 42*, 24–38.

Whalen, T., & Samaddar, S. (2001). Post-modern management science: A likely convergence of soft computing and knowledge management methods. *Human Systems Management, 20*(4), 291–300. Amsterdam.

Xyrichis, A., & Ream, E. (2008). Teamwork: A concept analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 61*(2), 232–241.

Zand, D. E. (1972). Trust and managerial problem solving. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 17*, 229–239.

Failures of Workplaces in Multiple Competitive Cultures

5

Values-based, character-defining spiritual leadership strikes a responsive chord in the minds of many coworkers in the modern American workplace. The idea of authentic communications between the leader and each worker seems somehow "right." And, while not part of the lexicon of leadership until recent times, relating personal factors of values and character to effective leadership also fit the psychology of many work community members in work groups. However, the intrinsic logic of values in leadership does not necessarily smooth its transition to full use in many workplaces. For example, forcing a work community to allow several different and competing subcultural groups to continue to honor their diverse customs—i.e., the unreserved acceptance of the cultural values and behavior of all persons making up a given work community—has complicated the full implementation of this kind of leadership. Indeed, at times it has altogether thwarted implementation of values-based leadership. As leaders learn how to lead effectively in work communities staffed by people of broadly diverse gender foci, multiple ethnicities, and from multiple nationalities they can lead their coworkers to perhaps more effective performance. Before this result can be obtained, however, the problems associated with the modern workplace defined as a compound of many complex convoluted and competitive cultures each with multiple core goals and those of leaders must be identified and removed. Effective understanding of leadership in a multicultural work environment based on the leader's spiritual self must include inquiry into the nature of multiculturalism per se. Of course leaders have always dealt with worker differences. Indeed, the leader's key role is to bring unity to a disparate group of workers—to make a work community out of what began as an amorphous group of strangers.

The present situation that encourages difference—not unity; separateness, not integration—makes the leader's job more difficult (Benhabib 2002), perhaps even impossible. The values of spiritual leadership and multiculturalism—as its name implies—differ on a fundamental level. Multicultural workplaces—and workers—prioritize seeking out and then recognizing and encouraging maintenance of each worker's cultural uniqueness. Rather, the leader's job is to build a harmonious unity

G.W. Fairholm, *Overcoming Workplace Pathologies*,
Management for Professionals, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-17154-8_5

among individuals who come to believe the leader's values and goals for them and vis-a-vis the work community are more desirable than their own. Both perspectives must be fit together in the work community before the leader can create a useful and effective calculus of worker–leader interrelationships—a highly difficult and unlikely task. A first step is for leaders to analyze and understand the nature of multiculturalism and the capacity of each coworker. The need to retain the positive results of inclusion of diverse workers in the work community is obvious. At the same time limiting the negative—even destructive—features that cultural separateness engender is equally obvious.

Left unchanged the cross-cultural character of modern work teams can have a substantial negative impact on the long-term viability of the work team and the leader's ability to lead it. A workplace characterized as a complex of competitive cultures—multiculturalism—challenges leaders on a number of fronts. A principal one is reluctance to deal frontally with personal values by both leaders and workers. For many people their values are personal to the individual. Attempting to change another's values is avoided. Other problems include the often physical distribution of coworkers over time and space, clarification of roles and responsibilities, language barriers across cultures, and failure to understand the local cultural landscape (Heywood 2000, p. 227), and diverse goals. These problems are pervasive in multiple-culture work communities (William and Clifton 2001).

The loss of productivity caused by cultural difference about work performance has not been highlighted in the professional literature until recently. Cultural differences in creeds, education, economics, politics, or language, laws, and customary behavior have a tendency to separate people, not unite them (Bloor 2010, p. 272). And unity is an essential aspect of any model of leadership and, indeed, of organization itself. When cultural differences are recognized, valued, and given pride of place in the work community over work-related values the organization suffers. On the other hand, as leaders work to integrate the diverse talents of culturally diverse workers useful synergies result.

5.1 Leadership in a Multicultural World

While they may vary in character and scope—often reflecting the period of their creation—today's leadership models have a predisposition toward Western- or Western European-influenced cultures (Bordas 2007). However, no longer is the typical work community model necessarily dominated by white, alpha men. Nor are workers predominately American or male. The trend today is to a diversified workforce. Actually, the focus is toward broad diversity in workers and acceptance of the cultural customs and traditions of each worker or worker group (Benhabib 2002). This situation of multiculturalism has become the preferred and much sought-for goal in many corporations, governments and quasi-government organizations, and community institutions. More and more leaders are encouraged to employ workers of every age group, ethnicity, nationality, and gender, race, and

religious persuasion—indeed often they are forced to do this by the nature of the worker pool from which they draw workers. From a work perspective, the prevailing logic undergirding the move to multiculturalism—apart for the physical fact of diversity—is that it facilitates creation and maintenance of an environment and the values that support creativity and a broad, literal idea of equality. It assumes that leaders can extend trust toward all workers because the collective mix adds to creativity and variety in approach and methods. It also assumes necessary cooperative interrelationships will follow. These assumptions of advocates rely on the overall belief that a multidifferentiated workforce is the only acceptable path to societal success in the chaotic years ahead. Finally, multiculturalism further assumes that the leadership role is to help facilitate a broadly diverse workforce. Diversity multiculturalist say is a fact and therefore it ought to be honored in any/every work group (Bordas 2007).

One problem is that the language of diversity all too easily slips into the idiom of exclusion. What make workers unique are their particular language, history, jargon, and modes of working and interrelationships dynamics. The unique nature of each worker expressed through these factors—refined through time—multiculturalist say is sacrosanct. For them every worker and every subgroup of similar workers in the work culture is authentic in its own terms. Such a view inspires celebration of all diversity. The practical consequence of this is the enduring myth of multiculturalism—every worker or worker subgroup deserves to have its cultural differences recognized and respected. In fact, while the question of cultural differences has preoccupied analysts from the beginning of formal study of leadership in small groups, it was not a question that particularly troubled either theorists in leadership or the sociology of work until recently.

The philosophy undergirding multiculturalism became institutionalized first in Europe and then in America in the 1960s and 1970s for reasons not relevant to this discussion (Benhabib 2002). As the movement matured it has extended to other societal domains including the socioeconomic domain. In this connection it has become of key factor impacting—often negatively—doing leadership in the work community. The growth of multiculturalism has not responded to the needs of work communities but has "created" artificial communities by imposing identities on workers not relevant to the idea of work. The real failure of multiculturalism at work is its failure to understand what is valuable about cultural diversity as lived experience. There is nothing prized in and of itself about diversity. It is important only insofar as it recognizes a reality. It opens people up to different experiences—not just relatively trivial ones but real differences of values, beliefs, and lifestyles—and creates the kinds of clashes and conflicts necessary for fertile dialogue and debate. It is from such clashes and conflicts that can emerge a collective language of corporate citizenship and real leadership based on integrating a variety of values into a shared value set that trigger real, useful, and productive action. But it needs leaders who can constrain that diversity and redirect it to such positive outcomes. The task of "redirecting" is the essence of spirit-based value leadership. The task of multiculturalists is to maintain those differences.

5.2 Defining Multiculturalism

As leaders—or others—concentrate on the fact that their workers are diverse in backgrounds they complicate the possible success of intergroup dialogue by imposing rigid identities upon the individuals who "belong" to each culture enclave. Being thus segregated in the workplace hampers the leader's work as they try to attain consensus about work goals and methods, establish consensus about word meanings, and understanding language used, and about accepting workers' self-identity in opposition to work group solidarity. It freezes cultural difference in place by fragmenting the work community into fixed subcultures. And, in the name of "tolerance" and "respect," emphasizing cultural difference results in limiting or eliminating the kinds of clashes and conflicts necessary for a vibrant evolving work cultures where real creativity can flourish. Founded on celebrating difference, not commonality, the multiculturalist believes that, in a plural workplace, there must be strict limits on free speech so as not to offend members with different customs and belief systems. If, they say, people are to occupy the same work space without conflict they mutually have to limit the extent to which they subject each other's fundamental values and practices to criticism (Bloor 2010). At the heart of most cultural philosophy is the belief that a worker's cultural background frames his or her identity and helps define who that worker is at both psychological and operational levels of existence. Hence, if we want to treat individuals with dignity and respect, we must also treat with dignity and respect the group cultural context that furnishes them with their sense of personal being. Multiculturalists take this line of argument to make a distinction between the equality of individuals and the general equality of the work community as a unit. And they fall on the side of prioritizing the worker's cultural identity over that of the work community. One of the ironies of trying to live in a more plural society seems to be that the preservation of diversity requires us to leave less room for diversity of views.

Conversely, in the real world, where work communities are plural, but are constrained to work together it is both inevitable and important that people sometimes offend the sensibilities of others. In this context where different beliefs are deeply held, clashes are unavoidable. And the leader's role is to deal with those clashes rather than support them. For out of this mélange come progress and a stronger, more fully formed unified work community—with emphasis on unity. Cultural collisions are important because the act of cooperative human interaction and progress necessarily involves offending extant deeply held subgroup sensibilities and changing them. From this conflict of ideals the collective work community forges a larger, creative, more inclusive culture, one the leader can use to get needed work done and to maximize the talents of all coworkers. But they need to unify around one outcome. Of course, individual workers do not have to hide or apologize for their work habits, but rather, good leaders ask coworkers to show respect for each other's difference and use that difference to mold a more creative, talented work community. The cost is that all workers adopt work community attitudes and arrangements to encourage conformity to a new—leader-created—group culture (Webster 1997).

The objective of a policy to accept all cultural values is, on its face, antagonistic to leadership and hinders, rather than helps, leaders lead. Multiculturalism is not a remedy for worker issues of sexism, racism, and educational underachievement. Rather, so questionable is multiculturalism's endorsement of biological classifications, so relativistic and moralistic are its arguments on cultural differences, and so negligent its analysis of human reasoning that it has become a pawn for others to exploit. Opportunistic workers use multiculturalism to thwart the effective operation of the work community and the larger corporate culture within which the work community lives and of which it is a part.

The right to subject each other's fundamental beliefs to testing and criticism is the bedrock of an open, diverse, and free workplace. It is especially critical to effective work community success—the place where actual work is done—where things are manufactured, customers served, and profits made. If liberty means anything it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear. Notwithstanding that multiculturalism constrains these kinds of clashes of opinion as a conscious policy such temporary discord is generally as well as economically unproductive. Stripped of polemics, these cultural conflicts can unleash the kinds of debate over core values that are potentially enhancing of the work community culture and its work values, methods, and goals (Benhabib 2002). Of course, overdone, subgroup conflict can transform legitimate and needed debate about the role and future of the work community into cultural collisions. Worse, for overall work community growth is that not constraining debate over work cultural differences can imprison individuals within their cultural identities and make such collisions when they must surely come to the surface measurably more detrimental to each side and to the productivity of the work community itself.

That is why the workplace is benefited as members see diversity as lived experience in a structured society. Leaders and led need to challenge multiculturalism's expressed virtues as a socioeconomic given. It has morphed from the fully American idea of advocacy of equal respect of the various cultures, to a policy of official promotion of the maintenance of cultural diversity per se. It has moved to policies in which people of various ethnic and religious groups are treated as defined special interest groups with unique privileges not offered to other members of the work community (Harper 2011, p. 50). This social trajectory exacerbates not minimizes interoffice conflict (Fairholm 2009).

Multiculturalism has the effect of encouraging different subcultural groups to live separate work lives, apart from mainstream workers. It has failed to provide a vision of a workplace within which members feel they want to belong (William and Clifton 2001). We have even tolerated segregated cliques that behave in ways that run counter to the values of the larger work community both philosophically and in terms of the work environment. Two main different and seemingly inconsistent strategies have developed through different policies and strategies (Marsh 1997, pp. 121–122). The first focuses on interaction and communication between different work cultures. Cultural subgroup interactions provide opportunities for differences to be communicated to create a workable workplace. The second centers on strict maintenance of diversity and cultural uniqueness. This cultural isolation protects

the uniqueness of each separate subculture within a work community but hampers—sometimes destroys—the work community. A common aspect of many policies following the second approach is that they avoid presenting any specific feature of a worker or subgroup of worker's values as central (Meyer 2010, p. 16) thus adding to the breakdown of the overall work community. Multiculturalism is often contrasted with the concepts of assimilation and has been described as a "salad bowl" or "cultural mosaic" rather than a "melting-pot" (Mooney Cotter 2011, p. 13). But unless cultural subgroups are assimilated (melded) into the work community, the leader's capacity to lead is fragmented and efficiency compromised.

In summary, the term *multicultural* has come to define a workplace that is particularly diverse. It has also come to redefine the policies necessary to manage such a culture. It embodies, in other words, both a *description* of the lived experience of diversity and a *proscription* for the leadership of such diversity. When most people say that multiculturalism is a good thing, what they mean is the experience of working in a community that is less insular, less homogeneous, more vibrant, and cosmopolitan than before produces beneficial outcomes (Benhabib 2002; Francis 1998). Those who advocate multiculturalism as a standard for leaders are, however, talking about something different. They argue for recognition and specific affirmation of all cultural differences whether they help productivity and cohesion or not. Leaders know that different peoples and cultures have different values, beliefs, and assumption which are valid in their own context. Work community success, however, is founded on intragroup harmony, not diversity. Multicultural policies create the kind of segmented society fully pathological to real leadership.

5.3 Areas Where Spiritual Leadership and Multiculturalism Management Intersect

Leaders act in an arena of multiple, often divergent forces. The typical work community has changed to become less homogenous. Today's labor pool includes people from multiple nations, with widely varying values, customs, and traditions. It is diverse and displays continuing signs of diversity at all levels. Workers' educational background is also different from those of the past. As a rule they are more educated and better trained. These differences pose major problems for leaders and for the leadership model they choose and for the idea of organization itself. Diversity makes the task of developing a cohesive work community more difficult to the point of impossibility. It also makes leadership more difficult, since leadership is founded on the voluntary association of (eventual) like-minded people. And the locus of the leader's exercise of leadership is the relationship of people who are like each other. Nevertheless, the leader's role remains: to build unified, congruent team out of diverse individuals. Common visions and values rarely come out of a sifting of ideas or values from a wide spectrum of possibilities. Rather, they are formed in the mind of one person—a leader—who then tries to articulate those values in ways that are attractive to coworkers. As they come to accept this vision and its implicit values the leader is successful in doing the job of coalescing them into a true community.

This is contrary to the objectives of a multicultural workplace—i.e., to unreservedly honor and accept each cultures values and customs with no thought as to how one set of cultural values impacts any other. Thus multiculturalism makes the leader's task more important while simultaneously making it more difficult. Leaders provide the values and vision-focus around which group consensus can be built. Leaders are not managers who can order others to work. They rely on shared values to influence the compliance of others—others who are, essentially, volunteers. Unless the workforce is unified, leadership cannot take place. Indeed, leadership is characterized by harmony between leaders and led in values, methods, and goals. Diversity in skill, knowledge, and ability is, obviously, valuable. But sanctioned diversity in core values and traditions works against mutual trust which relies at its core on a harmonious, unified workforce. And this kind of diversity hurts effective leadership more than it may help in the creation and implementation of new ideas or work methods.

The positive benefits of adding to the collective values, skills, and points-of-view of a diverse population are significant. Good leaders encourage innovation and change for reasons of enlightened self-interest and to maximize the contribution of each coworker. The present diverse nature of American work culture appears to require accommodation. But, the positive payoff as leaders build cultures characterized by trust, common values, common customs, and work systems is of even greater value. This is the only way that work community members can maintain their independence, engage their best efforts, satisfy their personal needs, and, at the same time, the leader can insure that coworkers voluntarily act in the interests of the group (Fairholm 1993). Absent this relationship, the leader must stop leading and resort to managerial control mechanisms to get needed work done. The growing situation of workplace diversity challenges the leader's ability to lead at all times unless they can induce their coworkers to accept common values, one vision, and one shared perspective about the work they do, way it should be done, and the goals sought.

The present failure of many workers, leadership researchers, and analysts to consider the detrimental impact of unrestrained multiculturalism on the leader's capacity to lead adds a pathological dimension into the work community (William and Clifton 2001). The dimensions of this pathology are many and varied. The following are brief descriptions of some of the issues leaders must deal with in their growingly multicultural work communities that impact doing leadership. This listing intends only to identify some of the key issues with which leaders must cope as they try to build trust, harmony, unity, and a productive work culture within which workers can change, grow, and find personal meaning in doing the group's work.

- *Loss of the "melting-pot" idea*: The old idea of cultural integration of new hires has been replaced. Multiculturalism actively encourages workers and groups to maintain their cultural difference rivaling the leader-set culture.
- *Fostering difference*: Increasingly workers have evidenced a strong desire to both accept the benefits of corporate citizenship and also retain their former cultural identities.

- *Encouraging exclusiveness*: Advocates of multiculturalism contend that encouraging exclusiveness in the workplace and requiring the leader to adapt to the values of new hires allow workers to contribute more fully to the work-community's work. The more powerful negative impact of this movement on the leader's ability to lead has been largely ignored.
- *Forced recognition*: Requiring accommodation of group differences in favor of multiculturalism threatens to further degrade the leader's role, destroy the leader's culture, and diminish or, even eliminate the work group's defining-values foundation.
- *A focus on the group, not the individual*: Multiculturalism does not focus on the individual worker. It has a group-oriented focus. This perspective on work community culture asks workers to work for group success, not personal achievement. The mantra is: act socially, and respect all workers' values. In this conception, this workplace philosophy provides workers with full freedom to accept which ever values and ways to do work they like. It eliminates the leader's role in building unity and trust to the group. Nor does it provide a clear and consistent sense of meaning in their work or in the goals attained by that work.
- *Protecting protected classes*: The discussion about multiculturalism focuses on greater sensitivity towards, and increased inclusion of each minority group represented in the work community or any of its stakeholder groups. But many such advocates go beyond these demands and mandate special benefits and separate status for these so-called protected classes of workers. This tendency raises cautions for leaders (Francis 1998). Treating individual coworkers doing essentially the same work differently destroys the idea of real equality in the workplace and engenders division, conflict, and waste. The idea of organization is to structure relationships to maximize efficiency, wide communications, and to direct work energy toward preset outcomes. To impose this role on the work community and its leader destroys organizational health and weakens the leader–follower relationship (Francis 1998, p. 33).
- *Moral relativism*: It is not uncommon for advocates of multiple cultures in the workplace to assume that truth is culturally based. They maintain that a group's traditions dictate what ideas about life including work life, and life's meaning and morality are permissible. They conclude that since multiple descriptions of reality exist; no one view can be true in any ultimate sense (Rorty 1989, p. 5). On the other hand leaders consciously work to instill one standard of moral reality into their worker's ethics, one that integrates workers' ideas about work, its meaning, and appropriate ways to do work. Deviation from that leader-set standard introduces waste, disunity, and distrust into the work community. Allowing multiple definitions of truth insofar as work matters are concerned is toxic to organization health and can kill leadership.
- *Language and sensitivity*: Perhaps the leader's most useful tool—after values displacement—is their ability to use language consistently to persuade workers to work jointly toward agreed-upon goals. A many-cultures approach fosters retention of workers' cultural characteristics including language. As language used in

the workplace becomes plural, intercommunication becomes increasingly more difficult for the leader with obvious detrimental results for the work community.

- *Maximizes talents of all people*: Advocates of multiple work community cultures brand past work culture as white, Western, and male, Christian, middle-class, and heterosexual. To counter this perception, their agenda includes demands on society that all workers need to be become more sensitive to minorities. While a good idea on many fronts, it is apropos here to note that the core—and traditional—role of leadership is to meld the disparate talents of coworkers to insure the work community is as creative, enthusiastic, open, ethical, and profitable as possible. This result is attained when all coworkers direct their energies congruently and trust each other to do their part. Only then is the leader successful. Absent this waste is a major part of the work matrix.

5.4 Pathologies Introduced into a Workplace Many Cultural Ideas Conflict

The present pattern of fostering multiple competitive cultures in work groups has far-reaching effects (William and Clifton 2001). Recent years have witnessed a sea change in the assumptions that many make regarding work. For example, where once workers were seen as corporate citizens, an increasing number of analysts now describe the workplace as a vast collection of competing subcultures, each bent on getting equal time and undeserving of any critique (Rorty 1989, p. 5). In fact, it is considered off-limits for those from one work community subgroup to speak to the values of another subgroup. Cultural elites increasingly teach that ethnic, sexual, and cultural identities supersede all other considerations at work (Benhabib 2002). This ideas springs from a "postmodern" mindset that we take for granted that worker interrelationships fall under the category of "social constructs." Postmodern analysts even challenge the philosophy of knowing (epistemology). They see knowledge exclusively as a group-specific, culture-centric phenomenon that leaves little room for transcendent ideals that apply to all workers of all subcultures (Putnam 2007).

Putnam surveyed 26,200 people in 40 American communities and concluded that the more racially diverse a community is, the greater the loss of trust. Workers, he said, in diverse communities don't trust the local leader or their cultural institutions. The down side of unrestrained cultural diversity is worse than had been imagined. And it's not just that workers don't trust their coworkers who are not like them. In diverse work communities, we don't trust people who are like us (Salter 2008, p. 146). Case studies of the United States, Africa, and South-East Asia find that multiethnic communities are less charitable and less able to cooperate to develop organizational infrastructure. Ethnically or racially diverse communities spend a smaller portion of their budgets and less per capita on general services than do the more homogenous communities (Johnson 2008). Johnson (2008, p. 29) found that a diverse group that is also peaceful or stable is against most historical precedent.

It appears that multiculturalism will only function if workers integrate it into the existing community (Mansur 2011).

Too often new hires and established workers perceive the idea of integration differently. Long-term workers tend to believe that integration means that new hires should change to become fully functioning members of the extant work community. That means they have to work and behave much like their older coworkers do. Many newcomers, on the other hand think integration means earning some money, continuing to speak the language of their origin, and otherwise maintain their previous cultural identity. That's why there is a discord. Indeed, discord may be too bland a term. Multiple cultures in a work community have caused divisions in the cultural life wherever it has been instituted (Francis 1998). Its touted benefits have not proven to be real. Increasing numbers of researchers are questioning the inroads new workers are making that have the effect of challenging core work values and customs into something wholly different than those previously held. Analysis of the experience of European nations that have abandoned multicultural policies as a national program points to pathologically negative impacts on the work community and its leadership. Among them the following are important (see Benhabib 2002; Mansur 2011):

- The founding workers are often denied rightful privileges and victimized by newly hired cultural subgroups.
- The cultural transformation triggered by new hires blurs the leader's work to create a core work community identity.
- Assimilation of workers with different cultures has caused discord, sometimes sabotage, violence, and often the formation of ethnic cliques complicating leadership.
- Treating new hires with tolerance while highlighting their diverse cultural, norms and values diminishes work community trust relationships and increases the leader's task of building unity.
- Integrating new hires into the founding culture adds to the work community's costs and training in material, time, and energy to be expended to protect and strengthen the founding work community culture.
- Subgroup prejudices destroy work relationships and make the leader's task of teaching followers core values and goals more difficult.
- Fostering a multicultural work community masks the real meaning of the work being done.
- Multiculturalism reduces worker loyalty to the full group.
- The tendency to equate multiculturalism with minorities demanding special rights wastes overall group energy, commitment, and enthusiasm. Some see it as promoting a thinly veiled prejudice.
- Leaders find it hard to inspire coworkers when individuals honor several different value systems.
- Self-control is taxed as workers have to consider multiple values in measuring individual and subgroup performance—there is no universally agreed-upon standard of measurement.
- Leaders find that understanding is lessened as coworkers attach their unique cultural usage to word connotations.

5.5 The Failure of Multiculturalism in the United States

The overall impact of instituting several competing cultures in the workplace has placed stress on leaders and on doing leadership. The health and vitality of the work community has been jeopardized evidenced by the loss of worker loyalty to coworkers, and a lessening of shared work norms and values. In the last several decades schools and business institutions have taught multiculturalism ostensibly in an attempt to increase respect for students and workers from minority cultures. A defining feature of this perspective is the view that all cultures are equally valuable, good, and worthy of deference. This in part stems from a mixture of postmodernist theory (which fosters the belief that there are no objective truths) and moral or cultural relativism (that counsel people not to be judgmental about the moral and cultural precepts of any group or individual). A consequence is the notion that host cultures should not expect new hires to internalize their defining character or customs. Rather, it is assumed that each cultural subgroup will maintain its distinct identity regardless of whether its values are contrary to those of the host work unit. Lack of integration and assimilation are not necessarily poor outcomes according to multiculturalists. Rather, such separateness, the theory states, is viewed as an indication of cultural inclusiveness and pride (Johnson 2008).

Given these characteristics of multiculturalism and its goals, it is little wonder that its presence in the workplace hampers full application of values-based spiritual leadership. Indeed, they represent pathological practices that jeopardize work community health and the effective practice of leadership. Absent unity of values, goals, and methods, leaders cannot lead. Rather they must resort to managerial control (read control or force) to ensure their objectives are met and workers devote needed energies to the work at hand. Of course, the unity providing the undergirding of leadership does not presuppose conformity to one set of ideas or only one outcome. Nothing is further from the truth. Spiritual leaders foster cultures that ensure the legal equality of the sexes and protect the rights of ethnic and social minorities, and homosexuals. Of course, practicing real leadership is not a panacea. Rather, leaders see coworker development as a path best guaranteed to protect individual freedoms enshrined in the American Constitution and Bill of Rights but harnessed in mutual search for attaining shared work goals and common methods of obtaining them.

Leaders act in character as they prescribe the cultural conditions to which new hires to the work community must adhere. The only way leadership works is if new hires come to accept and assimilate within the defining ethos of the extant work community. Joining such a group does not mean that members need to abandon their esteem for their previous cultural heritage (William and Clifton 2001). To the contrary, adding new dimensions of creativity, skill, or expertise along with helping to ensure coworker dignity and self-esteem are some of the advantages a diverse work community offers. Difference in coworkers should add to the potential for success but never redefine it for only a portion of the work community. Insofar as they are harnessed under the umbrella of the leader-led work community's goal and a code of conduct, all can prosper. Absent this unifying force, productivity is

reduced, antagonisms and anomie is increased, and the work community and the ambient work community lose.

Allowing individuals or subgroups to introduce cultural features that seek to overthrow or invalidate the leader's existing culture is, on its face, detrimental and inefficient. While good leaders are open to new ideas or methods, new hires do not have the right to promote alternative behaviors or values contrary to those set by the leader and concurred in by their coworker colleagues. Doing this introduces pathology into the workplace and diminishes the leader's influence. If work goals or methods are added to the work culture that interferes with the leader-set counterparts they move the work unit toward failure and limit leaders' attempts to lead from their spiritual core. They threaten its history, and redirect the work community's future as an economic unit (Benhabib 2002). They help destroy another situation where workers can magnify their capacities.

Following are specific pathologies destroying the leader's capacity to lead that multiculturalism threatens.

5.5.1 A Policy of Recognition

People need to feel recognized by their associates (Taylor 1993). This need for recognition has become a communal commodity, traded like anything else in the marketplace. For Taylor the work community—any public venue—has become a kind of catharsis center for all sorts of hurts and grievances that on another day would seem to be private issues. What makes the policy of recognition so difficult of resolution when applied to the leadership of others begins with the semantic shift from "character" to "recognition." Non-Americans typically found in America's traditional past a unique and valued "American character" forged on demonstrated capacity to contribute and the integrity to command trust. Today everyone demands recognition for his or her "right" of self-expression regardless of their skill or capacity—or willingness—to contribute to the joint enterprise. In the workplace, this morphing of character into mere recognition threatens to collapse the existing work culture which once was the basis for effective, productive, and interactive work relationships. Now, so that all might be recognized it is implied that no worker be outstanding. This removes a major motivational tool leaders use to influence exceptional worker performance. Workers inclined to excessive cultural inclusion have a view of human nature that stresses only one value, equality, in ranking coworkers—an essential sameness of every one (Francis 1998). It is responsible for the abolition not just of social and moral hierarchies but of the very concept of character itself. This view is that every worker based on the proposition that "all men are created equal" should be recognized in his or her innate dignity as a person. This is quite apart from the possession of any usable talent a worker may or may not also possess.

The leadership task is made more difficult by the introduction of this amorphous standard of measurement. It reduces to irrelevance of the values of expertise, self-esteem, personal empowerment, growth, and self-control leaders foster. It is pathologic to personal development, to worker's power of self-determination, and other

factors critical to building work relationships and a culture of work and achievement. All of these are critical tools leaders use to lead. Their absence reduces to impossibility of that capacity.

5.5.2 Culturally Acceptable Speech

Language matters. Its exploitation constitutes a major obstacle to success in any group action. Language is a kind of mirror. It reflects the work culture the leader creates. Human beings use language to interact authentically with one another. We should never underestimate the extent to which the language we use affects our views and our attitudes. Workers who advocate for acceptance of several cultural subgroups in the work community find that changing attitudes is hard. Therefore they have moved to redefine and apply in new ways some common words to mean something entirely different and bias them toward their goal of allowing multiple cultures each with equal status. They have changed the language we use to describe powerful ideas like loyalty, tolerance, equality and so forth, but only in terms of their desire for cultural inclusion. They hope that the attitude of unbridled acceptance of difference they seek will eventually follow.

All people use language to satisfy their personal or group goals. Some people use language as a tool to hurt others. They use it, for example, to legitimize their own value system by labeling other workers as "deviant" or "inferior" or "prejudiced." The negative impacts of these actions can emanate from either outside or within the work community. Either—both—leaders and workers use it to advance an anti-work community agenda or to foster a new focus for the work community. Typically advocates use these new definitions to promote a social agenda aimed at altering the work community's traditions of morality, spirituality, the work ethic, and the value of work itself within the work community.

The ostensible purpose is to ease potential discomfort of some workers by others. There is also a strong ideological control undercurrent. Enforcing such specific language use is an attempt by workers or research analysts to redirect the work community in ways that change the way coworkers think about others and common issues. It is a kind of social engineering. This kind of language can be used to legitimize behavior by individual workers, cliques, and leaders themselves to forward their agenda in less than overt ways. Society once believed this technique to be ethically or morally wrong. Now it is highlighted by powerful individuals and subgroups in the work community. The impact of this impediment to leadership in the work community is obvious. Such language directly impedes leadership in the work community. Indeed, it constitutes a major pathology hampering leader success. The result is that accurate assessment of both coworkers and systems are made more difficult. The leader-created culture is threatened and the definition of the work community culture is redefined. And, productive discourse is made more difficult—affecting issuing orders, training workers in needed skills, and overall interpersonal work relationships are hampered. The result is that accurate assessment of both coworkers and systems are made more difficult of definition as subgroups and/or individual workers' language is limited and controlled by a few individuals.

5.5.3 Inclusion and Truth

Multiple-culture advocates argue—rightly—that marginalized people need to be brought into the mainstream of ideas. No worker should ever have to feel left out. They are expending great effort to set standards to increase the voice of members of all protected classes of people in the workplace. However, evidence suggests that in doing this they have denigrated or ignored the contributions of traditional workers in order to be inclusive of other (newer) workers—often at the expense of accuracy. Insofar as the work community is concerned, inclusion has placed added stress on leaders as they try to meld the idiosyncratic cultures of both traditional and newly hired workers into a unity. In an overdesire for inclusiveness, many current leadership or management textbooks have been moving toward unhindered inclusion for some time. In order to make up for the neglect of say, women and minorities in past texts, some authors and publishers have gone to excess in their attempts to redress this perceived imbalance (Leo 1995, p. 23). Thus, leaders must counter the educational and historical biases present in the minds of new hires. It taxes the leader's abilities to teach workers needed job techniques and build a culture that balances historical realities and the present overemphasis on highlighting the contributions of the several protected groups. Further, it complicates the always difficult task of building work relationships based on the realities of individual worker's backgrounds, the needs of the work community, and the perceptions being promulgated by their customer base. Honest workers prefer that truth—what really happened in the past and what really is the case respecting minorities today. Leaders have to resist any efforts to skew that truth and counter workers who come to the work community with a similarly biased personal philosophy about work and the work environment. The leader's task is to build workers' self-control and esteem and to direct their energies and enthusiasm toward work community goals, not to promulgate any other agenda—laudable or not. Allowing the workplace to be used to foster non-work-related ends wastes scarce resources of time and talent, even if the goal is laudable.

Some people who study leadership today have specific ideas about the notion of truth. Paramount among these ideas is the belief that no truth transcends culture. That is, that no moral concept might be true for every cultural group or every human being all the time. This concept might be challenged on many fronts. But for the leader, allowing multiple ethical standards to dictate work decisions works against the leader's need to produce. Similarly, to let workers try to work efficiently while each is guided by different moral and ethical guidelines they have introduced to help create, direct, and maintain the work culture, and interactive relationships are detrimental. It masks the truth, it allows worker energy to be applied to non-work goal-oriented behavior, and reduces cohesion and trust, The notion of truth demands that leaders and workers be authentic and the work culture standard be clear, understandable, and defensible. The task this standard places before leaders is twofold. First, they need to insure that coworkers in the work community learn an accurate understanding of the work community's intellectual and economic history. Their second job is to coach coworkers in using that foundation of truth in their relationships with each other and with all stakeholders as they move collectively into the future.

5.5.4 Tolerance of Any and Every Thing

Part of the problem of leading a purposely multicultural work community is that it allows for an overbroad definition of cultural groups (Francis 1998). And it advocates full acceptance—that is, tolerance—for all groups. It asks leaders to take an objective, permissive attitude toward anyone whose opinions, practices, race, religion, nationality, or other characteristics differ from the leaders. Workers with this perspective argue that difference encourages creativity. The counterargument is that such workers foster toleration for only their agenda—which is to say they are intolerant of any deviation from that agenda. In fact, any self-styled unique individual or group can identify itself as marginalized and expect full acceptance by the work community members and its leader. To be considered culturally sensitive leaders and workers are asked to see and understand the perspective of the protected group member regardless of past practices or leader-set guidelines. They must share the same metaphysical perspective, not just sympathize—or even empathize—with them.

Tolerance has become a shackle limiting behavior toward others in the name of tolerance. Leaders are asked to have compassion for the "different" among their coworkers. At the same time they are adjured to ignore the deleterious impact that that lifestyle may have on work-related goal attainment. Whatever the kind of difference reflected in workers' behavior, these workers have asked leaders—all stakeholders—to give up their former view of a universe governed by immutable laws and replace them with a relativistic one. Tolerance becomes the only absolute. To be exclusive about truth, or to argue that some action might be morally wrong for all people all the time—or, even, more productive—violates this new absolute of tolerance. Such a philosophical stance violates the idea of leadership toward preset goals, formal assignment of roles within the work community, and undermines trust, and unity—the hallmarks of organization itself. Unmindful tolerance shackles leaders trying to persuade coworkers to accept one unified, coherent set of values, methods, and goals. It artificially divides the group rather than unites it into a cohesive unit where all coworker talent and energy can be directed to accomplishment of shared goals.

5.5.5 Justice and Truth

Justice is a characteristic of leadership—being fair to each coworker. While advocates of multiple cultures occasionally refer to justice, it is not a core objective of the movement. The reason is that justice is not possible without truth. In order to claim that someone's actions or words are unjust, one must assume that a moral hierarchy exists—a moral order that would be true for the work community culture now and over time. Injustice implies that justice exists and if justice exists it implies that moral laws exist and an ultimate source must also exist (Cameron 1991). Cameron argues that leaders can use the idea of justice to help create a workplace utopia. But he admits that multiculturalist coworkers (or others) cannot give any

noncircular arguments for why their idea of being unjust is the worst thing one can do. They invent moral laws, the foundation of which lies only in their preference for that law. Even if leaders accept such a personalized moral standard as useful, it leaves them with questions of truth. The first is: what does this created moral standard mean in practice in the work community? How can this manufactured-for-the-moment moral standard stand up when challenged by other work communities? Can the leader's views on justice withstand challenge by people from different cultures—work communities, industry groups, the ambient community, nations—with whom they do business? Without a generally accepted truth, without knowledge of right and wrong, justice is impossible, as is any notion of a good life. Any other personalized moral code becomes empty. Multiculturalists see all human cultures as morally equal because of their faith in a naturalistic world view. This view recognizes chance as the only possible cause for what exists. If this is true, absolute justice is meaningless.

5.6 Tools Leaders Can Use to Counter Political Correctness

The character of our workforce is changing, becoming more diverse, less homogenous. The people coming into our work communities enter with different values, mores, and customs. This fact is the source of many of the problems spiritual leaders face in building a cohesive unity in the work community—as has always been the case (Francis 1998). Diverse workers pose major problems in developing interpersonal trust. Unless the work community is homogeneous, leadership cannot take place. Diversity in skill, knowledge, and ability is valuable, but diversity in core work community values works against leadership. Leaders act in an arena of multiple, sometimes divergent forces (Fairholm 1993). Their role is to build unity, a team, out of diverse individuals. Indeed, we distinguish leaders by the fact that they provide the values focus around which group consensus can be formed. Leaders can lead only united, compatible, colleagues who, in essence, volunteer to accept the leader's leadership. The essential leadership tasks, therefore, are to set the vision and values and then seek continuous consensus from coworkers. The challenge is to do this and at the same time to assure that the organization's culture is continually open to new, different, and appropriate work practices in dealing with its stakeholders while maintaining focus on the leader's future vision. The perspective of fostering many cultures impedes this task; it does not change it (William and Clifton 2001)!

Following are some simple, but generally applicable actions spiritual leaders can take in coping with the multinational and multiethnic workers common in most modern work communities. Creating and maintaining the constantly evolving work community's culture is fundamentally a task of values change. The change needed is to match worker performance with work community needs while resolving a variety of operating system problems using workers who may not come from the same cultural tradition. The organization's system of communications is one

example. Others were discussed in terms of the pathologies identified above. Still others include (William and Clifton 2001):

- Managing meanings via understandable written and oral values statements, purposes, policies, and procedures.
- Offering training programs that are as much on culture-creation and maintenance tasks as they are on skills building ones.
- Leaders concentrate their teaching on inculcating organizational philosophy as well as on job-related skills building.
- Reinforcing group values in all decisions the leader makes.
- Controlling work community subcultural factions—a kind of balkanization—that is detrimental to trusting relationships and productivity.
- Set work and accountability standards that consider the diverse nature of their work force and alter them as the situation demands always keeping the need for preset work methods and goals in the forefront—for after all, they are the reasons workers get paid.
- Assist workers to take personal charge of their careers. The weight of experience supports the idea that the individual is primarily responsible for their own career progress and professional development.
- Help coworkers manage the stress of being bicultural in the workplace. The new worker's task is to align with that culture or change it or some of both.
- Multiculturalism is new for many organizations, and newness is by definition stressful. Learning to manage stress in socially acceptable ways can reduce the tension of working with culturally diverse coworkers.
- New hires need to consider their bosses in their career plans. Managing the boss involves the worker in a proactive, not a passive role. Workers help their leaders see the value in adapting their relationships to the particular needs of their community. Realizing that every leader is different is also a sound strategy.
- Clustering with other like-minded coworkers is good, comfortable, a kind of networking and support group. However, clustering is exclusionary and may lead to undervaluing some coworkers, cause conflict, and constrain free and open communication.

The tendency toward a multicultural workforce raises serious and difficult issues of ethics for leaders (Hart 1988). Concurrently voices are being raised suggesting that ethical diversity is a new good. These voices ignore the fact that America's values foundation was forged out of a very diverse community (Fairholm 2013). They found acceptance because of their general applicability to people from many nations and cultural backgrounds that joined together to form an American consensus, and American values set, and new American work relationships. A multidifferentiated work force compels strong leader action to set an ethical foundation for the work community. Individual ethical behavior is a function of many forces. But, in essence, individual ethics flow out of adherence to one set of shared values and the strength and scope of those values. And, the ethical standard of the work community is a function of leaders who articulate a set of values and influence coworkers to adopt them as their own (William and Clifton 2001).

References

Benhabib, S. (2002). *The claims of culture: Equality and diversity in the global era*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bloor, K. (2010). *The definitive guide to political ideologies*. Bloomington, IN: AuthorHouse.

Bordas, J. (2007). *Salsa, soul, and spirit: Leadership for a multicultural age*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Cameron, P. (1991). *Family research* (Newsletter of the Family Research Institute, Inc.). Colorado Springs, CO: The Family Research Institute.

Fairholm, G. W. (1993). *Organizational power politics: The tactics of leadership power*. New York: Praeger.

Fairholm, G. W. (2009). *Organizational power politics: Tactics of organizational leadership, 2nd edition*, ABC-CLIO, Praeger: Westport, Connecticut.

Fairholm, G. W. (2013). *Exceptional leadership: Lessons from the founding leaders*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Francis, S. (1998, April). The other face of multiculturalism. *Chronicles*, p. 33.

Harper, T. L. (2011). *Dialogues in urban and regional planning*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Hart, D. K. (1988, Spring). Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness: Organizational ethics and the founding fathers. *Exchange*, pp. 2–7.

Heywood, A. (2000). *Key concepts in politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Johnson, J. T. (2008). Indigeneity's challenges to the white settler-state: Creating a thirdspace for dynamic citizenship. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political, 33*, 29.

Leo, J. (1995, February 6). History standards are bunk. *U.S. News & World Report*.

Mansur, S. (2011). *Delectable lie: A liberal repudiation of multiculturalism*. North York, Ontario, Canada: Mantua Books.

Marsh, C. (1997). *Key concepts for understanding curriculum: Perspectives*. London: Falmer Press.

Meyer, E. J. (2010). *Gender and sexual diversity in schools: An introduction*. New York: Springer.

Mooney Cotter, A.-M. (2011). *Culture clash: An international legal perspective on ethnic discrimination*. Surrey, England: Ashgate.

Putnam, R. D. (2007). E pluribus unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century—The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize. *Scandinavian Political Studies, 30*(2), 137–174.

Rorty, R. (1989). *Contingency, irony, and solidarity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Salter, F. (2008). *On genetic interests: Family, ethnicity, and humanity in an age of mass migration*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction.

Taylor, C. (1993). Multiculturalism and the politics of recognition. In A. Gutmann, S. C. Rockefeller, M. Walzer, & S. Wolf (Eds.), *First things*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. 112 pp.

Webster, Y. O. (1997). *Against the multicultural agenda: A critical thinking alternative*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

William, M. A., & Clifton, D. O. (2001). *The 10 lenses: Your guide to living and working in a multicultural world*. Sterling, VA: Capital Books.

Politically Controlled Speech Shackles Leadership

6

Leadership remains, as it always has, basically concerned with communications (Bennis and Nanus 1985). A key leader role is in transferring values, information, facts, opinions, ideas, and their meanings. Leaders are symbol users, whether it is words, songs, diagrams, pictures, artifacts, speech, or something else. Leaders communicate meaning to their work community coworkers mostly via persuasion, not orders, instructions, or policy statements. The days when any leader could order employees to do the work and it got done are over if, indeed, this ever were the case. The interior world of the work community today is one of interdependence, not dependence; of uncertainty, not order; of negotiation, not fiat, of persuasion, not command. This kind of a world demands leaders who can motivate others, who can influence them to act, and to sway their opinions without resort to traditional authoritarian force, punishment, or compulsion (Gareau 1999). They appeal to stakeholders at the character-defining level of spirit. Persuasion, as a form of communication, is different from other forms. It implies equality, caring, and respect for the ideas and logic of the other person. It relies on the relatively bias-free use of language in logical argument. The act of leading asks leaders to communicate to change their coworker's values, their knowledge base, their logic and, thus, their behavior to conform to the leader's objectives. This task is made immeasurably more difficult by the current pressure to control and constrain language via politically correct speech.

Political correctness (PC) is a term referring to speech, practices, or policies promulgated by a leader, his or her coworkers or others intended to restructure or redirect the connotation of accepted word usage (Seigenthaler 1993). The ostensible purpose is to redress perceived or actual discrimination against or alienation of disadvantaged subgroups of workers. Subgroups or individual workers using this language intended to control work community program(s) most often reference issues including those defined by gender, race, religion, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or disability. It is used to redirect others' thinking or behavior. It intends to change others' perceptions of history, current experience, training curricular content—that is,

G.W. Fairholm, *Overcoming Workplace Pathologies,*
Management for Professionals, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-17154-8_6

the intellectual sources for both leader and led. PC also targets many other areas affected by rules, regulations, and intragroup interrelationships. In common usage, being politically correct affects leadership by twisting language to prioritize one work process, goal, or activity to the exclusion of that of the leader and the established work community members. It asks leaders and workers to think and speak about some people and some cultural phenomena in prescribed ways. That is, it proscribes truth and biases speech rather than encourage the reflection of reality especially as it relates to the role of members of a given protected class (Seigenthaler 1993; Perry 1992). A work culture that supports political correctness interferes with every aspect of the leader's communications with coworkers' roles in that it forces them to promulgate one cultural perspective often tangential to and superfluous to the work community. Most often PC requirements have no direct relevance to the specific goals and methods leaders see as essential to work success. Indeed, it complicates communication when the leader's goal is to make it simple, clear, and unmistakable.

Political correctness is defined as the conscious use of euphemisms or terms and phrases in reference to some workers that are deemed less offensive. Some see it as selective censorship; others refer to the practice as conscious sensitivity to others' feelings (Seigenthaler 1993). However defined, the main problem with politically correct thinking or speech is that it confuses kindness and courtesy with the promulgation of one prescribed mode of thinking to the point of becoming "groupthink." Such comments are intended to suppress rational dialogue and democratic conversation, to win by insult and intimidation rather than by reason, experience, or fact. It can strip leaders—all coworkers—of their real, honest opinions (Schultz 1993). It introduces caution and reticence into workplace conversation when directness and clarity are demanded. In causing that reluctance, political correctness constrains leaders' relationship-building efforts. It confuses the values leaders have set by adding arbitrary others—often without a direct or indirect relationships to the actual work of the work community. And it complicates leaders' efforts to define an encompassing meaning for the joint work done.

In the context of leadership, politically correct language is a weapon some coworkers—or others—uses to punish recalcitrance. They use PC to advance their social agenda. It is used initially often to justify the need for change. It reflects the relative success some workers have attained in altering society to their point of view. Similarly leaders can use PC in similar ways and for similar results to move forward their leadership agenda of building unity, trust, and forming coworkers into a viable, effective, and coordinated work community. PC is a basis for arguing for language reform as a strategy in the larger goal of leader–worker relationships by either actor. The communication modes used by coworkers reflect the work culture's values and is one of the principle measures of communication between members of a work group. We use language to interact with one another. In doing so the language used by participants cements the individual's place in the work community. That placement carries with it a ranked social status and a distinct grant of power. The kind and nature of the language used strengthens or weakens a worker or subgroup's power vis-a-vis coworkers. It can also be used to weaken others' power in the group.

Language is used by subgroups that enjoy the privileges of power to solidify and legitimize their own value system by labeling others as somehow irregular or inferior (Perry 1992).

As these reforms take hold the new sensitivity in language may potentially reflect a better society. But the reverse is also true (Seigenthaler 1993). Political correctness also means the alteration of one's choice of words in order to avoid either offending individuals or a subgroup of people or reinforcing a stereotype considered to be disadvantageous to a subgroup by, often unknown, others. On balance, political correctness degrades freedom of speech. George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* famously incorporated the notion of limiting thought through a new language: "Newspeak" (Cole and Scribner 1974). That has been the net result of political correctness—introduction of new coined words, redefinition of other words, and making being offended by someone a cause to alter the work community's norms and customary patterns of interrelationships.

American universities began imposing political correctness to prevent recognition of differences among gender, religion, belief systems, sexual orientation, and nationality beginning in the 1960s with the feminist movement. Feminists began to demand that the neutral pronouns "he," "him." and "his" be replaced with expressions like "he or she," "him or her" among other changes in grammar—even though many of these changes were grammatically incorrect and confused understanding. For example, the term mankind is said to be exclusive, misleading, and biased when it is employed to refer to both men and women. So they substitute "humankind." The politically correct fail to understand that language is the result of an evolved social process that corresponds to a systemic order achieved without the use of a deliberate overall plan. Language simply arises out of accidents, experiences, and historical borrowings and corruptions of other languages. No one intended to exclude women when generic terms like "he" or "mankind" were used. With respect to human beings, the male gender was used to denote the species. Using "he or she" or "him or her" simply clutters and confuses the language and conveys no further information. However, such use was made to imply that those who use the masculine terms hold hostile or exclusionary thoughts toward women. This adds to the leader's problems as some work community members come to believe that every use of generic male terms is evidence of male antagonism toward women when, in fact, such usage most often merely avoids awkward phrases and tangled language.

Further, feminists and now many others argued that no one would be able to understand that the masculine gender included the feminine gender in neutral contexts. The fact is that this was likely just part of a campaign to redefine the social roles traditionally associated with masculinity and femininity. In science, political correctness punishes anyone who criticizes the theory of evolution, the theory of relativity, or liberal dogma about global warming (Perry 1992).

Political correctness today is the result of many converging factors. The Sapir–Whorf hypothesis provided a theoretical basis for linking language with social structures—including work groups—for the feminist and civil rights movements in which these disadvantaged groups were struggling on several fronts for more power, Sapir and Whorf's work made language another viable front to attempt such changes

(Cole and Scribner 1974). As Stimpson (1991, p. 106) points out, this trend toward "opening up" our society to diversity of all kinds has continued and the language reform movement, designed to aid this social change, has developed concurrently. The impact PC has had and still has on work community behavior is significant. Put succinctly, Betsy Warland defines PC's impact in these words: "If we change language, we change everything" (Betsy Warland quoted in Beard and Cerf 1993).

It is evident that many of the motives underlying "politically correct" speech reform are laudable. Language should change to eliminate racist, sexist, classist, ageist, etc. pejoratives (Lingeman 1992, p. 405). But, the operational facts belie this goal. Politically correct speech has done more to obfuscate and confuse debate about such things than it has done to eliminate it. It has worked to the advantage of neither advocates of unity in the workplace nor those that opt for difference as a trigger to creativity. Leaders are caught in the middle of this debate and have to cope with confusing and inaccurate use of language to filter out bias and find a truth around which both leader and led can work together to attain work community ends. It is difficult and inappropriate to draw general conclusions about the overall effectiveness of the politically correct movement. But it does reinforce the fact of the power of language to affect behavior, Language matters. Language hurts. The language we use affects our views and our attitudes. Leaders know this—as intuitively—do most everyone else. But they use language to build unity and cooperation and to increase interactive loyalty. Language use is at the heart of the leader's work in forming viable work relationships. It is vital in forming clear and concise statements of values, methods, and goals that workers should jointly seek. It is central to their teaching–coaching role. It is also central to their ability to inspire others—along with modeling correct behavior. Finally language is essential in building a work culture where leader and coworkers trust each other enough to work together in harmony. These tasks are continuing since coworkers, customers, clients, and citizens also use language to push their individual agendas. Leaders are in constant tension with all parts of their work community who are continually pushing a directed and personal agenda—and perhaps a work community as well.

6.1 Issues Connected with Leadership When PC Is Part of the Workplace

On the surface politically correct speech is an outgrowth of overconcern with multiple cultures in the workplace; this time focusing on limiting language. The overall purpose is to protect some subgroups of workers at the expense of others especially the dominant cultural group. It is not a particularly useful leadership tool. Indeed, it more often limits the spiritual leader's ability to develop unity since it pits some coworkers against others. Significantly, the literature discussing politically correct speech largely ignores the costs of uncontrolled enthusiasm in this regard. For present purposes, key costs are in the very capacity of leaders to lead because it hampers

their work in building effective work relationships. It confuses work community values setting. Leaders use words to teach coworkers values, methods, and goals. They use words to inspire coworkers toward success in their joint work. They use language as they encourage workers to become co-leaders with them in moving the work community forward. And they use language to transfer meaning by building a trusting work culture. Accomplishing these essential leadership tasks while simultaneously limiting the range of their communication via politically correct speech is mutually incompatible.

Using language intended for one purpose to accomplish another wastes effort and does not help build the cooperation, loyalty, or harmony essential to effective leadership. This situation raises issues that leaders must deal with as they lead their work community such as the following:

- Politically correct views all derive from anti-Western, secular ideologies such as anti-capitalism, anti-imperialism, utilitarianism, feminism, multiculturalism, and environmentalism. These all share the aim of profoundly altering the established order in Western industrialized nations—all essential aspects of modern economic progress. Introducing PC into this work situation challenges the context of Western traditions—traditions that have combined to build America into the only economic superpower in the world. That status has already been jeopardized as politically correct speech has defused the economic focus in America. It undercuts uniquely American leadership traditions.
- Politically correct speech has altered the definition of success in work communities in ways that produce unwanted and unintended consequences. PC has redefined work relationships such that any individual worker or subgroup that has power can never be offended or hurt because they themselves dispense offense and hurt. At the same time they have "protected" so-called "powerless" workers so they can never be other than victims. The leader's job of building harmony in such a bifurcated work community is made immeasurably more difficult because of PC.
- Using politically correct language by some workers tends to homogenize language and thought to enhance the self-esteem of minorities, women, and others by making them protected classes toward which only certain behaviors and words are acceptable. Workers not in a given protected class receive other—often lesser—treatment.
- Politically correct language eliminates disparaging, discriminatory, or offensive words and phrases. But they substitute harmless vocabulary at the expense of the unvarnished truth, clarity, and logic. PC makes understanding more difficult to obtain. Leader effort to teach and inspire coworkers is thus made more difficult.
- Politically correct language narrows the range of acceptable opinions available to the leader and to coworkers as they search for solutions to shared problems. PC is aimed, often successful, to coerce the majority to accept the opinions of the enforcing subgroup by suppressing any contrary opinion and making independent

behavior unacceptable. This allows the enforcing worker(s) to avoid anticipated consequences of open discussion, or of making facts known which may damage their status, power, or ego position.

- While purportedly a program to help disadvantaged minorities or women, PC generally has a practical motivation. It wants something of value (money, jobs, special privileges, status) to which it has a weak claim vis-à-vis other work community members. Leaders and workers who use PC attempt to enforce their claim by ruling any disagreement outside the bounds of "acceptable" work group or professional discourse. Actually PC is unnecessary when the claim advocated is self-evidently strong. It is useful when it is seen as the only means of getting a week claim accepted.
- Politically correct language also comes with an admixture of moral indignation. It removes the issue from the ordinary give-and-take of rational discussion or the normal problem-solving process by injecting intense emotion. Politically correct language uses words with strong connotations, such as "discrimination" and "racism," or evokes ancient wrongs in order to associate any disagreement with these past abuses. Some PC users resort to labeling and name-calling to denigrate coworkers when their arguments are weak or absent—or as an initial strategy to immediately bias the discussion.
- Some workers justify PC on the theory that if members of a certain subgroup aren't, on average, doing well at work this must be the consequence of discrimination. Given this "judgement," they push to remedy this "lack" by some affirmative program. This action forces leaders' to treat some workers more advantageously than they otherwise would have earned by their individual effort. Failing this response, leaders are subjected to being labeled detractors or biased. The consequence for leaders—or subgroups within the work community—is to accept the name-calling or decide that the supposed imbalance is not significant enough or conclude that that is just the way the world happens to be.

Politically correct language can be found any time workers are afraid of or disagree with the consequences of an idea or a fact, and use social pressure to suppress discussion. The intensity of their reaction is usually an indication that they know or worry that the objectionable opinion is valid, but that they are invested (emotionally or literally) in its falsity. Politically correct language supplies a language through which it is easy for a worker to be a victim. And there always is someone or something that can be blamed. Terms like "culturally deprived," "developmentally challenged," and others exemplify this point. Politically correct language involves a lot of workers attempting to explain the reasons for their lack of success. These victim-type explanations generally include the idea that a worker is having a rough time because of his or her particular past record, ethnicity, or gender—or other unique characteristics, attitudes, background, or desires. Leaders can resist politically correct language by insisting on free, open and public discussion of even the most sensitive interpersonal relationship issues. The more it makes some people uncomfortable, the more important it is. A healthy work environment requires a free marketplace of ideas (Kapsidelis 2014).

6.2 Pathologies Introduced into Leadership due to Political Correctness

As noted, politically correct speech is not all positive. The directed use of language to control discussion oftentimes creates artificial barriers—instead of opens doors—for minorities and women as well as the majority in today's work community cultures. This kind of speech hinders leaders form full application of their values and technical leadership skills in the work community. The leader's expertise cannot be fully utilized in the work community when coworkers with an agenda try to operate from a different values base. When this happens obstructions to the leader's ability to lead occur that often rise to the level of organizational pathologies. This pathological behavior invariably diverts worker and leader energies, skills, and expertise away from accomplishing their shared purposes. Politically correct language routinely moves the work community toward the PC worker's ideas and desired outcomes and methods—not to preset, shared work methods and outcomes. That is to say, PC often results in waste!

6.2.1 PC Challenges Traditional Cultural Orthodoxy

Politically correct language is a tool used by some coworkers as part of a program to completely restructure American life. Advocates conclude that traditional beliefs have to be destroyed and then replaced with new thinking. They develop new ways to redirect language to their ends and make it as much a part of routine behavior as the old way of thinking and speaking had been (Seigenthaler 1993). Strongly influenced by revolutionary ideas, among them those of Marcuse (1987), PC ideas took hold in the tumultuous 1960s, A member of the Frankfurt School which rejected basic Western concepts, Marcuse embraced sexual liberation, and the merits of feminist and black revolution. The objectives of these radicals were clear: to foment a cultural revolution—this movement was and is directed toward the whole cultural establishment, including individual and group morality. Evident in the workplace now is the perceived—whether correct or not—rising intolerance shown by some PC advocates towards the speech of others who dislike or resist these attempts to introduce PC. Johnson (1992, pp. 44–46) notes that the most evil form of intolerance is correctness because it comes disguised as tolerance." Seigenthaler (1993) expresses a similar concern that enforcing politically correct speech (as happens on college campuses as well as in the workplace) is offensive to free speech liberties. It argues against traditional concepts that the work culture should foster an open marketplace of ideas.

Leadership as an essential part of all relationships comes out of the centuries-long evolution of the American economic system that began with the founding leaders (Fairholm 2013). It is inextricably tied to founding American values and traditions of equality independence, community, and freedom—freedom of speech being an essential part of this cultural evolution. Leaders cannot grapple with the real problems of prejudice, inequality, and powerlessness within the work

community without honest, open dialogue, however messy and hurtful it may at times be. Politically correct language limits certain ideas, specific words and phrases or certain kinds of speech and adds new words and phrases. The net effect of these changes is to discriminate between workers, give advantage to some and disadvantage to the rest. Rather than encourage compatibility this effort instead drives a wedge between leaders and led. It impedes real progress toward unity and shared purpose. Unless the leader—and every stakeholder—has free reign to use language to further his or her agenda, work community success is threatened. The work community is weakened when other forces dictate who is benefited and who is restricted based, not on work toward the leader's preset goals, but upon peripheral factors of ethnicity, gender, or sexual preference. None of these factors need have a direct effect on work performance.

6.2.2 PC Is Intolerant of Some as It Favors Other Workers

Contemporary use of PC by workers or subgroups often present their beliefs as merely a commitment to being sensitive to other people and embracing values such as tolerance and diversity. They base the efficacy of politically correct language on the idea that all human behavior is a result of culture (not ethnicity, heredity, or sex) and is thus malleable. The reality is less sanguine. Politically correct language is the use of culture as a sharp weapon to enforce new norms and to stigmatize those who dissent from the new dispensation (Seigenthaler 1993). It defames those who insist on retaining American values that impede the new PC regime: free speech and free and objective intellectual inquiry. Unity, trust, loyalty, and core ethics are placed in jeopardy when arbitrary policies are imposed that disparage and label workers granting esteem to some and not to others based on factors unrelated to the work. Fortunately from the perspective of leadership and cooperative work relationships a consensus is arising to the effect that politically correct language may have gone too far. Increasingly there is emerging a call for a sense of balance in promoting language reform. Society is slow to change, but there are definite signs that the clear lines formerly placing Politically correct language in the mainstream of work cultural dynamics are now being redrawn (Seigenthaler 1993; Fialkoff 1993; Lingeman 1992; Stimpson 1991). Causes of this include: (1) court challenges, (2) cogent challenges within the academic community, and (3) as a result of the impracticality and unworkability of some of the codes.

One primary cause for its reduced effectiveness is the fact that it is obviously of limited use in solving society's ills. Its application in the workplace shows no signs of increasing productivity or increased worker satisfaction. Stimpson (1991) predicts that this multicultural tool will lose its impact even though many cultural differences will persist. Lingeman (1992) agrees that inventing slick substitutes for real workplace maladies will not change the underlying relationships between coworkers. Indeed they might exacerbate them and, worse, subject them to ridicule (Fialkoff 1993). We need to use language that is more sensitive without enforcing a strident orthodoxy. Leadership functions form a base of clear, authentic interactive

communications between the boss and all stakeholders. When this straight forward information transfer is jeopardized in any way, it risks the leader's success and that of the entire work community. Politically correct language exacerbates confusion, adds unnecessary symbolic non-work-related meaning to ordinary information exchanges. At best it slows the movement of information to needed individuals. At worst it engenders distrust and adds waste into the relationships leaders have with followers. Neither effective work interrelationships nor full acceptance of unit goals and methodologies are enhanced by PC. Indeed it hampers these essential features of healthy organizations. It also limits leaders' efforts to teach and inspire and form a culture compatible with effective work effort.

6.2.3 PC Unfairly Controls Speech

Political correctness is an attack on free speech. Politically correct language is a tool used by one person or subgroup of a work community to shut down decent from anyone who disagrees with them. In this event speech becomes another battlefield in the always potential conflict between cliques or subgroups against each other or in opposition to the leader. Labeling some phrases or words—with their unique connotations—as unacceptable can drastically limit debate and serves to isolate workers who use that word or phrase. PC complicates in these ways the leader's ability to form work relationships and focus them toward preset outcomes. It narrows the field of conversation and the subjects for debate. And as it is allowed to continue divides the work community into factions and hampers the leader's job of creating a shared-values unified work team.

There is an unconcealed arrogance involved when one person challenges another person's right to use certain words or phrases in a free country; where one of our basic rights is the right to free speech. Of course the dignity of others should be considered in all interpersonal relationships. But good manners are not the foundation for denying another of their right to say what they want in the manner that best suits their purposes. If the hearer objects they have ways to end the interaction. Resorting to denial of founding rights to others is taking their objections too far. This kind of language can easily degenerate further into name-calling—a sure way to isolate one faction form another or one person from the work community. Name-calling introduces a totally unnecessary element of emotion into discussion that shuts off dialogue. Name-calling builds walls between people! Overall we have seen a skyrocketing increase in rude and uncivil behavior because there are no consequences for such conduct anymore.

Leaders have the sometimes difficult task monitoring not only work effort but the kinds of language coworker's use in everyday interaction with stakeholders. The leadership job is to ensure that language used is consistent in at least the following ways. Language should (1) not favor one faction of the work community over another. It (2) should not infringe on any person or small cluster of individuals' rights to free expression in their work. Nor should it (3) interfere with the peaceful relationships of any subgroup with those from other groups; and (4) it should not

hinder the work community in its attempts to protect cultural, social, economic, and other minorities whose views are equally valid and who have the "right" to equal opportunity, integrity, and point of view. Finally PC should not (5) promote stereotypes of any kind.

6.2.4 PC Damages Leadership Skills Usage

Politically correct language advocates appear to intend that none of the speaker's actions or words anger anyone. Use of politically correct speech in the workplace may be one of the causes of the recent loss of favor of leadership per se as our society's moral compass weakens. Needed is a commitment to civility, rooted in respect for universal human dignity. Our core values and our trust of others and in what is right and what is wrong is being destroyed by politically correct language both in leaders and in their coworkers. Leader and led alike must honor their passion for the common good defined by inclusion of the most vulnerable and a firm belief in institutional shared values like freedom and pluralism for the benefit of everyone in the work community. Leadership is not merely a function of position. It is about individuality that stands above the rest and illustrates qualities of character that include competence and skill in working with others. It speaks of the individual who has the courage and strength to make decisions—whether right or wrong—designed to improve the wellbeing of all workers and not just some special favorites. Engaging in PC behavior risks that leaders will compromise their effectiveness and honor. Honor is based on reputation and when people stop caring about their reputation and shame disappears, people devolve into doing—and being—the least they can without getting into legal trouble or getting fired. This leads to mediocrity, corruption, and incompetence. Politically correct speech makes it easy to avoid answering hard questions with truthful answers. It lets the leader avoid confrontations and make compromises rather than pursue difficult solutions. Being politically correct requires that the boss become one-of-the-group rather than its designated head. Leadership skills suffer as leaders defer or avoid decisions causing performance to slack. PC shuts down creativity and creates conflict among those who look to the leader to give them the intellectual tools and emotional support to be the best their innate talent lets them be. Politically correct language closes off opportunity for full coworker participation. Coworker active involvement in problem-solving is hampered as politically correct speech increases. Fewer workers volunteer possible solutions to work community needs. Workers lose confidence in the leader's decision making capacity and his or her ability to help them with matters important to them. PC sends a silent message that could very well mean that asking for help or assistance in matters is ridiculous or unwarranted. Being PC is another way of not dealing with people. Being PC reduces these leadership qualities and hampers creativity, involvement, risk-taking, and harmony. It limits overall work community productivity, performance, and growth.

6.2.5 PC Facilitates Lackadaisicalness

Politically correct speech limits open communication and dampers effective spiritual leadership but, for the casual leader it can be an excuse to ease the pressures to excel. The reason is that when lazy leaders embrace having a politically correct mindset coming from an erroneous concept of how to pursue status and advancement of individual goals and from ambition to climb the career ladder. Some are of the opinion that to create winners, losers must exist. And some leaders do not hesitate to deal wrongly with others during the course of their climb. In the face of conflict, dissension, threats, or controversy, these leaders tend to default to denial, justification, and/or rationalization. Leaders that do not want to create an issue hide in the safety of the majority and coast along without making waves instead of taking the risk of being innovative, willing to disrupt the status quo, or be bold, controversial, and speak truth to power (Wildavsky 1984). As society has become more complex and anonymous and the bonds of honor have dissolved we have had to rely on obedience rules and regulations to govern people's behavior.

The ability to let the facts and/or the truth surrounding a particular matter rise above the rhetoric and guide their actions rather than to blindly adopt an attitude of politically correct language is the mark of an honorable leader. These leaders keep themselves informed of what is going on within the work community and are skillful at recognizing times and events where stress will most likely occur. They take action to resolve issues before they become major problems. These leaders are not politically correct but are politically savvy as they put office politics and peer pressure aside so as to not making choices based upon just majority opinion. Rather they benchmark decisions against the question of is it the right thing to do? These leaders embrace office politics and deal with it frontally (Fairholm 2009). They balance the demands of all workers and develop strategies to convert internal and external adversaries into allies by recognizing the importance of human dynamics in organizational power-politics.

6.2.6 PC as Groupthink

Today to be seen as politically correct is sometimes more valuable a trait than being technically competent, honest, or trustworthy. In some offices, but especially on some college campuses, seeking higher standards of human accomplishments is no longer valued as highly as politically correct thinking (Nilson 1997). Academic freedom through free speech is accompanied by high social costs on campuses where truth is viewed as nothing more than different perspectives being offered by different groups in order to promote their own interests. Unfortunately, it is also the case in work communities across business and industry. Biased speech no matter the source restricts everyone's thinking. The focus is not so much on content as on being nonsexist, peace-centered, and politically correct. Thus some workers alter their vocabularies in order not to offend particular coworkers or cliques. And, some leaders adopt affirmative action in hiring, foster diversity in hiring and schedule

"tolerance training." Many work communities now require workshops in which workers are taught by "experts" how to be attuned to others' feelings and how to avoid being found guilty of such things as "sexual harassment," or "racial insensitivity." The government has also entered this arena of language reaction and in essence, eliminated most free speech protection in the workplace. Politically correct language threatens workers' free speech in government, business, and academic spheres and ultimately the very foundation of Western-world economic vitality. Restrictions on what workers can say and how they say it have been imposed to control debate and silence opposition (Atkinson 2013).

6.3 Ways the Leader Can Counter Politically Correct Speech

Like multiculturalism, the prevalence of politically correct speech is a major obstacle leaders face in leading their coworkers today. It pits worker against worker in the work community by altering language to focus power on a few and limiting the speech of the rest. Politically correct language uses language as a weapon, to augment the power of some workers and to diminish the power of the relatively powerless—although the reverse is often argued by PC advocates (Atkinson 2013). Leaders can counter this as they use power as intended—as a tool to communicate with and understand each other and to build mutual capacity. Allowing full use of language to enhance sensitivity and understanding lets leaders unleash the capacity and talent of each coworker. It mutes the repressiveness of forced and arbitrary language used to delimit meaning. Instead it directs thinking and action into broader paths. This kind of language reform—or restoration—is a primary and vital technique effective leaders can use to counter PC (Seigenthaler 1993).

Following are other simple, but generally applicable actions leaders can take in countering the disunity politically correct speech engenders. While the following ideas do not eliminate PC they provide opportunity for the leader to build a cohesive unity in the work community. These actions may even reduce the negative impact PC has had in compartmentalizing the larger ambient society into factional groupings that hinder overall cooperative action rather than enhance it.

- Lingeman (1992) calls for the use of humor in fighting against PC. Humor has always been effective in breaking down barriers between people. Humor can effectively highlight the overindulgences of PC speech. Use of humor points out the need for a more balanced approach in using language.
- One way leaders can counter the impact of politically correct language is learning to respect all coworkers. As leaders come to prize the person and the capacities of each coworker the negative impact of "labeling" language is muted (Bennis and Nanus 1985). Mutual respect in interaction is critical to success.
- Leaders in culturally diverse situations have the task of molding diverse workers' sundry values and customs into a new (different) culture, one that asks members to trust each other and cooperate according to specific work values as a high priority. As this technique succeeds, the need for PC becomes meaningless (Crosby 1996).

- A known and attractive future vision builds unity, trust, and can inspire coworkers. The leader's role is to lead the work community and to coordinate the actions of willing followers. In doing this leaders need to insure that every employee is working toward the same goals in ways that are conducive to their accomplishment. Politically correct language complicates this task; it does not eliminate it!
- Leaders integrate a wide variety of internal and external forces and operating systems to be effective. In doing this a key task is to develop interpersonal trust. This is fundamentally a task of maintaining interpersonal integrity over time individually with each coworker. The work community's system of communications is basic here. As leaders emphasize shared values and goals in every word and deed, they can mute the negative impact of PC. When leaders translate verbal and written materials into understandable values, purposes, policies, and procedures, they are managing a culture as well as the technical information flow system. Unless workers perceive the information flowing to them as consistent, appropriate, useful, and "right" for them, the mechanical process of passing information to them will be sterile and useless and trust will be lost.
- Increasingly dissimilar people are entering the workforce and demanding different treatment. But there are some underlying unifying forces also at work. Leaders create a common ambient culture based on shared ideas developed and matured in Western European tradition upon which to found their work community relationships. Our historical traditions are Roman and Greek and English. Our ethics come from America's Judeo-Christian past. Our aesthetic ideals come from a variety of places: Shakespeare, the Dutch masters, and the classical musicians. American culture is not strictly speaking any ethnic group's culture. It is a uniquely American culture. It is not anyone's culture, biologically. It is not a black culture, biologically; nor is it Latin. Nor is it a Native American culture. It is not the culture of past immigrants from Western European nations. It is an amalgam of these sources and much, much more. Leaders can use these facts about our culture in shaping their work community's culture along with new ideas and values systems. But the old, core values have a bonding influence upon which a specific work community culture can be formed, one which counters PC's tendencies toward fragmentation and factionalism.
- Politically correct language advocates reject any idea that any culture is better in any way than another. The effect of this mindset is to accept all people's values and their resultant behavior, whether or not they thwart needed productivity. The unbiased facts lead to an opposite conclusion: PC leads to organizational dissolution. Leadership, on the other hand is an integrative activity that proposes one value system, one cultural surround, around which many people can gather to accomplish socially useful results.
- Critics of PC argue that politically correct language is censorship and endangers free speech by limiting what is considered acceptable public discourse. They say that politically correct terms are awkward euphemisms for truer, original, stark language. That it marginalizes certain words, phrases, actions or attitudes through the instrumentation of public disesteem. Leaders note these criticisms and install in their language—both oral and written—patterns of communication that clarify rather than obfuscate meaning.

On balance politically correct language is a narrowing of the range of acceptable opinions held by a work group. It is an attempt, often successful, to coerce the majority to accept the opinions of the enforcing individual or subgroup by suppressing any contrary opinion and making independent thought difficult, frustrating, and unacceptable. The enforcing subgroup may be afraid of the consequences of open discussion, or of making the facts known. But, typically, it has a practical motivation: it wants something of value (money, jobs, special privileges, status) to which it has at best only an average—or a weak—claim. So it attempts to enforce its desires by ruling any disagreement from it outside the bounds of acceptable discourse. Politically correct language also comes with an admixture of moral indignation. The leader must aggressively counter the impacts of PC or risk loss of unity and cohesiveness in the work community and failure in attaining—or even of generalizing—in the work community share goals and ways of doing work. PC and real leadership are antithetical.

References

Atkinson, P. (2013, September 25). *A study of our decline*. Self-published.

Beard, H., & Cerf, C. (1993). *The official politically correct dictionary and handbook*. New York: Villard Books.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper and Row.

Cole, M., & Scribner, S. (1974). *Culture and thought: A psychological introduction*. New York: Wiley.

Crosby, Philip B. (1996). *Quality is Free*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fairholm, G. W. (2009). *Organizational power politics* (2nd ed.). New York: Praeger.

Fairholm, G. W. (2013). *Exceptional leadership: Lessons from the founding leaders*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Fialkoff, F. (1993). The word police. *Library Journal, 118*, 90.

Gareau, B. H. (1999). Driving change: Up the organization. *Hospital Materiel Management Quarterly, 21*(1), 59–65.

Johnson, J. (1992). Literature, political correctness and cultural equity. *English Today: The International Review of the English Language, 8*(2), 44–47.

Kapsidelis, K. (2014, April 16). *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, Richmond, VA. Cultural Challenges; Page B5.

Lingeman, R. (1992). The devil's dictionaries. *Nation, 255*, 404–406.

Marcuse, H. (1987). *Eros and civilization* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Nilson, A. P. (1997). *Sexism and language*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Perry, R. (1992). A short history of the term 'politically correct'. In P. Aufderheide (Ed.), *Beyond PC: Toward a politics of understanding*. Saint Paul, MN: Graywolf Press.

Schultz, D. L. (1993). *To reclaim a legacy of diversity: Analyzing the 'political correctness' debates in higher education*. New York: National Council for Research on Women.

Seigenthaler, J. (1993). Politically correct speech: An oxymoron. *Editor & Publisher, 126*, 38, 48.

Stimpson, C. R. (1991). *Presidential address 1990: On differences* (p. 106). New York: Modern Language Association of America.

Wildavsky, A. (1984). *The nursing father: Moses as a political leader*. Birmingham, England: University of Alabama Press.

Tolerance

7

Words have meaning. Words are symbols of our thoughts, ideas, and our character—both individually or as groups. We communicate ourselves, our values, and our aspirations through words along with a specific message intended in a given communication interchange. Indeed, the specific message words convey is often only incidental to the larger, more generic, and more powerful ideas loaded into certain words. These words have come to symbolize powerful cultural ideas that succinctly define what it is to be American—a citizen and a worker. Words—especially certain words like tolerance—leave an intellectual trail that captures a worker's cultural history and shapes his or her present and future actions. Leadership in America continues practices extending back over more than 200 years of our history. Operationally, intellectually, and emotionally who we are as workers and how we do leadership in this nation is traceable to founding values and ideals immortalized in a relatively few words. These words and the historical "loading" our heritage has instilled in them provide the foundation for our individual self-perception and the character of our leadership. They give life to the leader's words and meaning to their actions beyond the obvious.

In America's history these character-shaping words include: Liberty and Freedom and Independence and Equality and Opportunity and Happiness and Justice and Tolerance. Individually they describe Americans' values and ideals. Applied to the workplace they encompass a uniquely American work culture—one that is the envy of the world and the foundation of America's exceptionalism individually and economically (Fairholm 2013). In this age of electronics and digital databases it is easy to think that whatever information or ideas or values or ideals words might convey in formal discourse are just there "in the moment." That they are articulated to meet present needs and then can be discarded in favor of other words or other contexts as our culture changes. This is wrong. They have gravitas and support a uniquely American work culture. These core culture-bearing words that have defined and sustained American greatness are being usurped by those pushing for a new definition of American work life. They are recasting these words and the ideas they

G.W. Fairholm, *Overcoming Workplace Pathologies*,
Management for Professionals, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-17154-8_7

symbolize while maintaining the fiction that they are being used fully in line with past practice. Leaders and worker, or small subgroups of workers, and other stakeholders are changing them to use for their personal or groups' purposes while touting their extreme ideas as fully consistent with American economic traditions. They ignore the feelings, and emotions, the intellect and wisdom, that gave rise to these value-loaded words and their implied principles of action generations ago and still give them current vitality.

Words—and the ideals they symbolize—determine our thoughts, define what we prize, and direct our actions. Too often a few workers fail to prize the underlying ideals that those words only inadequately symbolize. When in fact the words, values, and ideas we use have a narrative that adds meaning, emotion, and intent to our communications. This is true about all of human activity—including leadership in our largest economic organizations and in the smallest work community. Leaders in all parts of the workplace use the words that shaped America to engage in dialogue with coworkers to form and reform work relationships to benefit both them and individual coworkers and their joint activities. That is to say leaders once used these culture-bearing words to do that. Today they are being redefined to justify a fundamental restructuring of American—Western—work cultures. Some in the work community are using these culture-bearing words now in routine work contexts but with entirely new meanings. One result is that they are subject to misperception and misunderstanding and deliberate misrepresentation to serve other than work-related ends.

Individual workers (or subgroups of the work community) have consciously redefined these words to purposely misdirect coworkers and their leaders. In the workplace this obfuscation threatens the leader's attempt to build cohesion and focus effort toward preset outcomes (Oaks 2011). This is a critical and dangerous movement toward disorder rather than order. It endangers the operational foundation of work community members and, indeed, the larger community of customers, suppliers, and other stakeholders. It tends all involved to view these core indicators of appropriate organized action toward moral relativism, That is, they are trying to influence workers that there is no absolute right and wrong—that all authority and all rules of behavior are choices that can prevail over the leader's values, rules, and procedures and over customary and traditional work practices. This relativist philosophy—holding that each person is free to choose for him or herself what is right and wrong—is becoming de facto dogma in America—and elsewhere. It challenges the leader's capacity to lead and ultimately the idea of organization itself.

A strong case can be made about the efforts to redefine each of the culture-bearing words being made in the workplace. Since the arguments for changing each of these words overlap, only one—Tolerance—will suffice here to make the intended point.

7.1 Areas Where Leadership and the Idea of Tolerance Intersect

Perhaps one of the most deceptive redefinitions of foundational values and American ideals is the idea of tolerance for difference in others. Tolerance for others' differences is a traditional and fundamental quality of effective leaders and

workers—indeed for all people. Tolerance defined traditionally describes the idea of sensitivity to others' differences (The American Heritage Dictionary 1994) and as such is a useful and often-used leadership tool. Formerly its de facto definition included the idea of equal freedom of expression, initially not only in religious matters but also in professional realms. As applied to the work community being tolerant allowed the leader to obtain the best contributions of time, talent, and skill from each coworker.

Intellectually—and over time—tolerance has advanced through several definitions. Walsham (2006, p. 233) notes that our present understanding of the word "toleration" may be very different from its historic meaning. Today tolerance is most often seen as a component of a laissez-faire worldview about human rights. *Now the idea is that a*s long as no one is harmed or their fundamental rights are not violated, work community members should tolerate what most of its members may find disgusting, disgraceful, or even degrading. John Rawls, Robert Nozick, Brian Barry, and Will Kymlicka, among others advocate this perspective in varying degrees (see Oberdiek 2001, p. vi). Rawls' theory of liberalism conceives of toleration as a pragmatic response to the fact of diversity. Diverse groups learn to tolerate one another by developing what Rawls calls "overlapping consensus." He (1971, p. 216) defines this as the idea that individuals and groups with diverse metaphysical views will find reasons to agree about certain principles of justice that will include principles of toleration. Toleration continues to retain this meaning but only insofar as the persons to whom this word is directed *agrees* with the ideology of the speaker. To all others the *opposite* is true. That is, tolerance has come to mean acceptance of the point of view of some workers in the work community—be it a coworker or a subgroup, or an outside person or group. Workers with other views are seen as intolerant—i.e., close-minded to these "new" or different ideas. This current iteration of tolerance flows from the unwillingness of some workers to accept contrary opinions or beliefs. They are impatient of dissent or opposition and deny or refuse the right of choice or alternative opinion in others. And when thwarted they are inclined to persecute or suppress dissent. Thus, today so-called tolerant people are broad-minded, liberal open-minded, and progressive but only about certain points of view. Those who disagree with them are dogmatic, reactionary, opinionated, small-minded, and anachronistic.

As modern transportation and communication have brought all workers into closer proximity to different peoples and different ideas, there is greater need for tolerance defined traditionally. Traditionally tolerance is defined not just agreeing with one another, but rather showing respect for the essential humanity in every person (Ury 1999, p. 127). In the modern workplace the greater exposure to diversity both enriches worker's lives and complicates them. Workers are enriched by associations with different peoples. But diversity in values also challenges leaders to identify what can be embraced as consistent within the work culture and values they create and what cannot be. Unrestrained diversity increases the potential for intracommunity conflict and requires leaders to be more thoughtful about the nature of tolerance as it plays out in day-to-day work situations. These are harder questions for those who affirm the former definition of tolerance in social intercourse than for those who believe that the idea of tolerance is a part of moral relativism. The weaker

the individual's hold on America's defining values and the fewer their moral absolutes, the fewer the occasions when the ideas or practices of others will confront them with the challenge to be truly tolerant. For example, a relativist worker has no need to decide the kinds of occasions when total clarity can be tolerated or when obfuscation should be confronted. Workers who don't believe in inflexibility in moral matters can see themselves as the most tolerant worker in the work community. For them, almost anything goes. This belief system can abide almost any behavior and almost any coworker—whether or not it advances the joint goals of the workgroup. Unfortunately some who believe in the new tolerance have difficulty tolerating those who insist on the old definitions and resort to intolerance, even denigration of those workers.

The leader coping with the new definition of tolerance faces several challenges (Oaks 2011). Being true to the ideal of leadership of others, true leaders recognize and treat all coworkers in the work community equally as colleagues. This commitment is at the core of their relationships. If they are successful in their leadership they also internalize this point of view and simultaneously find ways to treat each coworker fairly—not necessarily equally because each worker is different and has different needs. In this way they build unity out of the disparate cluster of workers—a task of teambuilding building on the various talents of each worker. Unfortunately, given the new definition of tolerance, leaders need to work harder to build mutual respect, and traditional tolerance one for another in the face of the arbitrary philosophies which today's activist workers espouse, Leadership is not easy—perhaps it is the most difficult of all of the roles operating in any work community today. Nevertheless the leader's task is to build unity from diversity and to accept individual differences as part of the "raw material" of work community cohesion. That is the central role leaders accept as leaders. In this situation leaders are asked to condition their need to tolerate differences only as they agree with the diatribes of others complicates this task sometimes to impossibility.

In doing leadership the leader will sometimes need to modify existing work rules and regulations that otherwise might impair their ability to fully practice leadership. The key point is that in doing so they need to rely on their innate values and convictions and not on arbitrary and changing dicta espoused by others. They must act in concert with their convictions of what is the right thing to do even when many others advocate alternative behavior in their work-related interpersonal relationships (Rassbach 2011, p. A11). As they deal with the idea of tolerance defined traditionally they counter the tendency toward fragmentation seen in many work situations where relativist definitions of tolerance are allowed to flourish unrestrained. Acting this way is one way that leaders gain and hold the coworker respect they need for success.

Of course, leaders need to lead from a foundation of authenticity. Workers need to know their bosses value and their contributions to the work community. They need to know their leaders value honesty in action, and the essentiality of hard work and commitment. This is a call to highlight honor. Leadership and sound character are the foundation of the leader's reputation. When they stop caring about their reputation, leaders—all coworkers—devolve into doing the least they can without

getting into trouble or getting fired. This is a recipe for mediocrity, corruption, and ineffectiveness. Treating stakeholders tolerantly is one way to demonstrate these traditional and still essential values in the workplace. However, the leader's tolerance and respect for others and their beliefs do not ask them to abandon their commitment to the truth about true leadership and their commitment to excellence. Leadership is a kind of combat in the age-old war between morality and immorality in relationships with coworkers. There is no middle ground. Leaders stand for moral uprightness—integrity—even as they practice real tolerance and respect for beliefs and ideas different from our own and for the people who hold them.

7.2 Pathologies Introduced at Work by Modern Usage of the Idea of Tolerance

Leaders practice tolerance and respect for others and their beliefs, including the right of coworkers to explain and advocate their positions. However, they are not required to respect and tolerate behavior antagonistic toward their [the leader's] preset values and work principles. Their duty to integrity to their core values requires leaders to seek to change coworkers from behavior that is antithetical to the work community's core values base. This is easy with extreme behaviors that coworkers recognize as wrong or unacceptable. As to less egregious departures from the leader's stated values the extent to which the leader should tolerate deviation is much more difficult to define. Obviously, the word, *tolerance*, does not stand alone. It requires an object and a response to qualify it as a virtue (Porter 2011, pp. 12–18). Tolerance of the behavior of others is like a two-sided coin. Tolerance or respect is on one side of the coin, but truth is always on the other. Neither leaders nor led can be or use tolerance effectively without being conscious of both factors.

In applying the sometimes-competing demands of truth and tolerance, leaders adhere unstintingly to their stated work values. They avoid compromising these guiding principles and measures of their leadership. To do otherwise is to be seen as inauthentic. The leader's obligation to tolerance also means that they deal with deviant coworker behavior with professional courtesy. Their relationship with worker behavior that departs from the values foundation the leader sets for the work community never involves attacking the worker's character or reputation. To do so adds to organizational problems. Leaders react similarly when coworkers resort to untruth. They take appropriate action, but do so with sensitivity and discretion.

Leaders have the task of navigating between traditional ideas of tolerance and more recent iterations that disguise tolerance for intolerance of any but the speaker's definition of what is the right thing to do (Peterson 2003). Given this dichotomy of understanding, exercising tolerance may seem impossible—even harmful—in certain situations. Certainly the modern iteration of tolerance is toxic—even pathological to leadership. It is a problem for modern leaders in that it hampers, rather than helps them lead. Being accepting of difference—in the traditional sense—nonetheless remains a crucial behavior in leader action. It is essential in easing hostile tensions between individuals and groups. Tolerant leaders help the work community move past

intractable conflict since tolerance is integral to effective group interaction. Intolerance is reduced as leaders and their coworkers react in respectful and understanding ways. In cases where the work community has been deeply entrenched in conflict, being tolerant helps the affected groups endure the dysfunction of the past and resolve their differences (Peterson 2003). The following describes some of the pathological elements of modern understanding of tolerance as it affects effective leadership. Organizational health turns pathological when the following conditions exist.

7.2.1 Zero Tolerance

Zero tolerance is defined as applying penalties to even minor infringements of a code in order to reinforce its overall importance and enhance deterrence. This policy has merit on the surface, but in practice it verges on the ridiculous. The result often leaves much to be desired from a leadership point of view. Preventing unwanted behavior by imposing harsh—even unreasonable—punishments is a faulty leadership practice. It seldom attains the desired deterrence and often engenders scorn. This threat-and-fear method is not a tool of leadership. It hinders task accomplishment, undermines good order and discipline, and fosters distrust. These are characteristics of the workplace which leaders try to remove from, not add, the work community culture. Coworkers come to respond to threat, not freedom of action which is the basis for successful group action. Nevertheless, the modern multicultural society endorses this kind of no exceptions policy as a legitimate way to direct human behavior.

The rationale put forward by advocates of zero tolerance is based on unthinking equality of response regardless of the circumstances within which a given action is taken. The issue, however, is human beings' motives for their actions are unique to each individual. No one can craft a policy or procedure that means the same to all workers or applies in all circumstances. Zero tolerance is anti-leadership and relies at its base on coercion, not shared responsibility or freedom of action integral to effective leadership of others (Grubbs 2012). Eliminating a policy like zero tolerance that protects those afraid to take initiative takes courage. Leaders display this courage as they break from cultural paradigms that cow-tow to expediency and the fad of the moment and truly lead. Some so-called leaders may be content with a generally agreed poor status quo rather than endure the emotional investment and risk required to change. These leaders accept bureaucratic constraints—even revel in the routine. They rely on seniority or past practice as the basis for their coworker guidance policies. They use zero tolerance as the stick to ensure compliance. These leaders look backward, not toward the horizon. Great leaders create great organizations that are willing to risk much to protect the smallest among them.

7.2.2 Moral Relativism

The phrase, moral relativism applies to any of several philosophical positions concerned with the differences in moral judgments across different peoples and cultures. On one level ethical moral relativism holds only that some workers do in

fact disagree about what actions or attitudes are moral. This perspective says that in such disagreements, nobody is objectively right or wrong. On the normative level, moral relativism implies that because nobody is right or wrong, we ought to tolerate the behavior of others even when we disagree about the morality of it. Not all normative relativists adopt ethical relativism, and, not all ethical relativists adopt normative relativism. Rorty (1982), for example, argued that relativist philosophers believe that the grounds for choosing between such opinions are less logical than one would expect. It is often an emotional judgment and not because one belief is equally as valid as any other. Moral relativism has been espoused, criticized, and debated for thousands of years, from ancient Greece and India to the present day, in diverse fields including philosophy, science, and religion as well as in economic activity. There appears to be no sure reason why being tolerant morally is appropriate (Oberdiek 2001, p. vi).

7.2.3 Tolerance for Ambiguity

Seldom is the course of life clear and straightforward. Contradictions and detours are a continuing part of any project we undertake, indeed of life itself. This is true for leading others as it is for all activities. Part of the conventional wisdom is that we should develop a tolerance for the uncertainties in life and be able to devise ways and means to counter these deviations from a clear, consistent course of action. This kind of tolerance involves skill in recognizing such deviations in information or behavior and the operational capacity to deal effectively with it. A tolerance for ambiguity means that leaders are not nonplussed by an unexpected problem with a planned program or course of action. It means that they learn to be prepared to plan and execute appropriate remedial actions in light of limited information or when a given program may fall victim to unexpected change. The emphasis is on being able to move forward in spite of limited or conflicting information, as opposed to merely neutrally recognizing that such a situation exists.

Today's economic environment is uncertain in the extreme. Leaders need to adapt to this culture of continual unexpected change and devise strategies for coping. This task is facilitated or hindered in part because of the individual leader's background and training. For example, some disciplines include strategies for dealing easily with ambiguities in the situation—like marketers or engineers—while others are less adaptable—such as accountants and IT experts. Regardless the responsible leader can improve their skill level by specific training in problem solving in situations of limited time or information—that is, in ambiguous situations. A similar logic applies to each coworker's preparation.

Such a skills enhancement strategy might include the following:

- First, make sure all potential data sources are exhausted.
- Brainstorm assumptions you can make to close the gaps in your data.
- Consideration of alternate assumptions.
- Testing assumptions.
- Executing the most desirable plan.

Ambiguity is a part of life. Acquiring coping mechanisms enable leaders to position their work community for growth and helps insure its survival in a constantly surprising world. Failure in dealing effectively with ambiguity results in diminished leadership and possible failure of the work community itself.

7.2.4 The Tendency Toward Intolerance

Intolerance drives groups apart, creating a sense of lasting separation between them. As one example, though the laws governing slavery in America were abolished generations ago, there still exists a perceptible level of—often self-imposed—personal separation between black and white workers. This continued racial division—whatever the cause—perpetuates the problems of work community internal resentment and hostility. As leaders lead in fostering sharing, acceptance of difference, and teaching a value-set to which all participants can subscribe the negative effects of tolerance-cum-intolerance can be muted, even eliminated.

7.2.5 Workplace Intolerance

On one level most discussion of tolerance and intolerance is emotional in nature. But much of the literature deals with specific facts in dealing with intolerance in the workplace. Worker intolerance is intolerance towards ideas or ways some workers behave that are different from coworkers. It is characterized by avoidance of examining new or different ideas and an unwillingness to see potential value in them. Intolerance at work is usually just called "intolerance," with the usage being understood in context. Such intolerance is often associated with cultural features that define intolerance as any idea or action that runs counter to a subgroup's limited definition of acceptable ways of doing work. Such behavior is unproductive—even pathological—because intolerant people misperceive or misunderstand procedural rules or avoid new or different actions, ideas, or work processes. And, based on that misunderstanding they elect not to change their responses to the leader's instructions.

Persons suffering from workplace intolerance fail to see the good in a different work process and as a result good ideas are often rejected and rendered taboo because of where they were first encountered. Leaders act insofar as possible to counteract this kind of intolerance through training and education of coworkers and broad intercommunications within the work community to minimize misunderstanding of new guidelines they introduce in the workplace. Given the extant—and growingly—broad levels of diversity in the American workplace intolerance can only bring dysfunction and waste to the work community. It is a social problem that leaders give high priority to resolving. Prosperity depends increasingly on interactions between diverse persons with different customs, which may have very different relationship patterns. Smoothing these differences is essential. Failure to do so is dysfunctional.

7.2.6 Intolerance Between Individuals

In the absence of their own direct personal experiences, individuals necessarily base their impressions and opinions of one another—or of situations—on their assumptions. These assumptions can be influenced by the positive or negative beliefs of those who are either closest or most influential in their lives, including parents or other family members, work colleagues, educators, and/or other role models. The antidote to assumptions is facts. A leadership task is to ensure that coworkers have access to both ideas and experiences of those with value-sets that differ from their own. As leaders shape coworkers' learning experiences to highlight the true qualities of other worker's backgrounds, cooperation and sharing of talents and ideas can be maximized and animosities reduced. Failing in this threatens the health of the work community and weakens unity and trust.

7.2.7 Intolerance in Public Relations

An individual's attitudes are also influenced by the images they have of other groups. These perceptions are often cultivated by the general media and the press as well as anecdotally via coworkers. Attitudes are also shaped by the official publications and statements of leaders directed toward coworkers and other stakeholders within the reach of that work community. As members of one cultural subgroup of the work community are portrayed—even obliquely—in a negative light, that image soon becomes generalized within the community (Sachs 2001). Studies suggest, however, that media images may not influence individuals in all cases. For example, a study conducted on stereotypes discovered people of specific towns in southeastern Australia did not agree with the negative stereotypes of Muslims presented in the media (Hague 2001, pp. 185–196).

7.2.8 Intolerance in Training

Much has been written about bias in public education in America. There exists school curricula and educational literature that provide biased and/or negative and unfactual historical accounts of world and local—even work community—cultures. Some of this bias can be traced to advocates of one particular philosophy or another. Other causes of educational bias may be due to economics. It is cheaper to buy textbooks analyzed and authorized by a few well-funded entities than to fund education materials that, in the minds of leaders of smaller work communities that they feel have a more balanced depiction of work cultural factors. Education or schooling based on myths can demonize and dehumanize some work group members rather than promote cultural understanding and a true tolerance for diversity and difference (Birnbaum 2010). These facts place a strong onus on leaders to undertake reeducation programs to counter this endemic shortcoming. It places added importance on work community orientation and continuing training programs to ensure that workers understand the bias in hierarchical work units and avoid it in their present-day work community interrelationships.

7.2.9 Intolerance Within the Work Community

There is evidence that routine work community contact does not necessarily reduce intergroup tensions. It may in fact exacerbate existing animosities. It is through these repetitive; often intimate intergroup contacts that group members most often base their opinions of one another. These contacts can exacerbate or reduce prejudices and increase or decrease tolerance (Amir 2000, pp. 162–181). Allport (in Pettigrew 1998, pp. 65–85) specified several conditions for optimal intergroup contact. Among them developing equality within the group facilitates tolerance and eases intergroup cooperation and support for authority. The leader's task in this regard is to mitigate individual differences and foster workplace norms that facilitate and shape the effects of intergroup contact that inure to the benefit of work community goals.

7.2.10 Intolerance in Intragroup Discussion

Lack of full and open communications among coworkers tends the work community toward intolerance. Obviously, therefore, leaders can enhance real work community tolerance levels by encouraging communication between all sides. Using dialogue mechanisms such as problem-solving workshops to facilitate communication increases opportunities for both sides to express their needs and interests and increase overall intragroup skill in understanding and tolerance. In such cases, participants engaged in the workshops or similar forums feel their concerns have been heard and recognized. Restorative justice programs such as mediation among many others also provide this kind of opportunity.

7.3 Ways Leaders Can Counter Intolerance Among Coworkers

Dealing with tolerance-cum-intolerance begins before a given instance of intolerance in the work community. At the outset, leaders should establish clear and unambiguous rules and policies defining intolerant behavior and set benchmarks for redressing infractions. These policies can have the force of rule, but always they should be definite and include specification of sanction systems. The policy should provide broad access to remediation provisions so that workers do not take justice into their own hands and resort to violence or subterfuge to settle their disputes. A workable tolerance policy might include the following:

- Insuring a tolerant workplace includes education: Rules and policy are necessary but rarely sufficient in this context. Intolerance is very often rooted in ignorance and fear: fear of the unknown in those from other cultures, nations, ethnic groups, or religions. Intolerance is also closely linked to an exaggerated sense of self-worth and pride, whether personal, ethnic, or rooted in workers' faith traditions.

These notions are taught and learned at an early age. Therefore, emphasis needs to be placed on educating workers about tolerance on a continuing basis. Education is a life-long experience and does not begin or end in school—or in an orientation meeting. Activity to build tolerance through training and education will not succeed unless it reaches all workers and its teachings are applied to both routine and random relationship interactivity. Education and training programs are often instrumental in promoting real tolerance and peaceful coexistence within the work community. For instance, a formal training program that creates a tolerant environment stimulates respect and understanding of coworkers from different cultures. Programs are available that are designed to support intercultural understanding by providing attendees the opportunity to learn and grow together in a tolerant environment (Peterson 2003).

- *Fighting intolerance requires access to information*: Ignorance causes the most harm to work community relationships when it is exploited to fulfil the personal ambitions of another worker or subgroup of the work community—or is assisted by outside individuals or stakeholder groups within the corporate or industry structure. Hatemongers often begin by identifying the workers' tolerance threshold. They then develop fallacious arguments, lie with or without statistics, and manipulate public opinion with misinformation and prejudice. The most efficient way to limit the influence of these intolerant coworkers is to develop policies that generate and promote full access to data and information about "different" coworkers' backgrounds gender, and ethnicity. Then, full discussion of their potential deleterious impact on the work community and on individual workers, is needed so all stakeholders can differentiate between facts and opinions.
- *Fighting intolerance requires individual awareness*: Bigotry, stereotyping, labeling, stigmatizing, insults, and racial jokes are examples of individual expressions of intolerance to which some people are routinely subjected. Intolerance breeds intolerance. It leaves its victims depressed, marginalized, and/or in pursuit of revenge. In order to fight intolerance individuals should become aware of the link between their behavior and the vicious cycle of mistrust and violence dormant in any work relationship generally that can bleed into the work community culture. Leaders take action to insure that both facts about and examples of intolerant behavior are known by each worker.
- *Tomorrow's problems will be increasingly global but the solutions are mainly local*: Leaders can do a lot to keep the work community members tolerant. But each worker must be taught and encouraged to not wait for official action when confronted with an escalation of intolerance among their colleagues. Each worker is part of the solution. Each should be encouraged to use their personal capacities to take nonviolent action to counter inappropriate behavior or language as it happens.

Leaders can use these techniques to encourage tolerance defined traditionally—that is, to reduce intolerance or deal with intolerance from only one person or subgroup's perspective. The leaders also can themselves and through others demonstrate that tolerating tolerance is preferable to tolerating intolerance. Other useful

strategies that individual leaders may be used as tools to promote tolerance follow (Peterson 2003).

- *Leaders focus on being tolerant of others in their daily lives*: This involves consciously challenging the stereotypes and assumptions that they typically encounter in making decisions about others and/or working with others in a professional work environment. As coworkers focus on the true character, values, and objectives of colleagues the work community as a culture improves and the quality of life of individual members is enhanced.
- *Leaders seek to convey a tolerant image*: As leaders act to ensure that the image they allow to be projected of the work community is positive and encouraging of the group's goals these actions promote tolerance, understanding—and cultural unity. The more groups and individuals are exposed to positive media messages about theirs as well as other culture's objectives and methods, the less they are likely to find faults with one another—particularly those extraneous communities who have little direct access to the work community and are susceptible to what the media tells them about it.
- *Leaders use many resources*: Most of the actions leaders can take to facilitate real tolerance among coworkers are located internal to the work community. Leaders can also take advantage of programs and actions mediation, arbitration, and negotiation undertaken by external groups. These can ease the leader's task of reducing intolerance and fostering real tolerance. Mechanisms intended to help parties to a conflict better communicate with one another is another example (Peterson 2003). Still other examples include, for instance, projects that aim to reduce tensions between the members of a work community or between work community members and those from collateral work communities in the corporation or industry. Additionally external individuals or groups may offer programs of training or indoctrination in such topics as promoting democracy, ethnic tolerance, and respect for human rights (Kriesberg 2000, pp. 182–198).

Real tolerance is an idea which allowed America, the "melting pot" of the world, to achieve much of its early wealth and cohesiveness despite the rapid influx of new cohorts of workers with cultures and customs that differ from their leaders. It continues today to allow commerce to thrive as worldwide transportation and communication have become ever faster, cheaper, and easier. It is equally an essential feature of successful work communities. Authentic acceptance of difference in others is an essential element of organization per se and of individual work community cohesion. Those who, for personal aggrandizement purposes, redefine tolerance to mean only tolerance of one perspective, or of one outcome, are risking overall group success. These people add a pathological dimension to the likely continuance of the work community.

Practitioners of this false tolerance for narrow, partisan purposes ignore the gains to be had from practicing real tolerance. They risk work community economic peace and work group prosperity. In an earlier generation someone could insult a neighbor hundreds of miles away and not worry about what they did. In today's

world where people thousands of miles away from the leader might decide to cut him or her off from a needed scarce resource or hold colleagues hostage, casual intolerance becomes a luxury no one can afford. Leaders risk a great deal even with accurate and necessary criticisms of coworkers who might take offence due to the leader's—or coworker's—ignorance of an uncommon cultural standard some workers traditionally used and continue to use in today's workplace. They risk even more as they allow cultural activists to redefine some actions that were formerly appropriate to mean the opposite. Nobody—except power-mongers—benefit in these kinds of situations. They and only they exacerbate the challenges of leadership in the global world.

References

Amir, Y. (2000). Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. In E. Weiner (Ed.), *The handbook of interethnic coexistence*. New York: The Continuing Publishing Company.

Birnbaum, M. (2010, March 18). Historians speak out against proposed Texas textbook changes. *The Washington Post*.

Grubbs, J. (2012). Zero tolerance means zero leadership. *New York Times*.

Hague, A. (2001). Attitudes of high school students and teachers towards Muslims and Islam in a southeastern Australian community. *Intercultural Education, 2*, 185–196.

Kriesberg, L. (2000). Coexistence and the reconciliation of communal conflicts. In E. Weiner (Ed.), *The handbook of interethnic coexistence*. New York: The Continuing Publishing Company.

Oaks, D. H. (2011, September 11). Balancing truth and tolerance. Salt Lake City, UT: Church Educational System. Retrieved from http://www.lds.org/broadcasts/article

Oberdiek, H. (2001). *Tolerance: Between forbearance and acceptance*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Peterson, S. (2003). Tolerance. In G. Burgess, H. Burgess (Eds.), *Beyond intractability*. Boulder: Conflict Information Consortium, University of Colorado. Posted: http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/tolerance

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65–85.

Porter, B. D. (2011, June). Defending the family in a troubled world, *Ensign*. Salt Lake City, UT: LDS Church.

Rassbach, E. (2011, August 16). In W. McGurn (Ed.), Religion and the cult of tolerance. *Wall Street Journal*.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rorty, R. (1982). *Consequences of pragmatism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Sachs, S. (2001, December 16). In one Muslim land, an effort to enforce lessons of tolerance. *The New York Times*, New York.

The American heritage dictionary of the English language. (1994). 5th ed. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Ury, W. (1999). *Getting to peace*. New York: The Penguin Group.

Walsham, A. (2006). *Charitable hatred: Tolerance and intolerance in England, 1500–1700*. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press.

Evil

8

Spiritual leaders incite passion and energy among their followers. They use the power of their character—their values, ideas, their spirit, and their position—to manipulate coworkers and inspire them to work together in achieving shared goals. And the same can be said for each coworker in the work community. As human beings we all have an innate drive to achieve our personal goals and to induce colleagues to adopt similar goals. This drive can be morally good in its innate nature. Or it can be evil. That is, it can produce positive or hurtful results for the individual and for coworkers. The fact that evil exists throughout the world seems incontrovertible. We see evil everyday in its infinitely diverse forms. It is this an issue in doing leadership.

- There are the cosmic, supernatural, transpersonal, or natural evils like floods, famine, fire, drought, disease, earthquakes, tornadoes, hurricanes, and harmful, unforeseeable accidents. Each of these wreak havoc, unmentionable suffering, even death on humanity. This is metaphysical or existential evil. Existential evil is an unavoidable part of human life, one with which individuals must reconcile as best they can, without closing themselves off to its tragic, intrinsic reality.
- Mental illness, or psychopathology, is evil in the guise of illness, and in its most radical manifestation—destructive violence—has now become the target of much intense psychological scrutiny and treatment. With escalating urgency, contemporary work culture calls upon the psychologist and psychiatrist to do battle with this evil: to explain, control, or "cure" workers who tend to be homicidal, suicidal, sexually perverted, assaultive, abusive, addicted, anorexic, alcoholic, or otherwise violently destructive to themselves and/or others.
- But there is, of course, another kind of evil at large: human evil—man's inhumanity to man. Human evil includes those attitudes and behaviors that promote excessive interpersonal aggression, cruelty, hostility, disregard for the integrity of others, self-destructiveness, and human misery in general. Aristotle called it lack of limitation. Human evil can be perpetrated by a single worker (personal evil) or by a work subgroup, or the core community itself (Adams and Balfour 2007).

G.W. Fairholm, *Overcoming Workplace Pathologies*,
Management for Professionals, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-17154-8_8

The workplace is the site of any of these types of evil. Leadership, of course, deals most effectively and often with the last of these evils—human evil. Workers driven by evil intentions have the potential to create several dangers in the work community. History has been witness to the rise in the catastrophes caused by individuals who have been intoxicated with their urge to gain power and control over others for their own ends (Adams and Balfour 2007). Such people often conjure up irrational reasoning to justify their action to themselves and to observers. Often they are fully prepared to cause multiple difficulties to reach their selfish goals or to cause hurt to others. Internecine wars on the basis of racial supremacy, genocide, and geographical domination have caused some of the darkest events in mankind's history. Whether played out on a world stage or within the confines of the work community, this form of evil is toxic to healthy leadership and group success. Evil workers can perpetrate great harm in their work community due to their self-serving tendencies, evil actions, and the malicious outcomes they intend (Staub 1992, p. xi).

It is rare to see serious discussion of workplace evil. This is often a conscious choice by authors and analysts. But neither ignorance nor avoidance can mask for long the fact of evil action at work as it is in all other domains of life. If we look for it, evil action is obvious to even the casual observer. It is a fact that workers sometimes do evil things. Equally it is true that some workers behave in ways others consider evil most of the time. And, a few people are evil in their character. One can define evil as the antithesis of good in all its principle senses. Staub (1992, p. 25) offers a more expansive characterization of evil. For him evil is not a scientific concept with an established meaning. The core of evil is the "destruction" of human beings humaneness. And Katz (1993, p. 5) describes evil in behavioral terms as action that deprives innocent people of their humanity from small-scale assaults on a person's dignity to mass murder. One can conceive of evil as a continuum of wrongdoing, with horrible, mass eruptions of evil, such as the Holocaust at one extreme, and the "small" transgression, such as a lie at the other. Evil is profound immorality. In certain contexts evil has been described as a supernatural force ("Evil," Oxford English Dictionary 2012). Definitions of evil vary, as does the analysis of its root motives and causes (Staub 1992, p. 32). However elements that are commonly associated with evil involve unbalanced behavior involving expediency, selfishness, ignorance, or neglect (Caitlin and Matthews 2004, p. 173). Evil is usually perceived as the dualistic, antagonistic opposite of good. That is, good should prevail and evil should be defeated. This basic dichotomy has developed so that today "good" is a broad concept that typically has an association with life, charity, continuity, happiness, love, and justice. "Evil" is typically associated with conscious and deliberate wrongdoing, discrimination designed to harm others or to humiliate them. Its goals include destructiveness and acts of unnecessary and/or indiscriminate violence—either physical or psychological.

Throughout history we have seen the disastrous repercussions of an evil regime, where progress of the human society has been held hostage to this phenomenon. Men fighting for noble causes have been lured to evil actions, as power corrupts their intentions (Dod 1860, p. 83). It is important to understand the true nature of evil at work. While most people would concede there may be exceptions, typically

no worker is inherently evil. Workers—most people—combine elements of both good and evil. As per the Confucian belief in the Yin-Yang, both individuals and leaders try to balance evil and good in their personal lives and in the work community. Thus, while everyone at times entertain both evil and good intentions, it is which impulse a worker decides to follow that determines whether they are good or not in a given situation. Those who choose to follow their dark side desires, often threaten the peacefulness of their work community and of those coworkers that fall victim to their evil actions.

Of course, leaders may also succumb to evil action—and some do. And when they do—as in all other interactions—they can impact powerfully their coworkers and the work community. The primary focus of this discussion is on the impacts of coworkers and the work group, on leadership, and on the leader when a worker or a subgroup of the work community resorts to evil action. But, obviously, some leaders are evil too. If some of the following discussion fails to identify the leader's role in the application of evil actions or intent, readers can assume that a leader could be a cause or certainly a contributor to the dysfunction.

8.1 Areas Where Spiritual Leadership and Evil Routinely Intersect

There are several key issues respecting evil and leadership that complicate the leader's job. Among them are the following:

8.1.1 Mistaking Realism for Leadership

A key tenet of leadership is that leadership shifts between the leader and any or all coworkers as the special skills held by the individual or the unusual needs of the work community would benefit by different guidance. Given this rotating leadership concept and according to certain schools of philosophy, leaders should be indifferent to good or evil, basing their actions solely upon their practical utility. This approach to leadership was famously put forth by Machiavelli (2003) a sixteenth-century Florentine writer, who advised leaders that it is safer—and more productive—to be feared than loved. In the same vein the international relations theories of realism and neorealism, sometimes called realpolitik counsel leaders to explicitly ban absolute moral and ethical considerations from their leadership actions and theory. The idea is to focus on self-interest, survival, and organizational power politics. Thus sometimes the work community benefits when the putative leader's values hold dominant. At other times those of a worker are more effective in attaining desired ends and should be adopted (Fairholm 2009) to realize the shared vision for the group. These model analysts hold to be more accurate in explaining a view of work as increasingly amoral and dangerous. These so-called realists usually justify this perspective by claiming it to be a higher moral duty than traditional managerial goal of efficient and effective task accomplishment. They contend that a coworker(s) can

usurp leadership, when necessary. The greatest evil, they say, is not taking leadership when needed goal attainment is at stake. To not do so is a failure of the work community to protect itself from the ineptitude of the formal leader. To buttress this argument they refer to Machiavelli (2003) who advised that some traits considered good, if followed, will lead to ruin, while others, considered vices which if practiced achieve security and wellbeing.

8.1.2 Determining Good from Evil

Distinguishing good behavior from evil action is crucial for work communities. The task of making this determination, some say, most often falls not to the economic community but to the faith community. Leaders tap into morality as defined by the faith community that permeates the culture of the individual leader's life experience (Mitroff and Denton 1999) as they build the work community's value system. By conforming to a leader-set standard of morality, workers improve themselves and, importantly, the wellbeing of their work community colleagues. Doing evil does not just threaten the worker's spiritual health but the productive health of their work community. All the institutions, customs, and manners that make up the traditions of a work community are inspired by this common understanding, which in turn is guided by its recognition of right and wrong behavior—e.g., good from evil—which the leader builds into the work community culture. While a work community that is corrupting its traditions — discarding, or reversing the nature of its manners (Forni 2008), customs, and institutions— is not only losing cohesion and thus faces dissolution, but it is embracing evil. As Mitroff and Denton (1999) contend society is now experiencing significant moral change, this chain of values threatens to jeopardize the leader's success.

8.1.3 Purposeful Evil in the Workplace

On another level, Peck (1983) describes evil as militant ignorance. He argues that most people are conscious that in America the Judeo-Christian concept of wrongdoing is still a part of a process that leads one to sometimes miss the mark and not achieve perfection. Nevertheless he contends that at least on some level, some leaders and workers are actively and militantly evil. He describes evil, not as a leadership tool, but as a malignant type of complacency which results in a projection of evil onto selected specific innocent victims—i.e., workers in relatively powerless positions. This kind of action in the work community is toxic and unchecked can morph into a pathological feature of the work community. It can taint some or all coworkers. At minimum, evil results ultimately in failure to reach intended goals. Peck (1983, p. 298) considers those he calls evil to be attempting through self-deception to escape and hide from their own conscience. The intent is to do evil but avoid guilt by maintaining a self-image of excellence. Evil-doers deceive others by

psychologically projecting their evil actions onto target coworkers, scapegoating them while treating everyone else normally. He views this as being distinct from the apparent absence of conscience evident in sociopaths (Peck 1983, p. 105). Peck also says evil people pretend to love, for the purposes of self-deception as much as the deception of others. They impose their will on others by overt or covert coercion. For him evil people are defined not so much by the magnitude of their social and professional offenses, but by the consistency of their destructiveness. Evil people are unable to think from the viewpoint of their victim. They are preoccupied with their own issues and are blind to the personal and workplace damage they cause. Often these evil people are subtle and tax the leader's skills in seeing evil patterns in the actions of their workers so they can remediate its impact. Countering purposeful evil action is a major and mostly undiscussed challenge in leadership.

8.1.4 Emotions and Evil

Spiritual leadership, the most comprehensive modern leadership theory, is concerned with rationality, strategy, and values-based interpersonal relationships. It is equally concerned with collective emotions guiding their coworkers. Leaders try to engender a positive culture of interactive caring, cooperation, and trust. Unfortunately many leaders lead in a work culture that also includes the potential that may be described with words like fear, hysteria, and evil intent. These, too, are part of the "raw materials" with which leaders must cope to produce desired shared outcomes. The potential for failure given these latter cultural—and worker—characteristics may be disastrous. The problem becomes pathological when the workplace is dominated by workers characterized as evil (Staub 1992) which is destructive of organizational unity and of workers' humanity. Good leaders do not intentionally create operational values and endorse worker personalities measured in strictly material terms. Doing this is a prime cause of ruinous outcomes. This kind of failure, like all other kinds, can be blamed on leadership—whether or not the leader is the evil member or a coworker is at fault.

8.1.5 Philosophical Evil

There is a philosophical problem when leadership action is taken as a result of evil intention or mental disorder, or psychopathology or persistent personality disorder characterized by antisocial behavior (Bostock 2010, pp. 11–18). Evil in the workplace is, therefore, of considerable concern to both leadership theory and practice. Whether or not the so-called evil worker is ill or intentionally acts to inflict evil will determine appropriate leader action. Regardless, the first steps involve determining if the offender is mentally ill and therefore in need of treatment, or bad [evil] and therefore in need of punishment or other remedial action. Staub (2013) defines evildoers, in terms of the destruction in other human beings he or she causes—even

where the original intention may not have been to cause evil. Another classification of evil workers is those in danger of producing extreme levels of dysfunctional activity within the work community. Yet another cohort of evil workers is those whose behavior or actions lead to consequences that most people regard as disastrous. These descriptors of evil worker' actions include as a key element the likelihood that pathological consequences may result. They have the advantage of leaving separate the question of an evaluation of the motives and the mental condition of the evil worker who, on achieving power, may cause catastrophic consequences (Bostock 2010, p. 18).

8.1.6 Administrative Evil

The last century and a half of the modern age has been called the age of technical rationality. Some contend that the ethical failures of leadership in modern organizations are rooted in significant part in the unquestioned dominance of technical rationality. Leaders sometimes adopt a technically rational way of thinking and living. That is, leaders build a work community culture that emphasizes a scientific-analytic mindset and the belief in technological progress. The idea of technical rationality has enabled a new and often confusing form of evil that can be called administrative evil. Relying on technology to the extreme lets leaders behave in ways that can mask evil action. The common characteristic is that workers—and their leaders—may engage in acts of evil without being aware that they are in fact doing anything wrong—because it is technically or procedurally correct. Seen this way, a worker may act in ways others may see as inappropriate. The action may be within administrative policy and at the same time, participate in what a reasonable outside observer would call evil. Even worse, under conditions of what is called moral inversion, in which something evil has been redefined convincingly as good, ordinary people can all too easily engage in acts of administrative evil while believing that what they are doing is not only correct, but in fact, good (Adams and Balfour 2007, pp. 29–36). This issue challenges the moral rectitude of both the leader and led.

8.1.7 Variety in Evil Leaders

Arguably evil not only exists but seems to thrive inside certain work organizations. Leaders face the often daunting task of identifying evil-tending coworkers unless, of course, they might be evil themselves. Some intraoffice dynamics leaders need to look for include:

- *People with no visible sign of values guiding their action*: They may have a copy of the work community values statements at their work station but they are not operational in their behavior.
- *Sometimes evil workers have an enforcer backing them up*: The leader may have to deal with truly heinous individuals who congregate around evil coworker(s)

and help protect them from others. An example might be labor or professional cliques, or an external professional or other interest group.

- *Dealing with evil workers may ask leaders to engage in conflict at least until they can alter the situation or the workers involved.*
- *Evil workers who are insensitive*: Some workers are preoccupied with their own issues and are blind to the damage they cause. Often these evil workers are subtle. In this eventuality leaders need to be perceptive enough to see evil patterns in the otherwise routine actions of their coworkers.

8.1.8 Ethical Character

The idea of ethics is imbedded in the idea of culture, custom, and character (Sims 1992). Ethical behavior is that behavior of work community members accepted as right and good as opposed to wrong, bad, or evil. Ethicality is a key component of character. Character is a cluster of related ideas that includes morality, ethics, honesty, and humane values. Leaders learn to know the difference between good and evil and teach followers a higher moral standard (Fairholm 2009). They understand that all people have the inalienable right of free moral choice. And they know that the irrevocable law of the harvest—restoring good for good—operates in life including work life. The challenge is to operationalize these character values with the day-to-day activities in the work community and among all coworkers.

8.1.9 Expediency

Sadly, sometimes, in some jobs leaders are asked by their superiors to sacrifice fundamental values (Fairholm 2009) at the altar of the expedient. Too often leaders are asked to accept a lower morality in their work as necessary to get things done in the real world of "practical" business or government. For example, politicians ask their constituents to judge them on their policies, not their personal conduct. Social activists claim high moral ground for their programs and sometimes use violence to obtain their ends. Business executives do not want their day-to-day conduct examined, but ask instead that others evaluate them on their bottom-line performance. Journalists may maintain a personal commitment to truth but often succumb to the pressure to be first, and rather than wait for the whole story, publish half-truths. Or, they print their biases as the truth. Another version of this kind of behavior is office politics. Office politics is prevalent in the workplace and sometimes places pressures on both leaders and their coworkers to accept standards that are morally questionably, and sometimes illegal. Leaders can play a major role in shielding their followers from the pressure of superior executives who ask their subordinates to compromise their ethical and/or moral standards. They must also find ways to reject similar pressures on themselves to compromise their standards of excellence (Fairholm 2009).

8.1.10 Psychological Pressures

Practicing good leadership is hard work. In comparison, bad leadership is often easier. Bad leaders learn that they can easily take advantage of followers who often fall prey to self-serving and exploitative colleagues who know how to manipulate and use psychological tactics to gain power. Among these tactics are the following (following Riggio 2009).

- *Using the in-group, out-group bias*: It is very easy for evil people to use in-group, out-group bias to motivate followers and to build follower commitment and solidarity to their—as opposed to the rest of the work community's—standards and practices. Subgroup competitions threaten unity and confuse the ethical foundation of the work community. They threaten work community cohesion and feed the natural tendency in people toward bias. Scapegoating is an often used tactic here.
- *Highlighting an external threat*: Fear of attack from the outside is also a psychological tactic used to induce workers to adopt an evil stance on a given issue. Nothing will focus a constituency better than an apparent threat from an outside group: The animosity on both sides escalates. Differences are magnified, while similarities are ignored. We see this in rival street gangs and in the work community where leaders allow the "other guys" to be vilified, primarily to solidify their coworkers' support.
- *Using unquestioning obedience*: Another tactic is to demand unquestioning obedience to the dictates of a coworker or coalition of workers within the work community. When an individual—worker or leader—demands absolute obedience that is a warning sign of this tactic. A leader or pseudo leader who does not consult with their putative followers, who do not allow sharing of power and who demand unquestioning loyalty, is not only a bad leader, but one who will likely be ineffective in the long run. A variation on the abuse of requiring follower obedience to authority is when a coworker aspiring to thwart the work community goals calls on the ultimate authority—deity. Many despotic leaders throughout history have used this ultimate authority as the foundation of their requests of others to follow them in their evil intent. Examples range from the Egyptian pharaohs, to modern times, such as People's Temple founder, Jim Jones.
- *Fostering too much conformity* can be a dangerous thing. So-called leaders who capitalize on followers' conformity, or use followers' conformity as verification that they are right and others wrong, are engaging in evil practice. Tactics here include the "bandwagon effect" and "social comparison" to garner followers.
- *Appeal to fear*: An easy and simple way to gain the unquestioning allegiance of coworkers is to create a sense of fear, and to offer followers protection in exchange for loyalty. Evilly-disposed leaders from the ancient to the modern—Coligula to Hitler to Saddam Hussein—have raised the spectre of fear and then offered protection from the evil if followers would simply obey.

8.2 Pathologies Introduced into Work Cultures When Evil Is a Part of the Dynamic

Modern organizations are characterized by diffusion of information and fragmentation of responsibility. In some cases no one in the organization has a complete enough picture to adequately comprehend the destructive activity that sometimes takes place in a work community. As a result some leaders or coworkers are unaware and therefore inexperienced in dealing with evil activity (Adams and Balfour 2007, p. 283). One result is the real possibility that well-intentioned workers who conscientiously perform their jobs will unintentionally participate in systems and processes that produce harm. Some may not even be aware that they are doing anything wrong. They are simply acting in consonance with accepted professional roles and practices. It is increasingly apparent nonetheless, that organizational and moral failure is characteristic of many work community cultures (Riggio 2009).

Of course, some of this evil behavior emanates from leaders. It is also apparent in coworkers who peruse a personal, self-aggrandizing agenda rather than the work community's. They tend to compartmentalize their work lives and separate work from other life activities. Similarly they sublimate their adherence to high moral standards. This tendency limits overall work community integrity and morality to their immediate work companions. This does not suggest that leaders and their coworkers necessarily foster evil practices—some do, others do not. It does suggest that this tendency contributes to the worst kinds of human behavior. Normal ethical standards and professional training does not adequately address the potential for evil action and behavior in the workplace. Thus, organizational dynamics can foster evil in the work community. Making up or down decisions on ethical issues become less clear and, therefore, more difficult. It becomes more common for leaders and workers to follow a pathway of small, ambiguous choices until a series of commitments and habits drive out ethics in favor of a comfortable conformity. This behavior hides overt evil. Only a conceptual framework that goes beyond the narrow vision of technical ease and recognizes the interactive, relational foundation of ethics can help us better understand and perhaps ameliorate—even if we cannot fully resolve—these moral paradoxes of evil in the modern workplace.

Several issues increasingly present in the modern workplace have risen to the level of organizational pathologies. They challenge leadership practice and theory as America moves fully into the twenty-first century. The following themes are consistent with the notion that evil exists at work. Whether shielded from casual view or are stark characteristics of the work culture, they represent serious impediments to organizational and group success. Evil is not an ethical theory or an abstract intellectual idea. It is a part of modern work life and a direct problem for leaders. People come to work carrying with them all of their emotions, skills and ideals and ideologies. They manifest in worker behavior that either helps or hinders task performance and goal attainment. Knowing that evil pathologies are potentially present can forearm leaders to cope effectively with these issues. Among them are the following:

8.2.1 Prevalence of Pathological Cultures

A critical impediment to leadership is the potential that the leader may have to function in an evil work community. In Freud's view the group mind demands leadership from which it seeks both strength and violence (Delbecq 2001, pp. 221–228). Sometimes the leader is responsible that this situation obtains. Sometimes a coworker is responsible. Freud (1955, pp. 118–129) concluded that where group members are in conflict, mental instability results leading ultimately to breakdown. That is the presence of evil per se impedes the leader's ability to lead. It is possible to recognize some psychological preconditions of an evil-induced pathological situation. They may be distinguished by a worker(s) who engages in:

- Consistent destructive, scapegoating behavior which may often be quite subtle
- Excessive, albeit usually covert, intolerance to criticism, and other forms of selfish injury
- Pronounced concern with a public image and self-image of respectability contributing not only to a stable lifestyle but also to pretentiousness and denial of hateful feelings or vengeful motives
- Intellectual deviousness with an increased likelihood of a mild schizophrenic-like disturbance of thinking at times of stress. It should be noted that it is difficult to examine evil people in depth, because it is their nature to avoid the light of inquiry. Denying their imperfection, the evil flee both self-examination and any situation in which they might be closely examined by others

8.2.2 Violence as a Tool of Evil

For many, evil has become synonymous with violence. More subtly, evil can be considered that tendency which—whether in oneself or others—inhibits personal growth, destroys or limits innate potentialities, inflicts pain, fragments or disintegrates the personality, and diminishes the quality of interpersonal relationships (Diamond 1996). Indeed, the warp and woof of society is under continual threat of evil-induced violence of every kind—murders on an almost daily basis, criminal active in many industries, street gang violence, civil war, poverty and starvation, sadism and pedophilia, and physical and mental abuse. Evil is endemic across the community, the nation and the world and it often manifests in violence. Its presence in the workplace and in workers becomes, therefore, a problem of internal integrity, organization for remedial action, and fidelity to the leader's preset plans.

The term *evil* has always been closely associated with anger, rage, and, of course, violence (Diamond 1996). Though the causes of violence in our culture are complex, the troublesome human emotions of anger and rage play a central role in the genesis of evil behavior. Buried deep in the human spirit is a conviction that powerful and subtle evil forces permeate culture and define in significant part what it is to be human. The dark side of the work culture includes evil people doing evil things. When evil takes hold in the workplace workers cheat and steal, sadists do terrible

hurt, some oppress their colleagues and customers, and do violence to each other. Evil is a real if hidden force, one few leadership training courses even mention let alone deal with frontally.

Evil is a means to an end. Nevertheless, the question presents itself: Why should anyone adopt evil means when ordinary "good" means are available? Research and history indicate that acting in evil ways are perceived as quicker and easier reasons for some people. Legitimate means may appear difficult or impossible—like getting a job done with a very short finish date. And, for some people violence can be more exciting, producing a mental high which contrasts with mundane daily routine. If legitimate authority is weak or absent, evil actions may have few or no impediments. Few if any perpetrators ever do an "evil" deed without good reason—from their viewpoint. Very few groups or individuals name themselves in positive affirmation of evil. Most workers regard themselves as good people who are in principle against the forces of evil (Staub 1992). Given the above, leaders are sometimes hard put to first see evil as it happens and then craft a strategy to deal with its containment and elimination. Solutions deal with building unity, trust, clear communication, a functioning sanctions system, and intimate knowledge about each worker.

8.2.3 Fear

Fear is one result of evil acts perpetrated by another person on a victim. It can also give rise to evil action in individual workers. Dealing with fear is another leadership task rarely mentioned in the common leadership literature. While a result in a given situation or not, fear is not a uniformly evil tendency in people (Lake and Rothchild 1996, pp. 41–75). Nevertheless, fear is a phenomenon that exists and has always existed and is often tied psychologically to evil actions or evil people. When someone behaves toward another person with evil intent, fear is a common side effect. That person becomes a threat and the object of fear, derision, or scorn (Peck 2006). In these cases many people see this kind of behavior as fearful, unethical, and hurtful, and oppose its use (Jurkiewicz and Brown 1995). Fear-filled workers add to the task of leadership. Fearful people lack creativity. They split their energies between work and self-protection—or anonymity. They are less likely to commit unreservedly to the task on hand, offer fewer ideas for improvement, and do not seek the limelight. They require more of the leader's personal attention. Workers in fear need continuous oversight. They ask leaders to have psychological acumen—and luck.

8.2.4 Scapegoating

Another psychological evil that humans have inflicted upon one another since ancient times is scapegoating. Scapegoating is a group phenomenon wherein some worker or workers will seek to ostracize a colleague or colleagues and blame them for the group's shortcomings. Scapegoats are workers others perceive to be weak. They are workers that colleagues believe, on both a conscious and unconscious level

will dilute or harm unit cohesiveness and thus their group strength and survival. Individuals in the work community will scapegoat a coworker, but so do, on occasion, leaders scapegoat a follower. In a scapegoating group the buck stops with the victims, the scapegoats, not with the group leader. In this connection Peck (2006, p. 298) says evil workers attempt to escape and hide from their own conscience by redirecting attention to the scapegoat. The intent is to avoid guilt while maintaining a self-image of perfection. Peck says evil people transfer their guilt to others for the purposes of self-deception as much as the deception of others. Evil people are preoccupied with their own issues and are blind to the hurt they cause others. Leaders need to be alert to the practice of scapegoating—a transference behavior—and take action to eliminate it in the interests of unit cohesion, trust, maintaining a focus on end results, and movement toward a harmonious work community culture.

8.2.5 Using Personal or Organizational Power with Evil Intent

American ambivalence toward power use is a result of our failure to deal with it frontally. On one hand our teachers taught us that we can become what we set our minds to become. On the other, they also teach us to reject—even fear and oppose—domination by others. Some even say that power is the polar opposite of virtue. The result is that many people connect power and evil at the symbolic level. And thus the techniques of power use, because of its negative overtones, is largely absent from leadership theory. This acculturation places the two ideas of freedom and power as opposites. This fact presents a problem for leaders. As applied to the workplace, workers accept power from their leaders, but are simultaneously threatened by its possible negative use to hurt them. Worker—and leaders too—want power for what it can do *for* them and to oppose the powerful for what they can do *to* them. We see it as part of our capacity to achieve and as a threat of external control (Lipman-Blumen 2005).

Nevertheless the operational use of power is a central element in leadership. For very many people, the idea of power has negative overtones (Fairholm 2009). This attitude stifles full effectiveness on the job and limits our success in all other dimensions of life. Perhaps the lack of prethought associated with much organizational politics accounts for its failure and therefore its negative image in the eyes of many group members. The result, psychologically speaking, is that many people have an intrinsic fear of power as a tool of another's evil designs. While true in a given situation or not, power is not uniformly evil. It is not a wholly negative aspect of worker interrelationships activity. Workers can use their personal power to hurt others or to thwart the settled goals and methods of the work team. The use of personal or group power can help the leader, but also any worker to achieve their either positive or negative outcomes. McClelland's (1975) much quoted article defines "two faces of power." One is a positive; the other is a negative, inner-directed, selfish dimension. The negative face seeks to dominate others. The positive face directs workers toward helping others develop their full potential. The evil in power, then, consists not in its being, but in the way it is used. Negative power is merely power applied to constrain and dominate others. It limits rather than expands human talent. Used this way, it

hobbles the human being. Leaders need not place power into one discrete ethical classification. Power is like fire: it can be useful—even life-saving. But it needs to be watched or it can destroy us (Lipman-Blumen 2005). The proper intellectual and practical attitude should be respect. There is a difference between using power and leadership. Power use is often applied for selfish ends. In contrast, leadership asks leaders to be selfless and prosocial in their orientation. It also follows that workers are more satisfied with those individuals who use their leadership as a means to better their—worker's—lives (Galinksy et al. 2008).

8.2.6 Bullying Others

Workplace bullying is repeated, health-harming mistreatment of one or more workers by one or more perpetrators that takes several forms. Sometimes bullying is seen in verbal abuse or in offensive behavior which is threatening, humiliating, or intimidating. Bullying is also seen in actions taken by one worker to interfere with the successful work of another member of the work community or of any stakeholder. This is a kind of sabotage which prevents the group's goals from being attained according to plan. Workplace bullying is driven by the bully's need to control the targeted individual or group. It is initiated by bullies who choose their targets, timing, location, and methods with a personal—as opposed to work-oriented—outcome in mind. Bullying has huge hidden costs in terms of worker wellbeing, leader success, and work community productivity. Importantly, bullies undermine the solidarity needed for work community success and can mutate into pathological behavior.

While a single worker often begins the bullying activity, it often escalates to involve coworkers who form a coalition to foster the bully's agenda—which are in opposition to the leaders. Bullying works against the purposes of coworkers, the work community, and the larger corporation of which the work community is a part. Bullying undermines legitimate business interests when bullies' personal agendas take precedence over the work itself. It is akin to domestic violence at work. Bullying involves the conscious repeated effort to wound and seriously harm a coworker not only with violence but also with words and actions and attitudes. Bullying damages the spiritual, physical, emotional, and mental health of the worker targeted. Bullying is analogous to psychological violence, harassment, and spiritual abuse in the workplace. Less precise, but often used euphemisms intended to trivialize bullying and its impact on bullied people include: incivility, disrespect, difficult people, personality conflict, negative conduct, ill treatment, and so forth. The workplace bully abuses power, brings misery to a coworker(s) and challenges that person's self-confidence. Bullies often involve others using many tactics such as blaming for errors, unreasonable work demands, insults, putdowns, stealing credit, threatening job loss, and discounting accomplishments.

Regardless of the politically correct language often used, bullying is hurtful to individuals toward whom it is directed. It lessens the leader's effectiveness in building a trusting and cohesive work culture. It lowers overall worker self-esteem. It confuses workers' ideas about which values really define the work community.

It diverts worker energies and enthusiasm away from the leader's goals. Bullying interferes with worker creativity. And it makes ultimate work community outcomes more difficult to attain. Inappropriately, some refrain from calling bullying "bullying," in order to avoid offending the sensibilities of the bully. This action does a disservice to bullied workers whose jobs, careers, and health have been threatened as the result. Words used to mask specific events or situations result in analyses not undertaken, situations misdefined, and problems ignored. The leader's job is to deal with these issues and when language masks these issues, leadership is reduced and effectiveness diminished. The result also is to allow waste and hurt to continue unnecessarily. Indeed, the recent economic downturn, with layoffs and financial pressures on everyone to increase individual performance may have exacerbated the bullying problem. Forni (2008) adds that worker–worker relations are at one of the lowest points in history. Civility in the work community is declining. It is also a key remedial action leaders can inculcate in the workplace to reduce bullying.

8.2.7 Group Evil

Group evil is distinct from the phenomenon of individual evil. Worker subgroups tend to behave in much the same ways as human workers—except at the level of practicing evil which is usually more primitive and immoral. People do bad things more easily as a part of a group than they would dare to alone. Leaders need to be constantly aware of this human tendency as they build their work cultures lest they become dysfunctional. The phenomenon of group immorality is, to use a psychiatric term, "overdetermined." This is to say that it is the result of multiple causes. One of those causes is the problem of specialization. Specialization is a common structural tool leader's use and can be helpful in directing the work community toward preset goals. Unwatched, specialization can contribute to the immorality of workers and their potential for evil through several different mechanisms. One such mechanism is called the fragmentation of conscience. When the roles of workers within a group become highly specialized, it becomes both possible and easy for the individual worker to pass the responsibility to act in a moral way to some other workers or subgroup of the work community. By this action individual workers cover up their personal involvement, evade responsibility, and accept the evil group behavior as justifiable—because everyone is doing it! Indeed, any work community is at risk of moving to evil actions unless all workers hold themselves directly and individually responsible for the collective moral behavior of the whole group. That is, individual workers tend to cover up their personal involvement in evil actions, evade responsibility, and accept evil group behavior as justifiable. As with any evil action, the primary motive of such a coverup is fear. Psychological growth reverses itself and morality is forsaken. Unless the leader intervenes, workers become more likely to act in evil ways especially in times of stress than in times of comfort (Staub 1992).

There are profound forces at work within a group to keep its individual members together and in line. When these forces toward cohesiveness fail, the group as a unity begins to disintegrate. Probably the most powerful of these group cohesive forces is narcissism. In its simplest and most benign form, this is manifested in

group pride. As the members feel proud of their group so the group members feel proud of themselves whatever the effect of their actions on others. A less benign, but practically universal form of group narcissism is what might be called "enemy creation," or hatred of the "out-group." When workers form together they first learn to develop friendship groups. These groups become cliques. Those who do not belong to the group (friendship group, club, or clique, or professional association, and so forth) are despised as having inferior skills or are evil or both. If a group does not already have an enemy, it will create one. It is almost common knowledge that the best way to cement group cohesiveness is to ferment the group's hatred of an external "enemy." Deficiencies within the group can be easily and painlessly overlooked by focusing attention on the deficiencies of the out-group.

8.2.8 The Evil Leader

Hostility, hatred, and violence are some of the great evils we have to contend with today. Evil is now, ever has been, and ever will be an existential reality, an inescapable fact with which all workers must reckon. The concept of evil can be taken to be a nonscientific culturally shared concept of actions leading to the destruction of human beings (Staub 1992, p. 25). Evil leadership is therefore leadership that causes harm and ultimately destruction of human beings—at least insofar as work is concerned. Staub does not define evil leadership in terms of evil intention, because the true nature of intentions can be hidden or disguised. Evil leadership requires an awareness of the likely consequence of large-scale destruction, to distinguish it from accidental consequence. When leaders behave in evil ways it manifests via organizational repercussions that may not be evil in intent but are in practice evil.

8.3 Ways Leaders Can Counter the Presence of Evil in the Workplace

Every leader has struggled with the problem of coping with evil actions perpetrated by coworkers in the work community. Nothing challenges the rationality of our belief in moral integrity more severely than the reality of suffering and wickedness caused by evil-inclined people. Its effects hamper group and individual worker effectiveness. Analyzing evil asks leaders to consider at least three aspects of this condition of character: (1) logical, (2) theological, and (3) practical. The logical problem of evil is the possibility that a world full of suffering and moral evil is pervasive—that neither the leader of anyone else can eliminate evil from their workplace. This aspect of the study of evil poses a puzzle of deep complexity. The theological problem deals with the apparent contradiction between certain Judeo-Christian concepts of a caring, deity, and the presence of evil in human interaction. And a practical problem of evil is the challenge of creating a trusting work community in the face of what seems to be pervasive evil.

Both leaders and workers are coming to recognize that many of the failings of our society are due to our past disregard for core moral values and a willingness to

let a minority of the coworkers set the moral standard of the workgroup. The world has moved from the war against evil to reverence for three contending gods: race, gender, and class. The conflict today is not against evil as should be the case, but against black against white. There are good black and white people and evil ones. We waste our time when we let questions of race determine our decisions and control our actions. Again, the conflict today is not against evil—as it should be—but is one of men against women. When men and women are in competition about feminism, abortion rights, jobs, etcetera, this conflict clouds our judgment. We cannot see the good or evil in coworkers or the qualities of the individual advocates. We only see the competition of the sexes that dissipates our energies and moves workers away from realization of their powerful inner spiritual values that make exceptionalism achievable. Finally, the conflict today is not against evil but is a struggle of the rich against poor and the poor against the rich. When we are conscious of economic class—e.g., comparative salaries—we cannot see the evils people do to each other in the push for pecuniary dominance. Our failure to recognize the powerful force that our collective spirituality represents and the tendency to waste our energies on unimportant practical skirmishes played out on the fringes of the work community—if at all. Giving race, gender, or class more place in our interaction than they merit has contributed to the contentious work-world in which we live.

How can leaders maintain a spiritual dynamic on the job if the workforce—or individuals within the workforce—are dishonorable to the trust invested in them? Leaders need to learn to know "good"—that is moral—workers from profane ones. Everyone—both leader and led—have the inalienable right of free moral choice. Workers feel better when they do what is right. Leaders need to forge a balance of self-interest and self-expression along with a commitment to group rules and responsibilities. Developing character without attention to sharing of our moral values is like trying to develop the muscles of an athlete without having a particular sport in mind.

When "the economy" becomes the main and engrossing concern of a work community and its leader, productivity will self-destruct. When leaders are only concerned with the bottom line, they begin to wallow in pride, envy, strife, and malice. Note the sequence: first we are well pleased with ourselves because of our wealth, and then life becomes a game of status and prestige, leading to competitive maneuvers, hatred, and dirty tricks, and finally the ultimate solution—evil. Where wealth is the key to respectability, principles melt away as the evil element in people rises to the top. Given full reign to these vices, the work community ends in utter frustration and total insecurity. Both morals and markets collapse together and the baffled experts surrender. We must have leaders at work whose virtue, clarity, and certainty will give coworkers the assurance that the course of work pursued under their leadership is good—not evil.

8.3.1 Tools Leaders Can Use to Fight Evil

Following are several techniques and tools the leader can use to mitigate evil actions by their coworkers. All leader actions noted revolve around the central need for unity and internal cohesion in the work community.

- *Unity*. The universal tool all leaders can use to counter evil action by one or a few is to unite the work community into a unity. This universal remedy is a work community characterized by shared values and goals, common methods, and accepted standards of conduct. It may be a minor task or a work of great moment which the work community is called upon to perform. Both require all the cooperation, strength, and force of character of which coworkers are capable. If the work community undertakes any work by their united force and strength, it can bring about that which they could not accomplish individually.
- *Concentration*. It requires a leader with strength and forcefulness to operate successfully against the evil forces always present in the workplace culture. When the leader can unite coworkers to a common vision and shared goals they form one body that can concentrate their skills and abilities toward desired goals overcoming opposition that also is always present.
- *Meaning-making*. As all stakeholders share a common meaning respecting their shared work, success follows.
- *Readiness*. Coworkers must be made ready under the leader's guidance and prepared to perform the work that is given them to do. How, or in what manner, they elect to deal with evil and unethical actions by a colleague will vary with the specific situation. But prompt, coordinated action has the most likelihood of success. The leader cannot know all the particulars in advance, for they change—often dramatically—with the situation. But the task is to be constantly on the alert for evil designs in the actions of coworkers or from subgroups.
- *Preparedness*. Leaders need to continually prepare for opposition to their work goals. The challenge may be mounted in physical terms—sabotage, for example. Or the attack may be mental—a consistent denigrating of the leaders instructions or continual challenge to his or her authority to lead. In either case, the damage is minimized by constant attention to signs of such action and a dynamic planned strategy to cope with such attacks on the leader-qua-leader.
- *Focus*. The greatest annoyance evil-minded workers will have will be the subtle but continual pressure to bring the minds of colleagues into subjection to their will and not that of the leader. Leaders must be alert to those who continually seek to overcome and entangle work community members in their snare. Because without union, without concentration and focus, it is clear that the leader cannot employ coworkers as they should be used.
- *Harmony*. Leaders can frustrate evil-minded coworkers as they try to stop contentions and strife that conceivably would create a problem for them and for those with whom they are associated. The leader has no sure foundation to work upon, unless the work community is united. In order to prevent discord and disunion—the results of everyone going their own way—leaders need to continually warn coworkers.
- If possible leaders can take more drastic, but effective, action such as firing the recalcitrant—or even a future evil-doer.
- Leaders can establish clear, meaningful values from day-one and build a culture and a team around those values.
- Leaders can promote and reward those that show moral character and reinforce workers who honor preset work community values.

- And finally, if all else fails the leader can find a new job. The results of staying in an untenable situation can have serious and long-term negative effects on any individual. And, given the inability to institute change, the leader may have to find satisfaction in leading elsewhere.
- *Humanness*. Leaders have developed certain characteristics such as cognitive complexity, seeking the humanity in others, and empathy. These skills facilitate coping with evilly-intending coworkers (Staub 2013).
- *Teaching*. Good leaders are teachers. They train coworkers and the media in similar ways. In so doing all can develop the sociopsychological preconditions that contribute to constructive leadership. Leaders can build effective interaction with members of opposition groups. They can build workplaces that teach techniques that help prevent discord and promote cooperation. Leaders prepared in these ways can turn a bad and hopefully temporary experience into a long-term, positive learning situation.
- *Perception*. It almost seems trite to suggest that an antidote for workplace evil rests with training and education. To study leadership is to engage in an inherently interdisciplinary endeavor. It is illuminated by a variety of disciplines. Full understanding of leadership is inevitably enriched by the application of multiple perspectives. It is therefore not surprising that those who attempt to make sense out of ethics and leadership in organization will observe two distinct conversations in play without much constructive crosstalk between them. These are the varying perspectives on the drivers of ethical behavior in organizations as put forth by the fields of ethics and psychology. Psychological cues drive much of human behavior. Zimbardao (2007) noted that systems and situations have great power to drive otherwise good people to do bad things. The inference is that efforts to develop individual character are anemic in the face of systemic pressures and the psychological cues that truly drive behavior. Of course individual workers are responsible for their own behavior. But the work community culture the leader creates has a heavy influence on individual behavior in group contexts and cannot be ignored.

References

Adams, G. B., & Balfour, D. L. (2007, May 31–June 2). *Administrative evil and the ethics of incompetence: Lessons from Katrina and Iraq. Ethical leadership in the context of globalization leadership*. Presentation in Leading the Future of the Public Sector: The Third Transatlantic Dialogue, University of Delaware, Newark, DE.

Bostock, W. W. (2010). Evil, toxic and pathological categories of leadership: Implications for political power. In *Challenging evil, time, society and changing concepts of the meaning of evil. At the interface*. Oxford, England: Inter-Disciplinary Press.

Caitlin, M., & Matthews, J. (2004). *Walkers between the worlds: The western mysteries from shaman to magus*. Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions. Bear.

Delbecq, A. L. (2001). "Evil" manifested in destructive individual behavior: A senior leadership challenge. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 10*(3), 221–226.

Diamond, S. (1996). *Anger, madness, and the daimonic: The psychological genesis of violence, evil and creativity* (Suny series in the philosophy of psychology). Albany: The University of New York Press.

Dod, R. P. (1860). *The peerage, baronetage and knightage of Great Britain and Ireland*. London: Whitaker.
Fairholm, G. W. (2009). *Organizational power politics* (2nd ed.). New York: Praeger.
Forni, P. M. (2008). *The civility solution: What to do when people are rude*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
Freud, S. (1955). *Beyond the pleasure principle, group psychology and other works*. Standard edition, XVIII (1920–1922). London: Hogarth.
Galinksy, A. D., Jordan, J., & Sivanathan, N. (2008). Harnessing power to capture leadership. In C. L. Hoyt, G. Goethals, & D. R. Forsyth (Eds.), *Social psychology and leadership*. New York: Praeger.
Jurkiewicz, C. L., & Brown, R. G. (1995). *The p/e ratio that really counts*. University of North Carolina, Department of Political Science: Charlotte.
Katz, F. E. (1993). *Ordinary people and extraordinary evil: A report on the beguilings of evil*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Lake, D. A., & Rothchild, D. (1996). Containing fear: The management of transnational ethnic conflict. *International Security, 21*(2), 41–75.
Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). Toxic leadership: When grand illusions masquerade as noble visions. Leader to Leader. Vol.2005. Is. 36, p. 29–36.
Machiavelli, N. (2003). *The prince*. Bel Air, CA: Dante University of America Press.
McClelland, D. C. (1975). *Power, the inner experience*. New York: Irvington.
Mitroff, I., & Denton, E. (1999). *A spiritual audit of corporate America: A hard look at spirituality, religion, and values in the workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Oxford English Dictionary. (2012). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
Peck, M. S. (1983). *People of the Lie: The hope for healing human evil*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
Peck, M. (2006). Leadership and relationship. *Journal of Financial Planning, 19*(8), 8.
Riggio, R. E. (2009, October 16). The psychology of good and bad leadership: Find out the cheap psychological tricks used by bad leaders. *Psychology Today*, New York.
Sims, Ronald R. (1992), "The challenge of ethical behavior in organizations," *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 11, 939–948.
Staub, E. (1992). *The roots of evil. The origins of genocide and other group violence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Staub, E. (2013). *Overcoming evil: Genocide, violent conflict, and terrorism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Zimbardao, P. (2007). The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil". *The Journal of The American Medical Association 298*(11): 1338–1340.

Hate

9

Many would agree with the statement that civility in America has deteriorated. Our social discourse has coarsened. Civility is based on the value of respect for others. It is seen often in such simple actions as showing courtesy toward others. Doing leadership from this perspective asks leaders to respect the feelings and concerns of their workers and customers. This often uncommon behavior works, but only if the leader's actions are authentic. Respect for others' value is universally useful. Unfortunately, too, many observers know that doing leadership is difficult in work climates characterized by the dissonance of contemporary forces compressing the actions of both leaders and led to lower and lower levels of civility (Senge 1998). The spiritual leadership paradigm focuses on personal and organizational values that reflect the tenets of genuine living: civility, authenticity, integrity, and concern for others. Among these priorities is a conscious threat of hateful behavior—by the leader but also among coworkers and all stakeholders.

Hate is part of human nature. It is a part of the normal life of people of all cultures and has been throughout history (Underhill 2012). Underhill says that hate and its opposite, love, are social and culturally similar. He says that this emotion exists in English, French, German, and all other cultures, but, it varies somewhat in the forms in which it is manifested. In America loving and hating invariably involve an object and therefore, a relationship with something or someone. In other cultures its object is less specific. In some of these cultures hate conveys the idea of frustration, apathy, and/or animosity present in the subject but establishes no relationship with a situation or specific individuals, other than an aimless desire for destruction. Hate has become such a politically charged word now that to say that you hate something generates negative responses. In this age where so-called politically correct tolerance is revered as the only acceptable way to communicate, it is important that leaders set boundaries that protect and preserve the things they value most. Protecting the group's values and their internal integrity is one of the most important roles in leadership (Stanusch and Wolfgang 2013).

G.W. Fairholm, *Overcoming Workplace Pathologies*,
Management for Professionals, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-17154-8_9

Expressing hate is a secondary response to a primary emotional upset. These precipitating emotional feelings often result from situations involving frustration or hindrance by others of one's goals, That is, defeat in attaining a desired objective may be tangential to the situation but the individual's decision to hate is a choice—a choice that can be controlled. Countering hate is the idea of love. To love is to invest in, to move forward with, to give, to inspire, and to empower others. To hate is to reject, to fear, to stray, to abandon, or to resist. Both love and hate are ingredients in a balanced life. The right combination of love and hate contributes to a balanced, harmonious, and peaceful life. Someone said that an individual's character can be measured by the size of a thing that makes him hate. Others say love is the key measure. Both work.

Of course eliminating all hate from the workplace may be a challenge beyond the efforts of any leader. But hate between coworkers causes waste as energies are directed to other than work-related activity. As such it needs to be reduced or eliminated. Hate diverts participants—the hater as well as the target of hate—to other than work tasks. Rather they both engage in hateful dialog, self-protection, and marshaling arguments and ally's to prosecute or counter these emotionally-triggered interactions. When someone engages in hate-related speech or action it causes trouble. Few of us reach adulthood without experiencing hate—our own or someone else's. Society suggests that occasional hate is inevitable and normal, even healthy. In the workplace, hate is most often unhealthy and harmful.

Most people define hate as to dislike intensely or passionately. Hate is a feeling of extreme aversion for or hostility toward someone or something. It is to detest that person or thing. Secondary meanings of the word include the idea of being unwilling to do something or to feel intense dislike or aversion toward someone or something. Unfortunately far too many individuals today are too easily provoked to hate (Staub 2003). Unchecked hate—whether verbal, physical, or both—leads to a host of problems: ill health, rage, workplace conflicts, and untold damage to work relationships. Hate is sometimes perpetuated for generations as some worker emotions carry forward to new workers. The negative consequences of hate are as many as there are hateful people. As the reader considers synonyms of the word hate they can see the wide range of negative feelings potentially generated by hate—none of which are helpful in work community interpersonal dynamics. To hate is to loathe, execrate; despise, abhor, detest, dislike, enmity, repugnance, rejection, antipathy, disdain, abominate, and disgust (Oxford English Dictionary 2012). Hate leaves a residue of emotions that include (as examples only) such things as:

Bullying	Harassment	Criticism
Improper feelings about others	Faultfinding	Violence
Murder	Offense	Name-calling
Loss of control	Physical assault	Destruction of property
Producing unkind feelings	Name-calling	Regret
Divorce	Ridicule	Thinking ill of others

The implication is clear: there is no justifiable work-related cause for countenancing hating in the work community. Hate is damaging to all concerned.

9.1 Areas Where Spiritual Leadership and Hate Intersect

Often instilling hate in the workplace causes manifold difficulties for the leader. Haters in effect are trying to redirect the work community to their—the hater's—goals. They want others to also hate what they hate. Leaders on the other hand have a major goal to insure that all work community members are working toward common goals in agreed-upon ways. As they try to inculcate unity in the workplace and foster positive values, haters try to get others to accept alternate goals and/or work methods. Hateful workers challenge leadership whether played out against the backdrop of the full work community or within the confines of the subgroup team. It is another pathological aspect of human interaction with which leaders must cope. Hate inflicts havoc in the work community due to its self-serving tendency and evil result (Staub 1992, p. xi). In the workplace hate can jeopardize leadership as coworkers divert energy from doing the work-community's work to countering perceived faults in their leader. Following are several typical situations where leader action can precipitate hateful reaction:

- Dissatisfaction or misunderstanding over significant changes in the order of work or in assignments can easily turn to hate. Leaders must be conscious of these emotions and take steps to make their orders as clear as possible and transparent as to underlying reasoning supporting the changes made.
- Employees want to come to work knowing what will happen. They do not want to have to guess whether or not the boss will be happy that day or will institute a new work schedule, assign different tasks, or announce a new work plan. Ongoing dialog with coworkers about the work to be done can mute hate and turn it into a motivation for improvement.
- Workers' emotions can turn to hate when the leader functions in terms of a set of norms for himself and a different set for the rest of the work community. The leader's behavior needs to be consistent and represent a model of expected behavior for the rest of the work group. Consistency is crucial in minimizing hateful reactions in coworkers.
- People also hate when they perceive that the leader has picked one individual or one team as a favorite.
- Employees hate when grand goals are announced from the leader but they have no way of knowing what, specifically, is expected of them. Making certain that every goal established includes worker input and understanding of needed next steps can do much to eliminate this problem.
- Employees hate when there is a gap between official rules and the informal ways people actually go about their work each day. Leaders need to insure that the informal culture of work standards are congruent insofar as possible to formal standards set to guide the work community.
- Workers typically like to be accountable and expect accountability from coworkers and their leaders. Successful leaders say what they mean and mean what they say and enforce their standards within the work community.
- Leadership is effective if it is out front and visible. Workers learn to hate their work and their bosses if they see duplicity in their leaders or their leaders are isolated in significant ways from the day-to-day work of the group.

Most people would say that hate is a negative emotion. Still it can be a catalyst to change, motivate, or clarify both personal and interpersonal relationships. While a negative emotion in most situations is to be avoided yet, if used as an impetus to change, hate can sometimes improve work life. For example if someone hates their current employment enough it may spark action to change jobs or a career. And, someone may "hate" to see people suffer, and that emotion inspires them to volunteer or make a difference in other peoples' lives. What you "hate" says a lot about who you are and what you value. It can be as revealing of character as love, or ambition, or a tendency to sloth. What you hate gives meaning to what you care about. To hate something can provide just as much perspective as love does. We all hate, but how we use the emotion can be either productive or destructive. To hate is to recognize emotions when they tell one they must stand up for what they believe. Importantly, hate must be used the right way or it can hurt both the hater and others. Leaders use hate in a way that solves, protects, and brings value to what they stand for. The power of hatred can make the leader's values and beliefs intentional. It can inspire them and coworkers to change the things they find unacceptable.

What individuals hate can determine how they may act to succeed in life and work. In the context of work life, to say one hates is about stating what they will not tolerate; what they will not endure or accommodate. Hating something gives the individual focus. It can make them stronger and protect them against the vicissitudes of life. To hate brings about motivation and clarity to resolve situations that are not acceptable. To hate something negative might make a worker more passionate about changing or improving it. As leaders understand their workers' "hates"—and their own—they can couch their leadership in ways to move their (the leader's) agenda forward.

9.2 Issues Connected With the Impact of Hate on Leadership

Dealing with the prospect of hateful behavior in the workplace asks the leader to first understand it and then take steps to eliminate or at least reduce it. Managing hate in the work community—whether the hater is the leader—or one or more coworkers—is a continual challenge. The leader can take advantage of the wisdom of the past in coping with hate in the work community.

Understanding so of the several principles describing the operation of hate may help in his task.

- The hater presumes that his or her view is the standard of truth for others to also follow on pain of consequences. That is, an individual can resort to hate if his or her views of what is right are not accepted by colleagues. When the work community fails to fulfill the individual's needs it can fill the heater with indignation and then give vent to the emotion of hate against the perpetrators.
- Leaders need—and get followers also—to separate hate from their moral capacity to decide (Bandura 2006). Failure to do so lets the individual become victim of an emotion—hate—not easily controlled.

- It is common to justify hateful talk or action by saying: "I lost my temper." But to lose something implies that giving vent to hate is an accident and that the perpetrator is not responsible for that action. In truth, hate results from surrendering self-control. Making the decision to hate is a personal voluntary choice for which the hater needs to be held accountable.
- Situational factors do not require one to hate. External factors may set up a choice situation, but the individual—not an objective situation—decides to hate. Leaders cannot minimize hate speech or hateful action until they can get perpetrators to accept personal responsibility. Only then can meaningful change take place. Sans this kind of personal responsibility, hate will dominate the work community and negatively effective group action and results.
- Bullying people is cruel and punishing to coworkers. Haters seem to like and enjoy bullying as a way to justify their own bad behavior. When someone takes their shortcomings in values or discipline out on others it is wrong. Such behavior often elicits hateful responses.
- Some leaders assume their coworkers are as dedicated to the work community's success as much as they are. While this is an end-goal for leaders, until this situation is the fact, acting on this assumption can engender bad feelings and can produce hatred in the leader toward coworkers or vice versa. Until the leader builds a culture of cooperation, trust, and unity, teaches workers to be self-reliant, and inculcates a common set of work values to coworkers, this goal can become onerous. Continuing this situation can tend some workers to hate their work and the boss.
- Some leaders are self-absorbed—they are egotistical, even vain. While sometimes getting to a position of leadership requires self-absorption, that characteristic can cause hate in some coworkers. Until leaders are seen to be consciously trying to model work community goals and methods and own up to their own shortcomings and mistakes they can expect resistance from their coworkers and even strong negative emotional responses like hate.
- Leaders who treat coworkers as a means to an end are often hated. Such leaders neglect their coworker's feelings and concerns—that is they see them as interchangeable cyphers. Doing this they fail to connect on the personal level and therefore do not/cannot lead.
- *Dishonest and inauthentic leaders also cause coworkers to rebel and resend them. This behavior can lead to hate*.

Countering these negative actions is not easy. It takes courage to change one's values. But leadership is, at its core a value displacement activity—first of the leader's values and then those of followers.

9.3 Pathologies Introduced into Work Cultures When Hate is Present

The full results of hate are not totally known, but it creates excessive physical and emotional responses in people and is generally regarded as negative. Hate is often physically destructive to the hateful person. Hate is an uncivil attempt to make

another feel hurt physically or emotionally or feel guilty. It is a cruel tool bad leaders use to correct their workers. It is often mislabeled as discipline. It is almost always counterproductive.

9.3.1 Hate Speech

Hate speech is any speech, gesture, or conduct, writing, or display which is purposefully inappropriate and is based on bias or prejudice to a coworker or group. It may also be illegal. Hate speech incites violence or prejudicial action against an individual or group, or against or by an individual or group, or it disparages or intimidates an individual or group (Nockleby 2000, pp. 1277–1279). Hate speech is speech perceived to disparage a person or group of people based on their social or ethnic (or other) characteristics or on their personal characteristics or actions (Oxford English Dictionary 2012) Hate speech is speech directed at persons based on their race, sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, sexual orientation, gender, disability, language ability, ideology, social class, occupation, appearance (height, weight, skin color, etc.), mental capacity, or any other distinction that might be considered by some as a liability. In some countries, a victim of hate speech may seek redress under civil law, criminal law, or both. Critics have argued that the term "hate speech" is a contemporary example of "Newspeak," used to silence critics of the leader's policies that have been poorly implemented (Seigenthaler 1993, p. 38). Regardless, hate speech in the workplace militates against trust, unity, and harmony and is a cause of wasted effort as both the hater and those hated expend energy in hate-filled relationships and not doing the group's work. Or they work to protect themselves from potential attack thus drawing time and energy away from the work community's goals.

Deliberate use of hate speech is a criminal offense prohibited under law. It is often alleged that the criminalization of hate speech is sometimes used to discourage legitimate discussion of negative aspects of voluntary behavior (such as competing operating policies for the work group, office politics, or philosophical allegiance). There is also some question as to whether or not hate speech falls under the protection of freedom of speech in the US Constitution. Hate speech in the work community is a source of potential conflict and division among coworkers. Leaders face the challenge of deciding when certain language used is hateful or defamatory of someone or some subgroup and taking appropriate action to resolve the issue. They also have the responsibility to build a work culture and an interrelationship values construct to discourage hate speech while keeping communication options as open and free from constraint as possible. Hate speech is toxic and can destroy the work community by putting some workers against others in highly emotional exchanges. In all cases hate works against sound organizational principles and confuses the leader's work to provide meaning, focus, and direction to the work community's efforts.

9.3.2 Hate Crimes

In America a hate crime generally refers to criminal acts which are seen to have been motivated by hate. Those who commit hate crimes target victims because of their perceived membership in a certain group, usually defined by race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, disability, class, ethnicity, nationality, age, gender identity, or political affiliation (Stotzer 2007). Incidents may involve physical assault, destruction of property, bullying, harassment, verbal abuse or insults, or offensive graffiti or letters (hate mail). Hate crimes, like hate speech, jeopardize the integrity of the work community and introduce fear along with disharmony into interpersonal relations, it destroys the leader's work to build positive relationships among coworkers and diverts worker energies and enthusiasm away from assigned work thus causing waste. Leaders need to take action to eliminate hate crimes—or the threat of such crimes—as soon as they become apparent. They are pathological and threaten the very meaning of the work "community" and its goals.

9.3.3 Personal Responsibility in Hate Situations

Sometimes people think that if only their coworker—or the boss—wouldn't do what they do, they would never give in to hate. Wrong! Each individual is ultimately responsible for their own emotions including who or what they hate. The science of emotions is interesting in this connection. For someone to feel hate, they must first be aware of some stimulus—an event, a thought, a memory. The next step is interpreting that stimulus—which is a personal judgment, a conscious decision. The interpretation of those stimuli can be relatively positive, neutral, or negative. After the personal choice the individual has an emotional response. The key idea here is that hate rises out of the interpretation the individual gives to a particular person, action, or event. It is a personal choice, not an automatic reaction. This fact becomes clear when the reader recalls situations where people around them received the same stimulus they did and yet responded very differently (Staub 2003). Essentially, Staub says, science teaches that each individual worker is responsible for their own thoughts because emotions are determined by a worker's thoughts. It follows then that individual workers are responsible for their emotional responses. Workers simply cannot blame events or others' actions for their hate. No one else "makes" someone hate. Of course, what others say and do is usually a part of the equation. But hate cannot arise without the worker's contribution.

Sadly, too often workers appear to have lost confidence in their leaders and in the programs that they lead. They have lost the sense of community that other work cultures provided: groups of independent workers have replaced work communities. Many of our business organizations lack the cohesion that mutual trust provides. As a result, many workers suffer from isolation, anomie, and anxiety. Unless workers trust both leaders' motives and their ability to lead, they will not follow

(Hitt et al. 1994). Past reliance on structural form or workflow processes have improved efficiency. Unfortunately, this focus alone largely ignores the sociopsychological dimensions of work life, and it is in this dimension of team interrelationships that we can find the solution for many contemporary problems. It is trust, more than power, control mechanisms, or hierarchical authority that makes a team function effectively (Barnes 1981).

9.3.4 Psychoanalytic Views

In psychoanalysis, Freud (1915) defined hate as an ego state that wishes to destroy the source of its unhappiness. For him hate is a deep, intense emotion expressing animosity and hostility towards a person, group, or object (Reber and Reber 2002). Because hatred is believed to be long-lasting, many psychologists consider it to be more of an attitude or disposition than a temporary emotional state. This attitudinal characteristic makes hate present in the workplace as a pathological factor. Leaders need to take action to insure its presence does not degrade the capacity of the work community or individual workers to attain shared goals. Effective leaders are continually acting to insure that the work culture is characterized by caring concern of the individual. They institute methods to remediate emotional tensions that might lead to hate, hostility, or violence. They also train coworkers in the need for and the mechanics of civility.

9.3.5 Some Ways Hate Impacts Leadership

The presence of hate in the workplace challenges the ability of the leader to, in fact, lead. Leadership is defined by several factors identified in the following subsections. If any of these factors are impeded by the presence of the emotion, hate, the work community is jeopardized and the leader cannot fully lead. In this event the leader must revert to management control to insure the group's work is done in goal-directed ways.

Setting Values: Individuals evolve a values-set that defines for them what is true or beautiful or good about their world. Work communities also do this. Indeed, a prime leadership role is to set and inculcate certain values to insure coworkers are working toward the same outcomes (Burns 1978). Either the putative leader creates a group values set or an informal leader does. When these formal or informal leaders use hate as a tool to acquire supporters or to hinder those who oppose them the real leader's work is complicated sometimes to the point of destruction.

Building Culture: Hate limits the leader's task of building a compatible work culture for success. It is clear that much of the current American work culture works against internal unity and cohesion and interactive trust. As diverse workers characterize the workplace, multiple competing cultures and subcultures with attendant different value systems are challenging the leader's work community culture both

from within and without. America is now in a situation where most work communities try to cope with multiple diverse value systems espoused by each of their stakeholders or subgroups. Leadership in this complex cultural environment is difficult at best, impossible at worst. It stretches our collective imagination to suggest that one person can, by dint of individual personality or capacity, bring together a group of diverse individuals and groups to produce anything. The task is simply beyond the capacity of any one leader. This is especially true when effort is also infected by hateful action, speech, or attitudes. There is little hope that acceptance of this situation will produce stable, effective, responsive work environments. The likelihood is that all that will be produced is balkanization. The need is for leadership to focus and direct individual action; even in the face of hateful coworkers who try to cement their ideas and values within the whole work community. Present models that do not include reference to coworker's core, character-defining values are inadequate to this task.

Instituting Positive Change: Leaders are change agents. Fostering change is getting people to sacrifice something to behave as the leader desires when they are under no specific obligation to do so. It is a persuasive task, developmental, growth-producing, and other-directed. It is not an exchange transaction—although it has some of these characteristics. It is more a teaching and counseling than it is a directive role. It is service-oriented. It involves commitment and sacrifices by both leader and led. And the results are change in the essential character of the leader and each coworker and the larger community within which they work. Barnes (1981) sees it as concerned with influencing the attitudes, abilities, and behaviors of coworkers. When hate is introduced into the matrix of change, the task of elevating the values of coworkers is multiplied in complexity. Leadership has a change-of-behavior orientation. It is paying attention to individuals one-by-one by understanding and sharing their need for personal development. The method is by increasing the use of their innate talent and autonomy. It is a philosophy that seeks to make values of self-direction and enhancement of the individual's talents and capacities high priorities not to accommodate the contaminating negative emotions associated with hate or any other powerful emotion.

Self-control: Workers need and want respect for their life and the quality of its living within the work group. They seek the freedom and liberty to function independently. Values-based spiritual leadership is a process of changing lives—the leader's own and that of all stakeholders. It defines a climate [culture] and the conditions that foster autonomy and personal development. All action by the leader needs to communicate to coworkers their authentic caring for workers' individual needs. When hate speech or action interferes it jeopardizes the very core idea of leadership as a unique functional element in any group. Leader action should support the need for independence, self-control, and self-development, but not hate-filled emotional responses. The direction of the life-change sought is toward a more empowered follower, not a cowering one. That is, the need is to change coworkers to help them be independent, free, and self-governing. When hate is part of dynamic these goals are hampered and the leader's ability to lead put at risk.

9.4 Tools Leaders Can Use to Counter Hate

Alleviating the negative consequences of hateful behavior in the work community asks leaders to be alert to its presence and expert in countering its infectious spread. There are a variety of actions available to the perceptive leader, a few of which are described very briefly below. Leaders need to be alert and take needed steps to counsel against emotionally-charged actions or language that might engender hate. They need, also to educate coworkers to the detrimental impact of letting hateful emotions disrupt workplace unity.

9.4.1 Overcoming Follower's Tendencies Toward Hate

Essential to effective leadership is the quality of self-control. Especially important is to insure that same quality is characteristic of the members of the work community the leader leads. As regards controlling expressions of hate in the workplace leader action to train, encourage, and exemplify this quality of character is paramount. Of course hate is endemic in society today. We see examples of hate speech and hateful action constantly in our leaders and their followers. Perhaps most publically, societal information networks are rife with hate-filled comments. This negative language is also common in our workplace leaders as well as among coworkers and work associates. Leaders need to develop a strategy of training, education, orientation, and a work community culture that eschews hate specific to the nature of their work community. Both workplace policies and interactions with individual coworkers are necessary to stop—or at lease limit—demonstrations of hate within the workforce.

9.4.2 Understand the Other's Point of View

The overall course of action that is best calculated to slow the impact of hate on the deterioration of our culture generally and in our work communities specifically is to understand the other person's point of view. Faced with hateful comments from those with whom we work can cause rifts in the fabric of the work culture. It can diminish effectiveness, weaken interrelationships, and result in a series of actions and behaviors that have the cumulative effect of introducing waste into the work community's processes. Regardless of the truth or falsity of the comments coworkers might make to colleagues couching them in hateful words communicates negative overtones that can totally negate the intended information or guidance the leader intends. Harsh words surely result in tension whether intentionally spoken or inadvertent. The leader can do much to mitigate the resultant emotional consequences. They can, for example, take action to insure that their point of view is made clear and that the emotional overtones are identified for what they are—"communications static"—and minimized. Sometimes direct intervention into the dialog between contending parties can eliminate the potential—or actual—hateful

emotions. More generally leaders can undertake continual steps to counsel against emotionally-charged actions or language that might engender hate and that educate affected parties to the true state of affairs. Formal training programs about the details and background surrounding routine and special work activities can help in this regard. Cultivating the talent of having a "thick skin" is also useful to leaders—and to coworkers—as is an attitude of forgiveness.

9.4.3 Develop Patience and Unselfish Concern for Others

We conquer hate by developing patience and sincerely caring for—loving—others. Examples of hateful behavior are common. So, too, are examples of compassionate behavior at work. Caring in the workplace is critical as the movement toward making work a centerpiece of worker's lives accelerates.

9.4.4 Using Humor

The wise use of humor in a tense situation will often endear an individual to others. Someone once made the disparaging remark to Abraham Lincoln that he was "two-faced." Without being the least bit offended, President Lincoln gave the clever response: "I leave it to my audience. If I had another face, do you think I'd wear this one?" (Freedman 1987, p. 4). In this witty and self-deprecating comment Lincoln defused what could be a destructive situation. Deflecting an offense with humor requires a concerted effort but it can pay off by deflecting hate and cooling emotions rampant in a given situation.

9.4.5 Replacing Hate with Encouragement

As a professor, years ago, I give an assignment to my students to write a paper on their work organization. I ask them to describe their boss' strengths, weaknesses, and the strength of his or her commitment to the work community. Perhaps the most common negative dimension of work life mentioned in student papers was the leader's temper. Typical was the comment that the leader retaliated against coworkers whenever they were thwarted. While surely not a legitimate statistic, my students' experiences underline the need for leaders to temper their tendencies to hateful rhetoric and or action that might produce a culture of hate. As an illustration, punishment as retribution for opposition most often does more damage than good. Workers tend to mimic behavior seen by their bosses. Leaders have immense influence on their coworkers and displays of hate speech or action do not engender feelings of cooperation or trust in coworkers. Rather it generates distress and hostile memories. And, importantly, it aggravates tension and destroys cohesion, trust, and puts at risk self-control and fidelity to common community values.

9.4.6 Smile in Times of Emotional Stress

A smile can expunge hate. As leaders display a positive attitude—often nothing more than a simple smile—they demonstrate good will. And this behavior is often mirrored in similar behavior in coworkers. They will be happier, do greater good, and feel a greater sense of wellbeing. As the leader sets the pace by reaching out to others with expressions of friendship, appreciation, and caring, the tendency toward hateful actions can be diminished.

9.4.7 Not Judging Too Much or on Too Minor Issues

Successful leaders refrain from personal judgment of their stakeholders and encourage similar restraint in coworkers. A nonjudgmental social culture minimizes hateful behavior.

9.4.8 Criticizing Diminishes Unity and Challenges Hierarchy

Criticism is a positive tool that leaders can use to encourage coworkers if it also balances praise for the good along with noting the damaging work done. Criticism unnecessarily or improperly administered, however, can be construed as hate speech. Criticism is always presumptuous and is often perceived as uncivil or, even, hateful.

9.4.9 Coping Strategies to Eliminate Hate

Another point that helps leaders deal with hate more constructively is to remember that hate is a signal that leaders need to correct the thought(s) that induced it. Hate is a reminder of weaknesses the leader needs to overcome. As they work to conquer institutionalized hate, leaders—all stakeholders—will have to prepare themselves to help others eliminate the destructiveness that hate introduces into work life. Only as leaders personally meet a challenge can they have success in helping others to do so. Workers cannot really know the success of living a company rule until they have lived it and used it effectively in normal day-to-day work. Understanding comes after they live the rules and follow the orders whether or not they fully understand them not before.

9.4.10 Hate Breeds Hatred and Contention

Experience reminds us that hate is opposed to love and peace. These emotions cannot prosper in the same subgroup or in the work community as hate. They are injurious of each other. Their interaction yields sorrow, the pain of conflict, and shattered hopes. Discord bred of hate is frequently observed at work. Hate doesn't solve anything nor does it build anything, but it can destroy everything (Wilder 1991, p. A2).

9.4.11 Specific Cures for Hate in the Work Culture

Following are selected universal interpersonal truths helpful in dealing with situations where hate is a part of the relationship. They are applicable also when other pathological issues arguing against leadership are being considered.

- *Reducing Hate*. Until workers achieve their goal of eliminating hate they need to remember that seldom does the work community culture or the leader frame specific guides for the constructive release of hate. At best they mitigate emotional behavior and only keep it in bounds. Leaders most often find themselves dealing with short-term crises, not long-term strategy to fully resolve the issue, rather they deal with the hate as it arises and not allows it to fester.
- *Interactive trust and trustworthiness*. Trust is the assurance that the leader—or a follower or subgroup—of the work community will consistently behave toward all stakeholders in ways that are consistent enough that other workers trust enough to assure themselves that they will continue to behave in that way in future. Personal integrity enough to engender active trust asks the leader to couch his orders in non-hateful terms.
- *Thoughtful assignment of tasks*. Effective leaders know the limitations of each coworker and assign workers to jobs they can do well or be trained to do well. In this, leaders are careful that they assign task appropriately to insure work is done and done according to preset plans. In doing this the leader insures that workers are assigned where they can be successful and the right worker, materials, money, and mind are placed on the job when and where they are needed.
- *Knowledge and awareness of the power of emotions*. Overcoming one's passions, self-governance, and control of personal feelings and disposition are crucial in minimizing hate-related activities. The functions of leadership include creating a culture that fosters civility—among other characteristics. Culture-creation highlights values such as quality service, civility, fostering innovation, and prioritizing teaming as the structural model for success. The two essential technologies that set leadership apart from other group functions are teaching the group's values and then acting consistently to support the principle of self-governance (Fairholm 1991).
- *Genuine caring*. It is hard to hate in a community characterized by authentic caring—love. As the leader fosters a climate that highlights mutual caring as a priority, the likelihood that hate will flourish is minimized. Caring includes action that shows concern for colleagues and aide in both personal (within reason) and professional needs.
- *Stewardship*. As workers are trained to consider community assets in ownership terms then destruction or injury to self or others through hate is seen as mistreatment of one's personal assets. Leadership thrives in such stewardship communities. At its core a steward-leader sees leadership as a trust. They treat leadership as a temporary assignment susceptible to termination at any time. But while they lead, they see their task as to transfer values that highlight giving comfort and assistance, extending opportunity to each other, and extending concern toward coworkers in their work. In this kind of culture hate is anathema.

- *Self-discipline*. As coworkers—leader and led—examine themselves and persist in eliminating harmful impulses. They learn patience and self-control, qualities that when applied to interactions to minimize the tendency toward hate. When leaders move people from being comfortable getting average results to being uncomfortable doing what is needed to get great results, strong feelings like hatred and hate are often triggered. The mark of good leadership is to induce high quality service by triggering caring not hate.

References

Bandura, A. (2006). Toward a psychology of human agency. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 1*, 2.

Barnes, L. B. (1981). Managing the paradox of organizational trust. *Harvard Business Review, 56*, 107–116.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Fairholm, G. W. (1991). *Values leadership: Toward a new philosophy of leadership*. New York: Praeger.

Freedman, R. (1987). *Lincoln: A photobiography*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Freud, S. (1915). *The unconscious*. New York: Penguin Books.

Hitt, M. A., Keats, B. W., Harback, H. F., & Nixon, R. D. (1994). Rightsizing. *Organizational Dynamics, 23*(2), 18–32.

Nockleby, J. T. (2000). Hate speech. In L. W. Levy & K. L. Karst (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of the American constitution* (2nd ed., Vol. 3). Detroit, MI: Macmillan.

Reber, A. S., & Reber, E. (2002). *The Penguin dictionary of psychology*. New York: Penguin Books.

Seigenthaler, J. (1993). Politically correct speech: An oxymoron. *Editor & Publisher 126,* 48, 38.

Senge, P. (1998). Leading learning organizations. In W. E. Rosenbach & R. Taylor (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in leadership* (4th ed., pp. 174–178). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Stanusch, A., & Wolfgang, A. (Eds.). (2013). *Integrity in organizations—Building the foundations for humanistic management*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Staub, E. (1992). *The roots of evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Staub, E. (2003). *The psychology of good and evil: Why children, adults, and groups help and harm others*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Stotzer, R. (2007). *Comparison of hate crime rates across protected and unprotected groups*. Los Angeles: Williams Institute, University of California.

The *Oxford English Dictionary* (Second Edition). (2012). Oxford University Press. Northamptonshire, England.

Underhill, J. W. (2012). *Ethnolinguistics and cultural concepts: Truth, love, hate & war*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Wilder, L. D. (1 Dec. 1991). Early hardships shaped candidates, *Deseret News,* p. A2.

Fear

10

Among other ideas leadership presents a conundrum: leaders need to be both analytical and emotional by turns. Psychologists suggest that there is only a small set of basic or innate emotions. Among them is fear. Others include joy, sadness, fright, dread, horror, panic, anxiety, and anger. Fear is frequently related to the specific behaviors of escape and avoidance (Öhman, 2000). People are driven by their emotions. So the problem for leaders is besides being astute decision makers they need to inspire strong emotions in order to persuade people to give their best (Maccoby, Gittel, & Ledeen, 2004). Powerful emotions like fear—or love—direct the action of members of the work community. Effective leaders develop skill in recognizing the presence of fear in their work community and develop strategies to cope with this emotion that, if present, can threaten its stability—even survival. Fear has the potential to create several dangers in the work community. History has been witness to the rise in the catastrophes caused by individuals who are influenced by fear either of their bosses or of someone else trying to gain control of others for their own ends (Adams & Balfour, 2007). Such people often conjure up irrational reasoning as justifications for inducing fear in others even though their reasons may seem logical to them.

Perhaps the most quoted question about whether or not to use fear or its threat in leadership is that of Niccolò Machiavelli (Grifin, 1991). Machiavelli made the choice stark when he asked whether it is better for a leader to be loved or feared. His answer was that if you can't be both—and few people can—being feared is more to be preferred. The competition between fear and love has been important in leadership practice, if not in theory since then—and arguably throughout recorded history. While the complexities of human nature resist definition in such stark terms behaviors lie along a continuum between the two poles: love and fear. We can classify fear as both a structural and psychological barrier to leadership (Snook, 2008). Fear is characterized by negative power-plays, rigid hierarchy, intrigue, internal strife, and distrust. Fear is the operative psychology and it, as much as any other barrier, is antithetical to development of trusting interrelationships (Fairholm, 2009).

G.W. Fairholm, *Overcoming Workplace Pathologies*,
Management for Professionals, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-17154-8_10

Workers accept another's leadership for many reasons—some overt others covert. Strong emotions like love and fear are determinative of whether or not a leader gains followers. This may be why the most attractive leadership characteristic is service. The service-oriented leader is perhaps the most respected leader. These leaders help shape coworkers into co-leaders (Fairholm, 1997). That is, the best leaders help coworkers so that eventually they don't need them. Another characteristic of liked leader is that they are loved and admired. And finally some good leaders are feared. Each of the above can—albeit by different methods—induce the work community members to do preset tasks in preset ways. One other example from the experience of many readers is the so-called leader who lets people push him around. This person is not, in fact, a leader at all (Maccoby et al., 2004).

10.1 Areas Where Spiritual Leadership and Fear Intersect

Machiavelli was a realist whose ideas may be applicable to modern leadership. His counsel in *The Prince* is that effective leadership behavior depends on the leader's nature and the challenges faced. That is, success is a function of the correspondence between the leader and the needs of the situation in which he or she operates. Neither fear nor love is better. The leader and the situation together determine whether love or hate is the best posture to adopt (Maccoby et al., 2004). If the leader understands the situation and responds authentically to his core character workers will know what is expected of them. Assuming the above, it is immaterial what specifically the leader does. If they believe the leader is authentic workers will follow. Workers who have lived through the Great Recession know their leaders cannot always guarantee employment. Nor can they insure that current work practices will continue. We live in a time of workplace turbulence. The anchor in the work community is the character and consistency of their leaders and the trust they convey to and about the work and the importance of each coworker to group success. Leaders who seek to avoid creating more chaos in times of chaos can attract commitment and trust in return. Deming (1986) said that focusing on quality demands that fear be eliminated from the work dynamic. As leaders clearly articulate their values so that coworkers know what to expect fear will be eliminated—or at least diminished. Failing that, the work community becomes an inefficient bureaucracy in that workers, when faced with a challenge, abdicate their share of responsibility for success and defer to others—the leader or another coworker.

Real leaders find fear to be anathema. It is not part of either the outcomes they desire or the methods they use to encourage coworkers to accomplish their goals. Still fear is often a part of the work community culture since some members see fear in play in other dimensions of their life and assume that fear in work interrelationships is also routine and inevitable (Snook, 2008). Others—sometimes including the aspiring leader—feel that leading via the application of fear tactics toward others is preferable. Fear can sway people in the short run via overt intimidation or more subtlety *al la* Machiavelli. But this approach tends to backfire as people find ways to retaliate against their bosses. They can, for example, hide information to

protect them from punishment. On the other hand some contend that fear can be positive. For example some leaders lead by fostering fear that the leader judges workers' performance by the highest standards and that failure to meet this high level of achievement will be rewarded by firing. Some analysts contend that this kind of fear-based leadership is necessary in today's fast-paced, competitive world (Maccoby et al., 2004). Snook (2008) lists several reasons for workers to prefer a fear-based boss:

- Being in a culture including fear as a mark of personal courage.
- Working in situations where the tasks and consequences of no compliance are known to provide a less stressful environment than the one where workers are asked to work independently.
- Autocratic executive behavior lets workers avoid personal decision making.
- A strong boss—who will push them beyond the limits to which they would go without fear of consequences for nonaction—will be more productive.

Until workers and leaders agree at the values level on methods and outcomes, using fear as a motivator may insure that work gets done. Fear-based tactics also can reduce the risk of worker nonperformance.

However, fear-based leader action underplays the preeminent leadership task of building a unique culture geared to the needs of the work community and equally to the core character of the leader. That is leaders work to build a unified, trust culture in the work community. This is an essential aspect of leadership itself. It defines leadership as a function of inducing essentially free people to constrain their freedom and to conform to group values; that is to become willing followers of leaders. The foundation for this action is mutual interactive trust—a group relationship that eschews fear as a strategy and highlights shared values and goals and ways to attain them. This requirement of leadership makes it not an individual, but a collective activity. It is only when the group is united and functioning in harmony that we can say that leadership is a successful part of the interactivity.

Defining leadership solely as a function of individual charisma, or talent is faulty. Experience just does not confirm this hypothesis. Rather leadership is an interactive function of a leader and several coworkers jointly engaged. It takes place in cultures where leader and led are united and trust enough to risk self in participation in the collective activity. Workers expect their leaders to follow the rules and typically see that as a basic element of work—all—relationships. To create a culture of trust, leaders must invite employees with relevant knowledge to participate in planning group actions and decision making. They need to communicate fully all the information and logic behind their decisions. Employees may still fear, for example, being downsized out of a job because of consolidations, technological innovations, or poor product sales. But if the organization is built on trust, they won't have to fear that changes are the result of the impulsive notions of the leader (Maccoby et al., 2004).

The leadership task is more than physical structuring of people or functions that has occupied our institutional managers for over a century. It includes relationships

that provide, in addition to trust, values, meaning, and focus within that structure. Spiritual leaders focus the power present in social relationships to shape the cultural surround within which its workers operate. Leaders provide direction, incentive, inspiration, and support to individual workers and groups, if any help is needed. Of course a strategy of fear can accomplish some of this work in the short term. But a shared responsibility relationship is more powerful than fear in achieving consistently high performance. That is particularly true in settings that require high levels of cooperation across boundaries. Effective cooperation requires people to step outside the safety of their occupational specialties or functional silos to communicate with those who have very different expertise and knowledge. Such barriers are not easily surmounted. Indeed, fear tends to make people revert to the safety of the known and to stay within the confines of the familiar. Managing performance through a fear-based divide-and-conquer strategy will set at odds the very people who must cooperate with each other to get needed work done.

10.2 Leadership Issues When Fear Is a Part of Workplace Dynamics

For the bulk of the twentieth century, executive action centered on attaining organizational ends via control—control of raw materials, and control of people and systems, Leadership was seen as merely a task of managing these "things" of production. In the twentieth century the operative mechanism to obtain needed control over people in America—the Westernized world—was at its core fear. While the twenty-first century leader is moving away from a fear—i.e., control-based style, vestiges remain like the following:

Physical fear: Formerly fear in the form of corporal punishment was common in schools. Its practice was less so in the workplace (Snook, 2008). In the twentieth century organization structures in the work communities across America was hierarchical and autocratic. The ordinary means of controlling workers were via systems of rewards and punishments. These, in turn, were based on fear and intimidation and dominated both discipline and incentive systems. Much has been done to remove fear as the motivator of leadership action, but it remains, if not always a real danger, a potential one for workers.

Prioritizing hard over soft science: The introduction of Scientific Management at the turn of the twentieth century focused leadership action on "hard sciences" techniques that ignores the human—humane—side of work interrelationships. The hard sciences focused on techniques that paid workers for obedience and punished deviation from preset procedures. Fear of being punished—the reason why the typical size of a work crew was five or six is because that is the number of men a straw boss could beat in a fight—having one's pay docked, or being fired has been a consistent undercurrent in the management theory and practice. Today's emphasis on leadership is not management—fixed attention on the needs to energize, inspire, and

motivate coworkers—not just control them. Leadership is fundamentally simple, not scientific. It is a series of dynamic relationships between people. It is not a control mechanism. It is the art of influencing coworkers.

High-quality service: High quality comes only as we move from a situation where workers work because they fear economic deprivation, to a situation where they work because they want to improve themselves and make a difference in the world (Snook, 2008). It is an empowerment idea. This shift in the predominant leadership model reflects the move from an industrial to an information economy.

Rise of knowledge workers: As the nature of work changed with the widespread introduction of highly sophisticated technologies the nature of worker needs also to be changed. The workplace has been tending toward knowledge workers since the middle of the twentieth century (Porter, Sargent, & Stupack, 1986). However, knowledge workers don't respond well to rigidity and fear (Gardner, 2008). Indeed, in fields requiring creativity and innovation—characteristics of the bulk of jobs today—tight controls stifle imagination and inspiration and limit commitment.

System controls: The old managerial pattern that ignored the need to free workers from the constraints of tight structural systems—that engender fear of job loss or worse—no longer works. These practices ignore workers' personal values, and their need to fulfill themselves in multiple dimensions of their life, not just the economic dimension (Henderson, 1994). The task now is to guide people who, because of the computer and other communication technologies, know about as much about the details of the organization, its customers, and constituencies as the chief executive. No longer can leaders control information in the sense of supervising its creation, dissemination, or application. And without "things" to control via fear techniques, management theory, and practice has little to offer as an executive construct.

All of these facts now unite to present what on the surface is a complex and confusing panorama of programs, movements, ideologies, theories, and work practices the thrust of which is to place emphasis on the intensely personal self. These self-interest programs directly confront the traditional tendency to dehumanize the workplace using fear-based scientific, mathematical, and controlling work systems. Fear as a motivator centers on maximizing efficiency at the expense of all other values. By contrast, leaders consider the personal and professional values of stakeholders as a priority along with productivity. They measure their success not by cowed workers but by coworkers—really co-leaders—whose values are congruent. Only then can there be real efficiency, or high quality, or maximized productivity. To counter fear, today's leaders focus on the following:

Fostering shared values: Leadership is an interactive relationship between a leader and several followers voluntarily engaged in communities where leader and led are united on values terms and trust each other enough to risk self in participation in joint activity. A fundamental issue in successful leadership is leader action to insure

that all members of the work community share the same values about appropriate methods and final outcomes of their joint work. Values displacement, therefore, becomes a prime leadership task, one that is impeded when strong emotions like fear are introduced into the work community dynamic. Leadership success depends upon the lender's ability to ensure that all coworkers are united in terms of core guiding values. Fear has no constructive role in such a work culture.

The Power of Relationship: For several reasons many of the managers among us implicitly choose fear as a tool for controlling others. One reason might be that they are trained to undervalue the role of intimate interpersonal relationships in achieving results. These executives often find it effective to control others by pitting them against each other, suggesting a reason not to strengthen relationships within the work community. These executives might use fear as a way to realize swift results, rather than build positive relationships that can be sustained over the long haul (Maccoby et al., 2004). The elements that make strong interpersonal relationships work include shared goals, shared knowledge, mutual respect, broad communication, and a focus on problem solving. None of these goals necessarily involve the use of fear in the leader–follower relationship.

Tolerance for Ambiguity: Fear is a challenging topic as it applies to leadership. While managers strive for tight control, leaders are open to some uncertainty, doubt, and flexibility. The challenge with fear is that it deals with consequences of actions, loss of value, and the unknown. Of course leaders—in concert with their followers—strive for common methods of doing work and for a shared set of outcomes. They share other common values as well. But, importantly, they are willing to let a coworker take the lead when that person has needed skill or knowledge. And, contrary to managerial myth, the world is a place where outcomes are unknown, people are somewhat unpredictable, and challenge and change are the norms.

10.3 Pathologies That Fear Introduces into Work Cultures

Analysis of the work community in today's world points to the inappropriateness of fear as a motivator. Tight management control and the need for physical means of inducing others to work may have been used in the last century. But, given the open, interactive nature of the modern work community, the twenty-first century workers and leaders will not countenance physical and/or psychological coercion and fear of punishment or job loss as the principle means of motivation. Rather, they see a work community characterized by collaboration as to methods of doing work, and even, sharing of leadership itself among work community members. This is the emerging character of the modern work place. The presence of fear in this matrix is anathema.

Life is personal! Work life is also personal. Each worker comes to work to get *their* values, vision, goals, and outcomes met, *not* just (often, not even) those of the work community. People join groups so that they can use the capacity of the group

to more wholly meet their goals. Leaders are no different. Leaders lead or accept another's leadership because they think in so doing they stand a better chance of achieving their personal purposes, not necessarily those of coworkers or the boss. All life is a complex competition between the individual and the groups in which the individual help realize the group's goals so they can also realize their own. Strong emotions can either help or hamper this dynamic. A caring loving culture facilitates attainment of both individual and group goals. A culture characterized by fear and stringent control over individual behavior most often hampers goal attainment by all concerned—although this outcome may be reversed in rare circumstances and for the short term by authentic leaders who help coworkers understand why fear is necessary.

Following are several aspects of the workplace where fear may be part of workplace dynamics. Fear, when present, threatens the foundation of the organization itself, leadership success, and of the health—personal or organizational—of the work community and individual workers.

10.3.1 Fear Kills Leadership

Fear kills leadership. The common definition of fear is of an emotion involving feelings of anxiety or apprehension caused by the presence or anticipation of danger. Whether real or imagined, fear is a trigger for often strong reactions. Snook (2008) asserts workers experience fear when they feel that someone is likely to cause them stress or pain. Leadership is founded on trust and confidence in the leader and by the leader. When fear is substituted for trust the idea of organization itself breaks down. In this sort of situation leadership is impossible. Fear destroys the leader's ability to lead in the work community (Peters & Waterman, 1982). Human beings have an inborn need to feel connected to others in group contexts in helpful satisfying ways. Fear interferes with this need in the work community—indeed, in any group setting. The loss of human connection, fear brings with it is driving some people out of organizations and impedes the leader's capacity to lead those that remain.

10.3.2 Fear of Failure

For some leaders—both new and experienced—fear of failure is a huge obstacle. While a problem psychologically in reality trying something and failing is more a learning situation than a failure scenario. It seasons leaders and makes their subsequent leadership more successful. Indeed taking risks is a routine part of the leadership job. Not acting because of fear of past failure is a sign of failed leadership. Taking action—even if the act is wrong or inappropriate—is often a better strategy to attain success. Sitting idly in a decision situation erodes the leader's credibility and reduces the trust and confidence coworkers have in the leader. Fear begins in the mind but it manifests in our actions and, importantly, it transfers easily into the minds and actions of all stakeholders.

10.3.3 Fear Destroys Trust

Trust, like leadership, is a universal idea. We all know intuitively what it is to trust and be trusted. But defining it operationally is difficult because the idea of trust permeates all that we do and are. Trust is a unifying and coalescing idea. Without it the idea of joint, cooperative action would be unthinkable, let alone practical. In theory, we do not need to trust in situations of absolute knowledge of the truth of a given person, action, or event. In these cases there is no risk, we *know*. Such absolute knowledge, however, is rarely present in most work relationships. Leaders seldom can rely on this level of mutual understanding of the reality [truth] of a situation, hence, the need for cultures that support a high degree of trust. Trust is a change process. Having trust in a person or something we believe to be true impels (empowers) us to change. It lets us act out of that trust. Properly placed trust empowers others, misplaced it spells defeat. Trusting others is not simple or fast; it takes time fully to trust a person or group. It is an incremental process. Each successful trust attempt is immediately reinforcing of the trust. Successive positive experiences with another cumulate until the worker comes fully to trust that person or group. Negative trust experiences produce the opposite result.

Obviously, therefore, trust is a risk relationship, but a necessary one. When we trust another person it places us at some risk of loss of control. The risk is always present in trusting others or in relying on given systems or policies or procedures or specific structural forms that they will not behave as expected. In essence when workers trust another person, event, or thing they agree to rely on the authenticity of that person, event, or thing. That is they agree to accept as true what they can now only assume is true.

Trust places obligation on both the trusting person and the person in whom we place our trust. It implies a mutual obligation to behave in specific and desirable ways. With trust leaders can function in an otherwise unknown, ambiguous, even risky, situation. With trust they can take control of a situation or circumstance. Without trust the individual leader has little real power in relationships. They have little control over other people not actually in sight. Trust is central to cultural ideas of empowerment, expectation, and predictability and crucial in leadership.

Defined as we have, we are all continually engaged in trusting relationships. Farmers plant seed without total assurance that a harvest will result. People marry without really knowing the full truth about their partner. Leaders delegate work to subordinates, or accept a leader's guidance without knowing their full importance or relevance to our personal concerns or responsibilities. And, we exercise faith in a Supreme Being without visual or tactile contact. Yet workers engage in these relationships and countless others daily, trusting that most of the time they will not misplace their trust. Trust and an eventually proved reality are inseparable. Properly placed trust empowers us. Misplaced trust spells defeat. Trust is effective only as individuals use it in terms of an ultimate reality—a reality that eventually will be proved-out in practice. Leaders must exercise trust, if it is to be effective in aiding the trusting person to act, in terms of the truth—the reality—trusted in. This means, that to trust one must have some evidence, some clue, an assumption, at least, about

what the real truth is. Only then can the trust be potentially effective. Failing this preassessment of the final reality, the risk of trusting is too great to let most workers take unconstrained action.

Given the above, when fear is introduced into the relationship the prospect that full trust will be forthcoming is placed in serious doubt. Fear constitutes a barrier between people—the leader and the led or between two workers—that introduces uncertainty, disharmony, and suspicion. These barriers place a cloud over finding the truth about another as a basis for interactive trust. To trust in untruth is costly. It results in eventual failure, dysfunction, and inaction. Success in work life is and must be based on *something* however intangible and ambiguous.

Blind trust, that is trust without at least some assurance that the unknown information, actions, events are real, is extremely risky. That kind of trust is, in fact, not trust, but foolhardiness. The fact is that work community life is always more or less unknown. Fear adds to this uncertainty and jeopardizes group success. Taken to its extreme, fear can even destroy an organization. However, trust represents a best guess, a hope that events and situations are as they purport to be. It gives us the assurance we need to act today in expectation of a desirable tomorrow.

10.3.4 Fear of the Improper Use of Power Hampers Leadership

Power, or the ability to get others to do what you want, even in the face of opposition, is compelling (Fairholm, 2009). Using power is central to all that individuals do in the work community and in all of life. The need for personal power is strong in most healthy workers and at the same time a source of fear in that others will use their power to hurt them. As workers come to expect more freedom to make their own work-related choices because of the nature of the boss's leadership, they also become more susceptible to direction from others who use fear tactics to gain dominance over them. The pressure for leaders to share their power with others, nevertheless, can be a barrier to development of a trust culture. Machiavelli said the desire to control our fellows is so strong that it dominates the minds of kings and commoners [read leaders and workers] (Grifin, 1991). Leaders themselves can thwart true, trusting leadership as they take actions that others construe as fearful (Gardner, 2008). Some people don't or can't exert power because they fear it. Or, when they do act independently, expected improvement doesn't take place; something else happens. People are flawed and the systems humans create are flawed. So, rather than helping, sometimes leaders (or coworkers) themselves become barriers rather than gates to progress.

10.3.5 Competition Over Relative Status Hinders Leadership

Membership in an organized group is a psychological need. It is also common that once the individual is a part of a larger social grouping, people want to have special place in that group (McClelland, 1998). The quest for status among our coworkers

is a common activity seen in work organizations. When workers seek to enhance their status via use of fear it can become a problem and lead to wasted effort, conflict, and diminution of unity and trust. Using fear to acquire a status advantage can blind individuals to goals and values common to members of the work community. Obtained this way the quest for status is dysfunctional—even pathological—as the individual worker turns from the institutional goal of customer service to personal need satisfaction. In this eventuality, the quest for status degenerates into a search for personal advantage at the expense of group interests. Fear erodes unit cohesion and reduces productivity (Deming, 1986) and destroys relationships—the venue for leadership action.

10.3.6 The Psychological Behavior Threats of Power Use to Leadership

McClelland (1998) suggests that some people have a need to use power. However, if the reasons for someone desiring power becomes psychologically stressed, the leaders'—or other stakeholders'—needs become pathological. Used this way power reduces trust and divides the culture and confuses group meaning-making. Those who use fear in the interrelationships determine their behavior based, not on the work community's needs, but on their self-interest. They typically behave according to their own rules, not those of their companions. And, they change these rules at their convenience. They typically feel little guilt or anxiety about their behavior or its impact on others no matter how aggressive, dominating, or demanding it is. They feel no close bonds with others. They lack the psychological ties to the value basis supporting the rest of the group. Presence in a culture of these organizational dysfunctional psychopathic coworkers reduces the likelihood of development of a unified trusting culture.

When leaders use fear as a technique to insure compliance the results are even more destructive to work community cohesion. Such leaders will prioritize their need for power over others and are willing to sacrifice the needs of the work community or any of its members in pursuit of their personal goals. Organizational and system requirements are also sacrificed to insure the leader's desires are met. These psychopathic people do not concentrate group power to accomplish a group vision or to promote accomplishment of the organization's goal. They do it to achieve dominance over other workers for personal reasons. Interactive trust is lost in this circumstance, organizational harmony is sacrificed, and productivity is lessened.

10.3.7 Cynical Behavior Endangers Leadership

The use of fear in the work group to secure compliance can also produce cynical behavior in the user of fear as well as the rest of the work community. Cynical behavior can be defined as the inability to believe in or care about what they or their organization are doing. Some group members see only the problems in any

assignment. This kind of skeptical fear-based behavior disrupts group action, reduces trust levels, and lessens creativity. While cynics can be passionate, they express their caring in negative terms. Some cynics are open about their negativity (e.g., "we've never done it this way before"), others are less obvious. Cynical behavior is contagious (Carr, 1990). Cynics are found in the ranks of both leaders and followers. The key to reorienting the cynic is motivation. The goal is to find common experiences, values, and purposes break down suspicions, and to develop trust in the leader and the goals set for the group. Dialogue with the cynic is critical to reordering his or her values foundation.

10.3.8 Internal Sabotage Puts Leaders at Risk

Unlike the open cynic, some members of some groups direct their negativity toward the group or its program(s) in subversive ways. Their purposes may be legitimate disagreement as to plans, programs, or methods. Sometimes it is revenge for a past sleight, or attack. Whatever the underlying reason this behavior undermines the organization and its leaders and programs, but in covert ways. Either the leader or followers can be subversive. Sometimes this covert enemy has a personal agenda to remove or discredit the leader via fear tactics (Grifin, 1991). At other times, the goal may be to stop some intended change. The typical techniques of this dysfunctional behavior are innuendo, slander, and rumor-mongering (DuBrin, 1978). The motive may be personal dislike or professional ambition. Development of a culture of cooperative, interactive trust is the best antidote to this organizational pathology. Leaders need to address the identified problems to the degree they are legitimate. Left unaddressed these organizational subversives can destroy a culture and eradicate cohesion entirely. The organization itself is at risk as this kind of fear-induced disruption is allowed to fester.

Leading by fear and intimidation has its own downsides—the potential for the leader's derailment is chief among them (Snook, 2008). If work community leaders are hard-nosed and dictatorial they can inspire great respect if they are also fully authentic. This kind of abrupt behavior is acceptable if it flows from genuine caring about the people making up the leader's work community or the work they do. Of course sometimes the soft approach to leadership is equally effective. But the essential factor is always the authenticity of the leader. To be effective leaders must act in concert with their core character—their spiritual, character-defining values. Given authentic behavior, in either case rule by fear or love can be effective.

10.4 Tools Leaders Can Use to Counter Fear

Perhaps the most powerful tool leader use to insure preset goals are achieved is by building strong interpersonal relationships in the work community. One way they do this is to be realistic about what makes relationships work. Of course good times and fun are enjoyable to most workers. And this behavior helps build relationships.

Beyond fun workers want to demonstrable success, clear rules, honesty, and mutual trust. When they sense that they are being treated fairly, their feelings of fear, if present, become secondary to their focus on their work community membership and shared goals. Performance is also encouraged when the work culture includes an appealing boss, one that sees his or her role as including being a coach. Importantly, leaders do not create relationships that produce results simply by having fun together. This—and other—characteristics need to be supported by a culture of discipline and a focus on achieving the end goals set by the work community. Research shows the value of having supervisors with small spans of control and close working relationships with front-line employees. Fear breeds insecurity and dysfunction; positive relationships lead to team-work and better performance (Maccoby et al., 2004).

Successful leaders adapt their style to either fear or love according to the specific event or circumstances. Style adaptability is, however, limited by the innate personality of the leader. Trying to behave in a way contrary to their innate character is inauthentic and will be seen as such by followers. In this case the result is often disastrous (Snook, 2008). The reason they call the leader's job leadership is because it is the out-front guide in any organization shaping both organizational goals and worker actions. Leaders determine how decisions are made, who makes them and the results obtained. Leaders determine how cohesive and cooperative workers are, and indeed, if they are coordinated as all. They play a major role in worker commitment, overall performance, loyalty, and trustworthiness. When the leader bases his or her actions on instilling fear, most of these results of successful leadership are forfeit. In this situation the leader must stop leading and resort to management control to secure worker compliance. Fear inserts a continual tension into the work community culture that must be eliminated before the leader can expect to achieve preset results. Workers cannot be productive when they are placed in a fearful situation or relationship with the boss or with a fellow worker(s). When they feel that decisions are arbitrary, they will eventually fail to respond to either emotion (Maccoby et al., 2004).

Fear undermines confidence and erodes leadership effectiveness (Pillay, 2012). The leader's best option when fear creeps into the work community—and it will—is to confront it directly. Ignoring it only takes control out of the leader's hands. Facing the fact of fear in the work community lets leaders take action to remediate it rather than let it fester. Fear ignored gets larger and becomes more of a problem. Trusted advisers and mentors are often good resources to help find action plans to counter the negative effects of fear in the group or in the lives of individuals—including the leader him- or herself. Left undealt with fear like other strong emotions will often resurface in another form. Action—of almost any kind—is better than ignoring the presence and effects of fear in the work community. Gibb (1961) identified acceptance as one of four dimensions of trust—the others being data flow, goal-formation, and control concerns. Acceptance is the center piece of Gibb's model. When leaders accept themselves their fear of personal failure and of the negative actions of others is reduced. Self-acceptance produces a consequent growth in the leader's level of confidence. This kind of acceptance of self gives the leader—any individual—the power to trust their colleagues even in the face of fear. Seen in this light, trust is one

of the values supporting a given culture that helps define how and in what degree members value others.

Leaders cannot allow fear to move them to rationalize away their instinct to do the right thing. The impact on the work community and its members of rationalizing behavior are significant and widespread in the workplace. Among them are the following (See Petrilli, 2012):

1. Interactive trust is diminished.
2. Fear gains the ascendency.
3. It erodes loyalty and commitment to group goals and values.
4. It sends a message to coworkers that compromising doing the right thing is okay.
5. Customer allegiance is also put at risk.
6. Jeopardizing stakeholder loyalty may contribute to the decline in long-term profitability as older, more reliable customers move on and costs are incurred to replace them.

All these issues reduce the leader's effectiveness and the fidelity of coworkers to shared values and goals.

Some leaders use intimidation and fear as techniques to get others to do required work. This is poor leadership. It does not work over the longer term. Feared leaders find that their workers produce less and display less loyalty than when they lead with a caring attitude. And, there likely will be negative consequences to leading by fear such as:

- *Increased stress*: Using fear as a motivator may positively affect the bottom line initially. But in long-term it produces stress that reduces productivity as stressed workers make more mistakes, lose focus on the job at hand, and use some of their energies to counter the negative impacts of stress in their lives.
- *Reduces creativity*: Fear kills creativity. Fear hinders workers from innovating by trying new ways to do old tasks or use new technologies to get the work done. Fear reduces the willingness of coworkers to take risks since taking risks might incur the wrath of a vengeful boss. Leading through fear has substantial impacts on the development and growth of the work community and all of its members and stakeholders.
- *Reduced worker commitment*: Given the opportunity coworkers will not want to work with a leader who uses fear as a technique in the same way they will for a caring leader. Fearful workers will not do anything more than their job description requires when fear is a part of the matrix of the leader–follower relationship.
- *Workers will stop contributing*: Leaders, like all people, make mistakes. When leaders lead by fear their coworkers will be reluctant to offer alternative suggestions. They will unthinkingly agree for fear of a negative reaction—i.e., more fearful action—by the leader.
- *Loss of talented workers*: Leading by fear intimidates workers and stifles their commitment, creativity, and trust. The most talented workers will find work

elsewhere thus reducing the overall quality of the work community and reducing the ability of the work community to attain their stated objectives.

- *Dealing with ambiguity*: We live in a world where outcomes are not always known, people are somewhat unpredictable, and challenges and changes are the norms. Accepting this truth, leaders take action to build their own and coworker's self-confidence. They do not allow fear and anxiety about the unknown to dominate their action, nor do they look at fear from the point of view of an outsider. Rather they face it and see it for what it is: false evidence appearing real. Leaders consider finding ways to overcome fear in a healthy way. Doing this is a core tool of a leader.

The above listing of likely negative outcomes of leading by fear does not suggest that a leader must cater to his workers' needs unthinkingly. Being too soft a leader produces about as many problems for success as being too hard on or vindictive to members of the work community. Spiritual leaders are patient, calm, good listeners, and compassionate. They are also demanding of excellence, wise disciplinarians, and genuine in their interrelationships with coworkers. Getting the right balance is difficult, but is the goal of all good leaders—something that cannot be obtained through fear.

References

Adams, G. B., & Balfour, D. L. (2007, May 31–June 2). Administrative evil and the ethics of incompetence: Lessons from Katrina and Iraq. Presentation in Leading the Future of the Public Sector: The Third Transatlantic Dialogue. *Ethical leadership in the context of globalization leadership*. Newark: University of Delaware

Carr, C. (1990). *Front-line customer service*. New York: Wiley.

Deming, W. E. (1986). *Out of the crisis*. Cambridge, MA: Center for Advanced Engineering Study, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

DuBrin, A. J. (1978). *Winning at office politics*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Fairholm, G. W. (1997). *Perspectives on leadership: From the science of management to its spiritual heart*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Fairholm, G. W. (2009). *Organizational power politics* (2nd ed.). New York: Praeger.

Gardner, D. (2008). *Risk: The science and politics of fear*. New York: Random House.

Gibb, J. R. (1961). Defense level and influence potential in small groups. In L. Petrillo & B. M. Bass (Eds.), *Leadership and interpersonal behavior*. New York: Holt, Rineheart & Winston.

Grifin, G. R. (1991). *Machiavelli on management*. New York: Praeger.

Henderson, G. (1994). *Cultural diversity in the workplace: Issues and strategies*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Maccoby, M., Gittel, J. H., & Ledeen, M. (2004, January 15, Winter). Leadership and the fear factor. *MIT Sloan Management Review Magazine*.

McClelland, D. C. (1998). Identifying competencies with behavioral-event interviews. *Psychological Science, 9*(5), 331–340.

Öhman, A. (2000). Fear and anxiety: Evolutionary, cognitive, and clinical perspectives. In M. Lewis & J. M. Haviland-Jones (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 573–593). New York: The Guilford Press.

Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). *In search of excellence*. New York: Harper & Row.

Petrilli, L. (July 2, 2012). *The leadership impact of rationalizing away your gut instinct.* C-Level Strategies. Visionary Leadership Blog.

Pillay, S. (2012). *Life unlocked: 7 revolutionary lessons to overcome fear*. New York: Rodele.

Porter, E. A., Sargent, A. G., & Stupack, R. J. (1986). Managing for excellence in the federal government. *Newmanagement, 4*, 24–32.

Snook, S. A. (January 2008). Love and fear and the modern boss. Special Issue on HBS Centennial. *Harvard Business Review 86*(1), 490–504.

Conventional Pathologies

11

Leading others takes place in a complex cultural metric that typically both helps the leader lead and presents obstacles to that leadership. In every work situation there are many factors present that work both for and against success. No work culture is ever fully congruent with the leader's needs. The typical work community includes people who purposefully or not act to impede progress toward the leader's goals of unity, productivity, and coordinated action. The chapters above have explored some of the most recent and most significant of these pathological features advanced ostensibly to improve the work culture that, in fact, works against this goal. They have been promoted as improvements. In fact, they have achieved the opposite result. They have hindered development of a viable, work culture and lessened the leader's ability to build a productive, mutually satisfying and effective work community. But these are not the only impediments to effective leadership.

Leadership grows out of the historical character of the particular organization led. It is a function of the habits of interrelationship developed over time in a given group. It develops its special character out of the dynamics of the interaction between coworkers and between a worker and the task assigned. Leadership facilitates coordinated activity by accommodating individual difference and by redirecting it to joint action. Leadership is possible in situations where people believe in each other enough to be open and honest about their needs and the tension between those needs and organization's needs. Achieving such a level of cooperation is not always easy given the personal tendency of some workers to dissimulate to get their own way.

Our civilization today is ill balanced. Our ethical, moral, and spiritual cultures lag so far behind our material culture in its development that we have no adequate control over the latter. This imbalance imperils us and the prosperity of our work communities. We have overemphasized materialism and undervalued morality. We have honored separateness and personal liberty and ignored the need for cooperative group action. We have eulogized wealth and power and ignored honesty and individual and group integrity.

G.W. Fairholm, *Overcoming Workplace Pathologies*,
Management for Professionals, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-17154-8_11

The people making up any work communities act and have always acted in ways they intend to advance their personal agenda whether or not the result helps of hinders work community goal attainment. For example, workers sometimes lie. They are moved to fabricate statements about their skills, knowledge, or abilities in the course of their employment. Some workers some of the time consciously deceive their leaders and coworkers to obtain some personal objective. They are at times untrustworthy, prideful, and dishonest. Or, they try to overcontrol their coworkers. Some coworkers tend to accept every idea or program anyone presents whether or not it advances their personal—or the work community's—objectives and whether or not it conforms to current accepted practice. They resist taking a stand. Others are "open-minded" to the point of being unable or unwilling to act consistently—sometimes even to act at all. Some workers exercise power over others to the point of domination. And, often they foster values that are opposite to those the leader sets. In each of these instances—and many others—they disrupt cohesion and unity—characteristics of an effective work community.

These characteristics of workers in any work culture are too often present. They have been part of organizational life from our founding. Alone they represent a constant source of problem for the leader. They require leader action to ameliorate this conduct if the work of the work community is to move successfully forward. When combined with the consciously structured systems described in preceding chapters, they can measurably increase the leader's potential for failure. Effective leaders must deal with these worker behaviors and alter them if the work community is to stay intact and meet its objectives. As a way to complete this discussion of work community pathologies that impede good leadership these common worker behaviors need to be included.

11.1 Lying

There is no universally accepted definition of lying to others (Kagan, 1998, p. 113). Generally speaking lies is an assertion, the content of which the speaker believes to be false, which is made with the intention to deceive the hearer with respect to that content (Williams, 2002, p. 96). That is, a person lies when he asserts something to another "which he believes to be false with the intention of getting the other to believe it to be true" (Kupfer, 1982, p. 104). According to these definitions, there are at least four necessary conditions for lying.

- Lying requires that a person makes a statement.
- Lying requires that the person believes the statement to be false. That is, lying requires that the statement be untruthful.
- Lying requires that the untruthful statement be made to another person.
- Lying requires that the person intends that that the other person believes the untruthful statement to be true.

These four necessary conditions for the most common definition of lying need to be explained, before objections to this definition can be entertained, and before alternative definitions of lying can be considered.

11.1.1 The Issue of Lying for Leadership

Lying is a part of everyday human interactions. In many cases lying can be beneficial in the short run for those who lie and those who are being lied to. Most of this type of lying with positive consequences occurs in a controlled way, thoughtfully, after careful weighting of beneficial consequences. Defined this way, everyone lies some times. Of more concern to the leader are workers who lie pathologically. Pathological liars are uncontrolled and their falsehoods are likely to have damaging consequences. Pathological liars lie on a regular basis and are unable to control their lying despite foreseeing inevitable negative consequences or ultimate disclosure of the lie. Generally such people have a self-defeating quality to them. These workers typically suffer from low self-esteem. They lie in an attempt to feel good about themselves, generally for a short period of time. In this respect lying is similar to the effect of drugs and alcohol use. Pathological liars repeatedly use dishonesty as an ego defense mechanism, which is primarily caused by the lack of ability to cope with everyday problems in more mature ways (Shibles, 1985).

Leaders have come to expect white lies. Coworkers say they've started projects they haven't begun. They call in sick when in fact they want a day off. Workers extol their job and at the same time circulate their resume. It is obvious that lying is pervasive. And leaders are not immune. They also fall victim to this negative interpersonal trend. How much people lie is uncertain, but it is common and has at least a long-term negative effect on individuals and the work community itself. Those telling the lies feel uncomfortable, or guilty. Lying negatively changes the interpersonal dynamic—sometimes permanently. Obviously most people would rather deal with reality than have to combat hypothetical issues. The increasingly common resort to lying adds to the task of leadership and complicates the leader–follower relationship. Leaders must determine why coworkers lie and find ways to remediate the consequences of this negative interpersonal relationship issue.

11.1.2 The Destructive Consequences of Lying in the Work Community

Some workers lie to take advantage of the situation or misguide a rival colleague or the boss. Others lie to avoid confrontation or punishment or to cover up lack of knowledge, ineptitude, or embarrassment. Some lie to entertain themselves or others. Liars lie because of failing expectations, or to receive unearned praise or avoid disappointment or disapproval. A few workers lie for the sake of lying. Habitual liars give very few if any physical or vocal signs of lying, due to the effortless nature of their lying. That said, most people give very little thought to lying and as a result they are usually inconsistent and obvious. Fear of personal loss or exposure of a fault is a major contributor in developing habitual lying in a worker for further advancement at work. Lying is more prevalent in conditions when the worker finds truth telling results in more frequent or more severe punishment. Lack of appreciating and likelihood of unwanted consequences of telling the truth may result in frequent opting out, which often involves less punishment and therefore becomes more desirable.

Lying is a common theme in organizations (Hedges, 2012). Evading the truth—lying—has reached a point where it is changing the nature of work relationships. In all facets of life—both inside the work community and in all other dimensions of life—we are faced with the fact that not everyone all the time will speak the truth. Leaders and members of work communities continually face coworkers who suppress information, mislead, or evade the truth. People lie to not have to reveal hurtful facts. They lie to hide something they did—either in the workplace or in another dimension of their life—that might reflect badly on their reputation with coworkers. So common is lying that leaders and workers become inured to it. It has become a fact of work life.

Research provides some help to the leader by identifying some of the prime causes of this pathological feature of the modern work life. While complex and often specific to the individual worker and the context in which he or she finds themselves, lying takes any of the several forms (Adler, 1997, pp. 435–452). Lying is a protective measure. Workers lie to avoid getting caught doing wrong, or avoid other negative fallout of their behavior from the leader or from coworkers. Workers lie as a way to protect themselves. To the extent that the work community is not yet fully cohesive and workers are not fully trusting of each other, some workers feel a need for a guard against others' actions. In this situation workers may feel the work community will act solely in its own best interest so workers feel they must follow suit. Lying is one way to protect their self-interest. This has been true for some work communities and true for some larger corporate units for generations. Importantly, leaders need to point out how corporate and personal interests are mutually supportive in the work community and thus forestall at least some lying behavior.

Workers are implicitly encouraged to lie because of the culture in some work communities. As leaders gloss over difficult issues and problems or ignore them a mindset focusing attention on only short-term problems and ignore the work community's real needs develop. One consequence is that workers get the ideas that it is okay to hide incipient problems before the boss finds out. Rather than speak or let the group deal with it as a team, some work community members sometimes hide problems. Or they provide overly positive responses, and do whatever it takes to not be the one to raise problems. Some leaders let workers feel that the entire work community is unethical and rewards office politics and deception. This reason for lying may be the most devious. When people willfully deceive customers or coworkers they are knowingly lying to each other. Lying becomes a situational custom. If this culture is to be altered leaders must first change before they can expect coworkers to change.

Lying is a powerful force in any small group. It can destroy a work community by decay from within. Often it is so subtle that the leader is unaware of its presence until the entire workplace is infected.

11.1.3 Leader Actions to Reverse the Culture of Deceit

Each member of a work community is free to act against the leader's values and choose those values they want to follow. But, as in any small group, culture members are often swayed by their coworkers. Leaders adopt and model the behavior they

want to see in their workers. Leaders in a deceitful environment modify their own behavior and expectations first. Their coworkers rise or fall to the leader's expectations. If the leader wants to encourage honesty, they should publicly reward people for being honest and truthful especially when it takes courage to do so. They take the time to thank and/or reward coworkers for acts of integrity. As leaders combat the impression that they value profit over people, they make overt moves to highlight times when the work community puts its people above or equal to its bottom line. The more workers see that the work community is devoted to its people—and its workers to each other—the more this rationale erodes.

As leaders work to change the lying cultural dynamic they create structured opportunities for workers to report problems to them both in public and private encounters. Thus leaders honor whistleblowers. And they take action when presented with the truth. They are authentic in that when an issue is raised by a coworker the leader takes prompt action to remediate the issue to the benefit of the work community and its members.

11.2 Deception

An important and often unrecognized idea in leadership thinking has to do with deception—of self and/or others. Many of the problems that prevent exceptional leadership performance in work communities are the result of either the leader or coworkers deceiving one another. Deception is of two types. Other-deception (Baron, 1988, pp. 431–449) is to deceive or to cause another person to believe something that is false. That is, a person who consciously or inadvertently causes another person to have a false belief deceives that other person. We can deceive another person by intentionally lying to them (Adler, 1997). It is also possible to deceive someone about some matter other than the content of the statement made, whether that statement is true or false. Self-deception, on the other hand, is the individual's process of denying or rationalizing away the relevance or significance of opposing evidence and/or logical argument. It involves convincing oneself of a truth (or lack of truth) of a statement or condition. When someone deceives themselves they do not have to have conscious knowledge of the deception. Understanding self-deception involves the analyst in several branches of knowledge: epistemology, psychology, sociology, and morality.

11.2.1 The Issue of Deceit

The most common paradigm of deception in the work community is interpersonal [other] deception. In this paradigm a person intentionally gets another to believe some proposition, all the while knowing or believing it to be untrue. Such deception is intentional and requires the deceiver to know or believe the proposition is false and the deceived to believe it to be true. In this traditional mode, deceivers must (1) hold contradictory beliefs and (2) intentionally get another worker to hold a belief they know or truly believe to be false (Hållén, 2011). This process of

rationalization can obscure intent. McLaughlin and Rorty (1988) illustrates that such rationalizations unintentionally misleads the other worker into believing or continuing to believe the statement of the deceiver via biased thinking. He deceives himself in a way appropriate for self-deception or he deceives another in the same way. No deceitful intention is required for this.

Current organizational theory and practice finds itself in the same situation that medicine faced a century and a half ago. In those days, doctors didn't understand how a single disease could lie below the surface of a range of different symptoms, and they had no conception of how germs cause disease. As a result, they could only treat symptoms. Work community members—like all other people—can be afflicted by "disease"—in this case the "disease" of deception, a major offender in workplace failure. It is easier to see self-deception in others. The careful observer will have witnessed both self-deception among politicians, corporate leaders, and other executives, clergy, coworkers, family, and friends. Deception among people of influence has hurt colleagues in social situations, in church, and in the work community.

11.2.2 Pathologies Introduced Into Work Cultures by Deceptive Practices

Deception can take many forms. Lying, of course, is one form. Others include: making indirect, ambiguous, or contradictory statements or concealing real intent by omitting information that is important or relevant to the given context, or engaging in behavior that helps hide relevant information. Exaggerating the truth or, conversely, minimizing the truth are both kinds of deception (Guerrero, Andersen, & Afifi, 2007). Whatever the form, the result is to disrupt, even, destroy organizational interrelationships. Deception includes several types of communications or omissions that serve to distort or omit the complete truth. Intent is critical with regard to deception. Intent differentiates between deception and an honest mistake. Deception is a major interpersonal relationship offence that can lead to feelings of betrayal and distrust between the deceiver and coworkers—or between the leader and his coworkers if it is the leader that is at fault. Deception violates interpersonal relationship rules and is considered to be a violation of expectations. Most people expect friends, coworkers, and their bosses—even strangers—to be truthful most of the time. If people expected most conversations to be untruthful, talking and communicating with others would require distraction and misdirection to acquire reliable information. A significant amount of deception occurs between relational partners (Guerrero et al., 2007). Deception, deceit, bluff, incomprehension, and subterfuge are acts to propagate beliefs that are not true, or not the whole truth—that is, half-truths or omission. It can involve dissimulation, propaganda, and sleight of hand, as well as distraction, camouflage, or concealment. There is also deception caused by bad faith.

In the work community deception challenges the integrity of the group, challenges group ethical standards, can move the work community away from group goals,

and thus negatively affects the work community culture. Allowed to continue it can destroy the group and make irrelevant work community values agreed-upon ways to doing work, and shared goals. Deception places pressure on the deceiver. He or she must recall previous statements so that the narrative remains consistent and believable over time. Deception is a complex, fluid, and mental process of mutual influence between a sender, who manipulates information to depart from the truth—or established practices and outcome intentions—and receiver(s), who attempt to establish the validity of the message (Griffiths, 2004). Apparently there is no nonverbal behavior that is uniquely associated with deception (Milgram, 1963, pp. 371–378). There are, however, some nonverbal behaviors that have been found to be correlated with deception. Milgram's (pp. 371–378) research found that examining a "cluster" of these cues was a significantly more reliable indicator of deception than examining a single cue.

There are several reasons why workers undertake to deceive the leader or a coworker(s) in work relationships. For example, workers use deception to avoid hurting a coworker or to help him enhance their own self-esteem. They also deceive to avoid worrying the boss or coworkers and to protect a coworker's relationship with someone else. This kind of deception can be viewed by some as beneficial and constructive to good order within the work community. Sometimes workers will dissemble to enhance their self-image or because want to shield themselves from anger, embarrassment or criticism. Action to protect the individual's self-image usually has negative consequences for the deceiver and the work community. Finally, some workers use deception to limit harm by avoiding conflict or interpersonal suffering (Guerrero et al., 2007). Well-intentioned examples of work deception are always of concern to leaders who work to eliminate it from the work community.

11.2.3 Tools Leaders Can Use to Counter Deceptive Practices at Work

Identifying deception in coworkers is often extremely difficult. Unless a coworker tells a blatant or obvious lie or contradicts something the other worker(s) knows to be true it can be difficult to discern. While it is difficult to deceive others over a long period of time, deception often occurs in day-to-day conversations between members of the work community (Guerrero et al., 2007). Identifying deception is difficult because there are no known completely reliable indicators of deception. Following are actions that the leaders have taken in given situations that have helped and that seem to work.

- If in selecting workers to join the work community leaders select workers with the best chance of being compatible with all coworkers.
- If workers like each other and are willing to share work and leisure time together.
- Deceit is lessened in a work community when workers share respect for each other's integrity.

- Deceit is reduced if workers are willing to try to understand each other, and keep confidences.
- It is reduced also when coworkers spend time identifying individual and group interpersonal needs through reflection and contemplation.
- Honest relations are enhanced when real effort is devoted to creating and maintaining the character of the work team and coworkers act to improve and sharpen it according to shared ideals of an effective work team.
- While not commonly discussed in the workplace, the character, reputation, and overall honesty and integrity of a work community and its individual members is lessened most when authentic caring—even love—is not part of the interpersonal dynamic.

11.2.4 Untrustworthiness

Our national character—shaped by our national culture—tends us to distrust others. Americans generally are suspicious of the motives of those in authority and increasingly today are distrustful of their colleagues in the work community. Workers distrust their leaders and the operating systems they are asked to follow to deal effectively with the complex and multidifferentiated tasks common to doing work in most work communities. This basic—almost intuitive—distrust of leaders has made leadership itself more difficult. The problem is not a lack of leaders, but a lack of trusting environments within which leadership is possible and without which it is impossible. Yet trust relationships are the bulwark of our lives. The work community culture increasingly defines life's quality and character. Our actions imply trust or distrust in everything we do or say. All aspects of the working relationship are based on our relative trust of others—superiors, peers, coworkers, clients, and all other stakeholders. Leadership in this kind of environment requires their personal adherence to ethical principles that highlight trust (Maccoby, 1981) and that workers highlight this key aspect of relationships in their interactions with coworkers.

11.2.5 The Issues Leaders Face in Encouraging Interactive Trust

The leadership task is creative, developmental, and integrative (Fairholm, 2011). The challenge is to mold followers into a unified, balanced, and inspiring whole capable of constant cooperative action. We can view this task as physical—that is—structural. Or we can see it in the informal psychological contracts leaders and followers make (Golembiewski & Gibson, 1983). In the past reliance on structural form or workflow processes have done something to improve efficiency. This focus alone largely ignores the psychological dimensions of organizational life. This is the cultural dimension. And, it is in this dimension of group interrelationships that we can find the solution for many contemporary problems. Leadership technologies can only operate when trust among coworkers in relationship is high. Trust can significantly alter individual and organizational effectiveness. It is trust more than

either power or hierarchy that really makes an organization function effectively (Barnes, 1981). Trust is prerequisite to any attempts by the leader to transform (change) his organization's culture (Sashkin, 1986). Trust is the salient factor in determining both worker and work community effectiveness on the job (Zand, 1972). It makes interpersonal acceptance and openness of expression easy. Mistrust evokes interpersonal rejection and arouses defensive behavior in both workers and their leaders. Trusting behavior consist in increasing one's vulnerability to another worker in ways and in circumstances where the risk is greater than the potential outcome to the trusting person. Trust and acceptance of self as a leader must have preceded acceptance and trust of coworkers. These factors provide a culture within which both leader and coworkers can commit to each other. These characteristics of the situation are critical in creating any relationship. Where trust is present leadership can take place. Where it is missing we lose the ability to lead.

11.2.6 Pathologies Introduced in Work Cultures Due to Distrust

Our recent love affair with diversity leads some to believe that taking diverse people into our work groups and allowing them to retain their different values, customs, and traditions is good—helpful—in doing the work-community's work. This is wrong! Of course, injecting new ideas and approaches offer the potential for positive change. But only a coordinated, integrated, trusting work community culture endures successfully over time. Such a culture exhibits unity and cohesion of which characteristics are essential to community. It stretches our collective imagination to suggest that a leader can, by dint of personality or authority, get diverse workers to cooperate long enough to consistently produce anything. The task is simply beyond the capacity of any one leader. All leadership is founded on a culture of mutual interactive trust. Different—diverse—ideas or methods do not build unity—it destroys it. The leader's goal is to change a bunch of diverse workers into a harmonious unit characterized by common purpose and united by trust. Absence of trust one can expect chaos, not cooperation or commitment (Wheatley, 1999) and no one can be assured that needed work is done or done well.

Workers, of course, may differ on a variety of issues. But success depends on a culture bound together with commonly held values and shared goals and methods of doing the work a given work community is asked to produce. While spontaneous at times, lasting leadership is a result of specific, planned actions to create an intimate, amicable ambience around the work values and ideals the leader and coworkers have come to share. Such a culture creates harmony among the disparate, sometimes competing, organizational, human, and program factions found in any complex organization and is an expression of authentic community. It is from such a shared trust culture that leadership evolves and flourishes and within which followers find fulfillment. Functions characteristic of leadership focus on the value of trustworthiness. Other useful ideals include cohesion, choice, unity, security, and cooperation. These values guide leadership tasks of building cultures that foster trust (Dreilinger, 1998).

Three actions highlight leadership as regards trust. Each is central to countering the detrimental effects of lack of trust in the work community. The first is creating and promulgating a viable vision of the future of the work community. The leader's role is to create a mutually trusting team out of diverse individuals. The result is to bring diverse workers into a union of purpose. They often do this via a vision statement articulating the group's future state of being. Leadership is about finding and then unleashing the natural human desire for unity and mutual trust underneath the chaos of everyday work (Wheatley, 1999). Second, sharing governance fosters mutual interactive trust and facilitates the emergence of interdependent teams and multiple team leaders. Leadership is a shared task and when that factor is lacking, the work community cannot expect success (Kaufman, 2004) now or in the future. Rewarding work community performance is the third need. Workers need to trust and be trusted based on more than just the bottom-line economic rewards possible through group work. Healthy workers need to be free to innovate and create, to do their work in various ways—not just the so-called one-best-way. In so doing they grow and mature. Unless leaders see developing, rewarding, and recognizing workers as major goals of group work, they cannot expect workers to follow their lead.

11.2.7 Tools Leaders Can Use to Counter Distrust

Distrust is reduced and trust is encouraged by shared experiences—for example, through participative leadership styles. The sharing can be sharing with coworkers of organizational tasks such as planning or decision making or cooperative work during a crisis. Or, it can be sharing of ideas or philosophies or goals with coworkers. Regardless of whether it is one or the other or a combination of several, the need for collaborative interaction is one essential in nurturing trust and reducing distrust. Leaders acting out of authentic shared leadership provide a culture that encourages—among other things—trust in them, in coworkers, and in the joint enterprise. Characteristics of this leadership approach include the presence in the situation of open and free communication. Leaders share leadership tasks with coworkers. In doing this they help them develop to the point that they can make independent decisions, plan, and perform other routine and special leadership tasks. Leaders encourage expression of feelings. They encourage formation of special project group structures and relationships.

Participation enhances the need for and the presence of trusting relationships. Where participation is low, followers reduce their trust in their leaders. Alternatively, we encourage trust by being open, honest, and by talking freely with followers about the need for trust. Leaders who show a willingness to change if the facts warrant it attract trusting followers more than those who do the opposite. Workers develop trust by trusting others. Trusting others produces self-controlled colleagues, not supervisor-controlled ones (Fairholm, 2011). Other ways leaders can reduce distrust is by:

- *Increasing Trust via a Helping Relationship*: A helping relationship is one in which someone intends that coworkers attain more appreciation of and more use of their latent personal resources. Helping relationships begin on the basis

of authentic liking for coworkers and a willingness to express it. It also depends on understanding of the coworker's needs and capacities and accommodating them insofar as is possible. A helping relationship is one in which leaders keep the relationship judgment-free to the extent that it is possible and prudent. They see things as the worker sees them. They relate on both an objective *and* a feeling level.

- *Increasing Trust via Naive Listening*: Naïve listening asks the listeners to listen as if they have never heard the communicated information before. Leaders listen in this way. They do not evaluate the speaker's words and ideas, at least, initially. They do not attach meaning to ideas prematurely. They are supportive, confirming, and encouraging of other's ideas at least until they are thoroughly vetted.
- *Increasing Trust via A Consistent Leadership Style*: As workers come to rely on the leader to behave in consistent and predictable ways they work better together. When behavior is erratic there is no true foundation upon which to develop a work community relationship (Howard, 2002).

11.2.8 Pride

The often used word, *pride*, is subject to several interpretations. Pride is one of the most deceptive and damaging traits that can affect the leader's ability to lead. Some see pride as a positive aspect of the leader's character, and it is—sometimes. If we define pride as self-confidence then it is a leadership virtue. But, pride can also be a negative part of the leader's character. When viewed as a virtue, pride in one's character and ability is known as virtuous pride, greatness of soul, or magnanimity. But viewed as a vice it is often termed vanity. When pride [vanity] begins to affect leadership, its effects can be devastating. And we can say the same things about worker's pride too. It can redound to the work community as either a positive or a negative quality. The real problem with pride in the work community is that it often masks its effect to the leader and to members of the work community.

11.2.9 The Issue of Pride in Leadership

Being proud is a mindset beset with problems. Uncontrolled it permeates the individual's thoughts, words, and actions. Subconsciously it can sabotage the prideful person. Coworkers will not see it as self-confidence but arrogance, conceit, and or selfishness—none of which endear coworkers to the leader. Spiritual leaders know this and insure that their focus is on their coworkers not themselves. They enable their coworkers. Rather than being proud they reflect a humble attitude that both internally and externally reflects their authentic character. As for all character traits, authenticity is the key to successful interpersonal relationships. And it is the same with humility. Unless it is authentic it isn't humility; it is a sham.

Leadership theories have changed over the years. Today we read a great deal about humility being a key leadership trait (Mahaney, 2005). Humility is a new idea

about leadership, one not noted in older leadership theories. While it may be a passing fad—like charisma, statistical decision making, or participatory leadership—the idea comports with sociological theory and most likely with the experience of most readers. Whatever the future holds, it is an idea worth consideration. Humility means not proud or haughty; not arrogant or overly assertive. Humility means accepting reality with no attempt to outsmart it. A humble leader or worker is continually learning to improve for the benefit of all members of the work community. Humble workers avoid arrogance, and importantly, keep growing for the benefit of all they work with and for the work community. To be humble does not imply the individual is wishy-washy, indecisive, or variable. Rather it means strength under control (Ibid.).

No matter how open-minded or far-reaching the leader's communications are, having a top executive role requires that he or she use diligent, mindful effort to stay grounded and in touch with how the decisions they make effect their coworkers in the work community and how it affects them [leaders]. It is the leader's job to build a culture where workers accept their skills but do not take their expertise so far that it morphs into hubris. Workers and their leaders have an independent responsibility to demonstrate personal integrity and take responsibility to do their job in a way that justifies their pride. While rarely seen in the literature, the antidote to self-aggrandizing pride is humility (Mahaney, 2005).

11.2.10 The Pathological Consequences of Pride in the Work Community

Hubris is defined as extreme pride or arrogance. This characteristic of excessive confidence or arrogance leads workers to believe that they may do no wrong. The overwhelming pride called hubris is often considered a flaw in character. Hubris often causes irrational and harmful behavior. It leads the individual to disconnect with reality instead of connecting with a legitimate self-confidence. Afflicted with hubris workers often misuse the power implicit in their expertise. Left unchecked the result invariably leads to lowered productivity, dysfunctional intercommunications, and waste as worker effort is redirected to countering the proud colleague's dysfunctional behavior (Chester, 2012). Rather than pride or hubris, the effective leader demonstrates its opposite, humility, to inspire loyalty and help to build and sustain a cohesive, productive work community. Leading humbly and often in the background these leaders see success. By contrast executives who rely solely on charisma sometimes lead coworkers to failure. The attribute of humility has been largely neglected in leadership theory, but not in practice (Mahaney, 2005). It is the counterbalance to and mutes the destructive, pathologically toxic effects of hubris.

Humility is not synonymous with indecision or weakness. It is not merely courtesy, or kindness, or friendly behavior. Nor does the humble worker necessarily shun publicity. The work community benefits when coworkers understand the value of marketing, including self-marketing. Humility helps the work community and individual workers flourish and prosper. Hubris, meanwhile, is not a fair label to apply to any person who thinks differently and has the courage to assert or act on

their convictions. Serious problems emerge, rather, when robust individualism commingles with narcissistic pride or hubris. Workers afflicted with hubris combine an exaggerated sense of their own abilities and achievements with a constant need for personal attention, vindication, and, or external approval. While the label tends to be applied loosely to anyone behaving in a self-absorbed way, psychologists know hubris to be a formal personality disorder for some, and a real impediment to all to their participation in healthy relationships. Prideful workers lack empathy and are often oversensitive to criticism or perceived insults. They frequently exaggerate their own contributions and claim expertise at many different things (Dame & Gedmin, 2013) beyond their true capacities.

11.2.11 Leader Actions to Reverse the Negative Impact of Pride

John Dame and Jeffrey Gedmin (2013) remind us that self-celebration is a characteristic of our times. It is easy to confuse work community success with, worker self-importance. They point out that in doing leadership it is easy to move to pride. The alpha instinct often gets mistaken for ability and effectiveness. While this perception is exposed as pride over the longer term, until then form can overcome function in the dynamics of the work community member interactivity. Moving from pride to humility involves a significant retraining of the individual worker. Leaders can create such a program as they include in the curriculum ideas like the following:

- Perhaps the best way to avoid the pitfalls of hubris is to not hire or promote self-promoting people.
- Cultivate more humility as a desirable—and rewarded—value in the work community.
- Too often a leader works by the old adage that "if you want something done well do it yourself." As leaders do what they do better than their coworkers and delegate to each worker tasks for which she or he is best suited by training and experience, the whole work community is enhanced, credit is shared, and no one is encouraged to take excessive pride in the tasks done.
- All people have a tendency to put the best spin on their contributions to work-community tasks. When taken to, excess humility is lost and pride takes over.
- Generally today's workers are better educated and far more independent than they formerly were. They are more aware of what is possible for them—and more wanting. Pfeffer (1977) says that people want to achieve feelings of control over their environment. Given this situation, it is more difficult for any one worker to think that they are the linchpin of the work community around which the group's success is geared. The work community is filled with other hard-working, high-IQ, and creative professionals. Sharing credit humbly is more logical than taking all credit to oneself.
- Leaders need to adopt a policy of embracing and promoting a spirit of service to each other in the work community. As workers come to understand that their

leaders and their coworkers have a goal of serving colleagues' needs as well as their own, the work community output and cooperation increased.

- Listen naively—that is, listen as if you have never heard what the speaker has said, even if you have heard it many times before (Fairholm, 2003). Too often leaders think their ideas better than a coworker's and fail to give the coworker's ideas sufficient close attention. Given a chance to be heard Dame and Gedmin (2013) say there is evidence that the most imaginative and valuable ideas tend to come from a coworker who may not hold a key position in the work community.

11.2.12 Overcontrol

Doing management and doing leadership continues to follow separate operational paths. They are two opposed dynamics. Leadership is a distinct and separate social interactivity present in all group relationships and embedded in the idea of relationship itself. That is, all interpersonal relationships that endure over time include doing leadership. Our work communities need authentic leaders who deal openly with moral and ethical issues, leaders trained and willing to honor and serve workers. It needs leaders who know that the work community composed of workers with diverse values cannot be controlled—only led. Doing leadership is putting forward a set of values and ensuring that it is adopted by the work group because only in cultures that share common values can needed work be sustained over time. Control techniques cannot duplicate this result (McFarland, Senn, & Childress, 1993).

Of course the leader's work community dynamic includes ways to control the flow of information and to direct work activities and skills to the right place and at the right time. This need is part of the infrastructure of any shared relationship. But it is not a prime motivator of worker action—influence is. And, over time neither leaders nor managers can control anyone, even direct reports absent extraordinary effort. Workers—like their bosses—come to work everyday to satisfy their own needs, not the work community's. There are fundamentally only two ways to get work-community work done. One way is to manage workers—that is, to create and enforce stringent organizational structures and managerial control techniques which consume great amounts of energy and require constant supervision and control. Or, they can lead by finding ways to get workers to *want* to do the work the leader wants them to do because they also want it. That is to induce workers to see their work as a way to realize their [worker's] personal goals while doing the work-community's work. Thus, no one needs to control anyone—except perhaps themselves. But leaders can influence nearly everyone by dint of their attractive values and goals for the future. This is the essence of true leadership. By this definition, Jesus, Mahatma Gandhi, and Martin Luther King, and Nelson Mandela were great leaders. They had control of virtually no one, yet their influence changed the course of history (Fairholm & Fairholm, 2009). Notwithstanding the above, some leaders some of the time try to get their needs met by overcontrolling the work of their coworkers.

Overcontrol or micromanaging does not hold up over time. And having a boss who is overcontrolling is one of the most difficult work situations workers have to deal with. Micromanaging limits worker's independent action, frustrates creativity, and reduces workers to automatons. To counter this behavior workers are forced to expend much energy and time to counter the controls leaders impose on their [worker] actions. They waste time unnecessarily when their bosses limit the flow of information to them and they must work to gain access to restricted, but needed, resources. Or leaders impose restrictive policies and procedures. Examples of overcontrol in business and government—indeed all—workplaces abound. This does not mean that workers should have no regulation. What it means is that workers should have only regulation that is necessary when the self-correcting elements in a market system fail. Limiting leadership to only those controls that are necessary is a standard intended to counter the perils of micromanagement.

11.2.13 The Issue of Overcontrol in Leadership

It is fair to say that all executives lose control of their work community at least sometime. Fear of losing control can lead to either under- or overcontrol. Of the two overcontrol is perhaps the worst leadership failure. The causes of overcontrolling coworkers are as many and varied as there are leaders in America. When anything goes wrong or a crisis is pending leaders sometimes stop leading and begin to exercise managerial control over their workers. When that happens, the movement from control to overcontrol often follows. The need to overcontrol those workers and things around us can prevent us from attaining the best result from work community effort (Hillman, 2011).

Losing control begins with compromises. It morphs into anxiety and insecurity and finally into fear of loss of coworker compliance. When in the US Air Force I learned that when a jet airplane goes out of control and begins to spin, the only thing the pilot can do is totally take his hands off the controls. If the pilot survives it is because the plane will get right itself. This goes against intuition. But it oftentimes works when nothing else will. And it works in the work community too. Our natural inclination is to control and manipulate people and things in order to bring them back to preset goals and methods of doing work. It is frightening to be out of control. Similar feelings challenge leaders in times of crises. While the right thing to do is relax control, too often they redouble their control efforts—they overcontrol. The need to overcontrol things around us can prevent us from achieving sought-after results. It is a sign of an unhealthy organization.

Micromanaging demands expenditures of large amounts of energy by the leader to impose controls on coworker action and similar amounts of worker energy to counter these restrictions. And the energy used by both is largely classified as waste, since little forward movement toward desired outcomes is forthcoming for that expenditure of work community resources. Micromanaging gets everyone nowhere fast, When work community members become frustrated with their overcontrolling

leader—or when leaders have to deal with overcontrolling subordinate managers this can often also result in conflict. While conflict can be productive on occasion, it is mostly unproductive and wasteful.

A major issue leaders struggle with is how much control to exert over the work community. Factors of size and task complexity complicate this determination. Extremely controlling leaders can become arrogant and sometimes abusive. Even worse, they limit worker creativity and professional development. Also, they ignore leadership succession needs because they deny coworkers experiences in, planning, decision making, and leading. The key to success in using control techniques is how the leader employs it. The leader, who insists on excellence, assigns the people that have the most appropriate expertise to run their areas, develop the best processes, and systems, and provide information and guidance end up on top. Leaders who think they are experts in everything and meddle in all aspects of the work-community's work end up failing and usually leave the work community without a successor.

Creativity and innovation are marks of leadership. These are minimized by over-control. The effective work community combines uniformity and consistency in coworker performance with improvisation and order with elements of spontaneity and a little disorder. Peters and Waterman (1982) expressed the idea that excellent leaders move beyond the routine when the situation warrants it. They do not adhere slavishly to standard procedures in their pursuit of excellence. One of the eight Peters and Waterman attributes of the excellent company is simultaneous "loose–tight controls." This idea is that leaders need to go beyond regular controls because to do otherwise is to micromanage which leads to wasted work effort. The clash between control and service highlights the basic issue leaders face vis-à-vis control. It is a matter of trade-offs. At one end of the continuum of action there is the optimal degree of control. That is, every procedure and process is defined in manuals which have the force of law. Exceptions are forbidden, and all events are policed and recorded to ensure that the work community literally works to rule. At the other end of the continuum, there's the optimal degree of freedom. People are trusted to behave honestly and intelligently and with the needed expertise. The reporting system is designed as a forward-looking aid to maximizing performance. Initiative, creativity, and innovation are encouraged and rules are few and far between (McGregor, 1960).

11.2.14 The Destructive Consequences of Overcontrol in the Work Community

Effective spiritual leaders build a work community characterized by harmony, an integrated system of work tasks, and voluntary, but coordinated, cooperation. The most common mistake made by the novice leader is to overcontrol to insure this result. Some leaders inherit a work community consisting of mostly peak performers. Others have to build such a work group. When these culture-building leaders insist that every worker—including long-term trained workers—have to ask

permission to take even routine action they create discontent,. Allowed to continue this micromanagement will cause initiative to decline and workers will wait to be told what to do in even simple situations. This loss of initiative can cause cohesion to deteriorate and destroy the work community's effectiveness.

Overcontrolling, micromanaging leaders trigger several changes in the culture of the work community—all of which sap innovation, willingness for workers to work hard, and misdirected focus on the end-products for which the work community was formed. Some leaders fall victim to one of these shortcomings. Others display several. And at least one in the author's experience reflected all of the following elements of overcontrol (adapted from Neuharth, 1998):

- Some leaders overcontrol by emotionally engulfing their coworkers. This behavior discourages independence and cultivates a tyranny of repetition in coworker's thoughts and feelings.
- Some leaders deprive workers by withholding attention and encouragement from their coworkers. They differentially treat workers to needed attention and recognition.
- When some leaders overcontrol workers to continuously excel a byproduct is fixation on internal group order, personal prestige, power, and or form over function in which case group integrity is lost to a sham reputation.
- Overcontrol by the leader can transform the work community into a faction with the leader at the head and all workers in the faction are equally "in the know" about everything going on in the work community and nonfaction workers are left without needed information to act.
- Overcontrol sometimes moves to a quasi-military type organization wherein members feel special and certain and rules of conduct are rigid.
- Some leaders faced with complex and confused work situations become unstable and confused. They resort to unpredictable moods, totally inconsistent discipline, and confusing communication.
- Some leaders overcontrol by becoming hypersensitive and self-centered. They see coworker gains as their loss, and consequently belittle colleagues.
- A few leaders verbally or emotionally bully coworkers as a way to tightly control their behavior. They see coworkers as potential—or actual—threats to the leader's self-esteem and treat them accordingly.

11.2.15 Leader Actions to Reverse the Negative Results of Overcontrol

More and more our work communities and their parent corporations, government agencies, and other groups have the characteristics of mini-cultures. As such one counter to micromanagement of work communities is to structure them in the federalism model (Handy, 1992). That is leaders can secure needed, but not excessive internal control by applying hierarchal principles to their leadership. Given the growth of society in general and work communities in particular, a federal structure

is particularly appropriate. It offers a well-recognized system for dealing with the need to make things big by keeping them small. It facilitates the need for individual and work community autonomy and does so as it also keeps small groups in bounds. Federalism also allows for variation in work methods while maintaining overall outcome standards and methods. It allows for both control and variety by balancing power among those in the center of the organization, those in the centers of expertise, and those in the center of the action—the front-line work communities. Federalism ensures a measure of democracy and creates a "dispersed center" that is more a network than a place.

There are other professional ways to deal with overcontrolling leaders. For example it is important to not overreact to an overcontrolling boss. Exercising restraint more often produces the desired change in the leader's behavior. Good advice on handling micromanaging leaders proceeds on the premise that this is a two-way street—micromanagement is often a problem behavior for both leader and the led. Workers also do things the leader interprets as inappropriate and sometimes impose new restrictive rules to counter that behavior. As both seek common grounds, such problems can be minimized and maybe eliminated. The terms "boss" and "subordinate" are being replaced in favor of terms like "work community leader," "team leader," or "direct report." Still, when the need is there normal practice is for one person to, exercise power over others. While not in common practice team decision making is an alternative to one-person rule. The typical "boss" often imposes—often unthinkingly—a powerful but negative effect on the emotional health of coworkers. Sharing decision making is a way to handle this problem (Kiechel, 2010, p. 320).

11.2.16 Being Too Open-Minded

Open-mindedness means that a worker will acknowledge the possibility that new evidence could in future lead to a change of mind. But this does not preclude the worker drawing reasonable conclusions in the near term. Open-mindedness is receptivity to new ideas. It relates to the way in which people approach the views and information of others and integrates the belief that others should also be free to express and be recognized in their views (Mitchell & Nicholas, 2006). In our western world, many people feel proud of themselves in being "open-minded." It is thought to be part of what is required to be free of being blinded by false ideas and superstitions. Among the benefits of open-mindedness is balance—individuals are less swayed by particular events and are more resistant to suggestion and manipulation. They are better able to predict others' behavior. Additionally, open-minded people maintain their beliefs by selectively exposing themselves to information that is likely to support their preconceived biases. They tend to be less critical of evidence that supports their beliefs than evidence that runs counter to their belief system.

Research suggests that leaders and their coworkers are more likely to be open-minded when they are not under time pressure. These individuals are more likely to

be open-minded when they believe they are making an important decision. This research suggests that the way in which an idea is presented can affect how open-minded someone is when considering it (Baron, 2000).

11.2.17 The Issue of Being Too Open-Minded as a Leader

It is generally acknowledged that open-mindedness is a leadership virtue. Open-mindedness requires that the leader abstain from drawing conclusions too quickly. Critically, it does not mean to be so flexible that leaders forego using their innate intelligence and common sense logic. Repeating the conventional wisdom will serve some people, not the effective leader. Innovative thinking and/or experiencing new stimuli makes the individual keener, more energetic, more creative, more sociable, and more open to new experiences and new ways of thinking (Hare, 2002). The key ingredients are to be open to new experiences and to make changes in previous ways of thinking about current experiences.

11.2.18 Being Too Open-Minded

But there is some confusion as to what open-mindedness actually involves. Looked at one way to be too open-minded is to be indecisive. The trait of open-mindedness is best understood as a state of mind. It is not so much about what beliefs individuals actually have, but how open they are to revising them in appropriate circumstances. It requires the true humility of self-acknowledged fallibility. It requires that leaders' and workers' minds be open to new evidence. But this is something very different from suggesting that they should be as equally accepting of nonsense as they are of sense. That is not open-mindedness; it is gullibility, or perhaps stupidity. The reader will see this in the mindless acceptance of every fad, new so-called theory, and/or work process introduced into the modern workplace. Leaders, by contrast, are open-minded to a point and then their mind is close to ineptitude, irrelevance, fad, or error. They resist being unthinkingly acceptant of anything and everything. In a word they are closed-minded to passing fads and fly-by-night schemes intended to fool the unthinking and bilk the unwary (Haiman, 2009).

11.2.19 Open- Versus Closed-Mindedness

The dictionary defines closed-minded as being intolerant of the beliefs and opinions of others' absent proofs. It is being stubbornly unreceptive to new, untried ideas (The American Heritage Dictionary, 2009). The challenge is to be open-minded to good—useful—ideas but closed to passing fashions. A closed mind is sometimes taken to mean the attitude of a person impervious to ideas, arguments, facts, and logic. It describes someone who clings stubbornly to some mixture of unwarranted assumptions, fashionable catch phrases, tribal prejudices, and/or emotions. But this

is not a "closed" mind. It is an inert one. It is a mind that has dispensed with—or never acquired—the practice of thinking or judging. It describes a leader or worker who feels threatened by any request to consider anything. What success in the work community requires in this regard is an individual with objectivity and an active mind able and zealously willing to examine ideas *critically, searchingly, and judiciously*. These leaders—or workers—do not give equal weight to both truth and falsehood. They are not passive about examining the details of work community actions and processes. They search for certainty in an uncertain environment—a certainty based on assiduous learning, analysis, and the application of common sense. The open-minded leader is searching for stability in an unstable society. They seek truth in a world where lying often pays off in the short term and too often is in greater supply than honesty. Open-minded leaders strive for the conviction of rightness, where most others settle for present practices or the middle ground.

Much of routine work life is governed by assumptions, prejudice, or bias concerning somebody or something that occupies the minds, thoughts, and feelings of most of the leader's contemporaries. These presuppositions are garnered almost by osmosis from the ambient culture. Few would argue that the human race's past is a history of closed mindedness. Traditions were handed down from generation to generation. People were taught what were "right" or "wrong," and "true" or "false." They were taught what to think or not think. They were taught what to do or not do. Anyone straying from the accepted views or ways were considered foolish, and possibly a danger to the group that the person belonged to. The leaders of the group would attempt to straighten out the foolish person by reeducation. If that did not work, the leaders would resort to some form of punishment to force the foolish worker to change. The punishment many times included trying to humiliate or discredit the recalcitrant colleague, isolating him or her from participating in the group, and verbally and physically abusing that person. The leader's purpose in doing this was to prevent a breakdown of the extant power structure that they controlled. Given the nature of the modern work place and the educated and "wanting" character of today's workers, such practices are suspected today. Leaders need to find other ways to discipline workers. The open-minded leader tries to subject such ruling presuppositions to critical examination. In their mind they are only cautiously accepting of the contemporary culture's "wisdom" until it is subjected to rigorous analysis.

11.2.20 The Destructive Consequences of Being Too Open-Minded

The tension caused in the minds of leaders as they try to cope with being cautiously open-minded about most issues facing them and consciously closed minded to other things presents a problem for them. There is a constant dialectic played out between what leaders see as fact and their opinions about something. A fact is something that it is—verifiable by one of the five senses. Absence of analysis opinions is neither right nor wrong. They, simply, are what the leader believes. Leaders can be either in

step or out of step with others, or they may have questionable morals but it is what they *think* is true. That is opinion; and opinions are not right or wrong. Learning the difference between fact and opinion is not a hard concept. For example: It is a fact that you are reading this book. Your opinion about it—the book is useful (or not useful)—is an opinion. Everyone can agree upon the fact. Not everyone can agree upon another's opinion since it is neither right nor wrong. Facts can be wrong but opinions can't be.

Leaders are constantly challenged to keep their minds open to uncover and promulgate facts and to mold work community members' opinions to facilitate attainment of the group's shared goals and methods. But, being unreservedly open-minded is a formula for failure. On the other hand, being fully closed minded to any and every new idea encountered can lead to disaster, even the dissolution of the work community as a reliable, dependable, coherent unity. As leaders confront issues, ideas, and situations in the normal operation of their work community business, they are continually assessing them. How they treat them—either with an open or a closed mind—is conditioned by at least the following factors that executed positively can enhance the work community, handled negatively it constitutes unhealthy work community pathology.

- Open-minded leaders humbly submit their ideas to the critical reactions of their coworkers, and thus, avoid the mistake of thinking that any superior knowledge they possess vis-a-vis workers confers infallibility on them. They acknowledge the risk that they may be shown to have made a mistake. Humility does not mean that the leader should think that his knowledge base is more valuable than coworkers. It may be but their experience often confers insights and wisdom not possessed by leaders. A humble demeanor facilitates success. Pride facilitates work community failure.
- *Individuals—either the leader or the led—with expertise sometimes claim the* ability to make an independent and critical judgment about every idea assuming others in the work community will rely on them. Unfortunately experts are not infallible. The open-minded individual is alive to this possibility and avoids falling into a risky belief that may morph into them being duped. No one is infallible. *Leaders* reject absolute certainty as unattainable and work to insure that coworker's beliefs are warranted in terms of presently available evidence. Failure to do this introduces a toxic element into the workplace dynamic.
- *Bias is* often mistakenly equated with simply having an opinion or a preference when in fact it is often baseless. An opinion that results from an impartial review of the evidence is an unbiased stance. Similarly, fairly reviewing evidence before drawing conclusions is not a bias; it is a determination to avoid this pitfall. Open-minded leaders seek to avoid bias in their leadership. Viewing each person, problem, or situation with an attitude of openness implies willingness to accept an idea regardless of its merits. Effective leaders give ideas due consideration and reject those ideas that cannot withstand critical analysis. This approach to intragroup activity allows coworkers to entertain challenges to their views but

keeps ultimate decision making founded on factual analysis—a significant aid to sustaining a healthy work community.

- At any given point in time open-minded individuals have a firm conviction and yet are prepared to reconsider it if contrary evidence surfaces. On the other hand, the dogmatic individual fails on this score since they regard their belief as having been laid down by an authority that cannot be disputed. An open-minded person ensures that claims and theories remain open to critical review and are not seen as fixed and final beyond all possibilities of further thoughts. Close-mindedness risks weakening the work community.
- *Gullibility is a* state of mind in which individuals are so ready to believe that they are easily taken in by any claim or spurious idea. If something seems too good to be true and is still regarded as true nevertheless illustrates this state of mind. Being well informed combined with the ability to think critically is the chief defense against credulity and is a powerful prop upholding work community standards and the leader's ability to lead.
- Unlike guesswork, judgment utilizes information to support a tentative factual claim that goes beyond the available evidence. Also unlike dictatorial assertions, judgment draws on information, together with general principles, to determine what ought to be done or what value something has. Open-minded leaders know that their judgments rest on limited information—maybe on misinformation—and are willing to suspend judgment when the evidence is insufficient to guard against damaging work community integrity.
- Judgment is not a passive unquestioning assent, but rather is intimately connected to naive listening. Naive listening involves really trying to connect with a coworker's ideas in order to really understand them. Open-minded leaders listen to what is said, to how it is said, and to what is not said. They are willing to limit their own contributions at least initially so as to give appropriate recognition to the ideas of coworkers. Leaders give coworkers the opportunity to develop their own opinions before sharing their own. In this sense the leader is neutral in many initial communications with coworkers. They hear the workers before they disclose their view of which action helps preserve worker unity, encourages creativity, and capitalizes on work community energy, innovation, and commitment.
- *Leaders use questions as a way to analyze issues and to remain open-minded for as long as possible*. Some questions assume a predetermined correct answer thus discouraging critical inquiry. Other questions create a risk of confusion by incorporating an uncertain presupposition. Still others arbitrarily restrict the range of listener's inquiries. All of this is hostile to open-mindedness. Conversely, good questions serve to open everyone's mind. A seemingly trivial question can sometimes reveal a novel idea or approach to resolve a work community problem. Poor questioning skills thwart unit cohesion, limit worker skills development, and general growth.
- Enthusiasm, passion, and commitment are powerful qualities that, if present, come through very clearly in the leader's manner. When the leader is enthusiastic about all aspects of the shared work, workers will often be caught up in the same excitement. However, no quality is absolutely blamable or praiseworthy and

positive fervor can soon pass over into undesirable zealotry. Too often zealotry translates into propaganda or indoctrination which is consistently detrimental to work community success.

Another pathology the good leader guards against in their work is the tendency to be too open-minded. Perhaps the reader will remember hearing someone say they always approach any significant issue with an "open mind." Leaders can hardly have a worse qualification than a fully open mind. It is a formula for disaster and carried to the extreme can be pathological for both the leader and the work community. Difficult issues require serious, sometimes prolonged study to master. Leaders need an open mind, but they also benefit—as does the work community—from a closed mind after they have settled on a significant decision affecting the manner of their leadership or the continuing successful functioning of the work community. There are times when leaders need to hold firm ideas about the issues they are charged with understanding. Open minds are not always a good thing in leadership. We look to leaders for new ideas, but they are also the source of stability, structure, and continuity. On this issue, leaders live between the two extremes of absolute open- and closed-mindedness. They balance black and white issues, good and bad courses of action—or people—and, being nonjudgmental and judgmental. Leaders are both open and closed in their thinking. It is inevitable in leadership.

The science of Complexity Theory argues that life is lived on the edge of chaos—on the border between chaos and order. Chaos at the extreme represents total receptivity to any idea. It is being so open that no single idea is ranked above any other idea. In this case the leader doesn't change, mature, or grow. Conversely, order at the extreme represents absolute systemic certainty. In this case, too, growth and maturing of the leader's leadership skills is also forestalled. Complexity Theory suggests that without balance there's no effectual life. The effective leader can take his work community to the edge between closed and open-minded—the formulaic and the flexible—because they have learned a workable balance between the two. A policy of either strict closed mindedness or strict open-mindedness isn't good leadership. It is no leadership at all. It is deadly (Sherman, 2009).

11.2.21 Summary

Factors of the work culture both help and hurt the leader's ability to practice spiritual leadership maximally. Some factors—like those few noted above—are always present in any organized group and present readymade impediments to leadership. Taken to their extreme they can become toxic to both leadership and the viability of the organizations they lead. Indeed they can become pathologies that can kill effective leadership. Coupled with the sociopolitical pathologies introduced into the workplace—quite apart from the goals of the leader and his work community—they can forestall workers' growth and hamper, redirect, and significantly lower both the quality and character of the work community and debase core values and objectives mutually set by its members.

References

Adler, J. (1997). Lying, deceiving, or falsely implicating. *Journal of Philosophy, 94*, 435–452.

Barnes, L. B. (1981). Managing the paradox of organizational trust. *Harvard Business Review, 59*(2), 107–116.

Baron, M. (1988). What is wrong with self-deception? In B. P. McLaughlin & A. Oksenberg Rorty (Eds.), *Perspectives on self-deception*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Baron, J. (2000). *Thinking and deciding* (3rd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chester, E. (2012). *Reviving work ethic: A leader's guide to ending entitlement and restoring pride in the emerging workforce*. Austin, TX: Greenleaf Book Group Press.

Dame, J., & Gedmin, J. (18 Sep 2013). Humility is key to workplace leadership. *Financial Review*. Sydney: Fairfax Media.

Dreilinger, C. (1998). Beyond cynicism: Building a culture which supports both ethical business practice and high performance. In W. E. Rosenbach & R. Taylor (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in leadership* (4th ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Fairholm, G. (2003). *Techniques of inner leadership: Making inner leadership work*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Fairholm, G. W. (2011). *Real leadership: How spiritual values give leadership meaning*. New York: Praeger.

Fairholm, M. R., & Fairholm, G. W. (2009). *Understanding leadership perspectives: Theoretical and practical applications*. New York: Springer.

Golembiewski, R. T., & Gibson, F. (1983). *Readings in public administration*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Griffiths, P. J. 2004. *Lying: An Augustinian Theology of Duplicity*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Brazos Press.

Guerrero, L. K., Andersen, P. A., & Afifi, W. A. (2007). *Close encounters: Communication in relationships* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.

Haiman, F. S. (2009). A revised scale for the measurement of open-mindedness. *Speech Monographs, 31*(2), 97–102.

Hållén, E. (2011). *A different kind of ignorance: Self-deception as flight from self-knowledge*. Diss. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet.

Handy, C. (1992). Balancing corporate power: A new federalist paper. *Harvard Business Review, 70*(6), 59–67.

Hare, W. (2002). Teaching and the attitude of open mindedness. *Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations, 16*(2), 103–124.

Hedges, K. (2012). *The power of presence: unlock your potential to influence and engage others*. New York: American Management Association.

Hillman, O. (2011). *Change agent: Engaging your passion to be the one who makes a difference*. Lake Mary, FL: Charisma House Book.

Howard, S. (2002). A spiritual perspective on learning in the workplace. *Journal of Management Psychology, 17*(3), 230–242.

Kagan, S. (1998). *Normative ethics*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Kaufman, H. (2004). *Values as foundation*. Boston: Interaction Associates.

Kiechel, W., III. (2010). *The lords of strategy: the secret intellectual history of the new corporate world*. New York: Harvard Business School Press.

Kupfer, J. (1982). The moral presumption against lying. *Review of Metaphysics, 36*, 103–126.

Maccoby, M. (1981). *The leader*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Mahaney, C. J. (2005). *Humility: True greatness*. Sisters, OR: Multnomah.

McFarland, L. J., Senn, L. E., & Childress, J. R. (1993). *Twenty-first century leadership: Dialogues with 100 top leaders*. Long Beach, CA: The Leadership Press.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McLaughlin, B. P. & A. Oksenberg Rorty (Eds.), *Perspectives on self-deception*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Milgram, S. (1963). Behavioral study of obedience. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67*(4), 371–378.

Mitchell, R., & Nicholas, S. (2006). Knowledge creation in groups: the value of cognitive diversity, transactive memory and open mindedness norms. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management, 4*, 67–74.

Neuharth, D. (1998). *If you had controlling parents: How to make peace with your past and take your place in the world*. New York: Cliff Street Books/HarperCollins.

Peters, T., & Waterman, R. (1982). *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies*. New York: Warner Books.

Pfeffer, J. (1977). The ambiguity of leadership. *Academy of Management Review, 2*, 104–112.

Sashkin, M. (1986). True vision in leadership. *Training and Development Journal, 40*, 58.

Sherman, J. (August 12, 2009). Ambigamy absolute open- or closed-mindedness: Beyond a shadow of a dot. *Psychology Today*.

Shibles, W. (1985). *Lying: A critical analysis*. Whitewater, WI: The Language Press.

The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 4th ed. (2009). New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Wheatley, M. (1999). *Leadership and the new science: Learning about organization from an orderly universe*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Williams, B. (2002). *Truth and truthfulness: An essay in genealogy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Zand, D. E. (1972). Trust and managerial problem solving. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 17*, 229–239.

Summary and Conclusions

12

A cohort of the growing body of theorists is coming to the conclusion that leadership is not just a cluster of skills, knowledge, and common practices of persons who occupy that group role. Rather, it is a function of the whole person of the individual leader. That is, the leader leads on the basis of his whole self and the task is to build relationships with followers at the level of their core self—their spirit self (Cacioppe, 2000; Capelli, 1999; Covey, 1992; Nirenberg, 1998; Ryan, 2000). In their search for success, spiritual leaders focus both upward toward their file leaders as well as downward toward their coworker-followers. In these rapidly changing times, workplace and personal success requires that both parts of the leader's continually shifting roles are active. Leadership is based on leaders displacing disparate worker values and substituting their [leader's] work values. In doing this they create a true, united, internally cohesive community. That is, leaders work to create a unified group that direct their combined efforts to the leader's set of work methods and one eventually mutually shared outcome. In fact, Cacioppe (2000) defines the central role of leadership as the development of spirit at individual, team, and organizational levels.

The workers making up the modern work community have changed. Of course they retain many of the characteristics typical of past generations of workers—diverse, differentially motivated, some skilled, some specialized, some not. The task of leading asks leaders to override the increasing acceptance of diversity-cum-diversity characteristic of today's workplaces. They differ today from their past counterparts in that they expect that their leader will accommodate their individual needs recognizing too that they must modify their values and needs in the interests of the work community. Doing leadership from this foundation of commonly held values, work methods and goals is the only effective way to lead in the twenty-first century. Leaders put forward a set of values and ensure that they are adopted by the work group because only in cultures that share common values can needed work be sustained over time.

G.W. Fairholm, *Overcoming Workplace Pathologies*,
Management for Professionals, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-17154-8_12

The traditional work community is defined as a complex culture which itself is part of a multifaceted hierarchy of cultures. And the culture is a composite of values, rules, customs, jargon, some level of worker autonomy, and a defined structure whether loosely or tightly defined. Each culture in the hierarchy characteristically has a sanction system, is stratified in discernable ways, and boasts a generally known goal system. Work communities have an understood task assignment system, and understood—not always accepted—methods of doing work. There is some degree of coworker warmth, support, and empathy present, a known level of safety or risk, and a sense of belonging and loyalty. This listing is illustrative only. Other factors also may be present in an organization that shape and condition its culture. Unfortunately present-day leaders are asked to work in a radically altered culture made artificial by the imposition of standards of conduct that place multiple new tensions on work interrelationships. These externally imposed requirements for dealing with coworkers and customers impinge on the effectiveness of the work of leadership and constrain—even obstruct—the leader's ability to lead. Leaders today work in a more complex and more broadly inclusive cultural milieu (Kelley, 1998). These modern complex cultures oftentimes place competing demands on the leader. Sometimes these demands rise to the level of pathologies that attack the leader's ability to lead. The effects of the contemporary multicultural work environment negatively affects the vibrancy—even existence—of present-day work communities.

Each of the features of culture noted in preceding Chapters can hamper the leader's and the work community's collective ability to perform needed work. Of course, in some cases some of these factors facilitate group and leader success—or are of only marginal concern. Yet the leader must accommodate each while doing leadership. Each of these new cultural features can constitute a threat to the organizational health and vitality of the work community. The readers to this point will have acquaintance with the major pathological aspects of the work culture in the contemporary world. Each of these cultural pathologies has, perhaps, always been potentially toxic in the work environment. Together they are fully descriptive of today's workplace and occupy an inordinate amount to the leader's time and talents to ameliorate. They are always present in any formal or informal group and in the various informal subgroups, factions, or cliques routinely present there. They are ready-made impediments to leadership. Failure to engage these cultural features frontally threaten to destroy effective leadership. Uncontrolled they can kill effective leadership.

Summarizing, any leader leading a small group of workers in business, government, or any other social group encounters the following pathologies that can threaten the health and wellbeing of the work community. They include:

12.1 Conventional Cultural Pathologies

Leaders have always dealt with the following coworker behaviors and actions:

- *Lying*—Intentional prevaricating is toxic when practiced by individual workers. It is even more detrimental when practiced by the leader. Only truth lets workers

work together without reservation, share new ideas, and give pride of place to others.

- *Deception*—deceiving others includes purposeful dishonesty such as trickery, sham, cheating, duplicity, and willingness for the perpetrator to assume multiple personas while performing work. Deception destroys the foundation of trust essential to any group action. It breaks down organization structures and can frustrate essential intercommunications essential to cooperative and coordinated group activity.
- *Untrustworthiness*—Lack of trust causes colleagues to withhold information or ideas from coworkers because they cannot be sure how this information will be used by them. Creativity is reduced when trust is absent. And change is impeded.
- *Pride*—is warranted or unwarranted attraction of honor or esteem to oneself at the expense of others or of the full truth. Proud people resist being part of any community. Indeed they isolate themselves from it and live and work by other standards than group-set guidelines.
- *Overcontrol*—is, in essence, reverting to management of others rather than leading them through the force of the leader's values.
- *Being too open-minded*—means to be accepting of every idea or proposal others introduce. *Being too open-minded is to be undiscerning, unthinking, and gullible*. A too open-mind worker or leader is as bad for the individual and the group as being closed-minded. In either case the work community is worsened.

Other pathologies seen commonly in small groups—but not directly discussed herein—also include:

- *Laziness*: or indolence is disinclination to activity or exertion despite having the ability to do so. Lazy workers or a lazy leader minimize—sometimes to the point of failure—the work community's capacity to attain their short- and long-term goals. Carried to extreme it is a pathological condition of the workforce.
- *Divided loyalties*: *are* among the workforce means that some workers, while loyal to the work community values and goals, also are sympathetic to the objectives of a coterie of coworkers, their professional affiliations, or some other set of ideas or ideals unrelated to the core work of the work community. Divided loyalties diminish worker energies and the skills they direct toward work community goals. This behavior reduces the group's service potential, collective creativity, worker self-control, and group unity.
- *Professional rivalries*: are either positive or negative. An organizationally healthy competitive spirit can have positive effects if the intent is to challenge complacency and push coworkers towards higher level of attainment. Sometimes this competition turns toxic, crossing the line into deceit, sabotage, and/or back-stabbing.
- *Ethicality*: concerns the integrity and honesty code around which leader and the led treat their coworkers. When these factors are handled negatively, leadership is not possible.
- *Morality*: is a constant honorable standard that inspires coworkers to ethical action (Nair, 1994). Leaders influence the moral conduct of others by demonstrating the

desired behavior, rewarding ethical behavior, and punishing unethical conduct (Covey, 1992). In the absence of a moral foundation, the work community faces the kind of increasing worker dissatisfaction that threatens the contemporary workplace.

- *Refusal to serve others' needs*: is antithetical to traditional work values. The innate need to be "of service" makes it inconceivable for leaders or those they lead to overcontrol others. Rather they are always looking after the broad range of interests of their followers. The goal is to make sure that other worker's highest priority needs are being served along with those of the group. Failing this the relationships vital to cooperative action are damaged and may be destroyed thereby making unified work impossible.
- *Not treating coworkers with basic humaneness*: Caring is defined as feelings of concern or interest for another. Caring is a part of the idea of consideration. It is a fundamental respect for the uniqueness of the individual (Fiedler, 1967). Caring involves the leader in giving time and attention to workers and what they do. Caring also implies respect. One cannot communicate caring and at the same time humiliate an employee, a client, an agency, or a program. To act in uncaring ways lessons the at-fault worker, weakens the community, and endangers its future existence.

These pathologies are typically continually present tests of the spiritual leader's skill in culture-building. They have been a potential—often actual—part of small group dynamics from the beginning of organized human activity. While commonly seen in the work community, they nonetheless represent significant challenges to leadership—a challenge that if not overcome can kill the leader's chance to successfully lead other human beings. They also put in jeopardy coherent, cooperative group activity. Leaders are leaders by definition in that they are influential in the work community and vis-à-vis their coworkers. Influence is a kind of power (Fairholm, 2009) and is the ability to get others to do what the leader wants them to do, even in the face of their opposition. This definition is strongly reminiscent of that of leadership itself. The result of power use and of leadership is the same: to get others to comply—that is, to get others to behave in desired ways. It is *the* essential leadership task. This task and this goal are impossible of accomplishment when the leader is overcome by the conventional cultural pathologies described above. Thus a key leadership skill is building a work community culture that lets leaders successfully cope with these cultural pathologies that can kill the leader–follower relationship.

12.2 Recent Cultural Pathologies

Other elements of culture are also strikingly present in today's work cultures that are of more recent origin. These newer features of the work community culture are flow out of the societal culture and entry to the workplace via each worker—new hires and older colleagues. That is, the present-day ambient culture is imposed on

the work community leader by the spillover from other cultural groups within the parent organization or from the general society. These also can be lethal to good organizational health and leadership. Described in preceding Chapters, these newly emphasized cultural pathologies are reviewed below to provide readers with a comprehensive listing of detrimental—pathological—challenges to leadership posed to leaders in the present-day, the twenty-first century American workplace.

In addition to the myriad of internal, so-called normal challenges they face in leading a work community composed of diverse people, today's leaders have to cope with relatively new (at least in terms of intensity and force) forms of human behavior that have crept into the work culture not necessarily directly connected to the work community or any of its associated economic cousins—or, even to the general and specific outcomes the work community works to attain. Leaders today face a welter of challenges to their success by cultural features interjected into day-to-day work life for reasons quite apart from the work being done. Striving to accommodate these changes in the work culture adds a powerful stressor to the extant work community structure and normal work relationships. These new impediments prevent worker growth and lower both the quality and character of the work community. They degrade core work community values and objectives mutually set by its members. And, they frustrate the leader's attempts to acquire and foster and then lead creative and productive workers. These cultural features are not incident to extant—or new—leadership theories. They are separate from normal work issues. These new cultural constructions have often masqueraded as traditional ideas and values. The sponsors often have used traditional words but have given then entirely new connotations. For example liberally used to mean generosity. Now it means a specific ideological orientation. And, being tolerant once meant accepting others' values. Now it means accepting only some ideas or people or values and being intolerant to the point of excluding any other values, coworkers, or opposing opinions. This confuses the casual worker and allows new cultural forms to invade the workplace and become established before the full import of their impact on the work culture and community relationships is known. By then it is almost too late to return to former roles and relationships and recapture traditional meanings for these key ideas/ideals that have defined America for centuries and shaped interpersonal relationships in the workplace and elsewhere in the larger society. Over the years these key descriptors (and others) of America have been commandeered to mean things many Americans cannot logically accept as compatible with American work values or healthy to its continued growth and maturation. Indeed, they have become toxic to the idea of individual worker freedom, liberty, and equality. Their presence in our work cultures lessens efforts to build a common community of interest, and maintain workable workplace cultural traditions. Where once these words conjured up ideas people saw as good for the individual and the work community, now they are limitations, slowing and redirecting the course of America's once vaunted economic productivity.

These newly accentuated cultural pathologies have introduced fear and hate into the culture as tools to force compliance to their specific ideal about not what American is and was but what they think it ought to be. And they have divided the

country into antagonistic factions that engender distrust, and along with hate and fear, force their goals on the work community in unrelated—to their goals—ways. These work cultural changes have, on the evidence, proved to be unhealthy in the workplace. The net effect is to change American work cultures into something they are not and to place new and toxic pressures on both leaders and coworkers. The impact on the work community—indeed, all socioeconomic institutions—is significant. Each of the cultural-redefinition initiatives have reduced the leader's ability to lead. They change the core nature of the leader–follower relationship by forcing multiple cultures on the work community effectively destroying the idea of community itself. They give special status to some workers over other workers further limiting community and reducing rather and fostering mutual interactive trust by encouraging differing standards for different workers or worker factions. The leader's work is made more difficult as they try to build a harmonious unity out of the people who come to work for them. Specifically, the following factors now part of most work communities are redefining the workplace and can have pathological implication for leaders and their work communities.

- *Highlighting undifferentiated ethics*: Fostering an ethical, fair, and balanced work relationship is made more difficult by these new cultural standards. And, when the ethics of the work community falter, there is real danger that the work relationship may become pathological.
- *Reorienting a service value*: Incentives to get workers to want to be of service to each other or their client base is hampered and can become toxic as extraneous cultural forces are interposed between the leader and those led.
- *Complicating training workers*: As cultural values and rules change to accommodate these added cultural elements, it makes the leader's tasks of training and developing coworkers more difficult and a continuous drain on his or her time, intelligence, energies, and other resources.
- *Subverting inspiration*: Inspiration flows from the leader's personal core spiritual values. When these values are denigrated in favor of those fostering any alternative ethos they hijack the leaders' actions aimed at achieving shared values. In so doing leadership is obstructed and organizational health jeopardized.
- *Neglecting change*: The leader's task of creating a unique work culture is largely taken out of his or her hands as these new culture changes take hold and force changes on the work community to make it harmonious with these none-work values. These changes often make no allowance for the routine and special demands of communal, cooperative work per se and threaten unit health.
- *Impeding empowerment*: The work community attains maximum productive effectiveness when the leader can work with individual coworkers in ways that maximize their individual talents, skills, and expertise. Constrained by other-than-work-related values and imposed parameters on member activity, neither the leader nor his work community coworkers can work to their full potential.
- *Suppressing creativity*: Encouraging creativity is likewise hampered in the current multicultural work environment which often argues for many alternative

measures of success and resists new or creative approaches in favor of each coworker's tradition.

- *Neglecting coworkers*: The leader's incentive to nurture and also support the realization of individual workers' personal needs is made more difficult by the overfocus on a many—any—cultural standards and not true worker needs. This can be pathological in its implications.
- *De-prioritizing self-control*: Individual worker's self-control is also put to test as new and often competing values are placed as the only choices before workers from which they must choose.
- *Confusing meaning-making*: Part of doing leadership is giving meaning to the work, methods, and goals set for the work community. When other cultures impose their values and objectives on the work community, the leader's attempts at meaning-making become meaningless and the focus and direction of group activity moves away from that desired by the leader into often meaningless (from the perspective of work) and unhealthy regions.
- *Fostering distrust*: An overarching characteristic of an effective work community relationship is that members trust each other enough to risk themselves in doing their work in the ways leaders think best suited to success. Trust and trustworthiness are values that leaders foster as a first priority and is a solid measure of group health. When anything or anyone interposes themselves between the leader and those lead or between one worker and another, trust is lost. And this loss destroys the work community as a united cohort of cooperative people. Loss of trust is a sure sign of organizational dissolution.
- *Promoting arbitrary values*: And, of primary concern is the fact that this situation has usurped the primary—and most critical—task of values-based spiritual leadership: establishing a values foundation for the work community culture. In the absence of a common set of values accepted by and acceptable to work community members the group degenerates into a toxic environment, detrimental to everyone.

Workers must align their efforts with the organization's larger strategic vision. They need to attack the job the best way they can and develop their ability to improvise (Capelli, 1999). Spiritual leaders facilitate these objectives. When the work culture is actively antagonistic to the leader's efforts to integrate a group of diverse people into a cohesive, cooperative work community, the results by definition will be detrimental to organization health and productivity. When features of the work culture change and other values are fostered that at best ignore work group needs and at worst are actively anti-coordinated work, the results are pathological to the work community and its leaders. Workers need to be able to move the change process along in ways that facilitate work accomplishment specific to their specific assignments. If progress and productivity are to be gained and maintained, the interposition of other values unrelated to the work dynamic defeats this goal. Values other than those set by the leader and agreed to by coworkers threaten to destroy both worker commitment and organizational health.

References

Cacioppe, R. (2000). Creating spirit at work: Re-visioning organization development and leadership—Part II. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 21*(2), 110–119.

Capelli, P. (1999). *The new deal at work: Managing the market driven workforce*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Covey, S. R. (1992). *Principle-centered leadership*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Fairholm, G. W. (2009). *Organizational power politics: Tactics of organizational leadership* (2nd ed.). Westport, CT: ABC-CLIO, Praeger.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kelley, R. (1998). *How to be a star at work*. New York: Times Books.

Nair, K. (1994). *A higher standard of leadership: Lessons from the life of Gandhi*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Nirenberg, J. (1998, Winter). Myths we teach, realities we ignore: Leadership education in business schools. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 5*(1), 82–99.

Ryan, L. V. (2000). Moral aspects of executive leadership: searching for a new leadership paradigm. *International Journal of Value-Based Management, 13*, 109–122.