Voices from the Past: Mary Parker Follett and Joseph Smith on Collaborative Leadership

Mark E. Mendenhall
J. Burton Frierson Chair of Excellence in Business Leadership
College of Business Administration
University of Tennessee, Chattanooga
615 McCallie Avenue
Chattanooga, TN 37403
Mark-Mendenhall@utc.edu
TEL: 423-886-4243

W. Jeffrey Marsh
Associate Professor of Ancient Scripture
College of Religious Education
Brigham Young University
365F JSB
Provo, UT 84602
jmarsh@byu.edu
TEL: 801-422-3371

This article was published in the *Journal of Management Inquiry*. Citation is:

Mendenhall, M.E., & Marsh, W.J. (2010) Voices from the past: Mary Parker Follett and Joseph Smith on collaborative leadership. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 19(4): 284-303.

Voices from the Past: Mary Parker Follett and Joseph Smith on Collaborative Leadership

Abstract

The post-war literature has yielded important insights regarding developing collaborative leadership competencies in managers and collaborative leadership systems within organizations. However, the work of pre-World War II scholars and practitioners in this area has largely been overlooked. After introductory "interviews" with Mary P. Follett and Joseph Smith, we review their frameworks of collaborative leadership. Drawing on their frameworks of collaborative leadership, we propose an extension to Raelin's 2006 framework of collaborative leadership, and then discuss the implications of this extended framework for current efforts in developing collaborative leadership in organizations.

Voices from the Past: Mary Parker Follett and Joseph Smith on Collaborative Leadership

Raelin (2006) has observed that in the past decade there has been an increase in interest on the part of scholars and practitioners in better understanding both the dynamics of collaborative leadership and how to assist organizations in developing and institutionalizing collaborative leadership competencies and processes. Post-war scholars and practitioners have defined and described the concept of collaborative leadership in many ways: participative leadership, democratic management, power sharing, joint decision-making, empowerment, and consultation (Drath & Palus, 1994; Raelin, 2003, 2006; Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958; Vroom & Yetton, 1973; Yukl, 2006), yet according to Raelin, all of the manifestations of the phenomenon in the literature share a common, undergirding axiom:

> When people who have a stake in a venture are given every chance to participate in the venture, including its implementation, their commitment to the venture will be assured…collaborative leadership requires true participation in leadership and decision-making at all levels and in multiple decision processes (p. 155)

Raelin (2006) also notes that attendant principles to the above axiom include: 1) the condition that all discussion in a group is based on a collective position or stance of "nonjudgmental inquiry;" 2) that input from group members is freely offered to the group for critical evaluation, discussion, and analysis; and 3) that group members enter collaborative discussion with the express view of creating something new or unique from their interaction that "could reconstruct the participants' view of reality." (Raelin, 2006, p. 155)

While the above principles offer useful directionality of focus for scholars and practitioners, they do not illuminate the philosophical constructs upon which collaborative leadership is based nor the experiential reality of the phenomenon. In short, they approach, but do

not delineate a full understanding of collaborative leadership—what it *is*. In an attempt to more fully conceptualize the dimensions of collaborative leadership, Raelin (2006) proposed four "operating perspectives" or conditions that must occur for the establishment of collaborative leadership in a group or throughout an organization (See Table 1).

Insert Table 1 about here

As Table 1 indicates, the operating perspective or condition of *Being Concurrent* involves group tolerance of more than one leader operating simultaneously at any given moment in a group, while the *Being Collective* condition reflects the capability of individual group members operating in tandem as leaders. *Being Mutual* is the condition where all group members have the right and the orientation to have the autonomy to advocate their viewpoints in a culture of mutual respect, and *Being Compassionate* is a condition that encompasses a variety of processes that are based on valuing the rights and opinions of group and extra-group members, and valuing the concept of collaborative leadership itself.

Raelin's 2006 framework reflects a distillation of the theoretical and empirical findings of post-war scholars and practitioners into a descriptive model of the phenomenon. However, in addition to post-war scholars, others have carefully studied collaborative leadership, and their work may have important contributions to make to modern scholarship. In the nineteenth century, and in the first two decades of the twentieth century, Mary Parker Follett and Joseph Smith thoughtfully addressed collaborative leadership processes in their writings and in their work. However, their work, and its potential to inform the field of collaborative leadership has remained largely unnoticed by post-war scholars. Scholars can often gain greater insight into a phenomenon by viewing it anew through fresh, new lenses. Both the work and writings of Follett and the case study of Smith's institutionalization of collaborative leadership principles into the church that he

founded (which has in large part contributed to its success over the past 180 years) may offer new insights to the field. Our effort also aligns with the emerging work of management scholars who are working at the nexus of religion and spirituality, and are actively applying leadership theory, philosophy, principles, and practices from that realm to for-profit organizations to gain deeper insights into how to better develop business leaders (please see: Benefiel, 2006; Boorom, 2009; Fry, 2003; 2004; 2005; Fry, Hannah, Noel, & Walumba, in press; Fry & Kriger, 2009; Fry & Slocum, 2008; Giacolone & Jurkiewicz, 2003; Giacalone, Jurkiewicz, & Fry, 2005; Thomas, 2008).

The work of Follett and Smith constitutes theoretical frameworks associated with collaborative leadership, and thus should be contrasted against the framework proposed by Raelin (2006), especially since their frameworks were designed to produce the conditions for collaborative leadership delineated by Raelin (2006). For these reasons their work should be brought to the awareness of scholars working in this field. We extend our discussion of the importance of studying the work of Follett and Smith in more detail below.

Learning from the Past: Mary Parker Follett. Follett's work has remained largely unknown by most management and organizational behavior scholars for over seventy-five years despite being highly influential in the first two decades of the 20th century. Slowly, over the past two decades however, an increasing number of scholars and practitioners have discovered—and in some cases, rediscovered—her work and have found it compelling and powerful (Bennis, 1995; Drucker, 1995; Graham, 1995; Kanter, 1995; Lawrence, 1995; Mintzberg, 1995; Tonn, 2003). She has been hailed by no less than Peter Drucker as being "the Prophet of Management" (Drucker, 1995) because her ideas either predated (Kanter, 1995) or directly influenced (Bennis, 1995) the fundamental constructs and processes that have emerged in the field of management over the past

six decades (Eylon, 1998; Feldheim, 2004; Graham, 1995; Mendenhall, Macomber, & Cutright, 2000; 1995; Tonn, 2003).

One proposed rationale for the burial of her work was due to the lack of fit her ideas had with the political and academic climate that emerged shortly after her death in 1933 (Drucker, 1995; Feldheim, 2004; Miller & O'Leary, 1989; Waldo, 1984). Her biographer, Joan Tonn, suggests that her writings lacked staying power beyond the 1920s and early 1930s because:

> [w]ith the New Deal generating a variety of federal programs in response to the suffering caused by the Great Depression, it was easy for government leaders and academicians to ignore Follett's concerns with citizen empowerment and effective group participation. And captains of industry concerned with the mere survival of their firms were more likely to centralize control rather than to empower their workers. Later, in the 1940s and 1950s, when World War II seemed to demand "domination" and the Cold War a "balance of power," Americans found it difficult to heed Follett's admonition to value differences and seek integrative resolution of conflict. (Tonn, 2003, p. 492)

Also, Follett did not obtain a graduate degree, and thus was not able to operate from the secure foundation of a university. This blocked her from obtaining research grants, drawing upon university resources for research assistance to empirically test her ideas, and from developing a coterie of graduate students to disseminate her ideas (Lawrence, 1995; Tonn, 2003). Though her books and writings were often widely acclaimed in her day, she was usually viewed within academe as an intellectual outsider, a kind of freak of nature; when she was gone, the allure of her ideas went with her.

Perhaps being on the outside of academe was a blessing in disguise for Follett, as it forced her to apply her innate genius to organizational processes unhindered by the expectation of "paradigm compliance" so ubiquitous in academe. Her ideas were thus developed unfettered by

institutional demands, and were honed and refined in her modus operandi of participant-observer—for most of her adult life Follett actively worked in not-for-profit organizations, served on boards, and observed with a keen eye the workings of both business and political organizations. (Tonn, 2003) Her theoretical work ranged across all aspects of social organization, often from a systemic view that embraced mutually causal interrelationships between multiple variables, across differing levels of analysis (Mendenhall, et. al., 2000). Perhaps the aspect of her work that has attracted the most attention by current management scholars and practitioners (Davis, 1991; Drucker, 1995; Feldheim, 2004; Fry & Thomas, 1996; McKersic & Walton, 1992) is that of integration: the collaborative combining of differences among group members to invent new realities, which according to Raelin (2006), is a process that lies at the core of the collaborative leadership.

Learning from the Past: Joseph Smith. Like Follett, Joseph Smith was well known, and often widely acclaimed while he lived (even by those who counted themselves his enemies) as having a genius for developing and applying creative and powerful organizational principles and processes. However, beyond a general recognition of his name and that of the church he founded—The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS)—perhaps more commonly known to many by its nickname, "The Mormon Church" — few know much more about his organizational contributions than these general facts.

Although he only lived to be 38 years of age, Smith accomplished much in his life. He was lieutenant general of an army; mayor of the city of Nauvoo, Illinois (which at the time of his death was the largest U.S. city west of Chicago); city planner; architect; linguist; translator; author; publisher; organizer and founder of a new religion; and, at the time of his assassination, a candidate for the U.S. Presidency. The New York Sun said of Smith on September 4, 1843:

> "This Joe Smith must be set down as an extraordinary character—a prophet-hero, as Carlyle might call him. He is one of the great men of this age, and in future history he will be ranked with those who, in one way or another, have stamped their impress strongly upon society." (New York Sun, 1843)

Despite the growth and success of the church under his leadership, due to socio-political and theological disagreements that eventually flamed into physical persecution by the majority of settlers who shared territory with Smith's followers on the western frontier of the United States in the 1840s. It became critical for Smith to look for an area of the North American continent where his organization could relocate and thrive without persecution (Bushman, 2005). At the time of his death Smith was planning to relocate his organization to the Rocky Mountains, and it fell upon Brigham Young, his successor, to accomplish that task. Young went on to lead the church founded by Smith on an exodus to Utah and continued as its leader there for the next thirty-three years.

Like Follett, with Smith's passing so passed the interest in what he said and what he had written and accomplished. The animus of those who felt passionately that Smith's ideas were dangerous to American society fell squarely upon Brigham Young, and slowly, Smith's organizational accomplishments were largely forgotten, or were discarded out of hand as the work of a charlatan or demagogue. However, Smith's core organizing framework was passed from generation to succeeding generation of leadership at the highest levels of the church, and thus survived as the administrative cornerstone of the church after his death. These organizing principles established by Smith have been one of the prime drivers in sustaining an organization that is often assessed by some as being among the fastest growing churches in the world on a yearly basis, and a new world religion (Bushman, 2005; Stark, 1984). That, in and of itself, deserves organizational scrutiny from management scholars and practitioners alike, if the idea of "best practices" has any utility.

The subsequent success and exponential growth of the LDS Church has generated an interest on the part of many social scientists and historians to know, "how did Joseph Smith do it?" and "how do Mormons continue to do it?" (Bloom, 1992; Bushman, 2005; Davies, 2003; 2005; Ostling & Ostling, 1999; Remini, 2002; Stark, 1984). Notable non-LDS scholars such as Robert V. Remini (2002) have concluded that Smith was, "unquestionably the most important reformer and innovator in American religious history," while Harold Bloom stated that,

> "I also do not find it possible to doubt that Joseph Smith was an authentic prophet. Where in all of American history can we find his match? . . . In proportion to his importance and his complexity, [Joseph Smith] remains the least-studied personage, of an undiminished vitality, in our entire national saga." (1992, p. 95)

Like Follett, Smith was an outsider and had no access to the accepted institutions of his day. There was no possibility of his attending a theological seminary or university, not only because of his theological views but also primarily because of his lack of formal education—he completed only two years of formal schooling (Bushman, 2005). Smith's organizational behavior, management, and leadership acumen was refined through active application of his ideas to the organization that he formed, unencumbered by the traditional paradigms of the institutions of his day. Smith offers current scholars and practitioners a concrete example of an elegant, flexible organizing framework founded on principles of collaborative leadership that for almost two centuries has stood the test of time.

During their lives, Follett and Smith were societal, academic, and professional outliers who contributed to both real world managerial practice in professional and religious organizational contexts and to theoretical insights regarding collaborative leadership, but their work was largely overlooked by post-war scholarship. We will argue that the thought and work of Mary P. Follett and Joseph Smith usefully inform the field of collaborative leadership today, especially in terms

of: 1) explicating the philosophical constructs that underlie collaborative leadership processes, 2) conceptualizing the experiential reality of collaborative leadership in management development training, 3) institutionalizing organizational structures that preserve collaborative leadership systems across time, and 4) designing learning systems that teach managers how to become collaborative leaders. Based on our review of their work, we conclude this paper by proposing an extension of Raelin's 2006 framework, and discussing the implications of the extended framework for current management development efforts associated with developing collaborative leadership.

Mary P. Follett and Joseph Smith, I presume?

Before we discuss how Mary P. Follett and Joseph Smith's contributions can inform our current perspective on collaborative leadership, we would like to introduce you to them. We thought it would be important for you to encounter their voice before you encounter our review of their work as it relates to collaborative leadership. We ask them questions and then use statements from archival records as their replies to our modern queries. We have placed very few of our own words in their mouths, and have only done so to facilitate transition from our questions to their answers in order to aid the flow of the interview. We offer these interviews as bare bones appetizers of their voice, and hope they may spur you to seek out their writings and discover them for yourself; we begin with Mary P. Follett.[1]

Question: Ms. Follett, a management theorist named Douglas McGregor wrote after your death the following: "Every managerial act rests on assumptions, generalizations, and hypotheses—that

[1] To preserve the conceptual flow of the interview we have not used quotation marks or indentation of text to mark quotations. The quotations for the first answer by Mary P. Follett can be found in Follett, M.P. 1918. *The new state*. Longman, Green and Company, pp. 69 -71. The quotations for the second answer by Mary P. Follett can be found in *The new state*. Longman, Green and Company, pp. 34-35; 39-40.

is to say, on theory." In turn, theories rest on core assumptions or premises as well. In your writing that addressed issues of leadership, what was the core assumption, principle, or premise that guided your theorizing?

Mary Parker Follett: Perhaps the core assumption on which I based by work was that of freedom. Freedom is the harmonious, unimpeded working of the law of one's own nature. The true nature of every man is found only in the whole. A man is ideally free only so far as he is interpermeated by every other human being; he gains his freedom through a perfect and complete relationship because thereby he achieves his whole nature. The essence of freedom is not irrelevant spontaneity but the fullness of relation. We do not curtail our liberty by joining with others; we find it and increase all our capacity for life through the interweaving of willings. It is only in a complex state of society that any large degree of freedom is possible, because nothing else can supply the many opportunities necessary to work out freedom. Freedom then is the identifying of the individual will with the whole will--the supreme activity of life. That we are free only through the social order, only as fast as we identify ourselves with the whole, implies practically that to gain our freedom we must take part in all the life around us: join groups, enter into many social relations, and begin to win freedom for ourselves. When we are the group in feeling, thought and will, we are free: it does what it wishes through us--that is our liberty. In a democracy the training of every child from the cradle--in nursery, school, at play--must be a training in group consciousness.

Question: You attempted to "change the world" by formulating organizational and leadership models that would allow women and men to expand their temporal and spiritual capacities. What

were some of the overarching principles that you embedded into your frameworks that you felt were critically important in order to assist people to learn how to lead in collaborative ways?

Mary P. Follett: Before we can lead collaboratively, we must first comprehend the reality of the social situation in which we find ourselves. The core of the social process is not likeness, but the harmonizing of difference through interpenetration. Unity is brought about by the reciprocal adaptings of the reactions of individuals, and this reciprocal adapting is based on both agreement and difference. The unity is but for an instant, it flows on to new differings which adjust themselves anew in fuller, more varied, richer synthesis. This is the process of evolution. Social progress is to be sure coadapting, but coadapting means always that the fresh unity becomes the pole of a fresh difference leading to again new unities which lead to broader and broader fields of activity. We attain unity only through variety. Differences must be integrated, not annihilated, nor absorbed. As long as we think of difference as that which divides us, we shall dislike it; when we think of it as that which unites us, we shall cherish it. The ignoring of differences is the most fatal mistake in politics or industry or international life: every difference that is swept up into a bigger conception feeds and enriches society; every difference which is ignored feeds on society and eventually corrupts it. Heterogeneity, not homogeneity, I repeat, makes unity. Give *your* difference, welcome *my* difference, unify all difference in the larger whole – such is the law of growth. The unifying of difference is the eternal process of life – the creative synthesis, the highest act of creation, the at-onement. The implications of this conception when we come to define democracy are profound.

We hope this brief interview with Mary P. Follett has whetted your appetite to learn more about the frameworks of both of these early thinkers and practitioners of collaborative leadership.

We will now review Follett's framework of collaboration and then present the brief interview with Joseph Smith along with a subsequent review of his framework of councils.

Mary P. Follett's Framework of Collaboration

To understand Follett's views on collaborative leadership, it is necessary to first comprehend her view of fundamental social behavior. She argued that "subject" and "object" in any social interaction are interdependent, and thus the interaction between both are mutually-causal; that is, both stimulate and respond to each other, and influence each other to produce behavioral outcomes. Follett's basic assumption was that "in the behavior-process, subject and object are equally important and that reality is in the relating of these, is in the endless evolving of these relatings." (Follett, 1924, pp. 54-55).

Follett thus departed from the paradigm of the majority of social scientists of her day (and ours) who in their research designs divide subject from object (independent variables from dependent variables); in her view, the disciplines of history, economics, political science, law, and psychology all erred, by seeing "reality either in subject or in object," for she contended we cannot "run fast enough from one to the other to keep ourselves within the region of truth" (Follett, 1924, p. 54).

This "process in which the various factors in a situation not only are constantly evolving but also are continually influencing each other" (Tonn, 2003, p. 326) she termed, "circular response." For her, it "formed a basic truth of all the social sciences" (Follett, 1924, p. 63). Follett describes the synergistic process of circular response thusly:

> The most fundamental thought about all this is that reaction is always reaction to a relating . . . . I never react to you but to you-plus-me; or to be more accurate, it is I-plus-you reacting to you-plus-me . . . that is, in the very process of meeting, by the very process of

> meeting, we both become something different. It begins even before we meet, in the anticipation of meeting. . . It is I plus the-interweaving-between-you-and-me meeting you plus the-interweaving-between-you-and-me, etc., etc. If we were doing it mathematically we should work it out to the nth power. (Follett, 1924, pp. 62-63)

Thus, the constant interweaving of behaviors form "the evolving situation" to which those involved act as creators. The notion of circular response, she believed, "is pregnant and important for the social sciences because it makes us think of our problems in terms of process and not of 'pictures'" (Graham, 1995, p. 62).

Circular Response and Integration

In applying the principle of circular response to group interaction, she argued that groups continually create new realities from their internal interactions. An important dimension to this creating was how groups handle intra- and inter-group conflict. To her, this was a key to the level of functionality or dysfuncationality of a group's collaborative leadership at any given moment in time. Follett argued that the most common ways of dealing with conflict in groups was through domination—"the victory of one side over the other"—and compromise, where "each side gives up a little in order to have peace…in order that the activity which has been interrupted by the conflict may go on" (Follett, 1925, p. 2). She proposed a third method, one that is rarely used but that is more robust for ending conflict: integration.

Follett held that conflict was nothing more and nothing less than the simple manifestation of difference between people; conflict in her view was difference (Follett, 1925). Because differences flow together and create the evolving situation via circular response, Follett felt it important to study processes by which evolving situations could be facilitated into functional, creative, and useful states of being (Follett, 1925). She held that difference between peoples'

views—conflict—"could be made constructive and that joint, interpenetrating responsibilities could be created if ways were found to integrate differences rather than dealing with them through domination or compromise" (Tonn, 2003, p. 98).

Integration involves applying collaborative principles within the evolving situation that allows the desires of all parties to find a place in the solution (Follett, 1925). For Follett, "conflict is a moment in the interacting of desire [and] the moment of the appearing and focusing of difference may be a sign of health, a prophecy of progress" (Follett, 1925, p. 4). The key to conflict resolution is to apply principles to the "conflict moment" so that a new, functional and efficacious solution is invented. "Compromise," she argued, "does not create, it deals with what already exists; integration creates something new" (Follett, 1925, pp. 4-5). "Only integration," she concluded, "really stabilizes. But by stabilization I do not mean anything stationary. Nothing ever stays put. I mean only that that particular conflict is settled and the next occurs on a higher level" in an ever ongoing series of "progressive integratings" (Follett, 1925, p. 6).

The Principle of Openness

Follett suggested than in order to achieve integration, individuals in a group setting had to apply principles associated with collaboration. Her first principle of collaboration is to:

> …bring the differences into the open. We cannot hope to integrate our differences unless we know what they are. . . . The first rule, then, for obtaining integration is to put your cards on the table, face the real issue, uncover the conflict, bring the whole thing into the open" (Follett, 1925, pp. 7; 9).

The antithesis of the principle of openness is suppression of differences. Follett held that the leader "has to get underneath all the camouflage, has to find the real demand as against the demand put forward, distinguish declared motive from real motive, alleged cause from real cause,

and to remember that sometimes the underlying motive is deliberately concealed and that sometimes it exists unconsciously" (Follett, 1925, p. 9).

Bringing differences into the open allows group members to see the issue at hand from the multiple perspectives of all group members. As each individual shares their perspective or desire regarding an issue, a collective understanding emerges as to what the issue truly looks like and a collective awareness of its variables and parts is enhanced. Follett called this collective understanding the "field of desire" and argued that

> …a business should be so organized … that full opportunity is given in any conflict . . . for the whole field of desire to be viewed. Our employees should be able to see, as we should be able to see, the whole field of desire; …many conflicts could, I believe, be prevented from ending disastrously by getting the desires of each side into one field of vision where they could be viewed together and compared (1925, p.10).

The Principle of Revaluation

If a manager is successful in bringing differences into the open, Follett found that a natural result is that a revaluation occurs within each group member. Revalution involves changing one's perspective or changing one's demands based upon a richer understanding of the collective desires and perspectives of the group (Follett, 1925). Follett observed that:

> This conception of revaluation of desire is necessary to keep in the foreground of our thinking in dealing with conflict, for neither side ever "gives in really, it is hopeless to expect it, but there often comes a moment when there is a simultaneous revaluation of interests on both sides and unity precipitates itself…Integration is often more a spontaneous flowing together of desire than one might think…the revaluing of interests on

> both sides may lead the interests to fit into each other, so that all find some place in the final solution (Follett, 1925, pp. 9-10).

Revaluation occurs within individual members of the group as they carefully compare their views in relation to the multiple views of their fellow group members. Yet, as individual revaluation occurs, to the degree that each member's revaluation is in harmony with that of the others', a united collective revaluation slowly evolves. Ideally, the group then is able to arrive at a united, shared understanding regarding the nature of the reality of the problem, issue, or topic that is under their consideration as a group.

The Principle of Breaking Wholes

As a collective revaluation evolves into focus among group members such that all group members are "seeing" the issue the same way, Follett stated forthrightly that "taking the demands of both sides and break[ing] them up into their constituent parts . . . is the way you [solve] business problems" (Follett, 1925, p. 11). Breaking up wholes is the approach whereby group members arrive at integrative solutions via collaboration through intense analysis of each aspect of the field of desire, and of the demands and desires of those with whom one is in conflict. (Tonn, 2003)

Breaking up the whole of a demand requires differentiating the demand into its constituent parts and probing for understanding as to what is truly motivating the demand or desire. For example, in management-labor wage negotiations Follett observed that:

> We can say, at the very least, that the workman does not "really want" wages above the point that will keep the factory open; that the employer does not "really want" wages low enough seriously to impair the productive power of the workman. The first question then is always: What is the demand a symbol of? (Follett, 1924, pp. 168-169)

Thus, when one finds what is behind the demand, often an integrative solution is more quickly and easily reached. Breaking up wholes also applies to better understanding the systemic dynamics of an issue once it has been brought clearly into the field of desire and a collective understanding of it exists in the group at a gross level. Taking the issue apart after there is agreement as to what the issue is, is prerequisite in Follett's view to the invention of an integrative solution. In other words, the process of breaking up wholes in a truly collaborative process precedes and naturally causes invention.

Follett did not state that there was one best technique for breaking up wholes, and she often used case examples to teach the principle in her writings. For example, Follett often served on Wage Boards and she used one of her experiences in that setting to illustrate one way to break up wholes. The members of the Confectionary Board of Massachusetts could not come to agreement regarding a cost of living increase for the women who worked in the manufacturing facilities of the industry—it became a deadlocked impasse. Follett was asked to chair a subcommittee to break the impasse. Rather than using the data that was traditionally available to the Board, her committee suggested that instead the Board focus on an important phrase in the Massachusetts Minimum Wage Law—"the minimum a girl can live on 'in health and decency.'

The committee suggested that the board consider all the elements that might influence living a life of health and decency (e.g., board, lodging, clothes, recreation, savings, etc.). The Board discussed each variable separately (in other words, the whole was broken up) and after each variable was addressed, the Board arrived at a united agreement regarding each variable. This process broke the impasse. By differentiating the issue into its various elements, the Board was able to move forward in a collaborative manner towards an integrative solution, which it could stand behind in unity (Tonn, 2003).

Follett was no Pollyanna. She conceded that it is not possible in all situations to achieve integration, but that integration could occur much more often if managers developed the collaborative leadership skills and abilities necessary to facilitate it. She understood the obstacles that managers face in facilitating integration through collaboration, and bemoaned the lack of training managers received in collaborative leadership techniques in their education (Follett, 1925). As a result she felt that they did not have the following perspective:

> This is the most important word, not only for business relations, but for all human relations: not to adapt ourselves to a situation—we are all more necessary to the world than that; neither to mould a situation to our liking—we are all, or rather each, of too little importance to the world for that; but to take account of that reciprocal adjustment, that interactive behavior between the situation and ourselves which means a change in both the situation and ourselves. . . We should never allow ourselves to be bullied by an "either-or." There is often the possibility of something better than either of two given alternatives. (Follett, 1925, p. 19)

Follett grounded her ideas for practice on axiomatic principles of fundamental human behavior that are compelling and powerful. We will argue that her writings can provide a firm theoretical and philosophical foundation upon which to construct a collaborative leadership learning system for any team or organization. We will discuss these issues later in the paper when we propose how her work can be integrated into Raelin's framework of collaborative leadership. Before we undertake that venture, however, we first introduce a 19th century case of long-term institutionalization of collaborative leadership within an organization in order to draw insights from it for modern management development efforts. As we introduced Follett's views on

collaborative leadership by first listening to her voice via a hypothetical interview, so we introduce Joseph Smith's framework of collaborative leadership with a similar interview.[2]

Learning from the Past: Joseph Smith

Question: Mr. Smith, a management theorist named Douglas McGregor wrote long after your death the following: "Every managerial act rests on assumptions, generalizations, and hypotheses—that is to say, on theory." What might be the key assumption, the underlying principle upon which your approach – your theory or framework – of collaborative leadership was based?

Joseph Smith: I suppose the key to understanding my philosophy regarding collaboration among people, what you call collaborative leadership, rests on my belief regarding human nature. Without this belief, trying to create collaborative leadership is impossible.

All the minds and spirits that God ever sent into the world are susceptible of enlargement. We consider that God has created man with a mind capable of instruction, and a faculty which may be enlarged in proportion to the heed and diligence given to the light communicated from heaven to the intellect; and that the nearer man approaches perfection, the clearer are his views, and the greater his enjoyments. This is a station to which no man ever arrived in a moment. It is

[2] To preserve the conceptual flow of the interview we have not used quotation marks or indentation of text to mark quotations. Many of the quotations for the answers by Joseph Smith can be found in Smith, J. 1991. *History of the Church*, (reprint edition) Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company. Hereafter this volume will be abbreviated as HC. Smith's statements from this answer can be found in HC 6:311, HC 2:6-8, and HC 5:498-499; also in Smith, J.F., & Galbraith, R.C. (eds.) 1993. *Scriptural teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith.* Salt Lake City, UT: Deseret Book Company, p. 62. The quotations for Smith's second answer can be found in: HC 4:227; HC 5:24; Jesse, D. 1977. "Howard Coray's Recollections of Joseph Smith." *BYU Studies*, 17(3): 2; and in Taylor, J. 1851. *Millennial Star,* Nov. 15, 1851, p. 339.

not wisdom that we should have all knowledge at once presented before us; but that we should have a little at a time; then we can comprehend it.

Additionally, it is a just principle, and it is one the force of which we believe ought to be duly considered by every individual, that all men are created equal, and that all have the privilege of thinking for themselves upon all matters relative to conscience. Consequently, then, we are not disposed, had we the power, to deprive anyone of exercising that free independence of mind which heaven has so graciously bestowed upon the human family as one of its choicest gifts. If it has been demonstrated that I have been willing to die for a 'Mormon,' I am bold to declare before Heaven that I am just as ready to die in defending the rights of a Presbyterian, a Baptist, or a good man of any other denomination; for the same principle which would trample upon the rights of the Latter-day Saints would trample upon the rights of the Roman Catholics, or of any other denomination who may be unpopular and too weak to defend themselves. If I esteem mankind to be in error, shall I bear them down? No. I will lift them up, and in their own way too, if I cannot persuade them my way is better; and I will not seek to compel any man to believe as I do, only by the force of reasoning, for truth will cut its own way.

Question: Any collaborative leadership practice must be structured to simultaneously reinforce the practice itself as well as the principles upon which the practice is based. In your view, what are some of the key principles upon which collaborative leadership practices must be based?

Joseph Smith: Love is one of the principles upon which collaborative leadership rests. Love is one of the chief characteristics of Deity, and a man filled with the love of God, is not content with blessing his family alone, but ranges through the whole world, anxious to bless the whole human race. When persons manifest the least kindness and love to me, O what power it has over my

mind, while the opposite course has a tendency to harrow up all the harsh feelings and depress the human mind. How oft have wise men and women sought to dictate [to me] by saying, 'Oh, if I were Brother Joseph, I would do this and that;' but if they were in Brother Joseph's shoes they would find that men or women could not be compelled, but must be dealt with in long-suffering. Wise men ought to have understanding enough to conquer men with kindness. No power or influence can or ought to be maintained by [leadership], only by persuasion, by long-suffering, by gentleness and meekness, and by love unfeigned; by kindness, and pure knowledge, which shall greatly enlarge the soul without hypocrisy, and without guile.

Another key principle of collaborative leadership is I believe what Ms. Follett has called "power-with" as opposed to "power-over." I think I can best describe it with an illustration. The prominent senator, Stephen A. Douglas, who after my death would later lose to Abraham Lincoln in the presidential election of 1860, once visited me in the city I founded, Nauvoo, Illinois. At the time, I was mayor of the city, and also president of a church of some 50,000 members worldwide. Many of these church members from the British Isles and from all over the United States and its territories had emigrated to Nauvoo and it's many satellite townships. Mr. Douglas asked me at that time the following question: "How do you manage to govern a people so diverse, coming from so many different countries with their peculiar manners and customs? How do you keep control over them? I replied to him: "I teach the people correct principles and they govern themselves."

Joseph Smith's Framework of Councils

Bushman observed that "Mormonism succeeded when other charismatic movements foundered on disputes and irreconcilable ill feelings partly because of the governing mechanisms Joseph [Smith] put in place early in the Church's history…Almost all of his major theological

innovations involved the creation of institutions…Joseph [Smith] thought institutionally more than any other visionary of his time, and the survival of his movement can largely be attributable to this gift." (2005, p. 251).

Unfortunately, there is a paucity of scholarly studies in the field of management that have investigated the leadership and/or organizational processes of the LDS Church (McConkie & Boss, 2005; Nelson, 1993, O'Dea, 1954; Payne, 1972; Thomas, 2008). Notable among the extant studies is Nelson's 1993 analysis in *Administrative Science Quarterly* of the governance system of the LDS Church, where he found that the LDS Church can be characterized as a Weberian, ideal-typical bureaucracy (Nelson, 1993); for example he found that

> Highly detailed manuals formulated at church headquarters determine every aspect of the local congregation's operations . . . The operation of LDS congregations is virtually identical the world over, and all units in all countries are linked directly to church headquarters in Salt Lake City through a functional chain of command. (Nelson, 1993, p. 668).

This "tight" dimension of organizational structure in the LDS Church described by Nelson is, however, balanced throughout by a "loose" dimension (the council system) that allows for flexibility in decision-making by local leadership. Addressing this balance between bureaucratic structure and innovation, M. Russell Ballard, an Apostle of the LDS Church, taught the entire membership of the LDS Church the following:

> We have handbooks of instruction, and their guidelines should be followed. But within that framework are substantial opportunities to think, to be creative, and to make use of individual talents . . . Because the eternal principle of agency gives us the freedom to choose and think for ourselves, we should become increasingly able to solve problems . . . Being innovative also means that we do not have to be told everything we should do. The

> Lord said, "It is not meet that I should command in all things; for he that is compelled in all things, the same is a slothful and not a wise servant" (Doctrine and Covenants, Section 58, verse 26). We trust you, brothers and sisters, to use inspiration. (2006, p. 18)

Very early on in the church's existence Smith began using councils, collaborative leadership groups, as the primary means by which decision-making was conducted to govern the church – to achieve what Ballard calls above, "being innovative." These early councils were usually made up of an average of eight church leaders, and Smith did not always moderate or take the lead in these groups. Instead, he rotated the moderator role, giving others the chance to manage the leadership decision-making process. Over time, this created multiple cadres of individuals in multiple communities who could form councils when needed to address any problem or challenge that might arise.

The consequence of this was that Smith's presence was not needed to govern local congregations—they instead were governed by groups of individuals through the aforementioned council format. Parenthetically, on multiple occasions Smith subjected his own behavior as a leader for review by these councils, and in some cases he was censured and corrected by the very councils he created – a rather remarkable occurrence for a leader who was considered by outsiders at the time to exert too much power over his followers (Bushman, 2005).

The Council of Fifty

Three months before his death, Smith taught a select group of individuals how to integrate different perspectives to produce efficacious, unified decisions in leadership teams. Smith had taught these principles throughout his tenure as president of the church (Bushman, 2005), but his teachings are more particularly recorded in the minutes and journals of those who were part of the church's council known as the Council of Fifty, an organization created to engage society in the

public square, on a more political level than other sub-units of the LDS Church were able to do at the time (Ehat, 1980). The Council of Fifty was a quasi-political organ of the church (Ehat, 1980; Quinn, 1980) made up of the leaders who had responsibility for the current and future temporal affairs of the church and its various communities. This council also contained a "handful of non-Mormons" and thus was an ecumenical organization. Because there were fifty men appointed to this governing body, they came to be known as "the Council of Fifty" (Ehat, 1980; Quinn, 1980).

Smith invited a sub-committee from the Council of Fifty to create a constitution from which the governing body would operate. Drafting a constitution for such a group proved to be a daunting task, and a member of the committee, John Taylor (who would later succeed Brigham Young as president of the church), reported to the group that the committee assigned to do so had "worked & strove to get up such a constitution as would suite our feelings" but that they had failed in their attempt (Ehat, 1980, p. 5). After their report was given, Smith told the group that he had sensed that the committee would not be successful in their efforts, and that he had inquired of God for help regarding the matter. He stated that in answer to his petition, he had been given the constitution for the group via divine inspiration. It was an unusual constitution. It reads in full (Ehat, 1980, p. 7):

> "Ye are my Constitution and I am your God and ye are my spokesmen… therefore from henceforth keep my commandments."

This simple, yet profound, statement stunned the members of the group. John Taylor recorded his views of this constitution in his journal in the following words:

> These words are pregnant with meaning & full of intelligence . . . It is expected of us that [we] can act right . . . That we should consider we are not acting for ourselves, but we are the Spokesmen of God selected for that purpose in the interest of God & to bless & exalt

> all humanity. . .There is peculiary [sic] significance to these things which needs some consideration. (Ehat, 1980, p. 6)

Orson Pratt, another member of the Council of Fifty, and who would later become a leader in the church in Utah, reflected in his journal (Ehat, 1980) that the constitution was a "living constitution," (p. 6) one that required the members to be a certain way in their hearts. Thus, the constitution, or foundation, that Smith provided this group with was not one that would guide so much by a large set of rules, but rather by a vision of their personal responsibility to God, to each other, to the community, and to all humankind.

The implication of the constitution was that when the council convened, members needed to subordinate their egos and should not seek to dominate or act with compulsion in order for their personal ideas to be accepted by the group. One's own view may not be what is best for the corporate group. Thus humility and a desire to listen to different views, with willingness to accept the best synthesis of the council's views, and the realization that one's own view may not be the best one was a paramount requirement for the successful operation of councils. The process elaborated by Smith's constitution strongly fits into Follett's concept of integration.

After the constitution was adopted, nine parliamentary rules that were numerically labeled were established on April 18, 1844 (Ehat, 1980). Seven rules were procedural in nature, involving such issues as, who convenes the council, how members should sit, the nature of the clerks' duties, how motions should be presented, the elements of the attendance policy, and how committee assignment is to be undertaken. The two other rules, however, presented a whole new way of organizing, of decision-making, and of governing to these individuals. For purpose of discussion, Rule 5 will be divided into its three conceptual elements.

Rule 5a: Principle of Unanimity

Rule Number 5 began with the following pronouncement: "To pass, a motion must be unanimous in the affirmative. . ." (Ehat, 1980, p. 6) The overarching principle in Smith's teachings regarding leadership, decision-making, and administration in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was that the decisions of leadership bodies must be unanimous in order to be efficacious. Previous to the organizing of the Council of Fifty, on March 28, 1835 Smith organized the church into a variety of leadership bodies called "quorums." In each quorum the process of decision-making was to be the same:

> And every decision made by … these quorums must be by the unanimous voice of the same; that is, every member in each quorum must be agreed to its decisions, in order to make their decisions of the same power or validity one with the other…Unless this is the case, their decisions are not entitled to the same blessings… (Doctrine and Covenants, Section 107, verses 27-29).

For Smith, unanimity was the desired outcome of every decision making process in every leadership unit within the church's organizational structure. However, unanimity can easily be replaced by a "Potemkin Village" mentality where façade, groupthink, and compliance replace integration and unity. This danger was anticipated in the second element of Rule 5, and it essentially is the same principle as Follett's "principle of openness" and is congruent with Raelin's dimension of Being Mutual.

Rule 5b: Principle of Openness

To foster the type of collaboration needed to create decisions that were truly unanimous, the second part of Rule 5 stated: "If any member has any objections he is under covenant to fully and freely make them known to the Council." (Ehat, 1980, p.6) In order for decisions to be

unanimous, and not just a reflection of compliant agreement on all parties, Rule 5b was necessary: all concerns, opinions, knowledge, facts, and perspectives from all the members needed to be shared, discussed, and then an emergent decision forged through the process of mutual counsel.

Members of the Council of Fifty thus were expected to be orderly in their discussions and to listen intently to better understand each other and the issue under discussion. Twelve years earlier, in another setting, Smith taught his followers that in groups where discussion and learning was taking place members should "let not all be spokesmen at once; but let one speak at a time and let all listen unto his sayings, that when all have spoken that all may be edified of all, and that every man may have an equal privilege" (Doctrine & Covenants, Section 88, verse 122).

Smith taught that if the council process produced something less than a true unanimity (which it did sometimes in the church then as it does sometimes in the modern LDS Church, Ballard, 1995) the efficacy of the decision is diluted. In order for Rule 5b to operate and function, the constitution had to be internally abided by each member of the group. Without the correct attitude or perspective, the process that aims toward unanimity and integration is aborted. Smith taught on another occasion to other leadership units that

> The decisions of these quorums [leadership units] . . . are to be made in all righteousness, in holiness, and lowliness of heart, meekness and long suffering, and in faith, and virtue, and knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness and charity; Because the promise is, if these things abound in them they shall not be unfruitful in the knowledge of the Lord. (Doctrine & Covenants, Section 107, verses 30-31)

The record of a council that Smith moderated provides a view into how these principles were actually applied in the church in the 1840s. Bushman summarizes the processes of that council, which considered the case of a member of the church whose behavior was contrary to the teachings of the church: "During the course of [the] hearings, twenty-eight men spoke their minds,

some as members of the council, others as observers in the meeting. By the end of the hearings, all sides having spoken, Joseph could say, 'I now swim in good clean water, with my head out." (2005, p. 251). The perspective of each person was listened to and respected, and slowly the full issue came into view, such that the decision was clear to Smith (the leader of this council) and to all who were in attendance.

Rule 5c: Principle of Sustaining

The final element of Rule 5 is the glue that holds the continuing existence of the council together over time; it reads:

> But if he cannot be convinced of the rightness of the course pursued by the Council he must either yield or withdraw membership in the Council. Thus a man will lose his place in the Council if he refuses to act in accordance with righteous principles in the deliberations of the Council. After action is taken and a motion accepted, no fault will be found or change sought for in regard to the motion (Ehat, 1980, p.6).

Once a collaborative solution emerged it was expected that the members would trust the process and accept and support the decision of the council. This is natural when the process works the way it should (through openness, revaluation, and then clarity as the decision is forged through respectful group interaction and discussion). However, Rule 5c anticipates human nature: that unanimity will not occur in every situation. If the collaborative leadership process has been facilitated correctly—or at least with sincerity—much harm can be done to future deliberations if a few members dig in their heels and refuse to sustain the result of the group's deliberations and efforts. Thus, Rule 5c ensures respect for collaborative leadership processes and for the continuance of the council in the case of rebellion. It also provides for the exit of individuals who would poison the collaborative leadership process over time, and is a reminder that in

collaborative leadership processes one is not superior to the collective contributions and thinking of the group. It is a reminder of the need for individual humility and a warning against hubris. In his analysis of the Council of Fifty, Ehat (1980) observed that:

> Without any question rule number five was the most important one to members of the Council. All the perplexing questions raised about government in general and theocracy in particular were answered by this rule. It eased their own anxiety regarding Joseph Smith's intentions in establishing a theocracy. . .Because of this rule Council members did not feel that they were bound to the "fanciful Revelation of Joe Smith, whether right or wrong," as anti-Mormons claimed. This rule satisfied members of the Council that they were involved in a theodemocratic republican from of government and not a theocratic tyranny. (p. 10)

Rule 6: Principle of Covenant

Entering into the Council of Fifty was done by covenant. Inherent in the covenant was an agreement to abide by the principles of the Council's collaborative leadership framework, and the constitution upon which it was based. Entry into the council was governed by Rule Number 6, which stated:

> …When invited into the Council he must covenant by uplifted hand to maintain all things of the Council inviolate agreeable to the order of the Council. Before he accepts his seat he must also agree to accept the name, constitution and rules of order and conduct of the Council. (Ehat, 1980, p. 7)

As stated before, in order for integration to occur it is necessary that individual observations, input, knowledge, and opinion regarding an issue be shared: what Follett would call, bringing the entire field of the issue into the open to be analyzed as a whole. To heighten the probability that this—and the other principles associated with collaborative leadership—were

applied consistently in councils, Smith felt that placing individuals under covenant to abide by such principles was necessary. This covenant reinforced in the minds and hearts of the individuals that what they were entering into was no small thing, but rather an important governance process that would require their best efforts.

Ehat (1980) summarizes Smith's view of the Council of Fifty's governance process thusly: "According to the theory, if fifty men seek in candor and order to put self and represented interest in perspective with all other points of view and are committed to find the locus where the best interests of all converge, then the Council will have found the will of God" (p. 264). In other words, if the council functioned according to correct principles of collaborative leadership, the members not only acted as co-creators of decisions with each other, but also as co-creators with the Divine.

Over time, the Council of Fifty slowly faded as a governing organ of the church, but the principles of its decision-making process were retained in subsequent evolutions of the church's administrative structure. As in Smith's era, today there is no full-time ministry in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints at the local level: all church leaders at the local level are unpaid, part-time lay officers who are not trained formally and professionally to be church leaders, and they govern the church through councils.

The principles of collaborative leadership that Smith institutionalized in the 1830s and early 1840s holds for every organizational unit in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints across all hierarchical levels of organization today—from the presidency of the church down to individual family councils that are held in homes of members of the church across the world. It is perhaps the starkest case of an organization that attempts to govern itself via collaborative leadership.

Toward a Model of Collaborative Leadership Learning

In this section of the paper we will discuss how Follett and Smith's contributions shed light and perspective on collaborative leadership generally, and propose how these contributions provide further insight into, and can be integrated with, the organizing perspectives set forth by Raelin (2006). These relationships are illustrated in Figure 1, in which we propose an extended model of collaborative leadership learning.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Criticality of Internalization of Power Sharing

The internalization of the value of power sharing in the individual(s) in whom power naturally resides, we argue, is the critical prerequisite phase of the establishment of collaborative leadership processes in any group or organization (See Figure 1). Follett argued that in order for collaboration to occur in groups, traditional authoritarian power relationships had to be changed.:

> It seems to me that whereas power usually means power-over, the power of some person or group over some other person or group, it is possible to develop the conception of power-with, a jointly developed power, a co-active, not a coercive power. (1924, p. xii)

Her concept of integration can only occur to the degree to which power-with processes exist in an organization; thus, power-sharing can only occur when the prerequisite processes of openness, revaluation, and breaking wholes are active amongst group members. For Follett, power was not inherently evil; in fact, she argued that it was only acting through power that any type of progress could be achieved. In 1925 she described the type of power that should exist in organizations thusly:

> If your business is so organized that you can influence a co-manager while he is influencing you, so organized that a workman has an opportunity of influencing you as you

> have of influencing him; if there is an interactive influence going on all the time between you, power-with may be built up. Throughout history we see that control brings disastrous consequences whenever it outruns integration." (Graham, 1995, p. 107)

While Smith did not articulate these principles in the same way as Follett, he nevertheless imbedded them into his system of organizing. Because the members of the church and communities that he founded looked to Smith for both personal and collective guidance and protection (Bushman, 2005), Smith had the power and opportunity to place himself in a condition of absolute power within his organization's structure. Yet, he organized the church he founded on principles of group versus individual governance, placing checks and controls on his and others' ability to wield absolute power. The council system would govern the church, not Smith acting arbitrarily alone (Bushman, 2005).

The individuals selected to govern in these councils were ordinary people—the vast majority had no sophisticated theological or organizational training, no set of competencies or experiences that would particularly qualify them to govern well. Smith taught them that the decisions of these councils of which they were members, when done according to correct principles, had the same status as if God had revealed something to Smith personally; that is, the decisions of these councils were viewed as being revelations from God through a collective instead of an individual mechanism (Bushman, 2005). Interestingly, at

> . . . the moment when Joseph's own revelatory powers were at their peak, he divested himself of sole responsibility for revealing the will of God and invested that gift in the councils of the Church, making it a charismatic bureaucracy." (Bushman, 2005, pp. 257-258.)

Smith would no doubt concur with Follett's summary statement on power sharing: "Genuine power can only be grown, it will slip from every arbitrary hand that grasps it; for genuine power is

not coercive control, but coactive control. Coercive power is the curse of the universe; coactive power, the enrichment and advancement of every human soul." (Follett, 1924, p. xii)

After an internalization of shared power exists in position leaders, it is then possible to socialize other group members to adopt the philosophy, principles, and practices necessary for them to engage in collaborative leadership. Raelin (2006) observes that individuals are often not ready to engage in power sharing for a variety of reasons (tradition, fear, lack of skills, ignorance, etc.), thus a comprehension of the critical aspects involved in socializing people to prepare them to engage in collaborative leadership is critical. Follett and Smith both offer us important insights into what the key aspects of a successful socialization process for collaborative leadership would consist of: 1) use of transformational pedagogiy; 2) principle-binding structures; and 3) covenantal ritual (See Figure 1).

Use of Transformative Pedagogy

From the work of Follett and Smith, it can be derived that the training of people to engage in collaborative leadership is not analogous to adding new skills to their managerial repertoires. It does not involve an incremental addition to their knowledge base. In the words of Follett, "managerial skill cannot be painted on the outside of executives – it has to go deeper than that." (1995, p. 137) It involves a transformation of worldview. Follett and Smith both understood the necessity of the heightening of the inner person in order to carry out collaborative leadership, and that normal people, behaving normally, do not naturally facilitate or engage in collaborative leadership.

For Follett and Smith, to truly participate in collaborative leadership one must first be—or be actively trying to become—the type of person who can pull it off. When individuals engage in collaborative leadership, they must be consciously aware that they are doing something special—

something that is far removed from the mundane. To accomplish such a mind-set shift, nontraditional training approaches will no doubt be necessary, thus we agree with Raelin (2006) that pedagogies based on action learning are most likely to facilitate this type of cognitive and emotional shift (for a review of how action learning can influence the learning of collaborative leadership competencies, see Raelin, 2006); however, action learning programs must be based on a visible philosophy to which the participants can continually turn to for reference and for an understanding of why and how they are trying to learn principles and techniques associated with collaborative leadership. We can think of no more powerful text upon which to house the conceptual foundation upon which action learning efforts should be built than on the writings of Mary P. Follett.

Not only did Follett delineate the axioms, constructs, and processes associated with integration, she employed numerous examples from her observations of organizational life to describe in rich detail what collaborative leadership is, how it occurs, what it looks like, what it feels like, and what people can actually do to bring it about. Follett undertook to take the reader into the actual collaborative leadership process through analogy, experience, exposition, and invitation. After reading Follett one almost feels as if one has actually experienced the phenomenon. When addressing politicians regarding challenges that the Canadian government was facing in a speech he gave in 1992, Mintzberg (1995) stated why he included many passages from Follett's writing in his speech:

> I did not quote Mary Parker Follett that day just because the ideas and the metaphors fitted so well. I quoted her because the eloquence and the inspiration of her words set the tone for a people who had lost their way. I know of nothing written before or since that comes anywhere close to this. I recount all of this here to show how relevant Mary Parker Follett's writings are to today's problems—really, to every day's problems (1995, p. 202).

Follett did not try to convince her readers—she attempted to transform them through the power of her writing to be the kind of people who could enact collaborative leadership and achieve integrative decision-making. While Follett's focus was secular, it also was not "anti-spiritual" either—indeed, some in her day felt as if they were being proselytized, for unlike the technical writing style used in academe, Follett wrote with passion. It would be prescient on the part of current organizations to consider basing their management education curricula associated with collaborative leadership on Follett's writings, for they call for a new way of approaching team interaction, one that is based on a philosophy that is intellectually engaging and draws one to a deep sense of collective responsibility and individual respect. As has been stated by many writers cited in this paper, the essential skills she covers in her writings are not necessarily new; however, her unveiling of the philosophy upon which those skills are based causes the skills to come alive, imbuing them with new validity and power.

Most organizations do not have as part of their training mentality that an intra-personal transformation of mindset and worldview is required in order to work at high levels of performance in teams, but Follett and Smith did. A lesson that can be learned from both of their work is the necessity of focusing on the front end of team performance, that collaborative leadership requires transformation of individuals, and that when this is not honestly addressed in initial team start-up training, mediocre team performance should be expected.

Principle-binding Structures

Behaviors associated with Raelin's dimensions of *Being Mutual* (the right and the tendency for all group members to have the autonomy to advocate points of view that they believe can contribute to the common good of the organization) and *Being Compassionate* (where all views are considered before a decision is made, each member of the group is granted dignity,

collaborative leadership is protected as a value, and all shareholders are respected) cannot be taught, learned, and practiced in a vacuum. Such behaviors are taught, learned, and practiced within an organizational structural context that ranges in the degree to which it is in philosophical and cultural congruity with collaborative leadership processes (See Figure 1).

Principles and practices associated with collaborative leadership, powerful and edifying as they might be when properly understood, will dissipate in their attractiveness and their power to trigger power sharing if they are not securely bound to some type of intra-cultural norm system or institutional policy. The norms and policies that form an organization's organizational structure produce obedience of a kind that either enhances or dampens collective leadership. In 1933, Follett observed that obedience is not an event, but rather a process:

> There is an active principle in obedience. Obedience is not a passive thing, for it is a moment in a process. There is, as a rule, a very elaborate and complex process going on. At one moment in that process something happens which we call obedience. I have said that it was an advantage to get agreement to instructions, yet it is a fallacy to think that an order gets its validity from consent. It gets its validity long before that, from the whole process to which both order-giver and order-receiver have contributed. (Graham, 1995, p. 137)

If philosophical congruity is low between desired behavior and structural context, the nature of obedience within group members produces behavior that is antithetical to collaborative leadership.

Smith proved that a simple, yet elegant structure imbued with collaborative leadership principles could sustain obedience that in turn supported collaborative leadership processes over long periods of time. Principles of collaborative leadership can be taught in theory, and initially must be done through the use of transformative pedagogies, but true learning of collaborative

leadership must come about via action learning processes (Raelin, 2006) — and such learning must be supported by rules, policies, and norms that support collaborative leadership.

One hundred and sixty six years after the death of Smith does the ideal of collaborative leadership always occur within all levels of the councils of the LDS Church? As was stated before, the principles associated with councils have been passed down from the original set of leaders that Smith taught throughout the presidencies of the highest governance councils in the Church across time to the present (Mendenhall, 2010). However this rich understanding of the warp and woof of collaborative discourse that has been common in the highest leadership councils in the church has sometimes been lacking in many of the local councils in the LDS Church from 1844 to the present (Ballard, 1995).

Being socialized in varying educational and business cultures, current members of the LDS Church have as much baggage as anyone else to shed in order to engage in collaborative leadership in their councils. Being a lay church, members are constantly engaged in local organizing efforts, but many of them have not internalized the skills of collaborative leadership deeply enough to consistently live in accordance with their internalized ideal (Ballard, 1995). Collaborative leadership occurs frequently enough in local lay councils to reinforce the ideal, and the ideal in turn acts as a continual reference point by which leadership behaviors are evaluated by rank and file church members. Thus, the principles of collaborative leadership that Smith bound to structure and doctrine remain an organizational "polar star" to the broad membership of the church, ensuring repeated attempts are made to achieve collaboration despite the personal weaknesses of many individuals that limit their abilities to fully do so.

Perhaps part of the legacy of Smith's genius is that the right structure, one that is bound to principles of collaborative leadership, has staying power and can generate and protect standards of collaborative leadership such that even if the ideal is not always attained, the behavior expended to

attempt to gain it is adequate to sustain the long term viability and health of the organization. Additionally, his framework shows that if the ideal is internalized in top management, that the on-going manifestation of collaborative leadership within top management teams can act as a continual reinforcer to individuals lower in the organizational hierarchy to continually attempt to strive for higher levels of collaborative group performance.

Covenantal Ritual

Another contribution of Follett and Smith to current scholars and practitioners is the insight that perhaps they have not gone far enough—or deep enough—in preparing individuals to exercise collaborative leadership. To ensure the consistent existence of a commitment to collaborate in every member of a council, as previously discussed, Smith established a covenant ritual as an entry requirement. This motivated those who joined councils to take the work and process of these groups very seriously—in other words, they took a vow that they would engage in sincere power sharing.

The formation of this covenantal ritual emerged naturally from the Zeitgeist of the 19th century. Bromley (1997) observed that after the Protestant Reformation two primary forms of social relations existed in western societies: covenantalism and contractualism. "For the first Americans, covenantalism was the reflexive form through which they organized themselves . . . Covenantal relations were the basis not only for religious organization but for community and political organization as well. Indeed, the first American constitution was a "covenant-constitution." (Bromley, 1997, p. 106)

Covenantalism involves social relations where the fundamental unit of human organization is the community rather than the individual. "The most fundamental relationships are covenantal since individuals are the product of the communities of which they are part" (Bromley, 1997, p.

106). Conversely, in contractualism the individual is the elemental unit of human organization, and "it is assumed that collective good is the product of individual actions in furtherance of personal interest." (Bromley, 1997, p. 106). Since World War II, contractualism has emerged as the predominant mode of social relations in the U.S., overshadowing covenantalism in importance to American society (Bromley, 1997). A full review of the role of covenantalism vs. contractualism in societies is beyond the scope of this paper; however, their core differences as delineated by Bromley (1997) are illustrated in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

Though Smith's use of covenantal ritual fit well with the social milieu of his time, it is also possible that collaborative leadership processes and their concomitant conditions as delineated by Raelin (2006) may best be nurtured in a covenantal context. If participants' personal philosophical foundations are rooted in covenantalism versus contractualism, it may be that the likelihood of emergence of collaborative leadership practices increases as well. Follett also evinced the necessity of covenantalism in developing collaborative leadership:

> The paradox of contract is that while it seems to be based on relation, it is in reality based on the individual. Contract is a particularist conception . . . Our common law has considered men as separate individuals, not as members of one another. These separate individuals were to be 'free' to fight out their differences as best they could, it being overlooked that freedom for one might not mean freedom for the other . . . (1918, p. 125)

Follett's view was that when a person comprehends their actual relationship with others, it is natural to covenant to collaborate with them: "The fundamental question of relation, of association is – Can you make one idea grow where two grew before? *This* is the law of fruitful

increase . . . You can have a contractual relation between two wills or you can have those two wills uniting to form one will. Contract never creates one will (1918, p. 124)."

Follett's and Smith's approaches to collaborative leadership through covenantal ritual implies that organizations may be unwittingly setting up collaborative leadership teams for failure because they do not educate team members regarding what it is they are truly embarking on—a different way of interacting with other human beings than the contractual mode in which they are likely psychologically grounded. To the degree that companies do not enact rituals whereby individuals covenant to live by principles of collaborative leadership may be the degree to which collaborative leadership is able to be manifest within organizations.

Additionally, there may be a mutually reinforcing relationship between covenantal ritual and the organizing structures that house a group's interactions (we illustrate this interactive relationship in Figure 1). The degree to which structures are principle-bound likely enhances the efficacy of covenantal rituals, and the degree to which these rituals evoke commitment within group members reinforces the efficacy of structures that reinforce collaborative leadership over time. The case study of governance processes in the LDS Church shows that when the principles and philosophy of collaborative leadership have been adequately socialized, and when structures are in place that are in congruence with the spirit of the principles and philosophy of collaborative leadership, covenantal ritual can be an additional strong catalyst for collaborative leadership.

Being Concurrent/Being Collective as Outcomes, and the Reinforcing Role of Innovation

In Figure 1 we illustrate our view that Raelin's collaborative leadership organizing dimensions, *Being Concurrent* and *Being Collective* are in reality outcomes produced from the process of internalization of power sharing by initial position leaders, subsequent socialization of group members in power sharing philosophy and principles, and commitment rituals that bind

members to structures formed around principles of power sharing. Without these processes occurring it is unlikely that more than one person will consistently step up and perform leadership behaviors in addition to the position leader (*Being Concurrent*) or that members will systemically interact and as sub-systems evince leadership behaviors (*Being Collective*).

The successful deployment of the three dimensions of the management education process described thus far ultimately leads, we propose, to the internalization of power sharing within group members (See Figure 1). When this internalization occurs through the action learning processes inherent in the socialization dimensions outlined in Figure 1, collaborative leadership on the part of group members without clear position authority begins to manifest itself.

For Follett, the outcome of collaborative leadership is integration: the creation of a new reality that has been impregnated with the desires, perspective, and wisdom of all group membership; in other words, the final outcome of the collaborative leadership process is invention, creation, inspiration, discovery, and innovation. We thus propose in our framework that one of the primary variables that continually lubricates collaborative leadership as an on-going process is the final output of the system: invention, creation, discovery, and innovation (See Figure 1). Follett held that being an integral part of a collaborative leadership process triggers high levels of intrinsic motivation in participants, provides them with a deep sense of purpose and accomplishment, and motivates them to continually stay in a process that produces such outcomes:

> Give your difference, welcome my difference, unify all difference in the larger whole—such is the law of growth. The unifying of difference is the eternal process of life—the creative synthesis, the highest act of creation, the at-onement…that richer joy which comes from having taken part in an act of creation . . . (Follett, 1918, p. 40).

Similarly, Smith's framework of councils holds this same view, yet from a different context. In Smith's framework, the group's purpose is not to simply solve a problem; rather, it is

to ascertain what God's will is regarding the problem by inventing a collaborative solution. Smith held that the Divine is inherent in the collaboration process itself; thus, members not only become co-creators with each other in the development of solutions or plans, they also become co-creators with God in implementing inspired plans when they abide by the principles of collaborative leadership—they experience collective inspiration.

While many scholars and practitioners have observed that high performance teams produce innovation, and that the process of producing innovative outcomes enhances intrinsic motivation, from Follett and Smith we gain a clearer picture of the relative importance of this variable in relation to collaborative leadership. From the writings of Follett, and from the historical analysis of Smith's organizing efforts, creation and innovation shift from ground to figure in terms of the valence of its role in sustaining and maintaining the existence of collaborative leadership processes. They argue that being part of a process that is involved with creation and innovation is no small thing to the human soul and that this reality should be addressed head on in management education efforts. One of the members of the Council of Fifty described his feelings of intrinsic motivation in his journal after being trained by Smith regarding principles of collaborative leadership on 18 April, 1844 in these words: "Much precious instructions were given, and it seems like heaven began on earth and the power of God is with us." (Ehat, 1980, p. 13)

What Follett and Smith attempt to evoke in their perspectives on collaborative leadership is a process that enthralls the human soul. Perhaps managers have unwittingly diminished this critical aspect of collaborative leadership in their management development training designs due to fears of appearing too emotional, too spiritual, too non-scientific, or perhaps too soft. However, this element may be the engine that drives the process, thus shying away from it in training programs or during action learning processes may wind up diluting the potential for individuals to internalize power sharing.

In conclusion, we aver that knowledge gained from further exploration into the frameworks of Mary P. Follett and Joseph Smith raises new and important insights for understanding how to better socialize, train, and educate managers regarding collaborative leadership processes. The degree to which their contributions can be efficacious to management educators of the 21st century cannot be fully known, of course, until the isolation of their contributions is lifted and a critical mass of scholars and practitioners begin studying and applying their work and thought. We hope that this introduction to their work and thought will engender that process, and lead to more efficacious processes and approaches for developing collaborative leadership in individuals and within organizations.

References

Ballard, M.R. (1995). *Counseling with our councils*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Publishing Company.

Ballard, M.R. (2006). O Be Wise. *Ensign,* November, 17–20

Benefiel, M. (2006). Strange bedfellows or natural partners? The academic study of spirituality and business. *Studies in Spirituality*, 16, 273-285.

Bennis, W. (1995). Thoughts on the "Essentials of Leadership." In P. Graham, P. (Ed.), *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of management* (pp. 177-182). Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.

Bloom, H. (1992). *The American religion: The emergence of the post-Christian nation*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Boorom, R. (2009). *Spiritual leadership: A study of the relationship between spiritual leadership theory and transformational leadership.* Regent University, AAT 3377759, UMI Dissertation Services.

Bromley, D.G. (1997). Remembering the future: A sociological narrative of crisis episodes, collective action, culture workers, and counter-movements. *Sociology of Religion*, 58(2), 105-140.

Bushman, R.L. (2005). *Joseph Smith: Rough stone rolling. A cultural biography of Mormonism's founder.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Davies, D.J. (2003). *An introduction to Mormonism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, D.J. (2005). World religion: Dynamics and constraints. Paper presented at the conference, "The Worlds of Joseph Smith," Library of Congress/Brigham Young University, May 7, 2005.

Davis, A. M. (1991). In practice - Follett on facts: Timely advice from an ADR pioneer. *Negotiation Journal*, 7 (2), 131-138

Doctrine and Covenants of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. (1989). Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Drath, W.H., & Palus, C.J. (1994). *Making common sense: Leadership and meaning-making in a community of practice.* Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Drucker, P. (1995). Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of management. In P. Graham, (Ed.), *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of management* (pp. 1-9). Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.

Ehat, A. F. (1980). "It seems like heaven began on earth" Joseph Smith and the constitution of the kingdom of God. *BYU Studies*, (20) 3, 253-279.

Eylon, D. (1998). Understanding empowerment and resolving its paradox: Lessons from Mary Parker Follett. *Journal of Management History*, (4) 1, 16-28.

Feldheim, M.A. (2004). Mary Parker Follett lost and found—again, and again, and again. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, (7) 3, 341-363.

Follett, M.P. (1918). *The new state.* Longmans, Green & Company. Republished in 1998 by The Pennsylvania State University Press: University Park, PA.

Follett, M. P. (1924). *Creative experience*. Longmans, Green and Company.

Follett, M.P. (1925). Constructive conflict. Paper presented at the Bureau of Personnel Administration. Reprinted in P. Graham. (Ed.) *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of management (pp.* 67-95). Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press, 1995.

Fry B.R., & Thomas L.L. (1996). Mary Parker Follett: Assessing the contribution and impact of her writings. *Journal of Management History*, (2) 2, 11-19.

Fry, L.W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 693-727.

Fry, L.W. (2004). Toward a theory of ethical and spiritual well-being, and corporate social responsibility through spiritual leadership. In R. Giacolone & C. Jurkiewicz (Eds.) *Positive psychology in business ethics and corporate responsibility (*pp.47-83).Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Fry, L. W. (2005). Toward a paradigm of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16 (5), 619-722.

Fry, L.W., Hannah, S., Noel, M., & Walumba, F. (in press). Impact of spiritual leadership on unit performance. *The Leadership Quarterly.*

Fry, L.W. & Kriger, M. (2009). Towards a being-centered theory of leadership: Multiple levels of being as context for effective leadership. *Human Relations*, 62 (11), 1667–1696.

Fry, L.W. & Slocum, J.W. (2008). Maximizing the triple bottom line through spiritual leadership. *Organizational Dynamics.* 37, 86-96.

Giacolone, R., & Jurkiewicz, C. (2003). Toward a science of workplace spirituality. In R. Giacolone & C. Jurkiewicz (Eds.) *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp. 3-28). New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Giacalone, R.A., Jurkiewicz, C.L., and Fry, L.W. (2005). From advocacy to science: The next steps in workplace spirituality research. In R. Paloutzian (Ed.), *Handbook of the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality* (pp. 515-528). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Graham, P. (Ed.) (1995). *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of management.* Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.

Jesse, D. (1977). Howard Coray's Recollections of Joseph Smith. *BYU Studies*, 17(3), 1-5.

Kanter, R.M. (1995). Preface. In P. Graham (Ed.), *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of management*. (pp. xii – xix). Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.

Lawrence, P.R. (1995). Epilogue. In P. Graham (Ed.) *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of management* (pp. 291-296). Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.

McConkie, M.L., & Boss, W. (2005). "I Teach Them Correct Principles and They Govern Themselves." The Leadership Genius of the Mormon Prophet. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 28 (5 & 6), 437-463.

McKersic, R., & Walton, R. A. (1992). Retrospective on the behavioral theory of labor negotiations." *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* Special Issue: Conflict and Negotiation in Organizations: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives, 13 (3), 277-285.

Mendenhall, M. (2010). Organizational routines and the perpetuation of top management team leadership processes in the LDS Church. Unpublished manuscript, University of Tennessee, Chattanooga, TN.

Mendenhall, M., Macomber, J., & Cutright, M. (2000). Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of chaos and complexity. *Journal of Management History*, 6 (4), 191-204.

Miller, P., & O'Leary, T. (1989). Hierarchies and American ideals, 1900-1940. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(2), 250-265.

Mintzberg, H. (1995). Co-ordination. In P. Graham (Ed.), *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of management* (pp. 199-204). Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.

Nelson, R.E. (1993). Authority, organization, and societal context in multinational churches. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 653-682.

The New York Sun. (1843). 4 September, 1843.

O'Dea, T.F. (1954). Mormonism and the avoidance of sectarian stagnation: A study of church, sect, and incipient nationality, *The American Journal of Sociology*, 60 (3), 285-293

Ostling, R.N. & Ostling, J.K. (1999). *Mormon America: The power and the promise.* San Francisco: Harper.

Payne, D.E. (1972). Socioeconomic status and leadership selection in the Mormon missionary system. *Review of Religious Research*, 13(2), 118-125

Quinn, D. M. (1980). The "Council of Fifty" and its members, 1844 to 1945. *BYU Studies*, 20 (2), 163-197

Raelin, J. (2003). *Creating leaderful organizations: How to bring out leadership in everyone.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Raelin, J. (2006). Does action learning promote collaborative leadership? *Academy of Management Learning & Education,* 5(2), 152-168.

Remini, R.V. (2002). *Joseph Smith*. Viking Press.

Smith, J. (1991). *History of the Church*, Volume 6 (reprint edition). Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company.

Stark, R. (1984). The rise of a new world faith. *Review of Religious Research*, 26(1), 18-27.

Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W. (1958). How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review*, 36(2), 95-101.

Thomas, R.J. (2008). Crucibles of leadership development. *Sloan Management Review*, 49(3), 15-18.

Tonn, J.C. (2003). *Mary P. Follett: Creating democracy, transforming management.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Vroom, V.H., & Yetton, P.W. (1973). *Leadership and decision-making.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Waldo, D. (1984). *The administrative state* (2nd ed.). New York: Holmes and Meier.

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Table 1
Raelin's "Operating Perspectives Framework" of Collaborative Leadership
See Raelin, 2006. pp. 156-157

Being Concurrent • Having tolerance of more than one leader operating simultaneously at any given moment in a group. • While position leaders exist in a collaborative leadership context, they share leadership by allowing others in the group to offer leadership through a wide variety of behaviors. • Sharing power and influence in the ongoing process of the group.	***Being Collective*** • Reflects group behavior where individual group members operate *in tandem* as leaders. • Leadership radiates out of the dynamics of group sub-systems and not necessarily from a single individual or a few individuals engaging in solitary influence attempts on the group as a whole.
Being Mutual *The right or the tendency for all group members to:* • Advocate a point of view that they believe can contribute to the common good of the organization. • Assertively share their views while having concurrent sensitivity to the views and feelings of others. • Seek to engage in a dialogue in which they willing open their beliefs and values to the scrutiny of others. • Understand the difference between collaborating as a pretense versus becoming fully involved.	***Being Compassionate*** • Having a commitment to all stakeholders of the group • The norm of having all views considered before a decision is made • Each member of the group is granted dignity • All viewpoints are considered regardless whether they conform to current thought processes. • The shared understanding of group members that collaborative leadership is worthy of dignity and protection as a value in and of itself.

Table 2
Dimensions of Covenantalism and Contractualism
See Bromley, 1997, pp. 106-108

Covenantalism	*Contractualism*
The elemental unit of human organization is the community rather than the individual. The most fundamental relationships are covenantal since individuals are the product of the communities of which they are part.	The individual is the elemental unit of human organization. Institutions are derivative units legitimated by and responsive to individual interests.
Individuals are obligated to pursue collective good and to frame individual aspirations and actions in this context.	It is assumed that collective good is the product of individual actions in furtherance of personal interest.
Individuals signal intentionality through vow-taking processes with a goal of reaching mutual commitment.	Individuals signal their intentionality through the process of negotiation with a goal of reaching mutual agreement.
Individuals pledge to contribute to another's well-being rather than to specific performances.	Individuals make pledges to specific performances rather than to another's overall well-being.
The objective is to achieve social integration through bonding and unity.	The objective is to effect an exchange, which is orchestrated through a sequence of performance rituals that accentuate the presence choice and voluntarism.
Covenantalism is organized on a personal basis, where role and person are integrated, thus it is the uniqueness of the individual that shapes relationships.	There is a sharp distinction between role and person. Contractual exchanges are positional in nature, which means it is the category (e.g., buyer/seller) from which individuals operates that is most important.
Mutual commitment increases if the parties perceive one another to be acting in the proper spirit (with the correct intentions).	Mutual commitment is achieved if the parties perceive one another to be acting reasonably.
Participants symbolize the larger whole of which they are part as being ordered by spiritual/personal agency, such as the laws of Love or God.	Participants symbolize the larger whole of which they are a part as being ordered by mechanistic laws, such as justice, market, and science.
Covenantal social relations orient individuals in terms of spirit (heart).	Contractual social relations are oriented in terms of the mind (brain).
Primary disorder is constituted when there is a loss of transpersonal integration with the larger whole of which the individual is a part.	Primary disorder is constituted when there is a loss of personal integration that impedes individual cognitive functioning or autonomy.

Figure 1: Extended Collaborative Leadership Framework