In 1970 Alvin Toffler wrote about the phenomenon of “future shock”—the reaction to a period of technological innovation, accumulation of knowledge, and access to information that occurred so rapidly that people and systems in society were overwhelmed and under stress to make adjustments and accommodation to its impact. At about the same time, men like Prigogine, Feigenbaum, and a handful of other scientists scattered about the country were grappling with ideas that would begin to explain the nature of the change process that Toffler had noted. They were committed to the study of dynamic systems that today is referred to under the rubric “chaos” (Gleick, 1987). Science and technology have opened the way to new vision and understanding of the world, but at the same time created new complex systems that seem to require greater energy to maintain. New relationships and new ways of connecting by individuals and families with work, business, government, and social institutions are having startling and unpredictable consequences for economic, political, and social behaviors.

Old concepts of change as gradual, connected, cumulative, and progressive are no longer always valid (Kagan, 1980).

*Susan M. Scott contributed ideas to sections of this chapter.
Prigogine, a biochemist, and collaborators have developed a new theory of change for which Prigogine received the Nobel Prize for Chemistry in 1977. His theory of dissipative structure first described how order is achieved out of chaos. He later applied this theory to social change (Prigogine & Stengers, 1984). This theory postulates that when fluctuations within the system become sufficiently turbulent so that old connecting points no longer work, the system transforms itself into a higher order with new and different connecting points that are more integrated and connected than in the preceding one. But, also a larger flow of energy is required to maintain it. Not only does this theory more fully describe the process of change, but it explains the critical role of stress in change.

How does science change its mind? Kuhn (1962) noted that new paradigms, explanatory models that more effectively explain phenomena, are at first met with resistance. As the more powerful idea gains ascendance, however, a shift occurs as if the old model is suddenly replaced in a revolutionary manner. Tensions and dissonance caused by turbulence stimulate the opportunity for new ways of acting upon the world, but they may, also, frighten people to withdraw into a protective stance trying to hold on to the security of the old way of living and resisting with a last gasp for the familiar and seemingly safe world. Students in recent years have been labeled the “me generation,” concerned only with achieving private ends to take care of and protect themselves (Levine, 1980). But, Boyer (1987) found undergraduates often torn between ambiguous feelings of idealism on the one hand (aspirations to reach beyond themselves) and on the other hand the temptation to pursue their private interests that could leave them politically and socially disengaged.

Indeed, a world that is undergoing transformation rather than maintenance is in need of an extraordinary form of leadership—the type of leadership that is able to inspire and create new processes of social existence. Leaders are needed who are similar to those leaders that shaped the beginnings of this country—leaders with broad knowledge, a sense of courage, a belief in a strong set of ethical and moral principles, and creative, imaginative minds capable of identifying many potentials.
LEADERSHIP THEORY

Leadership, according to Burns (1978, pp. 18-19) is "the exercise of those with power potential, to engage, mobilize, induce, and transform followers to act for certain goals which represent the values and motivations—the wants and the needs, the aspirations of both leaders and followers." The leader is powerful but not a power wielder. The leader takes initiative creating links for communication. The leader is moral, raising the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration. The leader is "transforming" as followers proceed to higher levels permitting the relationship to change. The extent of the quality and power of the leader is measured by actual accomplishment toward promised change.

Leadership has been a topic of widespread interest throughout much of recorded history from Plato’s discussion of the "philosopher king" and Machiavelli’s description of the “Prince” to countless modern day biographies of American presidents, generals, and world leaders in nearly every walk of life. Management science programs require courses in leadership, political scientists research the nature of individual impact, and sociologists and social psychologists study the interface of individual and group dynamics. Still leadership in many ways remains an enigma, a much discussed but little understood phenomenon (Burns, 1978).

Fiedler (1967) reviewed many of the diverse descriptions of leadership enumerating phrases such as the exercise of authority and responsibility, the making of decisions, the initiation of acts leading to purposeful group solutions, the creation of change, and the direction and coordination of task relevant group activity. Leadership also has been viewed as the relationship of leader to follower: as an ability to understand human behavior, to listen, to understand, and to respond to human need (Kouzes & Posner, 1987). The relationship potentially can be one of transaction, and agreement between two levels: transformation, encouraging followers to greater potential; and transcendence, which elevates followers to leaders (Burns, 1978). The following historical development of leadership theory provides perspective for the present status of this complex and sometimes controversial subject.
Leadership Theory In The Twentieth Century

Two major explanations were used as models for the description of leadership 50 years ago. One was commonly referred to as the "Great Man" theory, which described qualities of superiority that were ascribed as the domain of certain elite. They became leaders because of a natural tendency for "the cream to rise to the top." A counter theory, the Zeitgeist, explained leadership as a result of the situation with factors of time, place, and circumstance as preeminent determinants in the emergence of leader behavior. In the 1930s and 1940s, early research on group dynamics attempted to isolate the behaviors and qualities that identified leadership. The White and Lippitt (1968) study of democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire behaviors exemplified research that isolated leader behavior and its impact upon the group.

In the 1950s, a study of specific characteristics of leaders seen as effective by subordinates was carried out by researchers at The Ohio State University (Forsyth, 1983). This study was the first to identify two sets of variables that became the focus for leadership study during the sixties. The first of these variables followed a dimension that has been variously called maintenance, relationship, likability, or process. The second dimension was described as task, structure, initiation, or production (Hershey & Blanchard, 1977). Studies of relationships between variables in the leader behavior and the performance or effectiveness of the group led to the subsequent emphasis on the interaction of a situation with the leader's behavior.

The "contingency model" was an outcome of style and situation research. Fiedler (1967) considered three variables: (1) the group atmosphere, measure of the leader-group relationship, (2) the task structure, the specificity of goals, and (3) the leader power position, the authority over group members. He concluded that the favorableness of leader behavior was contingent upon the situation. Task-oriented leaders performed best in less favorable situational structure, and relationship-oriented leaders functioned best in moderately structured settings. Thus, the leader must either adapt to the situation, or the appropriate leader must be matched
to the situation (Fiedler, 1967). Subsequent research has considered variations on this theme, including changing leadership styles (Fiedler & Mahar, 1979).

Tannebaum and Schmidt (1973) emphasized that a person with qualities of sensitivity, insight, and flexibility is more able to adapt and have a higher batting average in successfully assessing appropriate behavior for the setting. House and Mitchell (1974) reasoned that a leader’s choice of behavior is related directly to the awareness of subordinate motivation and the influence the leader has in influencing the work goals and personal goals on a personally satisfying path.

Hershey and Blanchard (1977) took the relationship and task dichotomies and added a “life cycle” or time maturity dimension. The life cycle theory demonstrates the relationship of task and maintenance functions to the maturity level of group or follower development. As the level of maturity of the group increases, the leader behavior requires less structure and support. Four patterns of potential leader behavior are expressed on these continua: (1) dictating (telling), (2) persuading (selling), (3) facilitating (participating), and (4) involving (delegating). A leader may assume a different pattern of behavior based upon the readiness of subordinates.

House (1971) in the path-goal model of leadership theory identified the leader as the person providing a motivational function for subordinates. Leaders, by understanding the reasons for individuals’ choices, facilitate the attainment of their goals by reducing obstacles and enhancing satisfaction in the path toward the goal. The leader may provide guidance and performance incentives. This model is best demonstrated in situations where goals are concrete, structure is clear, and incentives are readily identifiable.

Vroom and Yetton’s (1973) decision-process model is yet another case of situational leadership theory. The emphasis in this model is on the social process in which decisions take place. The leader is advised to approach the decision process based upon the attributes that define a problem situation. Seven attributes or levels of the decision process are evaluated by a yes/no decision tree that in turn determine...
a prescribed set of rules to apply to the situation. These attributes consider such factors as amount of information available concerning the problem, level of acceptance with members, amount of structure, shared goals, and amount of conflict likely for a solution. Vroom (1984) pointed out that a leader in the educational environment does not operate in a closed system, the internal organization of subordinates. The leader must mediate an interaction with the forces in the surrounding environment (boards, taxpayers, granting agencies, and others) as well as charting a course for subordinates within the institutional structure.

Herzberg (1968) emphasized the leader's need to understand what really motivates followers. He maintained that the commonly assumed means of directing action (money, benefits) are "hygiene" factors that do not motivate or satisfy workers, although they are means for causing dissatisfaction. Herzberg hypothesized that the true motivators are individual responsibility, achievement, internal recognition, growth, advancement, and learning.

The description of theory and research over the past 50 years has demonstrated the interaction of variables such as style, behavior, situational structure, follower maturity, motivation, and adaptability. The interdisciplinary nature of leadership has left a wide range of philosophical, social, psychological, and political perspectives with need for a synthesizer. Burns (1978), a political scientist, presidential biographer, and ardent student of leadership theory across all disciplines, offered the most complete dynamic theory of leadership to date. He described leadership as a reciprocal and interactive relationship between leader and follower. It is a dynamic interaction that involves a continual dialectic give and take. Burns based his ideas of leadership on both motivation theory (Maslow, 1954) and developmental theory (Erikson, 1968; Kohlberg, 1981). Maslow's hierarchy of needs explains how the attainment of a lower level of need depletes the drive or motivation for that need. For example, once people feel secure in an environment, unthreatened by arbitrary or punitive intervention, they may then be willing to risk more open relationships with associates. The leader's role is to recognize continually and facilitate the follower's striving toward
higher levels of personal fulfillment. Developmental theories are used to explain the process people experience when moving through crisis to equilibrium, a process leading to increased levels of personal competence and confidence in achieving potentials and moral commitment. People mature through stages in life in which personal issues are confronted and resolved and tasks mastered before advancing. Burns uses extensive case evidence of famous world leaders of the century—Churchill, Mao, Gandhi, and several American presidents—to assess and identify qualities of leadership.

A discussion of the leader-situation interaction applied to education settings was provided by Blake, Mouton, and Williams (1981). They held that by considering two functional aspects of leadership, concern for institutional performance and concern for people, as horizontal and vertical scaled continua (ranging from low 1 to high 9), an administrator's leadership style may be described as coordinates of a grid (see Figure 4.1.). Administrators that are 1,1 on the grid are called "caretakers"; they exert the minimum amount of effort required to meet minimum work expectations and demand little from subordinates. One/nine administrators (1,9 on the grid) are characterized as "comfortable and pleasant" and are concerned primarily with creating satisfying relationships and a pleasant work tempo. They display little concern for production and reaching institutional goals. Administrators whose emphasis is on efficiency in operations with little regard for the feelings of staff are 9,1 on the grid. They concentrate on getting results by the use of power and authority, and demand unquestioning obedience from subordinates. Leaders who subscribe to a "constituency-centered" approach (5,5 on the grid) attempt to balance the needs of the college to get results while maintaining good morale among the staff. The "team administrator" (9,9 on the grid) has equally high concern for institutional performance and people. This style leader encourages staff to achieve at high levels and attempts to motivate them by gaining their commitment to the college's goals.

LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Institutions of higher education, facing a period in which economic conditions, changing student populations, technological
Figure 4.1. The Academic Administrator Grid.

innovations, shifting emphases in the world of work, and enhanced methods for the storage and communication of information that have revolutionized the world, have the need to respond, to make adjustments, and to accommodate the shifts that have stressed and made obsolete many of the methods for operating an educational system in the recent past. This constant need for change presents continuing opportunity for academia to develop higher levels of functioning that will prepare more diverse populations with increased educational needs to live in a complex world.

Keller (1983) assessed the needs for managing higher education during a period of change, and indicated the importance of leadership that is willing to take the initiative and create an inevitable tension between stability and change. Leadership from the top down may be the single most important factor in managing the process of change, but Keller also mentioned that it is all too frequently found lacking on college campuses.

Most research and theory on leadership has evolved from the business field. Peters and Waterman (1982) identified management characteristic of the most successful American companies. Douglas (1981) applied these same characteristics to the college campus. These eight characteristics are summarized as follows:

1. **Hold a bias for action**—must be able to adjust and make changes more rapidly to keep institutions alive and viable; leaders must lead and take action even though the resources and structure in many institutions make it difficult.

2. **Listen closely to consumer**—form a partnership by being attentive to diverse needs of population served.

3. **Encourage autonomy and creativity**—promote an atmosphere of autonomy, entrepreneurship, allow people (staffs) to take risks, unlock creativity.

4. **Implement Theory Y of work**—appreciate people, allow for (encourage) employee growth and development.
5. Transmit a message of value—integrity of organization is determined through consistency of behaviors (e.g., if an institution says rigor and standards are important then the actions of leaders must reinforce this).

6. Stay with what you know—do not try to be all things to all people.

7. Simple organizational structure—lean staffing, do not have too many layers of bureaucracy, and administrative "flab," keep organization streamlined and trim, but do not pare away bone and muscle along with the fat.

8. Simultaneous loose-tight properties—flexible response system in which people are free to do job they are hired to do, but managers take corrective action when either crisis or opportunity determines it is necessary.

Vroom (1984) indicated that he was employed for over two decades in the academic setting without researching or even thinking about making application of leadership principles to the college setting. He indicated that the vagueness of educational mission statements, the tendency toward anarchy in the internal governing structure, and the presence of factors such as tenure create in the university setting certain unique situations not present in the business setting. Vroom's conclusion from limited study in academic settings was that this setting is best suited for forms of highly participatory leadership in which the presence of diverse ideas, research attitudes, and intellectual input can lead to greater innovation, higher levels of commitment to the institution, and greater levels of staff satisfaction.

Three universities participated in a Kellogg Foundation grant for developing institutional leadership for supporting effective change strategies during the early 1980s (Hipps, 1982). While organizational structure and methods of change were considered in the project the emphasis was placed on the people factors, such as enhancing communication, participatory problem solving methods, and preparing individuals in collaborative work efforts. On one campus over 100 faculty
and administrative staff members participated in an extensive training program to prepare individuals to assume new leadership responsibilities. The conclusion of the project emphasized the input of leadership development activities as the single most important component for change on all three campuses.

NEW WAYS FOR VIEWING LEADERSHIP

Paradigms or models are tools that help conceptualize and explain certain aspects of reality. In one sense they become maps that help to explore unfamiliar territory and act as guides that permit individuals to look beyond present positions. But paradigms and models are always incomplete and invite generalizations that go beyond their original purpose. They are restrictive, too, because people tend to become accustomed to their perceptions and will not give up an old framework until circumstances demand it. This leads to the creation of new paradigms.

Generally, developmental theorists have explained developmental change to be the result of seeking a balance, and accommodation with the environment, or a state of equilibrium. They have usually perceived change as being gradual, progressive, predictable, and connected; they have viewed behavior as directed toward stability, equilibrium, and balance. New theory called Self organization Theory has challenged these conceptualizations and proposed that many changes are found in disequilibrium (Caple, 1987a). This theory is build on General System Theory (Bertalanffy, 1968), the theory of Dissipative Structures and a new ordering principle underlying them called Order Through Fluctuations (Nicolis & Prigogine, 1977; Prigogine, 1976; Prigogine & Stengers, 1984).

The central concepts in general system theory are (1) the open system model—every living system, including the human being, is an open or partially open system that maintains itself only in a continuous exchange of energy with its environment; (2) boundaries—every system has either spatial or dynamic boundaries that regulate the exchange of energy
with the environment; (3) autonomy—the function of consciously managing the system’s boundaries, which represents both the potential and the limitation of a human system; and (4) the developmental process—proceeds from a state of differentiation to a state of articulation and hierarchial order, and which reflects the sense of a differentiated self emerging from the environment.

Central concepts of the theory of Dissipative Structures are (1) nonequilibrium—dissipative structures originate from conditions of nonequilibrium and interact with the outside environment in such a way that they are open to reordering; (2) connections—any living or open system is connected at various points and the more complex this structure the more energy required to maintain its connections; and (3) fluctuations—the continuous flow of energy through a system creates fluctuations, many of which are absorbed or adjusted to without altering the system’s structural integrity (a first-order change), but some of which, because of high levels of turbulence, result in old connecting points no longer working which produce system transformation to a higher order with new and different connecting points (second-order change).

The principles of self-organization theory apply equally well to social groups and organizations as they do to human organisms, and certain principles apply to systems in general irrespective of the nature of the entities concerned (Bertalanffy, 1968). Jantsch (1980) viewed self-organizing principles applying from the cell to society, and proposed four levels of planning that are useful as a model for leaders to follow: (1) tactical—the level of day-to-day planning for short-range goals; (2) strategic—the level at which a variety of options is created, tested, and prepared for implementation on a broad range, creating a mental structure that is not in equilibrium, with fluctuations fed into it deliberately to trigger further evolution; (3) policy—the level at which the dynamics of the system (organization or group) are considered in relation to the larger society; and (4) creative—the level that goes beyond the rational, logical responses of the other levels to effect value creation. If an organization is to evolve, upper levels must be open to the introduction and integration of creativity.
In process-oriented management, the role of the leader is that of a catalyst and process is emphasized rather than product. Although process is emphasized, outcomes are not altogether ignored, but are seen in relation to the process. Autonomy is basic to each concept within self-organization theory, and it increases as the organization achieves differentiation from its environment. Conflict is viewed as being inherent to the change process. The natural efforts to dampen fluctuations within systems and to perceive equilibrium as the more desirable state may lead observers to interpret the resulting conflict as negative experience. In truth, likely the fluctuations leading to change are experienced as conflict and are necessary and constructive forces in the change process (Caple, 1987b).

Self-organization theory provides student affairs practitioners with a broad theory of change from which to view the development of students. Leaders oriented toward providing services and physical facilities will emphasize and support first-order changes and resist second-order changes. Leaders who are oriented toward self-organizing principles will emphasize process and will be aware that outcomes cannot always be specified before they occur. Their emphasis will be on creating experience rather than maintaining the system and on awareness of the system's coevolution with its environment.

Kuh, Whitt, and Shedd (1987) identified similar characteristics of an emergent paradigm with implications for student affairs leaders. They indicated that situations must be viewed in complex and diverse ways rather than in simple reductionist explanations. For example, enrollment management studies are only able to factor out 20 to 30% of the variance to explain dropouts. Patterns need to be identified in what was termed as holonomic (that is, any part of a system, such as a department or unit, reflects in some ways the character of the whole division and even the institution). This inner relatedness and interdependence is exemplified by how curriculums are modified through a process that involves individuals, departments, divisions, other institutions in a system, consortia, and even governing boards. Kuh and his colleagues further elaborated that this emergent model reflects an indeterminate understanding of causality in
understanding human behavior. Ambiguity, subtlety, and mutual shaping of subject and context become important considerations in the establishment of an organizational response. No two students are necessarily shaped in the same way by environmental conditions. This requires strategies that can pick up the uniqueness and nuances of a situation. An individual student's academic success, for example, may be enhanced by supportive intervention, by challenge, or by appropriate doses of both (the choice of which may vary considerably with the knowledge and response of that student).

To implement the strategies of the emerging perspective described by Kuh et al. (1987), will require the preparation of student affairs professionals with vision and leadership. Good leaders will be able to generate understanding among those they lead. This requires skills in group facilitation, negotiation, and conflict management and knowledge of participative decision models, leadership theories, and planning models. But, what the leader stands for and does is far more important than what the leader says. The leader must show integrity, consistently articulate values, and adhere to principles in all that he or she does.

PROPOSITIONS FOR EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP

Based on reference from both the general field of leadership and the more specific area of higher education, the following seven propositions for effective leadership are proposed. Each is described and further explained by the use of student affairs related examples.

1. A leader is aware of his or her role and responsibility within a system and of the connections that relate and affect this position. A leader realizes that people, interacting in a system, will always influence one another. Recognition of this need to connect is made through the process of group cooperation and communication. Emphasis needs to be on this “process.” Process is the way or manner in which people interact to accomplish a goal. The most productive leaders are aware of the process of interaction and will focus their
attention on the quality of these connection points. A connected leader is not laissez faire, ignoring conflicts and avoidance behaviors, or similar signals of problems with interacting people. Instead, the leader will use strategies that bring dynamics into the open, will embrace conflict as a tool for growth, and will not hesitate to give clear and immediate feedback.

An important aspect of providing clarity in the process of communication is the ability to self-differentiate. Friedman (1985, p. 229) described a leader as one who takes "primary responsibility for his or her own position as head and works to define his or her own goals, while staying in touch with the rest of the organism." To know one’s own needs, wishes, prejudices, and perceptions will at least minimize the possibility of projecting these personal predispositions on others. Heider (1985, p. 15) cited the Taoist metaphor of water as an example of this type of leadership. "Water cleanses and refreshes all creatures without distinction and judgement; water frequently and fearlessly goes deep below the surface of things; water is fluid and responsive ..." A leader speaks simply and honestly and intervenes in order to shed light and create harmony.

Deliberate strategies may be used in the management of student affairs units to facilitate the process of the work group. Establishing, as an explicit norm, that it is appropriate to discuss concerns about the way a staff communicates, makes decisions, and interacts together is an important initial step. Planning retreats or workshops at the beginning stage of interaction, such as the start of a school year, can provide needed discussion to establish procedures for considering process issues. On an individual basis a leader needs to consistently pay attention to his or her own connections to staff. Quality connections are dependent upon confrontation, recognition, and other forms of direct feedback that constitute open communication.

2. A leader is able to articulate and act consistently with a clear set of values. Mission statements are typically written as reflections of the values for which institutions purport to stand. However, these statements are often lost and forgotten in the hidden recesses of college catalogs. Real
values are demonstrated, however, in the daily experience of the campus. The action of leaders should similarly reflect an underlying value orientation. A leader must identify a personal sense of value and then function with these values as a source of commitment and empowerment for subsequent action. In some cases, following a principled path may necessitate courage and risk taking on the part of the leader. Leaders that act in this way, however, will receive respect for their courage of conviction and need not in retrospect take a defensive stance to justify their actions.

A common example is espousal of an affirmative action, equal opportunity position in the hiring of staff. This position may be stated in job announcements due to legislated requirements, but in many instances it may only be window dressing for the actual hiring process. How often has a search taken place with a job description written for a particular individual but openly advertised, with a preferred “in-house” candidate that is unknown to other candidates, with certain characteristics being sought that are not communicated in public, or with an implication of interest in minority candidates but without the necessary initiative to actively seek them? Leaders must establish their values and implement them with their very first contacts beginning with the hiring process.

3. A leader demonstrates respect for people through actions that value human dignity. Higher education is a system that concerns people, and its product is people. Frequently the more tangible aspects of its operation—facilities, technical assistance, computer operations, research apparatus, volumes in the library—too often command the attention of budget makers. Comparisons of institutions may even focus on how well an institution keeps pace with technology, volume collections in the library, or other quantitative measures. The people, however, make the difference at all levels of campus operations. Is an institution willing to invest in the improvement of employee conditions, the accessibility of faculty advisors to students and vice versa, the growth and enhancement opportunities for support personnel, and the representation of all campus constituents on policy making committees? Are minorities given reasonable opportunity to find a place in a college environment that accepts cultural differences
and enhances success potentials, or do they feel disenfranchised in an alien milieu, under represented in the decision-making process, and without successful role models to emulate? An institution must invest fully in the enhancement and development of people by setting clear priorities in the reward system; by recognition of conditions that influence the dignity of students, employees, and public; and by communicating an attitude of human concern from the top down.

4. A leader is a model for others. In many ways a leader teaches by doing, particularly for younger members of the staff. Bandura (1977) has demonstrated that many complex occupational and social requirements are learned as a result of modeling. Human development and, perhaps, survival is facilitated by the ability of individuals to acquire new responses, by watching someone else perform an activity before doing it themselves.

The most effective way to accomplish this form of leadership is rarely by assuming the “expert” role and pretending to be special. Eastern thinking may best summarize this point:

A leader is best
When people barely know that one exists,
Not so good when people obey and acclaim him/her.
Worst when they despise him/her.
   Fail to honor people,
   They fail to honor you.
But of a good leader who talks little
When his/her work is done, his/her aim fulfilled.
They will say, “We did this ourselves.”

From the Way of Life: Tao Te Ching
according to Lao-tzu, a Taoist Chinese Scholar.

Leadership done so deftly that people are barely aware of the effort made to accomplish the task is a goal worth achieving.

5. A leader knows when to assert direct or indirect influence and when to distribute power. A familiar Kenny Rogers' song about a riverboat gambler reflects the importance of the sense of timing involved in knowing when to act, when
it suggests that one needs to know when to fold, or when to hold a poker hand and, perhaps more important, when to walk away from the game completely. A leader knows when to exercise power by making decisions, when to let a consensus of the work group make a decision, or when to allow a decision to "make itself." An understanding of when to use resources and when to conserve them is also important.

Power exercised in the natural order of things creates energy. "Potency comes from knowing what is happening and acting accordingly" (Heider, 1985, p. 77). On the other hand, potency is not a "calculation or manipulation, or a matter of trying to look good." A leader acts from clarity of value, consciousness of purpose and the courage of belief and not from a sense of self-aggrandizement and personal reward. A leader who exerts power in this manner will actually energize and empower followers.

Many times in the work life of a student affairs staff this form of leadership may be demonstrated. Standing up for and supporting a position that may be generally unpopular with other segments of the campus administration is an example. Initially this may be seen as risking a position of influence with significant connections in the authority structure, but when grounded in clear argument and presented with conviction, it will generally be respected by others even when holding a different opinion. Constructing and implementing a budget is another example where leadership can exert influence by putting these resources behind the implementation of decisions and goals of an organization. Frequently, budgets are perpetuated from year to year without looking for creative possibilities to redistribute some of the available resources.

6. A leader is aware of the special nature of the system in which she or he is embedded and how this system relates (exchanges) energy with its environment. At some points a leader must focus on specific detail as it applies to a given situation but at other times the leader must view the larger picture giving attention to the total organization and its relationship to the wider world. Hall and Quinn (1983) described (1) how organizations are the means by which public policy is implemented (for example, governmental agencies,
groups from the private sector, political action committees), and (3) how the bulk of public policy is aimed at organizations (for example, labor relation laws, taxation). Although the interconnections between public policy and organizations is obvious, little attention is given to this fact by many leaders.

Many modern organizations have become larger and more powerful than nation-states (Morgan, 1986). As organizations function and assert their identities they can influence transitions in the social ecology to which they belong. Institutions of higher learning are public organizations, too. Student affairs leaders need to be aware of how their institutions connect, interact, and respond to other policy making organizations. Leaders need to understand and reflect on their role in this process and function as managers of change.

7. A leader is able to make transitions to higher levels of order and inspire people to achieve similar levels of functioning. Increased awareness and enhanced autonomy are basic parts of human development. Burns (1978) proposed that a leader who is able to assist others in transcending their previous mindsets and elevate goals toward higher levels is a "transforming" leader. Instead of bargaining for separate goals, based upon individual need, the transforming leader seeks the common goal of personal development of leader and follower, each wanting to move to a higher level of potential. The value of this type of leadership is to move toward ends that reflect concepts such as liberty, justice, equality, and morality as measuring rods. Burns has seen this type of leadership as sorely lacking at times in history. He cited the examples of a Ghandi or even presidential figures like Kennedy who elicited strong feeling and reactions from people, in some cases anger, that inspired and elicited greater levels of achievement and moral direction from many followers.

Within the student affairs profession, this mode of transforming leadership is especially important to deal with cultural diversity and to achieve inclusion of previously disenfranchised groups. Examples fairly common to many campus situations are (1) student government leaders and staff advisors convincing a frugal student senate and campus administration that child care for the relatively small number
of students with children should be the responsibility of the entire campus and, therefore, taxing themselves for this purpose; (2) a residence hall staff initiating education and support programs for gay and lesbian students; and (3) the establishment of student behavior guidelines that provide clear sanctions against sexual discrimination and harassment that were once seen as the “harmless” behavior of “college boys.”

Transforming leadership has the potential to influence the transcendence of an entire community to a level that celebrates diversity and enhances greater human understanding and acceptance.

**SUMMARY**

This chapter has emphasized the need for leadership in student affairs that encompasses a broad and effective range of values and behaviors. Skills in communication, budgeting, group facilitation, and computer applications are important, but even more essential are the values a leader holds with regard to human dignity and a social structure that functions with concern for the welfare and development of all people. Leaders cannot predict all changes that will occur, but they can manage change as it occurs and help prepare people for new structure in their systems that results from those changes.

Professional education is an important influence on student affairs leaders. Academic programs need to emphasize the knowledge and skill required to function as student affairs professionals, but, in addition, they also need to focus on the values of future leaders in the field. The combined efforts of practitioners, faculty in graduate training programs, and professional associations are necessary to support and encourage quality leadership in the field.
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