Allied Academies
International Conference

Reno, NV
October 15-17, 2008

Academy of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict

PROCEEDINGS

Table of Contents

SAVING AMERICAN BUSINESS: CHANGING THE CULTURE OF CORPORATE LEADERSHIP BEYOND THE NEXT QUARTER'S PROFITS

David W. Arnesen, Seattle University
arnesen@seattleu.edu
William L. Weis, Seattle University
billweis@seattleu.edu

ABSTRACT

CEO compensation, golden parachutes, interlocking boards of directors, and management rewarded for short term profits are issues which require a radical change in the culture of corporate leadership if American business is going to survive as a global leader in the next decade. This article advocates that these changes at the executive level must focus on integrity, innovation, long term profits and business expansion.

Saving American business requires rebuilding a culture of responsibility within corporate leadership. This lack of responsibility in leadership has resulted in international investments pouring into business in China, India, Vietnam and throughout the world while questioning the ability American business culture to change, grow and be competitive. Change in the culture of American business leadership is clearly necessary for businesses in the United States to survive in the next decade and beyond.

This cultural leadership change requires CEOs being rewarded based on performance; elimination of multimillion dollar golden parachutes when there has been ineffective leadership; limiting interlocking boards of directors; boards of directors recognizing that there are many individuals who can lead an organization if given the opportunity; a culture that downsizing should not be celebrated and that the goal of corporate leadership should focus on long term business expansion and profits not the short term quarterly value of the stock.

COMMUNICATION COMPETENCIES: PERCEPTIONS OF AACSB COLLEGE OF BUSINESS DEANS AND BUSINESS COMMUNICATION STUDENTS

Donald English, Texas A&M University-Commerce
Edgar Manton, Texas A&M University-Commerce
Janet Walker, Texas A&M University-Commerce
Tom Brodnax, Texas A&M University-Commerce
donald_english@tamu-commerce.edu

ABSTRACT

The problem of this study was to determine which business communication competencies AACSB college of business deans and business communication students viewed as most essential for the workplace. The deans of AACSB accredited schools of business and students enrolled in business communication classes were surveyed. Forty-three communication competencies were studied. AACSB deans ranked "uses personal integrity in all communication" as most essential. Communication students ranked "spells correctly" as most essential.

PEER TEACHING AND LEARNING DURING TEAM QUIZ ASSESSMENTS: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY

Penny Herickhoff, Minnesota State University Mankato
Vicki Luoma, Minnesota State University Mankato
Milton Luoma, Metropolitan State University
penny.herickhoff@mnsu.edu

ABSTRACT

In Team Based Learning, quizzing is used as a learning tool rather than strictly an evaluation tool. Team Based Learning is a method of teaching that requires students to solve complex problems, in teams, in order to help students to think critically, to make decisions and to accomplish deep learning. Team Based Learning starts with students reading assigned subject matter outside of the classroom and then taking an individual Readiness Assurance Test (RAT). Thereafter, students retake the same quiz, the Group Readiness Assurance Test (GRAT), with their team members to encourage them to collaborate, to pool their knowledge and understandings. In addition to enhancing the subject matter mastery of its members, Team Quiz activities may also help the teams become more cohesive, trusting and affective. This paper examines results of student scores on the individual RAT and GRATs to determine if the data supports that Team Quiz activities actually work as a learning tool.

LIAR! LIAR! YOUR PANTS ARE ON FIRE: DECEPTIVE COMMUNICATION IN THE WORKPLACE

Julie Indvik, California State University-Chico
jindivk@csuchico.edu
Pamela R. Johnson, California State University-Chico
pjohnson@csuchico.edu

ABSTRACT

We live with lies in the workplace every day. From everyday paperclips to the hollow commitments made to new recruits to the increasingly wistful search for the relationship between performance and reward, work is a showcase for human duplicity Lies, for the most part, are more prevalent in the business world than at home because the work environment is viewed more impersonally. In the workplace, where high performance is everything, lies are told to put a better light on a situation or a result, to justify an action, to be reassuring, or for our own protection. And the cost of dishonesty ranges from $6 to $200 billion annually in the U.S. This paper will give a definition of lying, discuss who lies and the reasons why people lie, describe if people can actually detect lies, discuss the costs of lying in business, and describe what managers can do to help their organizations.

INTRODUCTION

"A lie would have no sense unless the truth was felt as dangerous."
Alfred Adler

Several centuries before the era of suspicion and performance indicators, the French philosopher Blaise Pascal noted "mutual cheating is the foundation of society." Deception is a pervasive element of daily working life. Sometimes it is an official part of one's work. Workplace cultures socialize individuals into using deception as a tool in performing their everyday work (Shulman, 2006). There are the lies we use to ease out of an uncomfortable situation. "My boss insists we rotate suppliers, so we won't be doing business with you this year." After awhile, however, we have trouble distinguishing between reality and the embroidered information we have put out to the world (Penson, 1997).

BACKGROUND

"Oh what a tangled web we weave when first we practice to deceive."
Sir Walter Scott

In English medieval courts, truth was tested by ordeals of fire and water, on the basis a truthful person would be protected by God. Someone suspected of lying would have to carry a red-hot iron bar for nine paces. Alternatively, s/he could opt to walk across nine red-hot ploughshares. Either way, if the suspect was burned, then this was proof that s/he was lying and so could be promptly hanged. Other courts went in for trial by water. In the ultimate "no-win" situation, the person accused of lying was put into a sack and thrown into a pond. If the accused sank, this showed s/he was innocent, but s/he might drown anyway. If s/he floated, this was taken as proof that s/he was lying and s/he would be hanged (A Brief History, 2002).

In the 19th Century, a "new science" called phrenology entailed measuring "bumps" on a person's skull. Supposedly, it led to the idea that lies could be detected by looking at physical symptoms. In the 20th century, the search for "scientific" ways of spotting liars moved from bumps on the head to brain chemistry, with the search for a "truth serum" drug. In 1963, The US Supreme Court said "serum-induced confession" was in effect a form of torture and the practice was ruled unconstitutional. In the 21st Century, makers of the latest lie detector machine which measures supposedly tell-tale changes in temperature around the eye sockets when somebody is telling a deliberate untruth claim a success rate of 83% in detecting liars.

Whether it is being told that the person you want to speak to is "in a meeting" or large-scale fraud resulting in the collapse of an entire organization, failing to tell the truth is an aspect of the business world you ignore at your peril (Michalczyk, 1999).

DEFINITION OF LYING

"Half the truth is often a great lie."
Benjamin Franklin

Lying is "any intentional deceptive message in the form of a statement" (Minkler & Miceli, 2004). An "official" lie actually misleads, deliberately conveying a false impression. Although we are socialized from the time we can speak to believe that it is always better to tell the truth, in reality, society often encourages and even rewards deception. Show up late for an early morning meeting at work, and it is best not to admit that you overslept. You are punished far more than you would be if you lie and say you were stuck in traffic. Moreover, lying is integral to many occupations. Think how often we see lawyers constructing farfetched theories on behalf of their clients or reporters misrepresenting themselves in order to gain access to good stories (Kornet, 1997).

WHO LIES?

"A liar should have a good memory."
Quintilian

Anyone under enough pressure, or given enough incentive, will lie. Most people lie once or twice a day, almost as often as they snack from the refrigerator or brush their teeth. Both men and women lie in approximately a fifth of their social exchanges lasting 10 or more minutes. Over the course of a week, they deceive about 30 percent of those with whom they interact one-on-one (Kornet, 1997).

Another survey found a nation of inventive cheats. There was the marketing manager who bought his wedding shoes on a company credit card; the office manager who sold a laptop computer he left out of a company audit; and the business consultant who extended a work-related stay at London's Savoy Hotel. In addition, a large majority of workers confessed they had taken stationery home or embellished their resumes (Overell, 2003)

With the exception of politicians, perhaps no one fibs as beautifully as Alibi Network, a three-year-old service that provides elaborately constructed excuses for its clients. Whether you are looking to skip a day of work or to secretly leave town for the weekend, Alibi Network can provide fake airline receipts or phone calls to your boss explaining your absence and even mock up an entire itinerary for a bogus conference you were "attending." The Chicago-based company charges from $75 for a simple phone call to thousands of dollars for extensive lying, on top of a $75 annual fee. The most popular service is the "virtual hotel," in which the fibber can provide a boss or family member with the phone number of a hotel where he is supposed to be. After the telephone call is placed, one of Alibi's actors will answer the call as if a particular hotel has been reached. The incoming call then can be forwarded to the fibber's cell phone, making it seem as if he is in a certain city even though he is not. Although the pronoun "he" is used, half of Alibi's members are female (Tucker, 2007).

REASONS FOR LYING

"Ask me no questions, and I'll tell you no lies."
Oliver Goldsmith

It is not uncommon to see lies rewarded in business, and it can be difficult to convince others and ourselves that lying should be obliterated (Penson, 1991).
Some reasons that people lie include: (1) Fear – people are trying to avoid punishment for something they have done or perceived they have done. (2) Habitual fear – in this case people are in constant fear of being punished and it becomes a reflex or habit. In this case, they insist the lie is the truth. This is called compulsive lying. (3) Modeling – someone sees another person lying and getting away with it, and s/he becomes more prone to lying, and (4) Reward – in this case the truth won't get you what you want, so you use a lie to get the reward or goal (Miller, 2007).

DETECTING LIES

"Some people can't tell a lie; others can't tell the truth, and fortunately
most people can't tell the difference."

Most of us are not very good at spotting if someone is lying. Even people whose job it is to detect deception like police officers, FBI agents, and judges perform, on average, little better than if they had taken a guess. In a review of 253 studies, the overall accuracy hovers around 53 percent. That is hardly better than flipping a coin (Persaud, 2005). One of the biggest myths about body language is the belief that eye contact, or lack of it, exposes a liar. Even when presented with evidence to the contrary, many of us still suspect that liars out themselves by averting their eyes. Far more reliable than eye contact is tone of voice. With the exception of sociopaths, who are expert liars, most people sound tense, their voices highly pitched, when they fib (Lawson, 2006).

With regard to lie detection, there is a new computer program called "The Silent Talker." This program, developed by the University of Manchester, uses a camera and artificial intelligence to process patterns of nonverbal behavior. In a pilot study, Silent Talker correctly classified 80% of responses as true or false. With the Silent Talker, there is no biased and irrational human subjectivity, so the system is more likely able to extract the true emotion, personality, behavior, or medical state to offer results that are better, fairer and truer (Cristol, 2003).

COSTS OF LYING

> "The liar's punishment is not in the least that he is not believed, but that he cannot believe anyone else."
>
> George Bernard Shaw

Undetected lies of prospective or current employees cost business billions a year. The ability to detect these lies would be of immense benefit. In fact, the costs of applicant dishonesty and employee misconduct are difficult to calculate yet estimates range from $6 to $200 billion annually in the United States (Walczyk, et. al., 2005). In addition, credibility is a form of wealth. Everyone has access to some credibility. If credibility is squandered, believers are less readily available. The costs of lying are, indeed, high (Best, 2007).

WHAT CAN MANGERS DO TO HELP?

> "It is hard to tell if a man is telling the truth when you know you would lie if you were in his place."
>
> H. L. Mencken

How can managers get workers to cut down on their lies? First, employers need to take some of the blame for workplace lies. People do not like lying, so much so that it produces physiological changes in their bodies. Employers need to ensure they create an environment that recognizes and accepts unchangeable aspects of the human condition. People are not machines. We all have lapses in motivation and attention to detail and, accordingly, we make mistakes. At other times, we just want to take time out for a day or so to attend to personal matters. Employers who run the mantra that work is No. 1 and that nothing short of perfection is acceptable set themselves up for being fed a litany of lies. It is in such an environment that people hide mistakes and take time out without forewarning (Bagaric, 2007).

Eighty-five percent of managers say they will not promote someone who is caught lying. Being deceitful can impact a career, and bosses and coworkers can easily begin to distrust you. Honesty is still the best policy.

CONCLUSION

"The lie is a condition of life." Friedrich Nietzsche

Current stories of inflated reports of corporate assets, outright lies by the federal government, sexual abuse by priests, along with continuing lies in other spheres of social life, raise the questions about the short-term and long-term consequences of deception. Certainly, anyone who insists on condemning all lies should ponder what would happen if we could reliably tell when our family, friends, colleagues, and government leaders were deceiving us. It is tempting to think that the world would become a better place when purged of the deceptions that seem to interfere with our attempts at genuine communication or intimacy. On the other hand, perhaps our social lives would collapse under the weight of relentless honesty, with unveiled truths destroying our ability to connect with others. The ubiquity of lying is clearly a problem, but would we really want to will away all of our lies?

REFERENCES

A Brief History of Lying. (2002, January 6). http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/1740746.stm

Bagaric, M. (29007, January 31). We Don't Lie in the Workplace. Yeah right! http://www.theage.com.au/news/business/lies-in-the-workplace-never/2007/01/30/116991

Best, B. (2007). Some Philosophizing About Lying. http://www/benbest.com/philo/lying.html

Cristol, H. (2003 September/October). New System Reads Body Language. *The Futurist*, 37(5), 16.

Kornet, A. (1997, May). The Truth About Lying. *Psychology Today*, 30(3), 52-57.

Lawson, W. (2006, January/February). The Eyes Don't Have It. *Psychology Today*, 39(1), 24.

Michalczyk, I. (1999, February). Would I Lie to You? *Accountancy*, 123(1266), 44.

Miller, J. (2007). Lying in the Workplace. http://joymillerblog.blogspot.com/2007/lying-in-workplace.html

Minkler, L., & Miceli, T. (2004, March). Lying, Integrity, and Cooperation. *Review of Social Economy,* 62(1), 27-50.

Overell, S. (2003, June 30). Cheating: We're All at It. *Financial Times, 4.*

Penson, P. (1997, March 7). Lying: A Fact of Life in Today's Workplace, *Management Matters*, Jackson Business Journal, 3.

Shulman, D. *From Hire to Liar: The Role of Deception in the Workplace.* http://www.cornellpresss.cornell.edu/cup_detail.taf?ti_id=4609

Tucker, R. (2007, September 21-23.) Are You For Real? *USA Weekend*, 18.

Walczyk, J., et.al. (2005, Spring). Lying Person-to-Person About Life Events: A Cognitive Framework for Lie Detection. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(1), 141-171.

STRENGTH OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE: A MODERATING ROLE ON ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE'S IMPACT ON EMPLOYEE BEHAVIOR

Brandon Kilburn, University of Tennessee Martin
bkilburn@utm.edu

ABSTRACT

Organizational culture and climate have been extensively researched by scholars over the past few decades (Schneider, Salvaggio and Subirats, 2002; Denison, 1996; Schneider and Brief, 1996; Moran and Volkswein, 1992; Kopleman, Brief and Guzzo, 1990; Reichers and Schneider, 1990; Schwartz and Davis, 1981). However, further research is necessary in order to provide a greater understanding of each of the two constructs. Organizational culture and climate both provide an organization's employees with similar expectations, underlying beliefs, and values. Just as societies have distinct cultures and climates, organizations have their own unique cultures and climates which influence the actions, emotions, and cognitions of their members (Kopleman, et al, 1990).

Schneider, et al (2002) suggests that climate strength has received little empirical exploration. As a result, its role in employee interpretation of organizational climate is limited. Therefore, further examination of organizational climate strength will allow both researchers and practitioners to better understand employee behavior based on climate strength. In addition, organizations may expend great efforts to establish an organizational culture that facilitates and enhances productive employee attitudes and behaviors.

Research suggests that employee determination of behavior stems from routines established by organizational climate. However, there exist circumstances where the organization's climate is weak or ambiguous. Here, employees lack a frame of reference in order to determine the appropriate behaviors and expected rewards. The following discussion uses climate strength is used as a moderating variable on the relationship between employee reliance on organizational culture and the employee's determination of behavior.

PREDICTORS OF VOICE PROPENSITY

Jacqueline Landau, Salem State College
Jlandau@salemstate.edu

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates both individual and organizational predictors of voice propensity for a sample of 225 employees across a range of organizations. Previous research suggests that in order for employees to voice their concerns or make suggestions for change four conditions need to exist: (1) they must have something to say (Frese, et al. 1999; Morrison and Phelps, 1999); (2) they must feel that it is their responsibility to speak up (Fuller, et al, 2006); (3) they must believe that the benefits of speaking up will outweigh the costs (Fuller, et al., 2007; Gorden, et al.,1988; Krefting and Powers, 1998); and (4) they must believe that their suggestions will be treated seriously and will have some impact on the organization and/or its employees (Parker, 1993). Whether these conditions are met will depend both on individual characteristics and the organizational context.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is not to test a complete model of all four factors, but to examine two individual characteristics and two organizational context factors that might be particularly important. The two individual characteristics are general self-efficacy and power distance orientation. Self-efficacy may influence whether employees believe they have anything to say that will be taken seriously by management, while high power distance may influence whether employees believe it is their responsibility to speak up. General self-efficacy, a personality trait, has been found to have a strong-relationship to several organizational behaviors, but only a couple of studies (Avery, 2003; Parker, 1993) have examined the relationship between self-efficacy and voice. The relationship of power distance to voice has only been directly investigated in one study (Xu Huang, Van de Vliert, andVan der Vegt, 2005), yet this factor could be very important as workforces in organizations become increasingly diverse and multicultural.

The organizational context variables I include are whether employees perceive that their supervisors are good voice managers, and the number of voice mechanisms they perceive are available within the organization. Both of these variables may influence whether employees perceive the benefits of speaking up outweigh the costs, and whether they believe the organization will take their comments seriously. With the exception of grievance procedures in unionized settings, only a couple of studies have examined voice mechanisms in relation to voice (Frese, Teng, and Wijnen, 1999, Spencer, 1996).

The definition of voice in this study is what Kassing (1998, 2000) defined as articulated dissent: "expressing dissent openly and clearly in a constructive fashion within organizations to audiences that can effectively influence organizational adjustment" (Kassing, 2000, p.61). This is very similar to Detert and Burris' voice construct, "verbal behavior that is improvement oriented and directed towards a specific target who holds power inside the organization" (2007, p. 870) In line with many previous studies, I investigate voice propensity (self reports of voice intention) rather than actual voice behavior (Fuller et. al., 2007; Kassing, 2000; Lee and Jablin, 1992; Saunders et al., 1992). Van Dyne and LePine (1998) found that self-reported voice was stable over time and positively related to peer and supervisory ratings of voice behavior. Also research has shown that intention is usually a good predictor of actual behavior (Ajzen and Fishbein,1977).

Hierarchical regression analysis showed that voice propensity was positively related to being a supervisor, self-efficacy, and having a supervisor who was responsive and approachable. Voice propensity was negatively related to high power distance. Results suggest that organizations that want to promote employee voice should work on increasing employee self-efficacy through selection or training. They may also need to train supervisors to be approachable and more receptive to employee complaints and suggestions. Finally, organizations also need to learn how to encourage voice among employees who have a high power distance orientation. In the United States we generally expect that people who have something to say will voice orally and directly, but with increasingly diverse workforces, organizations might need to encourage other forms of voice.

REFERENCES

Ajzen, I., & M. Fishbein, (1977). Attitude-behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84, 888-918.

Avery, D. R. & M.A.Quinones (2004). Individual differences and the voice effect: The oderating role of value of voice,/*Group and Organization Management,* 29(1), 106-124.

Detert, J.R. & E. R. Burris (2007), Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? *The Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4); 869-884.

Frese, M., E. Teng, & C. Wijnen, (1999). Helping to improve suggestion systems: Predictors of making suggestions in companies. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(7), 1139-1150.

Fuller, J. B., T. Barnet, K. Hester, C. Relyea, & L. Frey (2007). An exploratory examination of voice behavior from an impression management perspective. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 19(1), 134-153.

Fuller, J. B., L.E. Marler, & K. Hester (2006). Promoting felt responsibility for constructive change and proactive behavior: Exploring aspects of an elaborated model of work design. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(8), 1089-1120.

Gorden, W., D.Infante, & E. Graham (1988). Corporate conditions conducive to employee voice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights* Journal, 1(2), 101-111.

Kassing, J. W. (1998). Development and validation of the organizational dissent scale,.*Management Communication Quarterly*, 12(2), 183-230.

Kassing, J.W. (2000). Investigating the relationship between superior-subordinate relationship quality and employee dissent. *Communication Research Reports*, 17(1), 58-70.

Krefting, L.A. & K. J. Powers (1998). Exercised Voices as Management Failure: Implications of Willing Compliance Theories of Management and Individualism for *De Facto* Employee Voice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 11(4), 263-277.

Lee, J. & F. Jablin (1992). A cross-cultural investigation of exit, voice, loyalty and neglect as responses to dissatisfying job conditions. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 29(3), 203-226.

LePine, J.A. & L. Van Dyne, (1998). Predicting voice behavior in work groups, *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 83(6), 853-868.

Morrison, E. W & C. Phelp (1999). Taking charge at work: Extrarole efforts to initiate workplace change. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 42(4), 403-419.

Parker, L. (1993). When to fix it and when to leave: Relationships among perceived control, self-efficacy, dissent and exit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(6), 949-959.

Van Dyne, L.& J.A. LePine (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviour: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1), 108-119.

Xu, H., E. Van de Vliert, & G. Van der Vegt (2005). Breaking the silence culture: Stimulation of participation and employee opinion withholding cross-nationally. *Management and Organization Review*, 1(3) 459-482.

THE USE OF VIRTUAL COMMUNITIES TO REDUCE EMPLOYEE TURNOVER: A THEORETICAL MODEL

Cecilia Maldonado, Georgia Southwestern State University
Dawn Valentine, Georgia Southwestern State University
cmaldonado57@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Employee turnover is an ongoing issue that many organizations face. It is important for an organization to be aware of potential ways to increase retain valuable employees. The Internet has been long recognized as a useful tool for organizations to communicate with consumers; however, the usefulness of the Internet as a tool to communicate with current or potential employees has not been as widely recognized. This paper is conceptual research that proposes a relationship between the Internet, through the use of work-related virtual communities, and a reduction in employee turnover, and develops a theoretical framework that provides support for this relationship.

THE MODERN DAY WORK ENVIRONMENT

Bala Maniam, Sam Houston State University
Madison Law, Sam Houston State University
Geetha Subramaniam, University Technologi Malaysia
maniam@shsu.edu

ABSTRACT

The job market is an ever changing environment. This paper looks at the past and current state of the job market. The effect the job environment has had on the family over time. Also will examine the different sex-specific characteristics that are in the job environment and how they have changed over time. The current job market for the U.S. is in a decline and has not shown any signs of improvement while, the family environment has changed from the traditional one breadwinner to a more common two breadwinners. Women have shown a major increase in labor participation, and this has been improved with regulation and incentives to bring women into the labor market. There are still some hurdles that need to be overcome in order for true equality though.

DEVELOPING AN UNDERSTANDING OF CHARISMATIC AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

James Reagan McLaurin, American University of Sharjah
jmclaurin@aus.edu
Mohammed Bushanain Al Amri, Dubai Government
mb.alamri@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Leadership is a dynamic relationship which is based on mutual influence between leaders and followers which results in a higher level of motivation and technical development as it promotes changes. The theories of leadership have evolved from traits, behaviors and situations to a more change-oriented approach. The two key types of leadership in this new approach are – Charismatic Leadership and Transformational Leadership.

Charismatic leaders can be defined as those who have high self-confidence, a clear vision, engage in unconventional behavior, and act as a change agent, while remaining realistic about environmental constraints. Their key behaviors include role modeling, image building, articulation of goals, showing confidence and arousing follower's motives.

Transformational leaders are those who stimulate interest among followers to view their work from new perspectives, generate awareness of the vision of the organization, develop followers to higher levels of ability and potential, and motivate colleagues and followers to look beyond their own interests toward those that will benefit the group. Their key behaviors include empowerment, role modeling, creating a vision, acting as change agents, and making the norms and value clear to all.

Though there are similarities between the two concepts, there are also numerous differences. The main similarities are the focus on the vision, ideals, values and charisma from the leader's perspective. The major differences include charisma being one among the qualities of a transformational leader rather than the sole element, the effect of situational favorableness or uncertainty on both approaches, transformational behavior de-emphasizing charisma, the charismatic leader's possible self-centeredness and the probable negative effects of charismatic leadership.

This article takes the reader through the general history and development of charismatic and transformational theories of leadership. Transformational leadership and charismatic leadership styles will be analyzed in depth and a comparison between these two leadership styles will be reviewed. During the process, some light will also be thrown on transactional Leadership due to its proximity with studies on transformational leadership theory. This article allows the reader to gain an overall understanding of the development of understanding of the theories and a practical application of them.

INTRODUCTION

Up until the late 1970s, the theories on leadership were built on supervision as a means to create improvements in the performance of stable work units. However, the study of leadership has then shifted to charismatic / transformational leadership in which "actions of single managers appear to create extraordinarily high levels of employee commitment, effort and willingness to take risks in support of the organization or its mission" (Behling & McFillen, 1996).

This change is suggested to be a result of the growth of foreign competition in the United States as well as other problems during that period. Conducting business became harder and companies had to learn to make major changes in order to survive. Managers were in the search for new means of leading so that they could convince their followers to adopt drastically new ways of doing things (Behling & McFillen, 1996).

The question that hence emerged was what indeed was required in giving the leaders the capability to predict and prepare for the most effective changes in the future? The answers were provided by the concept known as change-oriented leadership; which included two major components – charismatic leadership and transformational leadership (Greenberg & Baron, 2000).

DISCUSSION

Charismatic Leadership The charisma term was used by Weber to differentiate self-appointed leaders followed by people who are in pain and need to follow the leader because they believe him or her to be extraordinarily qualified (Aaltio-Marjosola, I & Takala, T. ,2000). The charismatic leaders' actions are inspirational and the enthusiasms they prompt heavily influence the followers. For this reason, charismatic heroes and prophets such as Prophet Mohammed and Mother Theresa are viewed as truly revolutionary forces in history (Gerth, H. & Mills, C.W., 1964),

The study of charisma and the difference views of authors have given charisma different definitions. While some authors indicated that charisma represents the ability of a leader to exercise diffuse and strong influences over the beliefs, values, behaviors, and performance of followers through his/her vision, behaviors, beliefs, and personal examples (Conger & Kanungo, 1987, House, Spangler & Woycke, 1991) others have suggested that "charisma is the ability to influence others positively by connecting with them physically, emotionally, and intellectually." (Aaltio-Marjosola, I & Takala, T., 2000)

Studying different views and definitions, it is safe to conclude that charisma is an indefinable personal quality that is based on the emotional aspects of both the leaders and the followers. In order to understand charisma and its effect on the followers, followers' reactions and perceptions must be examined.

Charismatic leaders can be defined as those who have a high self-confidence, a clear vision, engage in unconventional behavior, and act as a change agent, while remaining realistic about environmental constraints. Charismatic leaders are believed to possess particular personality traits and abilities while displaying unique behavioral model. Different researchers have identified common characteristics for charismatic leaders with an addition or an omission of a characteristic or two. Robbins (1992) specified some of the characteristics that differentiate the charismatic leaders from non- charismatic leaders. The characteristics he mentioned include:

a) Self-confidence
b) Strong faith in that vision
c) Out of ordinary behavior
d) Change seekers

House (1977) identified five key behavioral aspects of charismatic leaders. He pointed out that charismatic leaders share the following behavioral traits:

a) Role modeling
b) Image Building
c) Articulation of goals
d) Showing confidence
e) Arousing follower's motives

Transformational Leadership A more recent approach to understanding the phenomenon of leadership which gained popularity since the early 1980s is that of transformational leadership (Northouse, 1997). Transformational leadership completes the trio of concepts within "the New leadership" paradigm suggested by Bryman (1992) which also includes charismatic and visionary leadership whereby these concepts are stated to "integrate ideas from trait, style and contingency approaches of leadership and also incorporates and builds on work of sociologists such as Weber (1947) and political scientists such as Burns (1978)" (den Hartog, van Muijen and Koopman, 1997). Transformational leadership is a part of "the New leadership" paradigm suggested by Bryman (1992) which also includes charismatic and visionary leadership

Northouse (1997) suggests that transformational leaders motivate followers to do better than they earlier expected or even considered achievable by doing the following -

a) Empowerment–
b) Role models -
c) Create a vision -
d) Change Agent -
e) Social architects -

Bass and Avolio claim that transformational leaders, unlike transactional leaders, engage in much more with their colleagues than a simple exchange process (1994). They behave in different ways to achieve superior results by using factors better known as the "Four I's" (Avolio, Waldman & Yammarino, 1991). These elements are –

a) Idealized influence
b) Inspirational motivation
c) Intellectual stimulation
d) Individualized consideration

Nonleadership As the French terms suggests, a laissez-faire leader follows an approach whereby he lets things run the way they are. Such a leader does not assume responsibility, delays decisions and makes little effort to understand followers' needs and satisfy them. Since there is neither an exchange with the followers nor any attempts to help them grow, this approach is also called "non leadership." An example for this approach is the president of a garment manufacturing firm who has no long term plans for his organization and maintains very limited contact with its employees. Bass, in his Model of Transformational and Transactional Leadership places laissez-faire at one end of the leadership continuum as a nonleadership approach (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

From the explanations above, it is very evident that there exists a huge difference between transactional and transformational leadership. Some of the key differences are –

a) Transactional leadership is a bargaining exchange process between the leader and follower while transformational leadership involves various activities including motivating, meeting individualized needs and challenging the way of working and forming trust within the relationship (Bass & Avolio, 1994).
b) Transformational leadership involves leader cultivating the employee acceptance in the mission of the group (Deluga, 1988).
c) While transactional leadership leads to the expected or planned outcomes, transformational leadership leads to performance that is well beyond expectations (Bass & Avolio, 1994).
d) Transactional leaders, due to their focus on maintaining the status quo, "limit employee's -efforts towards the goals, job satisfaction and effectiveness toward contributing to organizational goals" (Deluga, 1988).
e) Transactional leadership does not consider the needs of the followers on an individual basis, unlike transformational leadership (Northouse, 1997).
f) Transactional leadership also overlooks the personal development needs of the followers (Northouse, 1997).
g) Studies have shown that the flow of power and influence between the leader and follower is subject to constant fluctuation during transactional leadership, while it is more stable in transformational since the leader and the follower work closely towards the common organizational goals (Deluga, 1988).

Though there are many differences between the two forms of leadership, Bass (1997) claimed that studies have failed to show one among the two leadership styles as the best one (Green, Odom, Bearden & Bazar, 2003). Most leaders' profiles are said to have a full range of leadership which includes both forms – transformational and transactional (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

The distinguishing factor on what kind of a leader one is depends on the degree to which one assume each of two approaches. If a leader's activities are much more transformational than transactional, then he/she is defined as a transformational one. At the same time, a leader whose beliefs and values are consistent with transactional leadership may still behave transformationally in some situations (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1998).

As Bass (1998) puts it, "the best of leadership is both transformational and transactional" (Green, Odom, Bearden & Bazar, 2003). Transformational leadership can be described as complementary to the effectiveness of transactional leadership rather than a replacement for it, as portrayed in the diagram ahead (Waldman, Bass, & Yammarino, 1990). The importance of transactional leadership within the leadership paradigm is also supported by Lowe, Kroeck and Subramanian (1996) (Green, Odom, Bearden & Bazar, 2003).

Northouse (1997) identified the following strengths for transformational leadership based on the present studies on the subject:

a) Widely researched
b) Intuitive appeal

c) Process between leaders and followers
d) Broader view of leadership
e) Emphasis on follower needs, values and morals

Alongside its many strength's, Northouse (1997) presents some of the key criticisms against transformational leadership:

a) Lacks conceptual clarity
b) Either – or approach
c) Treats leadership as a personality trait
d) Elitist and Antidemocratic
e) Purely qualitative data
f) Potential for abuse

However, in spite of these weaknesses, transformational leadership remains to be a valuable and widely used approach of leadership.

CONCLUSION

Though scholars admit that research on leadership in the past was limited due to inconsistent results and limited advance in theory, there is light at the end of the tunnel now. What started off with the trait approach in the 1930s, the behavioral approach in the 1950s, the contingency approach in the 1970s has come a long way to what Bryman (1992) identifies as the "new Leadership" paradigm (Antonakis & House, 2002).

The theories of Bass and the revisions by Bass and Avolio on transactional, transformational and laissez-faire leadership have been commended as models that hold substantial promise in explaining the leadership phenomena (Antonakis & House, 2002).

Regarding to the study of charisma, Bass (1990) pointed out that the degree of change in charisma can not only be attributed to the exceptional individual, but also to the exceptional situation and to the interaction between the two; further emphasizing the fact that this approach is highly dependent on the situation (Howell, 1997).

On the other hand, transformational leadership approach is more likely to exist in situations where the basic level of anxiety is not high and the focus is on the development needs of the team. To summarize, the transformational approach is more dependent "on the leader's view of himself/herself as transformational and less on the organizational context than do transactional and charismatic leadership" (Popper & Zakkai, 1994)

FINDING WATER AT THE OASIS? EXECUTIVE TEAM LEADERSHIP IN THE CITY OF GOLD

James Reagan McLaurin, American University of Sharjah
jmclaurin@aus.edu
Peter M. Mitias, American, University of Sharjah
pmitias@aus.edu

ABSTRACT

This paper marks the conclusion of an in depth examination of the leadership of Dubai, one of the fasting growing cities in the Middle East and the world. The leader of Dubai, Sheik Mohammad Bin Rashid Al Mahktoum, is viewed as the transformational leader of the Emirate of Dubai. His vision is widely acclaimed at having been the inspiration for the amazing transformation of Dubai from the small trading city into the modern, 21st century center of commerce. The implementation of that vision has resulted in many Western best business practices being adopted by many of the Dubai Government entities. Considering the traditional Arab customs and culture, this is a remarkable achievement. One of the issues that comes to the forefront is how does the leadership of various governmental agencies implement his vision. Are the executive leadership groups within these organizations actively involved in the transformation of their organizations into those future organizations that represent the high performance ones required to run the modern Dubai or do they give lip service to the vision and merely seek to preserve the status quo? Do the executive levels of leadership in governmental entities care more for their own power bases than they do for the implementation of the Sheik's vision?

This study examines the executive leadership team effectiveness of Dubai Municipality as evidenced by the executive team strategy survey results of the Leadership Group, 200+ mid and upper level-managers in the organization. The individuals were participating in the creation of the five year strategic plan for the organization. The purpose of this survey plus others was essential in the creation of relevant goals and objectives for the strategic plan. The results of this survey offer a unique look at the executive leadership team in this Arabian city of gold.

INTRODUCTION

The executive leadership team in an organization represents the chief decision making authority. Their ability to influence the organization is reflected in how they direct decisions, allocate resources, establish rewards, select other leaders, promote individuals, and serve as role models. Any successful attempt at transforming an organization to a desired future state must be done with the executive leadership team's active blessing and support. Otherwise, it will not reach the levels of achievement needed in the organization (Nahavandi, 2006)

Executive leadership team decisions decide the journey upon which the organization is engaged in. They are as the master of the ship, directing which seas the organization sails and the destinations that they strive to reach. They are the ones who oversee the formulation of the vision, goals and strategies for the organization. They are the ones who determine the activities engaged in and their priorities (Gupta, 1986). The executive leadership team will be the group who decides not only the journey the organization embarks upon but also the seaworthiness of the organization. Does the structure and the integration within it meet the needs of the seas to be traversed. If not, it is up to the executive leadership to guide the adjustments (Miller & Droge, 1986; Nahavandi, 1993; Yasi-Ardekiani, 1986, 1989).

The allocation of resources within the organization is one of the most powerful tools exercised by executive leaders that impacts departmental and individuals alike (Kerr & Slocum, 1987; Schien, 2004). Without proper funding, departments will not be able to reach the goals they set for themselves. Without allocation of resources to provide rewards for individuals, employees will become de-motivated and dissatisfied (Kets de Vries & Miller, 1986; Miller, 1987, Schien, 2004). The rewards provided will promote norms and behaviors held in high regard by the executive leadership and discourage those norms and behaviors that aren't (Schien, 2004).

Perhaps the most telling of all the behaviors engaged in by the executive leadership team is that of role modeling (Nahavandi & Malekzaden, 1993a; Schein, 2004). The executive leadership team is the representation of transformational leadership. Individuals adopt and emulate transformational behaviors they see (Shivers-Blackwell, 2004) (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). The executive leadership team must challenge the status quo in the organization and make a convincing case for change, inspire a shared vision for the future, provide effective leadership during the change, and make the change a permanent and institutionalized part of the organization (Hines & Hines, 2002). How the executive leaders treat people, view customer service, are hard working, are passionate about the vision of the organization and other behaviors are all duly noted by the organizational members and deemed the appropriate way to respond and behave. Just as the captain of a ship, stands firm in a tempest, giving orders to the members of the crew in order to assure its safe passage. Should the captain break for the lifeboat to flee the ship, the crew will not be long in following. If the members of the organization, see that the only things the executive leadership value and not the organizational values, they will not likely hold to them.

METHODOLOGY

The population examined in this study was referred to as the Leadership Group and consisted of individuals from the middle and upper-levels of management within the Municipality. The sample consists of 227 respondents from 30 various departments and centers in the organization. At the time, over 17,000 people were employed and thus was the single largest employer in Dubai. The executive level consisted of the Director General, two Associate Director Generals, and ten Assistant Director Generals. These individuals were not part of the study sample (McLaurin, 2008; McLaurin & Mitias, 2008; McLaurin & Mitias, 2008a).

The executive team survey consists of 15 items. The instrument allows respondents to rate the executive team on a scale of 1 to 5. A score of 1 means that they strongly disagree with the statement, while a score of 5 means that they strongly agree with the statement. The neutral position is represented by a score of 3. The surveys were answered as part of a three day workshop on leadership for the Leadership Group. The Leadership Group completed the survey about the executive team and their perceptions of how they performed given the nature of the questions in the survey.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Construct validity of the instrument is checked by using a correlational comparison with earlier scores on the same instrument as administered to other governmental entities in Dubai. The scores are correlated with previous applications of the scale at the .70 level or higher (Cooper & Schindler, 2006). Reliability is determined by assessment of internal consistency to determine the degree to which the instrument items are homogenous and reflect the same underlying construct. The Cronbach's Alpha is significant for the scale with a value of .914 and all items on the scale which is confirmed by the significance of the Hotelling's T-Squared statistic of 284.47 with a corresponding F statistic of 19.042.

A factor analysis is performed utilizing a principal components analysis and a varimax rotation. The purpose is to determine whether underlying factors (grouping of variables) exist, and if so, would it help in the interpretation of our results. The Bartlett Test of Sphericity, a statistical test for the presence of correlations among the variables, indicates significance and the Measure of Sampling adequacy is .926 which indicates the degree of intercorrelations among the variables and the appropriateness of the factor analysis (Hair et al, 1995).

The results from the principal components analysis and the subsequent orthogonal varimax rotaions results in two factors emerging that are closely aligned with the original construct of transformational strategy. The rotated model extracted two factors with double loadings on two of the variables. Interpretation of the two rotated factors provides no clear understanding about what either factor identifies. However, the principal components method provides two factors but with only one factor having components above 0.500. This would be in line with how the instrument was originally designed; as a single instrument measure of the effectiveness of the executive leadership team at an organizational level.

The executive team survey reveals that the Leadership Group regards the executive team as maintaining the status quo. The mean scores for the 15 behaviors examined range between a high of 3.56 for building relationships with external stakeholders to a low of 2.5 for conducting site visits to enhance communication. Additionally, two other items fall below the 3.0 mark including leadership development efforts and performance evaluation.

For all 15 of the items combined, the average score is 3.1**.** This means that seldom are the desirable traits outlined in the survey displayed. The highest performing organizations would expect to see scores somewhere between 4 and 5 for the vast majority of the questions. This means that the Municipality could expect to see performance gains by developing any of the 15 behaviors explored in the survey.

The characteristics of interest receiving the highest scores pertain to Cooperative Discussion, Openness, Accountability, Guiding Mission and Leading by example. The mean score from the Municipality respondents for Cooperative discussion is 3.3319. While cooperative discussion sometimes occurs in team discussions, it is not pervasive. 46 percent of respondents (104 of 226) feel that the executive team usually or always works in this fashion while 54 percent (122 of 226) believe that this occurs only sometimes, rarely, or never. While still rating the executive team in the sometimes range with a score of 3.3142 for Openness, respondents did rate this among the highest items in the executive team scores suggesting that this may be a relative strength. Almost half, 48.2 percent of respondents (109 out of 226) felt that this occurs usually or always while the remaining 51.8 percent (117) rated this item as sometimes, rarely, or never. With respect to Accountability, this is one of the higher ranking items on the executive team survey with a mean score of 3.3186. At this average score, however, it is still only sometimes the case that such accountability happens. Indeed, 56.6 percent of respondents (128 out of 226) felt that an accountability environment only occurs sometimes, rarely, or never. 43.4 percent of respondents (98 people), however, felt that that accountability is always or usually a part of organizational life within the Municipality. The mean score for Guiding Mission from the Municipality respondents is 3.375 out of a possible 5 points indicating that this is sometimes true but is not the modus operandi for the group.120 out of 224 respondents felt that the executive team is guided in its decision making by such a vision only sometimes, rarely or never. The responses to Leadership by example indicate that this is very much the case in the Municipality. The mean score of 3.5575 is the highest average score in this survey. Over half of all respondents felt that leaders lead by example usually or always (128 of 226 or 56.6%) while only 43.4 percent (98 of 226 employees) felt that this occurs only sometimes, rarely, or never. Such examples will continue to be important in helping the Municipality live according to its mission and values.

The areas receiving only 'average' scores pertain to Meeting Clarity and Climate, Consensus, Valuing Diversity of Ideas and of Interests and Qualifications, Stakeholder Relations, and the Reporting process. The mean score for Meeting Clarity from the Municipality respondents is 3.177 out of a possible 5 points. This suggests that, again, only sometimes does such a climate prevail within team meetings. Of 226 respondents, 139 or 61.5% felt that team meetings are dominated by goal clarity and a friendly climate only sometimes, rarely, or never. Also, the respondents felt that Consensus through Effective Group Techniques s does occur sometimes, with a mean score of 3.2522. However, 130 out of 226 (57.5 percent) respondents indicated that this occurs sometimes, rarely, or never while 116 (42.5 percent) suggested that it happens usually or always. The development of stakeholder relation occurs sometimes with the mean score to this question being 3.1883. 62.8 percent of respondents (150 of 223) felt that this occurs only sometimes, rarely, or never while the remaining 37.2 percent (83) felt like this was the norm for the team. Both statements with respect to valuing diversity were similar. The average score for the first statement was again around the midpoint at 3.1814 meaning that valuing diversity occurs sometimes. Only 38.5 percent of respondents (87 of 226) felt that this occurs usually or always while 61.5 percent felt that this happens sometimes, usually, or always. T he results show that 3.2589 is the average score for valuing diversity of interests, suggesting that this occurs sometimes. Only 44.2 percent (99 of 224) indicated that this happens usually or always while 55.8 percent (125 of 224) felt that valuing such differences occurred only sometimes, rarely, or never. The mean score in regarding to the reporting process is 3.2212 indicating that this does occur sometimes. 56.6 percent of respondents (128 of 225) felt that this occurs only sometimes, rarely, or never while 43.4 percent (98) feel that this is a fairly common procedure within the Municipality.

The results indicate that there are five areas that warrant serious attention: Shared Decision making, Leadership Development, Group Site Visits, and Performance Evaluation. When it comes to shared decision making the results reveal that this occurs sometimes with the executive team (mean score of 3.0796) but it is not the normal way of doing things. Only 32.3 percent of all respondents (73 of 226) feel that this occurs usually or always. The remaining 67.7 percent (153 employees) indicate that this happens sometimes, rarely, or never. It appears that the executive team is subject to a high degree of authoritarian decision making. Of significance is that Leadership Development received the second lowest average score among all items with a mean value of 2.5689. A full 80 percent of all respondents (180 of 225) indicate that this happens only sometimes, rarely, or never. 46 respondents or 20.4 percent actually felt that this never happens. This is more than the 45 people (20 percent) who indicated that this usually or always happens. The results of this survey indicate that there are great gains to be had in developing the leadership abilities of executive team members who will take on greater formal leadership responsibilities in the future. Not surprisingly, the question about group site visits received the lowest average score at 2.5177. Such visits tend to place heavy time demands on executive team members who may already be dealing with full schedules. Only 21.7 (49) percent of respondents answered that this occurs usually or always while 78.3 percent (177 of 226) felt that it occurs sometimes, rarely, or never. While we would not expect such visits to take place frequently they can be an effective, if occasional, tool for building relationships. That these visits only take place sometimes or rarely should not be a matter of too much concern. In those teams in which they never take place (23.5 percent) implementing occasional visits may be an effective improvement strategy. Also of concern is the result with respect to Performance Evaluation. The results indicate that this is one of the lowest rated items in the scale with a mean value of 2.6858 meaning that such evaluation and improvement from such evaluation occurs only rarely or sometimes. Indeed, a very large 75.2 percent of respondents (170 of 226) felt that this happens sometimes, rarely, or never. 24.8 percent (56 of 226) felt that it occurs usually or always. This may be another key area in which large strides could be made in improving top team performance.

CONCLUSION

As the Municipality attempts to develop and implement a transformational organizational strategy to bring them to their desired future state, the executive leadership team must first develop the requisite leadership capabilities to meet that challenge. They are best viewed at maintaining the status quo. Evaluating and developing themselves is not something the executive leadership team does with great effectiveness. The results of this study indicate that they do not seem to be very involved in the activities beneath their level. One must conclude that they prefer the power distance they have and are doing not doing a successful job in trying to decrease it. There will hinder the executive team from successfully devising and implementing a transformational organizational strategy. Indeed, water seems to be in short supply at the oasis.

THE IMPACT OF A SUPERVISOR'S TOLERANCE FOR FREEDOM ON A SUBORDINATE'S PROPENSITY FOR BURNOUT

Kyle Ristig, Centenary College of Louisiana
kylegr@bellsouth.net

ABSTRACT

The term "burnout" was first used in 1974 by clinical psychologist Herbert Freudenberger as a descriptor of the stress responses shown by staff members in free clinics and halfway houses (Jackson, Schwab, & Schuler, 1986). Physical problems such as sleep disturbances, chronic fatigue, physical exhaustion, and alcohol abuse are linked to burnout and could affect job performance (Turnipseed, 1994; Nordhaus-Bike, 1995).

A number of studies have identified variables related to burnout, including demographic variables. These control variables (age, gender, work experience, marital status, and strength of religious beliefs) are considered to be moderators which are in place prior to the experience of a situation.

This study proposes that, while moderated by age, gender, experience, marital status, and religious beliefs, the propensity for burnout increases as the supervisor's tolerance of the subordinate's freedom decreases. With this knowledge, the supervisor can adjust his or her overt expression of that variable in order to reduce the subordinates' potential for burnout and maximize the subordinates' efficiency.

THE USE OF TRAINING GROUPS (T-GROUPS) IN RAISING SELF AND SOCIAL AWARENESS AND ENHANCING EMOTIONALLY INTELLIGENT BEHAVIORS

William L. Weis, Seattle University
billweis@seattleu.edu
Lisa Hanson, Seattle University
lhanson@seattleu.edu

ABSTRACT

The application of training group (T-Group) dynamics in teaching emotional intelligence (EQ) offers a promising methodology for raising self and social awareness, for practicing authentic communication among group participants, and for enhancing emotionally intelligent behaviors. This paper discusses how the particular needs of an EQ-training program can be effectively served with a well-managed T-Group experience. It also addresses questions about "why are we doing this?" which inevitably emerge from the frustrations of T-Group participation.

The T-Group has been a viable learning modality for 60 years, and has seen myriad changes in its intended use and its application procedures over that time. This paper presents a model that is significantly truncated from the original T-Group format, and, as such, is more adaptable to short-term training interventions, as well as to MBA and management development courses that meet in short sessions.

GOALS OF TEACHING EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

In a nutshell, developing emotional intelligence is about learning how to "show up as yourself" – and by doing so adding the most value that you are capable of adding to your organization, to your family, and to your community. It's about being in sustained relationship with your colleagues, family members, and friends, and about showing up in those relationships as an autonomous, individuated, authentic self.

To get the most from its workforce, every organization needs to have authentic, differentiated individuals showing up as themselves – telling their truths, saying what they mean, facilitating open communication, and implementing authentic data flow that is critical to the organization's success.

In teaching emotional intelligence, we begin by positing the model of an intersection of interpersonal relations that juxtaposes competing innate tendencies to be both connected and separated, the Conviction/Connection Model (see Diagram 1). We all have a fundamental desire, and need, to be differentiated individuals, having our own thoughts, beliefs, values, desires, and feelings. We call that tendency "conviction" – where we are embracing our individuality in the face of other people and other forces. In Diagram 1 the conviction axis runs from the polar extremes of fixed rigidity to complete malleability ("wishy-washy"). We also have a competing fundamental need to be connected to other human beings, to be part of a social system. We call that tendency "connection" – where we gravitate toward relating to the people around us. In Diagram 1, the connection axis runs from the extremes of total "cut-off" to total fusion.

Conviction and connection are inherently opposing forces, and the goal of teaching emotional intelligence is to help individuals balance these tendencies. By "balance" we mean mitigate the extreme positions and lean toward the intersection of these opposing forces. The center of this model is a space where you know who you are and are open to receiving ideas from others (conviction), where you are present, engaged, and value the feelings of others while also being aware of your own feelings (connection). Whether in business or personal relationships, achieving this balance of fundamental needs allows you to best make your authentic contribution, to remain in sustained relationship, and to be at your most valuable and productive. Diagram 1, courtesy of the management consulting firm *Teams & Leaders,* depicts this tension and provides a visual mapping for the goals of emotional intelligence training – specifically helping learners to move toward the intersection of these axes.

In summary, enhancing one's EQ is about moving toward the intersection of conviction and connection, and being there, in sustained relationship, with one's authentic self – with the true values, beliefs, wants, feelings and thoughts that comprise that self. That is why self awareness is foundational to emotional intelligence. We need to know who we are, authentically, in order to show up at that intersection as our true selves. What is our essence? What do we value, care about, want, feel, think, and believe?

THE "T GROUP" – SOME BACKGROUND

The "T Group" has been used as a training tool for over a half century, having originated in the National Training Laboratories (NTL) in Bethel, Maine, in 1947. The principal pioneers in developing T-Groups were, first and foremost, Kurt Lewin (although he died before the T-Group became the basic training format for the NTL's Human Relations Laboratory), followed by Kenneth Benne, Ron Lippitt and Leland Bradford (Benne, 1964).

In brief, the T Group is a vehicle for learning about yourself, about your impact on others, and about adopting behaviors that enhance your effectiveness in group and interpersonal encounters. This is accomplished by assembling a small group, usually from 6 to 8 individuals, for the purpose of exploring their own behaviors when they are interacting with each other in a closed system. The process of personal exploration and evaluation is augmented by feedback from a second group of individuals who observe the members of the first group as they interact with each other. In addition, a T-Group trainer provides structure to the group, and serves four key functions that are critical to a successful T-Group learning experience: emotional stimulation, caring, meaning attribution, and executive function (Lieberman, et al, 1973).

When we look at a partial list of the goals of T-Group training, it becomes readily apparent that this is a good fit for pedagogy in teaching emotional intelligence:

1. To increase awareness of your own feelings in the moment
2. To increase awareness of the impact of your behavior on others

3. To enhance your skills in giving and receiving feedback
4. To enhance your skills in managing and learning from conflict
5. To gain knowledge of group dynamics and team development
6. To gain and practice skills in facilitating group processes
7. To heighten your awareness of and sensitivity to the feelings of others
8. To hone your interpersonal communication skills
9. To clarify responsibility for your feelings, thoughts, and actions
10. To learn to make conscious choices, in the moment, that reflect your authenticity

Participants in T-Group training are coaxed and coached to be mindful and authentic. The structure and basic ground rules are both simple and frustrating. Participants sit in a circle and engage in spontaneous interaction. They are told to remain in the present and in the confines of the circle – in the here and now. They are coached to be present with their own feelings, thoughts, wants, and sensory awareness – in essence, to be mindful of their authenticity in the moment. A facilitator or facilitators will intervene, intrusively and often irritatingly, to keep the participants in the "here and now" and authentic with their verbal and nonverbal interactions.

To say the least, beginning practitioners find the format frustrating, irritating, uncomfortable, aggravating, challenging – and a bit weird. After a modicum of practice, however, most participants rise to the challenge, begin sanctioning their own departures from the "here and now," and appreciate the learning that emerges from this unique methodology. And they begin to see the connection to enhancing EQ behaviors, especially the constant struggle to remain in sustained relationship while showing up as authentic, autonomous individuals.

T-GROUP BASICS

Before we describe what a T-Group session might look like, let's clarify some basic rules about what a T-Group is and does, and what it is not and does not do. A T-Group:

- DOES encourage participants to share their emotional reactions to their fellow participants' words and gestures – that is, to share truthful feedback.

- DOES NOT encourage participants to share opinions, judgments, or conclusions – that is, to offer evaluative and subjective feedback.

- DOES encourage participants to remain in the "here and now" with their fellow participants.

- DOES NOT encourage digression to the "there and then" – to a space and time away from the present time and present circle of participants.

- DOES encourage participants to be their authentic selves – to show up as themselves.

- DOES NOT encourage participants to be phony – to show up in roles other than as themselves.

The T-Group trainer intervenes to help participants speak their truths (to be themselves) and remain in the here and now. A skillful trainer helps participants learn from what is transpiring in their group. He or she creates the physical structure for the group, helps the group commit to norms and rules that support the learning process (for example, an agreement to stay in the here and now), monitors compliance with these group norms (for example, intrudes when a group member drifts from the here and now), and supports the T-Group development with training in communication, feedback, coaching, and listening skills.

We realize that this brief description of the leader's role leaves much to the reader's imagination. Without many hours of practice both as a participant and as a T-Group facilitator, much about the workings of T-Groups will remain somewhat abstract and inaccessible. The brief simulation of T-Group interactions and leader interventions that follows may at least pique your interest in this training innovation – it will not, regrettably, make clear and comprehensible the structure and dynamics of an effective T-Group experience.