

 Open access • Journal Article • DOI:10.1177/1742715016681120

## **Leadership, leadership development and all that jazz: — Source link**

Richard T. Harrison

**Institutions:** University of Edinburgh

**Published on:** 01 Feb 2017 - Leadership (SAGE Publications)

**Topics:** Shared leadership, Leadership style, Servant leadership, Leadership studies and Leadership development

Related papers:

- [Leadership moment by moment](#)
- [Leadership Presence: Character Development as the Choreography of Body-Mind](#)
- [Leadership in Organizations](#)
- [Performing Leadership: “is”, “as”, Enactment, Narrative and Audience](#)
- [Personal leadership as form of spirituality](#)

Share this paper:    

View more about this paper here: <https://typeset.io/papers/leadership-leadership-development-and-all-that-jazz-3rca3kxf6q>



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

## Leadership, leadership development and all that jazz

**Citation for published version:**

Harrison, RT 2016, 'Leadership, leadership development and all that jazz', *Leadership*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 81-99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715016681120>

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.1177/1742715016681120](https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715016681120)

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

**Published In:**

Leadership

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



***Forthcoming in Leadership 13(1), February 2017***

LEADERSHIP, LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT AND ALL THAT JAZZ<sup>1</sup>

Richard T Harrison  
University of Edinburgh Business School  
29 Buccleuch Place  
Edinburgh EH8 9JS  
[r.harrison@ed.ac.uk](mailto:r.harrison@ed.ac.uk)

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper draws in part on ideas originally presented in RT Harrison (1999) "Playing the spaces between the notes: from competence to creativity in executive development", in RE Purser and A Montuori (eds) *Social Creativity Volume 2*. Hampton Press: Cresskill, NJ, pp.257-289.

## LEADERSHIP, LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT AND ALL THAT JAZZ

The notes I handle no better than many pianists. But the spaces between the notes—ah, that is where the art lies.

Artur Schnabel (Austrian pianist and composer, 1882-1951)

Research without an actively selective point of view becomes the ditty bag of an idiot, filled with bits of pebbles, straws, feathers and other random hoardings.

Robert S Lynd (1939, 183)

### ABSTRACT

This paper critiques key elements of contemporary leadership theory and practice, notably the persistent modernist emphasis on heroic individualism in models of the leader and leadership and the highly instrumental and performative nature of the competence approach to leadership development. Against this, the paper draws on the history of jazz as an improvisational art form to develop a view of leadership based on fluidity and adaptability, commitment, creativity and change, community and team enabling and the idea of mastery and wisdom. Leadership-as-practice, in this view, is 'collective coherent thinking' based on a lifetime of preparation for exploring the spaces between the notes where creative interpretation meets and responds to uncertainty and unpredictability.

### KEY WORDS

Leadership-as-practice; jazz; improvisation; heroic and post-heroic leadership; leadership development; mastery; wisdom

### INTRODUCTION

In a world of change leadership and leadership development is an ongoing process rather than a set of outcomes. It is, to adapt a musical analogy that will be developed later, part of the music of organizations. The jazz musician Sidney Bechet (1980) described how the improvisational dynamic between an individual performer's skill and the community created a musical road:

The music, it's that road. There's good things alongside it, and there's miseries. You stop by the way and you can't ever be sure what you're going to find waiting. But the music itself, the road itself—there's no stopping that. It goes on all the time. It's the thing that brings you to everything else. You have to trust that.

For Ogren (1989, 165), "Improvisational music promises no sure passages, rather it captures the inevitability of mobility and change". However, much contemporary thinking about leaders and leadership remains firmly rooted in a relentlessly performative approach to systematic training and development, in which the key aim is, misguidedly, to find, explore, chart, and publish those apparently sure passages.

#### LEADERSHIP, DEVELOPMENT AND PERFORMANCE

The often highly instrumental nature of leader/leadership development, archetypically represented in the debate over leadership competencies but more widely reflected in leadership development practices, including those rooted in post-heroic leadership theories, is important for three reasons. First, this reflects an all-pervasive mindset without which the contemporary leadership debate, it seems, cannot occur. To illustrate, a Google Scholar search for leadership competence/competencies/competency throws up around 30,000 items, of which 18,000 have been published since 2010. Despite claims (aspirations?) of its demise, the competence mindset is alive and well in leadership studies. That this is even more so in leadership practice is reflected in a similar Google search, which throws up some 715,000 items. Second, the concept of competence in particular claims to unlock, in a way few other concepts and ideas have, the fundamental determinants of exceptional performance, itself increasingly highly prized in a world of turbulent change. Third, more than any other concept or arena of debate, the limitations and often undiscussed assumptions of this instrumentalism provide a basis for an enlarged and enriched view of leadership development and organizational transformation (Bolden and Gosling 2006; Carroll et al 2008).

This performative mindset has arisen out of the attempt to answer three instrumentally driven questions: What do leaders really do? How do they acquire the knowledge, skills and competence to do what they do? What can educators and trainers do to improve the process by which leaders acquire this knowledge, skill and competence? The key concern, therefore, has been to provide a framework for the assessment and development of leadership capability, through that to identify and develop effective leader behavior, and thus improve leadership, and by implication organizational, performance.

Despite the enormous amount of effort that has been and is currently being devoted to this, however, there have been relatively few attempts, with the notable exception of the critical leadership tradition, to address the fundamental question of the extent to which the model of leadership and the organization assumed in this approach is consistent with that required for effective response to the challenge of unpredictable change. One problem is that much of the debate has been rhetorical rather than substantive: precise meaning is of less importance and advocacy has tended to dominate discourse to the exclusion of careful definitions, objective criteria, and reasoned analysis (Fagan 1984, p. 75).

This is important because it raises the possibility that the instrumental leadership development debate may well have a language but lacks a clear concept. Indeed, given the nature of leadership development practice, the absence of a clear concept to be accessed

through the conventional methodological assumptions of the canonical neopositivist research paradigm may be inevitable: as Sternberg (1985) concluded in his study of practical intelligence (which included a sample of business executives), "Underlying successful performance in many real-world tasks is *tacit knowledge* of a kind that is never explicitly taught and in many instances never even verbalised" (p. 151). The essence of this tacit knowledge has been captured in Polanyi's (1962) distinction between subsidiary awareness and focal awareness. In the everyday context of, for example, striking a nail with a hammer, subsidiary awareness refers to the sensation of the hammer handle on the palm of a gripping hand as the hammer strikes the nail; this contrasts with the focal awareness of actually driving in the nail. It is important to grasp the difference between these two levels of awareness:

Subsidiary awareness and focal awareness are mutually exclusive. If a pianist shifts his attention from the piece he is playing to the observation of what he is doing with his fingers while playing it, he gets confused and may have to stop. This happens generally if we switch our focal attention to particulars of which we had previously been aware only in their subsidiary role. (p. 56)

Following this, concern with the emphasis on performativity can be expressed at two levels. First, it is possible to accept that this emphasis is fair, acceptable, and desirable, but that current procedures to measure and develop leadership skills, competence and capabilities are inadequate. This is reminiscent of the German theologian Dietrich Bonhoeffer's observation that if the train is heading in the wrong direction, no matter how fast you run in the opposite direction you will never reach your destination. Second, and more significantly, an examination of some of the fundamental assumptions underlying performative leadership development suggests that in important respects the approach itself is fundamentally flawed and cannot therefore adequately deliver all that is expected of it. Specifically, common to all manifestations of this performative instrumentalism, including much of the post-heroic leadership schools, is an approach that can best be described as a factorial, dimensional or even trait based. The question, "What do leaders do?" has been turned into the question, "What are the main factors in a leader's role?" Researchers have differentiated, and subjected to validity testing to their own satisfaction, lists of factors out of the job wholes of samples of subjects, on which the entire performative approach rests.

This, however, raises a fundamental question: Do leaders in fact experience their roles as lists? If they do, which is unlikely, then methodologically the reductionist proliferation of mediating and moderating variables in the literature on charismatic and transformational leadership may be justified (van Knippenberg and Sitkin 2013). However, if they do not, and if Sternberg (1985) is correct in identifying tacit knowledge as critical to the development of practical intelligence, then leaders' perception of what it takes to be effective may be affective or intuitive—soaked up through the soles of their feet—rather than formally cognitive. What is important, therefore, is an understanding of what has variously been referred to as theory-in-use or practice theory. This comprises models of situations and relations to them that an actor develops in his or her mind and uses to guide their practice, bearing some relation to public, objective theories about organizational situations, but in no sense identical with them. Analysis that reduces the whole into its constituent parts, and

assumes that the whole is merely an aggregate of the parts, can be subject to extensive criticism on epistemological and methodological grounds, not the least of which is the danger of falling victim to Polanyi's (1962) strictures about the danger of elevating matters of subsidiary awareness to the realm of focal awareness.

For this instrumental performative approach to be effective, a number of propositions, assumed implicitly or explicitly, must hold, and there are strong grounds for arguing, on the basis of Polanyi's fundamental distinction between subsidiary and focal awareness, that each of these propositions is flawed in some way.

*Independence of leadership competencies.* This proposition arises from the epistemological and methodological reductionism inherent in the canonical "list of factors" approach. Increasingly, however, it is acknowledged that skills, attributes and competencies do cluster or group (or at least that such groupings can be imposed on them). This, in turn, leads to attempts to separately distinguish these from, on the one hand, the metacompetencies necessary to develop/acquire other competencies (the 'learning how to learn' challenge) and, on the other, the elements and constituents of individual competencies. Although this proliferation of levels of analysis, reminiscent of the physicists' parallel search for both the fundamental subatomic building blocks of matter and the grand unified theory of everything (Barrow 1991), reflects the much more complex, clustered, world of leadership-in-practice, it does make more questionable the identification of discrete competencies and the development of teaching and development strategies to produce them.

Again, this is not a new phenomenon, nor one restricted to leadership. The conflict between particularist and reductionist explanations, on the one hand, and comprehensive integrative insight on the other, has been a long-standing area of debate in physics:

We spoke of the "Properties of Things", and of the degree to which these properties could be investigated. As an extreme thought, the following question was proposed: supposing it was possible to discover all the properties of a grain of sand, would we then have gained a complete knowledge of the whole universe? Would there then remain no unsolved component of our comprehension of the universe?  
(Moszkowski, quoted in Barrow, 1991, p. 76; emphasis added).

*Identifiable Outputs.* There is a fundamental assumption of a causal relation between the presumed intra-individual entities described as skills, attributes and competencies and overt behaviour, and between their underlying characteristics and leadership, and by extension, organizational performance. If performativity is the capacity to produce an intended identifiable consequence, and leadership is (as we will go on to consider later) more like an interactive flowing process than a cause-effect structure, can the atomistic concept of competency-based performativity have any relevance at all? Furthermore, despite extensive research the implied causal relation involved here has proved difficult if not impossible to establish in practice, and we are left with relationships that are at best associational and arguments that are concerned more with advocacy than analysis. The shift from associational relationships to the assumption of causality in terms of the linearity of post-Aristotelian logic ignores the asymmetry in many cause-effect situations, particularly those involving a probabilistic element: to take an example from elementary logic classes, if I see

that it is raining, I can predict that I will see people with umbrellas; but if I see people with umbrellas, I cannot predict with equal probability that it will rain.

*Possession Equals Use.* It is assumed that exercise of a leadership attribute is relatively unaffected by the real-time here-and-now perceptions of the leader. However, perceiving is not an act but a process occurring continuously in conjunction with, not before or after, an action in a situation. My perception of what I am doing and what is happening are inextricably intertwined with what I *am* doing and what *is* happening. Following Polanyi, the exercise of my competencies and the understanding of their effects are, therefore, perceptions which are of a different order to, and perhaps are more deeply rooted in, character and personality on the one hand and experience-based tacit knowledge on the other, than competencies as conventionally identified. There is little awareness to date in the performative leadership development literature of the implications of this deeper phenomenon for the acquisition and application of particular characteristics (save for the inclusion of "self-awareness" in some leadership characteristics lists, which as a discrete competence has all the power-in-action of the instruction to "force yourself to relax").

*Transferability and Context Independence.* There is a tension between the assumed transferability of leadership characteristics across a wide range of action contexts and their often context-dependent demonstration. This decontextualization assumes that skills, attributes and competence are intrinsic and can be exercised (or at least identified in outcomes) independent of the specific intercontextual or interpersonal situation. However, in social behavior there are always at least two purposeful consciousnesses at work, each choosing actions in light of itself and the other in real time. If skills, attributes and competence, therefore, can be demonstrated only to the extent to which the context permits them to be demonstrated, they are situationally constrained and fail to provide the basis for the transformation of that situation.

#### LIMITATIONS OF THE PERFORMATIVE VIEW

There are, therefore, fundamental problems in relying on the competence approach to provide an adequate basis for leadership development. First, the proposition "if we find effective leaders, we can discover what attributes and characteristics they possess and what skills and competencies they use" makes the fundamental assumption that, first, these actually exist, and second, that it is possible to measure them. However, in every case, these are constructs and not something we can observe directly. In seeking to "support an inferential leap from an observed consistency (in the evidence) to a construct that accounts for that consistency" (Messick, 1975, p. 12) there is a very real danger of committing what the philosopher Alfred North Whitehead (1925/1967) described as the fallacy of misplaced concreteness, in which exclusive attention is paid to a group of abstractions which, by the nature of the case, are abstracted from the remainder of things. If, as in the performative leadership development movement's separation of action from consciousness, the excluded things are important in your experience, your modes of thought are not fitted to deal with them. The problems this creates have been well captured, albeit in a slightly different context, by the science fiction writer, Philip K Dick (1968):



but the problem [of defining reality] is a real one, not a mere intellectual game. Because today we live in a society in which spurious realities are manufactured by the media, by governments, by big corporations, by religious groups, political groups and the electronic hardware exists by which to deliver those pseudo-worlds right into the hearts of the reader, the viewer, the listener . . . the matter of defining what is real—that is a serious topic, even a vital topic. And in there somewhere is the other topic, the definition of the authentic human. Because the bombardment of pseudo-realities begins to produce inauthentic humans very quickly, spurious humans as fake as the data pressing at them from all sides. . . Fake realities will produce fake humans. Or, fake humans will generate fake realities and then sell them to other humans, turning them, eventually, into forgeries of themselves . . . what kind of person would write about something he knows doesn't exist, and how can something that doesn't exist have aspects? (pp. 10-13)

Second, there is some equivocation, even growing concern, even among those sympathetic to the performative approach, that it cannot be applied at all levels of the organization. This reflects two particular concerns. On the one hand, there is the heroic assertion that this approach does in fact have salience at senior levels, and that the top leaders in organisations will increasingly divide their time between a number of discrete but interrelated sets of activities that draw significantly on their key competencies. Archetypically, this is represented in a recent HBR feature (Giles 2016) which asks “What makes an effective leader?” and answers, for the community of organizational scientists, executive coaches, and leadership development consultants, by identifying 74 (!) leadership competencies grouped into five major themes that suggest a set of priorities for leaders and leadership development programmes. On the other hand is the view that as one moves from a management to a leadership perspective the competence and standards-based approach becomes less and less relevant, both because the mechanistic and prescriptive nature of the approaches being developed does not recognize the diversity and qualitative nature of leader's tasks and roles, and because such a focus is inward looking rather than being outward looking, reflective, and aware of the changing organisational and business environment. As a result there is a very real danger that these inward looking approaches will produce clones, unable to open their minds to new markets, ideas and technologies – Dick's ‘fake humans’ – and that instrumental and mechanistic approaches to leadership development will not and cannot produce the leaders of tomorrow.

Third, competencies tend to be oriented to those necessary to allow the organization to continue to do what it is already doing well. This is necessary and useful but taken alone will tend to fix or reinforce current or historical ways of doing things in a company. It places greatest emphasis on the role of the leader-manager as creator and restorer of order. If, however, leaders are increasingly required to be innovators, inspirers, or creators of disorder, then it seems likely that the characteristics that go with creating change and stimulating transformation might be even less unit-like and easily understood than those which go with the maintenance of equilibrium. Gareth Morgan has made the point effectively (albeit with respect to managers rather than leaders, reflecting the fact that he was writing before the current hagiography of leaders and leadership):

It is not enough to look at what excellent organizations and managers are already doing. It is also necessary to be proactive in relation to the future: to anticipate some of the changes that are likely to occur and to position organizations and their members to address these new challenges effectively . . . it rests in the development of attitudes, values and "mind sets" that allow managers to confront, understand and deal with a wide range of forces within and outside their organizations. (Morgan 1988, p. 25)

Put another way, and to reinforce Morgan's point, any specification of requisite leadership skills, attributes and competencies assumes that we know the future and what it will require. That this is not, in fact, the case is clear from the extent to which we are speculating about a world of radical transformation in which the most strategic competency of all may be the capacity to "shelve one's competence in favour of an openness to the new " (Vaill, 1989, p. 37).

More specifically, the performativity debate is at root a debate about procedures, pursued on the argument that exceptional performance is a role-bound activity. However, on closer scrutiny, organizational, role-bound, procedure-driven activities are rarely adhered to in practice. An example of this is given by John Seely Brown of the Xerox Palo Alto Research Center:

There has been a lot of talk about procedures and routines. . . . Let me go back to some office studies originally done by Lucy Suchman, an ethnomethodologist...

Lucy went into one of the most routinized offices in our operation, the accounting office, and started looking at how clerks were using accounting procedures. The interesting thing is, if you had actually asked the clerks for a description of what they were doing, they'd come up with descriptions which were very close to what the manuals prescribed the procedures to be. They thought they were following the procedures. Although the procedures were acting as the major resource, they were, in fact, not being followed. You know what they were doing? The clerks were improvising left, right and sideways to get the job done. But by the end of the day they had created a set of files that looked like they would have, had they been produced by an agent following the procedure. The procedures were acting as a resource indirectly specifying properties and constraints of final state, but they were not using these procedures to get to this final state. The procedures provided an indirect specification of about where they were heading. They were improvising off an aspect of the procedures, but not in the obvious ways most of us would have thought. It was an interesting discovery when we saw how these procedures were actually being used as a resource but not as a recipe. (Brown 1993, pp. 92-93)

The key lesson to emerge from this organizational story is the emphasis on improvisation in practice: As Wenger (1991) has pointed out in similar terms, organizations are best viewed as communities of practice, and the ability of any individual to learn and perform his or her job "depends on their community—its shared memories, routines, improvisations, innovations and connections to the world. This community functions within and without—and sometimes in spite of—the company's official organizational and procedural

frameworks" (p. 7). Understanding organizations and understanding the leadership of organizations, therefore, is best viewed from the perspective of how that improvisation takes place. In so doing, to borrow another musical reference, it is important to remember that improvisation is not a completely role-absent phenomenon:

Music can never be an abstraction, however thoughtful and objectless—for its object is the living man [sic] in time—nor can it be accidental, however improvised . . . because improvisation is not the expression of accident but rather of the accumulated yearnings, dreams and wisdom of our very soul. (Menuhin, 1972, p. 91)

The focus of performative leadership development, the emphasis on procedures and rules, is on the playing of the notes. The response to an ever-changing future is improvisation, redirecting emphasis to the spaces between the notes, to see music-as-performance as more than just the sequence of notes on the score. It is, rather, a dynamic, interpretative, creative process that engages both performer and audience, "the inexplicably but beautifully controlled sympathy between the artist and his audience" (Davies, 1990, p. 523). It is our argument that underlying creativity and leadership as providing a platform for an orientation to the future and the creation and communication of vision, is the concept of improvisation, which represents the framework for understanding life-in-organization and leadership-as-practice in a turbulent changing world.

## CREATIVITY

One simple illustration will demonstrate the manner in which creativity transcends competence and paves the way for improvisation. Our starting point is *data* as the fundamental elemental building block (the molecular analysis of a cake, for example), of little direct meaning or utility on its own. *Information* is data with context (the list of ingredients for the cake), capable of elucidation, intelligence, and transmittable directly between people or via different media. *Knowledge* represents the 'how to' interpretation of information (using explicit and tacit knowledge to make the cake), presupposes the storing of information (in human or artificial memories) and is built up in a process in which new information is linked with previous experience. But knowledge alone is not sufficient for effective action. *Competence*, in its widest sense of capacity, aptitude, skills, attitude and ability, is a relative (not an absolute) concept, defined in comparison to others or to a task; it requires that knowledge must be relevant and employable in an activity with a definable aim and purpose; and it presupposes a link with an environment, necessary for the identification of relevance. To return to Bonhoeffer's metaphor of the train, however, none of these address the 'know why' question. This remains the domain of *wisdom*, the integral and relational process that addresses the ambiguous functional stupidity of organisational leadership, the unwillingness or inability to use reflective capacities in anything other than circumspect ways (Alvesson and Spicer 2012; Küpers and Pauleen 2016).

The shift from competent knowledge to wisdom, requires *creativity*, a kind of synergism in which the whole becomes more than the sum of the parts. It requires the capacity for sifting information and combining knowledge and pieces of information in such a manner that

something new is created. In so doing, it is imperative to recognize that competence alone is not enough. For example, in the early 15th century, Gutenberg confronted the problem of duplicating books in a context in which existing printing techniques were slow and costly, relying on individual hand-carved wooden plates for each page over which single sheets of paper were rubbed by hand (Koestler, 1964). For Gutenberg, competence in the domain of 15th century printing was a prerequisite for transformation, but it was not sufficient. In his letters he makes clear that the idea of casting lead types and manufacturing the first printing press was born not out of his experience of and competence in contemporary printing techniques but out of his observations of local wine farmers pressing juice from grapes with great force: in short, neither bounded by the past, nor fixed to the limits of the present, "the creative person realizes new facets of individuality by continuing to respond to life in unique ways" (Moustakas, 1977, p. 2).

This emphasis on creativity is fundamental to an understanding of leadership, future orientation, and envisioning, which are the requirements for contemporary individual and organizational transformation. It has been recognized, implicitly at least, in many previous accounts of the management task. For example, Chester Barnard, the rationalist supreme who probably did more than any other writer to establish management as a discipline on "sound theoretical foundations," clearly set out the scientific systematic approach (Barnard, 1938):

the executive functions, which have been distinguished for purposes of exposition and which are the basis of functional specialization in organizations, have no separate concrete existence. They are parts or aspects of a process of organisation as a whole. This process in the more complex organisations, and usually even in simple unit organisations, is made the special responsibility of executives or leaders. The means utilized are to a considerable extent concrete acts logically determined (p. 235)

But Barnard did not stop there, although many who followed him appear to have done so. He continued directly:

but the essential aspect of the process is the sensing of the organisation as a whole and the total situation relevant to it. It transcends the capacity of merely intellectual methods, and the techniques of discriminating the factors of the situation. The terms pertinent to it are "feeling", "judgement", "sense", "proportion", "balance", "appropriateness". It is a matter of art rather than science, and is aesthetic rather than logical. For this reason, it is recognised rather than described and is known by its effects rather than by analysis, (p. 235)

This, of course, if it is to be followed, requires something of a paradigm shift in our analysis of and discourse about leadership practice, which goes beyond the discipline of leadership alone:

You can think and you can learn. You do these things like an educated modern man. But you cannot feel, except like a primitive. Your plight is quite a common one, especially in our day when thinking and learning have been given such absurd

prominence, and we have thought and learned our way into world-wide messes. We must educate your feeling and persuade you to experience it like a man and not like a maimed, dull child . . . understanding is not the point. Feeling is the point. Understanding and experimenting are not interchangeable . Any theologian understands martyrdom, but only the martyr experience the fire. (Davies, 1990, p. 343)

To respond to Barnard's challenge, leadership developers will have to become more martyr than theologian. In so doing, the nature of and basis for leadership in organizations requires reconsideration.

### IMPROVISATION

What then can we say of the role of the leader in this new world we live in? To start with, it is helpful to remember Peter Drucker's analogy between leadership and the conductor of an orchestra: The conductor draws together the individual players and their instruments, draws the best out of each member, and welds that into an inspirational whole which is, at its best, more than the sum of the parts. But in a number of key respects the symphony orchestra metaphor is limited. First, it reinforces the stereotype of the "leader as hero," a theme common to both the contemporary leadership and entrepreneurship discourses. The elevation of the leader/entrepreneur to demigod status is, perhaps, a reaction to the turbulence and change in the socioinstitutional framework of late-20th century advanced industrial economics, an attempt to return to past certainties before they are swept away completely for

our current intellectual predicament springs not, as it has been fashionable to say, from the death of God, but from the demise of nineteenth century God-surrogates. We are facing a new situation in which the old polarities of thought can no longer apply or at the very least require scrutiny. This clearly will be the cultural task of social thought during the coming years. (Gellner, 1993, p. 3)

In hindsight, the resurgence of the messianic heroic individualism, with its overweening emphasis on over-attribution and the romanticising of traditional leadership behaviours (Spector 2014), once characteristic of 19th century liberalism will be seen as one more reaction to *fin de siecle* uncertainty (Mestrovic, 1992). The alternative emerging view is to emphasize the "team as hero," and the role of community. The role shift is from leader to enabler; as the saxophonist Joe Henderson put it, speaking of his time playing with Miles Davis, "Miles wouldn't have appreciated us going in there and being a clone of what he had been. I couldn't do that anyway, neither could any of the others. He was known as the enabler, and he would choose material that would enable musicians to launch into directions that developed them as individuals." (Henderson, quoted in Fordham, 1993).

Second, the orchestral analogy places primary emphasis on organizationally constrained order rather than on freedom and enterprise. Regardless of the interpretative skills of the conductor, the orchestra and its constituent members play exactly the same notes in the

same order as they are set down in the score, performance after performance. However, the orchestral analogy does serve to emphasize one important discussion of creativity which has a significant role to play in developing an understanding of life-in-organization and leadership-as-practice. One participant in a Swedish seminar on creativity in the human sciences, for example, stated in passing,

I have toyed with the idea of studying the beneficial effects upon 'creativity' of different kinds of music. After all, they do this sort of thing with cows and it would be nice to know that Bach, for example, is conducive in logical thinking, or Bruckner to transcendental insight!" (Hans Aldskogius, in Buttimer, 1983, p. 81).

More generally, as part of the wider postmodernist interest in cultural and social rather than technological and economic change (Harvey, 1989; Rosenau, 1992), the link between leadership and organization theory and art has become a legitimate subject for debate. In particular, the analysis of organizational themes, such as the formal properties of organizations (which bears strong similarities to synthesizer programming) or the thematic analysis of leadership (which draws on the analogy with "theme" as a recurrent melody in music), can be facilitated by adopting a musical metaphor. More specifically, in application to the understanding of the practice of leadership as and within a community of practice, the jazz ensemble provides a useful metaphor for not only understanding, developing and enhancing team learning.

Jazz, and the earlier now-parallel musical form, blues, represents an alternative and richer image of what leadership-as-practice entails, or what playing the spaces between the notes actually means, built as it is on the practice of improvisation and the improvisations of practice. Alan Lomax, in his oral history of the blues in the Mississippi Delta, summarizes the difference between the formal orchestral style and the expressive improvisational style of the blues or jazz musician in the words of a trumpeter from a New Orleans marching band.

"I can read notes all right, and I do that when I have to, but when I'm really playing, the notes get in the way of what I'm hearing in my head." . . . You've defined the difference between the folk tradition—the improvisatory, head tradition—and the scored, written-down tradition. In the latter, the performer is tied down to the score; in the former he can add his own feeling to every note, to every phrase. (Lomax, 1993, p. 345)

From this blues tradition comes the recognition that fixed forms may not be adequate for new realities and modes of expression and that progress and the creation of the new require the creation of new forms and the dissolution of old categories. It is no accident that the early development of the blues was based on the harmonica and the guitar. Both instruments were easily transportable by a largely itinerant blues playing population and both lent themselves to a particular style of playing, particularly with the popularity of slide playing, one of the oldest blues guitar techniques:

by sliding the knife along the guitar strings . . . he provided a silvery, crying tone that followed the gliding notes of his song. . . . It was just a one-phrase melody, but had to put down in notes. It had intervals that did not match the piano scale, little

quavers that changed with each repetition and often the voice stopped and the guitar filled the space with strange sounds that no guitar Handy knew had made before. But this was 1903, the first time anyone had heard a blues holler set to guitar. (Lomax, 1993, p. 166)

Only with the growing popularity of the blues in the honky tonks and barrelhouses of labour camps and Southern towns did the piano become prominent in blues music. For this to happen, accepted playing styles had to change, and the physical and musical constraints of the instrument had to be overcome. As the notes of the piano were fixed, blues pianists had to achieve the flattened or bent "blue notes," so easily achieved in slide guitar playing and much loved by blues performers, by striking adjacent notes almost simultaneously to give the illusion of passing notes. They had, literally, to play the spaces between the notes, and in so doing advanced a new musical form. More generally, Lomax (1993), among others, sets the improvisatory blues style—in music, dance, and singing—in a wider cultural context. Based on a comparative cross-cultural analysis of performance style, he argues that black African performance swerves on velocity and changefulness were the highest recorded, making the most use of many shifts of level, direction, limb use, facing and energy in dance, and of changes in voice quality, tempo, register, ensemble, mood, metre, harmony and melody in music, "along with the greatest facility in shifting style collectively in close coordination. Black style is outstandingly accelerative, collectively accelerative." (Lomax 1993, p. 137). The key emphasis here is on the collective nature of this improvisation: spontaneous but coordinated.

However, the key development of this musical metaphor for leadership as a community of practice occurs in consideration of the jazz tradition and practice. From this comes the realization that the relationship between the members of a group, unlike that in a symphony orchestra, can be fluid and changing. To quote the jazz musician Ornette Coleman, "Jazz is the only music in which the same note can be played night after night but differently each time." Improvisation is not only accepted but encouraged by other members of the group, and the overall performance is created anew on each occasion. The outcome is the antithesis of the view of the leader as hero, but the identification of the leader as team member: as in a jazz band, in which individual improvisation and virtuosity supports and is supported by the group performance. The "severe and unique disciplines of the jazz or improvising musician" to quote Bill Evans (1959, p. 2), pianist with the Miles Davis sextet in the late 1950s is based on the conviction that "direct deed is the most meaningful reflection".

However, group improvisation is a further challenge. Aside from the technical problem of collective coherent thinking, there is the very human, even social need for sympathy from all members to bend for the common result (Evans, 1959, p. 2). This capability to have and give free rein to individual virtuosity without losing the coherence of and commitment to the integrity and unity of the group, and without in practice abdicating the title/position of 'leader', contrasts with the conventional orchestral situation: As Edward Deming, one of the gurus of quality put it, the best players don't join orchestras. This emphasis on collective coherent thinking, team learning in the patois of the leadership development industry, rather than on unbridled individualism or formal structured group processes, is important.

The jazz metaphor is particularly apposite for this purpose, partly because, as the music of America's "lost generation" in the 1920s, jazz reflected and responded to a "period of composed transition from values already fixed to values that had to be created" (Cowley, 1956, p. 9). It is also, more significantly in the present context, the embodiment of a tradition that is the antithesis of late 19<sup>th</sup> century liberal individualism: As Ogren (1989) variously expresses it, jazz is the embodiment of "participating performance" (p. 68), "participatory culture" (p. 85), or, most closely echoing the community of practice construct, the "practice of communal creation" (p. 19).

Ogren (1989) further draws on Turner's (1974, 1977) use of social drama analysis to argue that jazz played a role in "public reflexivity" in which a group communicates itself to itself. In particular, of course, the communication was not restricted to the group which originated it "since it was a music most closely identified with blacks and entertainers—two social groups often labelled marginal—yet it helped white Americans with diverse social background explain their world" (p. 8). This emphasis on the symbolic meaning of performance—for jazz is in essence a performance musical form—and the emphasis on collective performance not individual performance (see Turner's [1969] discussion of the contrast between the jazz artist and traditional American success values), form the basis of the metaphorical analogy between jazz and, in particular, leadership in organizations<sup>2</sup>.

What is important for organizations as communities of practice, therefore, is not so much the process of leading (that is, the development of team work and collective coherent thinking) but the purpose of leadership embodied in the symbolism of performance in organizations. This communicative power of jazz has been captured in its description as a destructive "language" (Nanry & Berger, 1979). As a "language," there is a further parallel to develop between the symbolic analysis of performance and the view of organization as collective storytellings (e.g., Attali, 1985; Bauman, 1977; Schechner, 1977). It is through this process of collective performance and storytelling that the "essential organizational aspect of the process [of organization]" (Barnard, 1938, p. 285) is developed, communicated, and transmitted.

This exploration of the metaphor of jazz and its potential prompts the recognition of two very different views of the leader and the identification of a very different orientation to the future. To change the metaphor, and to borrow an illustration from Schumacher (1979), a leader is more like the balloon man at a fun fair than the star at the top of the Christmas tree. Schumacher describes the Christmas tree:

---

<sup>2</sup> The improvisation metaphor, of course, is not restricted to North American jazz (Frost and Yarrow 2015; Siddall and Waterman 2016). In the theatrical domain, for example, there is a long tradition of improvisation traceable to the European *commedia dell'arte* in the sixteenth century (Crossan and Sorrenti 1997) and reflected in contemporary improvisational comedy. US actor Tina Fey (2012), for example, has identified the core requirements for improvisational comedy as agreement on a given set of circumstances (collective coherent thinking), adding to the discussion (contributing to and extending the performance), making statements with confidence (based on one's mastery) and recognising that there are no mistakes (miscommunication as a stimulus to creativity). Internationally, improvisation as represented in other musical traditions, such as the Brazilian *Choro* (Flach and Antonello 2011), has been represented as a learning process.



with a star at the top and all sorts of nuts underneath, more or less nourishing and useful nuts . . . one normally looks to the star at the top for the initiative because all the rest are executors of the policy. One man's initiative, no matter how able, and then a diminishing scale downwards of initiative is just not good enough to keep the thing alive (p. 70)

This contrasts with the metaphor of organization captured in the notion of the improvising jazz group or the balloon seller:

at a fun fair, who in one hand holds hundreds of strings, and at the end of each string a balloon. Each balloon has its own buoyancy, a nice round thing . . . of course you need someone to hold it all together, but it is not a star at the top, it is a man underneath and each balloon has its own buoyancy. Each balloon is somehow a limited thing, and thus, in a manner of speaking, the more the merrier (p. 70)

#### FUTURE, VISION AND COMMITMENT

This second view of leadership, as collective improvisation (collective coherent thinking in Evans' phrase) not individual heroism within a community of practice held together and given meaning though symbolically important performance and collective organization storytelling, clearly establishes the importance of linking, conceptually and practically, the development of leadership (often considered exclusively and incompletely in the personal domain) with the evolution of organizations. This is not a simple or straightforward task, and development, change and (dare we say it) transformation in individuals and companies (as in a jazz ensemble) requires space, time and proper support. It is not something that happens overnight, nor does it happen without the necessary thinking through before, during and after, nor without the necessary community-building skills of supporting, challenging and developing. To change the analogy, the task is akin to that of an actor preparing for a role—studying and establishing the life of a role necessarily precedes putting it into physical form: "The preparatory work on a role can be divided into three great periods: studying it; establishing the life of the role; putting it into physical form" (Stanislavski, 1961, p. 3).

It is no accident that in all its manifestations the new leadership literature has placed prominent attention on the role of vision in individual and organizational development. And vision, of course, implies an orientation to and awareness of the future—without an image of the future there is no good reason for changing what we do now. Why change or learn when we have nowhere we want to go? However, for organizations caught in the culture of entitlement, there is no internal or intrinsic pressure to learn, to change, or develop. However illusory, the status quo is something to manage, to be preserved. In Bardwick's (1995) analysis, the culture of entitlement is the result of too much generosity: People are given what they expect, are not held responsible for meeting criteria of excellence, and have so much security that they do not have to earn their rewards. In this environment, "the future" is a concept that constrains rather than liberates, frightens rather than enriches. For those comfortable with themselves and in their organizations, any prospect of change to the here and now either from within through the establishment and dissemination of a new

vision for the organization or from outside in response to unpredictable and largely uncontrollable forces, the culture of entitlement (stability and certainty) almost inevitably yields under pressure of change (instability and uncertainty) to a culture of fear. To quote the playwright Tennessee Williams (1957), "The future is called 'perhaps', which is the only possible thing to call the future. And the important thing is not to allow that to scare you." But the task of the leader is to create, communicate, and build commitment to a vision—an image of the future for the organization—to manage the dream.

This requires a different attitude to and stance toward the future. Conventional strategic planning and envisioning, as with the conventional approach to forecasting in economic and business decision models, works from the present and recent past to establish a basis for deciding what the future may be. This approach is fundamentally flawed. As Eliasson's (1996) work confirms, forecasts are most likely to be accurate when they are least needed, in circumstances in which the near future is the same as the recent past. But where there are major destabilizations of context, either in the changing interrelationships of key variables which have not been captured in the model or in the environment itself, forecasting rapidly proves difficult, if not impossible, and the subject of ridicule. As such, the key challenge for leadership is the development of the skills of reading the future, of identifying the emerging fracture lines or discontinuities in the social and economic system and of effectively building the ensemble to respond to these.

This, of course, has its precedent in literature. As the novelist Antoine de Saint-Exupery's (1984) expressed it, "as for the Future, your task is not to foresee, but to enable it" (p. 50). This perspective is not a new one and can be traced back, taking a cue from emphasis on the magical elements in leadership, to the instruction given to the young king-to-be Arthur by Merlyn the magician, as reported in T.H. White's (1938) novel, *The Sword in the Stone*:

"Ah yes", said Merlyn. "Now ordinary people are born forwards in Time, if you understand what I mean, and nearly everything in the world goes forward too. This makes it quite easy for the ordinary people to live. . . . But unfortunately I was born at the wrong end of time, and I have to live backwards from in front, while surrounded by a lot of people living forwards from behind, (p. 40)

This perspective changes how the present is viewed. No longer an accumulation of the past, the present is an enactment of the future, and the significance of present events and decisions is determined in the light of future states.

The magician Merlyn had a strange laugh, and it was heard when nobody else was laughing. He laughed at the beggar who was bewailing his fate as he lay stretched on a dunghill; he laughed at the foppish young man who was making a great fuss about choosing a pair of shoes. He laughed because he knew that deep in a dunghill was a golden cup that would have made the beggar a rich man; he laughed because he knew that the pernickety young man would be stabbed in a quarrel before the soles of his new shoes were soiled. *He laughed because he knew what was coming next* (Davies, 1990, pp. 652-653; emphasis in original).

In other words, the Merlin principle suggests that strategy as a vehicle for the exercise of leadership in organisations works backwards. Instead of a decision tree bifurcating outward from the present, representing one present and multiple futures, we see the establishment of a vision, an arena of possibilities (Sidney Bechet's 'road'), with a strategy to reach that vision constructed backward in time. Because at each stage there are likely to be a number of alternative points from which the next stage is a possibility, we can envisage a single future with multiple presents. It is within this framework that Karl Weick's arguments that corporate strategies are the post facto rationalisations of past decision events rather than the template for future actions assume significance for our understanding of organizational life.

To do this successfully requires communication and the building of commitment - persuasion. The challenge is that facing the actor before every performance: "If someone asked me to put in one sentence what acting was, I should say that acting is the art of persuasion. The actor persuades himself, first, and through himself, the audience" (Sir Lawrence Olivier, quoted in Cole & Chinoy, 1970, p. 410). The leader must first persuade her- or himself and through that, and only through that, the other members of the organization. And, as with the actor, every successive audience must feel that it is witnessing the enactment for the very first time: "Each successive audience before which [the performance] is given must feel, not think or reason about, but feel—that it is witnessing, not one of a thousand weary repetitions, but a life episode that is being lived just across the magic barrier of the footlights" (William Hooker Gillette, quoted in Cole & Chinoy, 1970, p. 565).

This emphasis on the applicability of artistic performance as a metaphor for leadership activity reinforces our earlier references to the role of practice theory or theory-in-use and the metaphor of jazz as symbolic performance to provide a deeper appreciation of leadership as neither art nor science, but as practice. In the metaphor of leadership as performance, organizations become in part creative fictions, the structured stories we create to impose order on and create meaning in the world. Accordingly,

a few words must be said here on the sort of imaginative meaning achieved by actions . . . on the meaning of an actor's performance on the stage. A play does not speak of real persons or of actual events: the actor's part is to represent persons and actions imagined by the writer. He must respond by his own imagination to that of the author, and, thus guided, he must embody the part assigned to him. (Polanyi & Prosch, 1975,p.117)

In so doing, it is important to understand the precise role of rules, explicit and explicable, in this process of achieving imaginative meaning: "Rules of art can be useful, but they do not determine the practice of an art; they are maxims, which can serve as a guide to an art only if they can be integrated into the practical knowledge of the art. They cannot replace this knowledge" (Polanyi, 1962, p. 50). More specifically, although made in the context of a discussion of scientific research method rather than leadership practice,

method cannot always be avoided—a singer, for example, must sing a certain way, or he will get hoarse. Quite true! But such a "certain way" cannot be caught in fixed

and stable rules which is why there are various schools of singing and why a singer who violates basic rules shared by almost all schools may still sing better than his rule-bound colleagues. (Feyerabend, 1978, p. 189)

Given, therefore, that as in these examples, leadership-as-practice is indeed a practice that cannot be specified in rule-bound detail, it follows that it cannot be transmitted by prescription because no prescription for it exists. It can be passed on only by example from master to apprentice. In so doing, and only in so doing, the new leader will begin to engage the process of organizational change and development. As with the improvising jazz band, as indeed in the case of artistic expression on the stage, the new leader will have to emphasize the importance of paying attention to the non-rule-bound, non-rational, intuitive, mythical side of life in companies, for no other reason than that the planned, reasoned, systematic approaches to leadership development are not sufficient. As individuals, we cannot transform ourselves by logic alone; we need to make some intuitive leap, to play a wild card, to inject some random element, to introduce new and unexpected variety. So it is with leadership in organizations. Increasingly the process of envisioning will be grounded in the tales, rumours, legends, myths and dreams people use in organisations to describe their experiences. In so doing, fundamental human values become more important and prominent in organizational life. To quote John Keating, the Robin Williams character in the film *Dead Poets Society*, "No matter what anybody tells you, words and ideas can change the world". Increasingly those ideas and words have their roots not in the "concrete acts logically determined" view of organizational life which has been Barnard's (1938) legacy to organizational studies, but in the aesthetic, supra-analytic perspective:

We don't read and write poetry because it's cute. We read and write poetry because we are members of the human race, and the human race is filled with passion. Medicine, law, business, engineering—these are noble pursuits, necessary to sustain life. But poetry, beauty, romance, love: these are what we stay alive for. ("John Keating")

The task of a leader is to restore these higher values to the life of people in organizations, to build a connection between the noble pursuit of business and the values we stay alive for.

## CONCLUSION

It has been fundamental to the argument in this paper that many current approaches to leadership development, including particularly the competence approach, are flawed in resting on unsustainable propositions and in being grounded in an inadequate view of the organization and organizational membership. This approach does not provide an adequate basis for the development and redevelopment of organizations in a world of change. An alternative approach, moving beyond competence, has been presented which is based on four fundamental positions: an acceptance of creativity, a restoration of leadership, an orientation to the future, and the creation and communication of vision. These collectively arise out of a metaphorical view of leadership as practice which is anchored in the metaphor of jazz improvisation as artistic performance. Two points are made in conclusion.

First, it is necessary for both those leading and working in organizations and those thinking about organizations to recognize that organizational transformation is dependent on a very different set of characteristics than those with which we have become familiar. The ideal of the organization as a smoothly running machine, clean and austere effective, becomes dangerous. Rather, from a postmodern perspective, organizational survival depends ultimately on the insinuation of polyglot, immersion in metaphor, and the prevalence of creative confusion. Rather than autonomous, self-directing leaders, thoroughgoing interdependence and the quality of relatedness replaces the character of the individual as the centre of concern.

Second, for the individual as leader, at whatever level that leadership is exercised, whatever the instrument played in the jazz band, the image of the leader as broker of the dream is a powerful one. The visionary as dreamer (and a vision is, in a real sense, a waking dream) is often taken pejoratively, the dream viewed as the antithesis of action. However, as the Irish playwright and poet W.B. Yeats reminds us, "in dreams begins responsibility". The challenge is to accept that responsibility and to act on it. In so doing, Henry David Thoreau's words serve as a call to action:

If one advances confidently in the direction of his dreams, and endeavours to live the life he has imagined, he will meet with a success in common hours. . . . If you have built castles in the air, your work need not be lost. It is where they should be. Now put the foundation under them.

## REFERENCES

- Alvesson M and Spicer A (2012) A stupidity-based theory of organizations, *Journal of Management Studies*, 49, 1194-1220
- Attali, J. (1985). *Noise: The political economy of music*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bardwick, J. M. (1995). *Danger in the comfort zone*. New York: Amacom.
- Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Barrow, J. D. (1991). *Theories of everything: The quest for ultimate explanation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bauman, R. (1977). *Verbal art as performance*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bechet, S. (1980). *Treat it gentle*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Bolden R and Gosling J (2006) Leadership Competencies: Time to Change the Tune? *Leadership*, 2, 147-163.
- Brown, J. S. (1993). Presentation. In M. Crossan et al. (Eds.), *Learning in organizations* (pp. 89-99). London: Western Business School, University of Western Ontario.
- Buttimer, A. (1983). *Creativity and context: A seminar report*. Lund, Sweden: Clark, Gleerup.
- Carroll B, Levy L and Richmond D (2008) Leadership as Practice: Challenging the Competency Paradigm, *Leadership* 4, 363-379,
- Cole, T., & Chinoy, H. K. (Eds.). (1970). *Actors on acting: The theories, techniques and practices of the world's great actors told in their own words*. New York: Crown.
- Cowley, M. (1956). *Exile's detour*. New York: Viking.
- Crossan M and Sorrenti M (1997) Making sense of improvisation. In Walsh JP, Huff AS, *Advances in strategic management* 14, 155-180
- Davies, R. (1990). *The Deptford trilogy: Fifth business: The manticore: World of wonder*. New York: Viking Press.
- de Saint-Exupery, A. (1984). *The wisdom of the sands*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dick, P. K. (1968). Introduction: How to build a universe that doesn't fall apart two days later. In M. Hurst & P. Williams (Eds.), *I hope I shall arrive soon* (pp. 7-34). London: Gollanez.
- Eliasson G (1996) *Firm Objectives, Controls and Organization: the Use of Information and the Transfer of Knowledge within the Firm*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Evans, B. (1959) *Improvisation in jazz* [Liner notes]. Miles Davis: Kind of Blue. CBS 460603 2.
- Fagan, E. R. (1984). Competence in educational practice: A rhetorical perspective. In E.C. Short (Ed.), *Competence: Inquiries into its meaning and acquisition in educational settings* (pp. 71-86). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

- Fey T (2012) *Bossypants*. Sphere: New York
- Feyerabend, P. K. (1978). *Science in a free society*. London: New Left Books.
- Flach L and Antonella CS (2011) Improvisation and learning processes in organizations: a metaphor applying the Brazilian rhythm Choro, *Salvador* 18, 681-699
- Fordham, J. (1993, July 26). A colossus steps forward. *The Guardian*, section 2, p. 6.
- Frost A and Yarrow R (eds) (2015) *Improvisation in drama, theatre and performance*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Palgrave
- Gellner, E. (1993, July 3-4). What do we need now? Social anthropology and its new global context. *The Times Literary Supplement*, p. 16.
- Giles S (2016) The most important leadership competencies, according to leaders around the world, *Harvard Business Review*, <https://hbr.org/2016/03/the-most-important-leadership-competencies-according-to-leaders-around-the-world/>? Accessed 25 October 2016
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The condition of postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Koestler, A. (1964). *The act of creation*. New York: Macmillan.
- Küpers W Pauleen D J (eds). (2013) *A Handbook of Practical Wisdom: Leadership, Organization and Integral Business Practice*. Gower Publishing
- Lomax, A. (1993). *The land where blues began*. London: Methuen.
- Lynd R S (1939) *Knowledge for what? The place of social science in American culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press
- Menuhin, Y. (1972). *Theme and variations*. New York: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Messick, S. (1975, October). The standard problem: Meaning and values in measurement and observation. *American Psychologist*, 955-966.
- Mestrovic, S. G. (1992). *The coming fin de siecle: An application of Durkheim's sociology to modernity and postmodernism*. London: Routledge.
- Morgan, G. (1988). *Riding the waves of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Moustakas, C. E. (1977). *Creative life*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Nanry, C., & Berger, E. (1979). *The jazz text*. New York: Van Nostrand.
- Ogren, K. J. (1989). *The jazz revolution: Twenties America and the Meaning of jazz*. New York and London: Oxford University Press.
- Polanyi, M. (1962) *Personal knowledge: Towards a post-critical philosophy*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Polanyi, M., & Prosch, H. (1975). *Meaning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rosenau, P. M. (1992). *Post-modernism and the social sciences*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Schechner, R. (1977). *Essays on performance theory 1970-1976*. New York: Drama Books.

- Schumacher, E. F. (1979). *Good work*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Siddall G and Waterman E (2016) (eds) *Negotiated moments: improvisation, sound and subjectivity*. Duke University Press
- Spector B (2014) Flawed from the “Get-Go”: Lee Iacocca and the origins of transformational leadership, *Leadership* 10, 361-379
- Stanislavski, C. (1961). *Creating a role*. New York: Theatre Arts Books
- Sternberg, R. J. (1985) *Beyond IQ: A triarchic theory of human intelligence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Thoreau H D (2004/1854) *Walden & Civil Disobedience*. Signet Classics
- Turner, F. W. (1969). Black jazz artists: The darker side of Horatio Alger. *The Massachusetts Review*, 10, 341-353.
- Turner, V. (1974). *Drama, fields and metaphors*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Turner, V. (1977). Frame, flow and reflection: Ritual drama as public liminality. In M. Brenamou & C. Ceramillo (Eds.), *Performance in post-modern culture*. Madison, WI: Coda Press.
- Vaill, P. (1989). *Managing as a performing art*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Van Knippenberg D and Sitkin S B (2013): A Critical Assessment of Charismatic —Transformational Leadership Research: Back to the Drawing Board?, *The Academy of Management Annals*, 7:1, 1-60
- Wenger, E. (1991, Fall) Communities of practice: Where learning happens. *Benchmark*, pp. 6-8.
- White, T. H. (1938). *The sword in the stone*. London: William Collins Sons.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1967/1925). *Science in the modern world*. New York: The Free Press.
- Williams, T. (1957) The past, present and perhaps. In *Orpheus Descending*.