MICHIGAN
ROSS SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

Released 05/17/2005

From the Center for
Positive Organizational Scholarship

WORKING PAPER SERIES

Entering the Fundamental State of Leadership: A Framework for the Positive Transformation of Self and Others

Forthcoming in Burk, R. & Cooper, C. (Eds.) *Inspiring Leaders*, London: Routledge.

By

Robert E. Quinn
M.E. Tracy Collegiate Professor Business Administration;
Professor Management and Organizations

Gretchen M. Spreitzer
Professor of Management and Organizations

LEADING IN THOUGHT AND ACTION

> "Although learning about how the environment influences actors is important, learning more about how actors influence the environment is the first step not only to understanding the world, but changing it (Ganz: 2005: 231)."

In the extensive literature on leadership there are hundreds of definitions and new ones keep coming. There is, however, a theme that runs across most of the definitions. Leadership is about influencing people (Yukl, 1998). Much of the literature assumes self-interested social exchange and focuses on the influence wielded by people in positions of hierarchical authority. A smaller segment of the literature focuses on transformational leadership. Here the emphasis is on getting people to transcend their self interests and embrace the common good (Shamir, House & Arthur, 1993). This paper will focus on positive transformational influence. More specifically, we will provide a framework that anyone might use to elevate themselves into a higher state of transformational influence.

We follow Hackman (2005) who calls for theories that bridge the two worlds of scholarship and practice. He notes that while scholars tend to be concerned with causes, practitioners tend to be concerned with outcomes. Nevertheless, it is possible, he argues, to generate frameworks that are both conceptually sound and able to guide constructive action. We seek to do this by generating ideas that lend themselves to empirical examination as well as practice. We present a theoretical framework that is designed to be of value to both scholars and practitioners.

We present a framework derived from the analysis of people facing extreme challenges (Quinn, 2004). The people were forced by their extreme challenges to extend themselves in ways that they would never have predicted. In the process, they experienced some form of personal transformation. After facing the challenges, they reported, among other things, having an altered self-concept, an increased awareness of external resources and the tendency to engage in new patterns of behavior. They report having an increased capacity to lift other people to higher levels of performance. From the analysis of such

cases, Quinn specifies a concept called the fundamental state of leadership (Quinn, 2004; 2005). He indicates that people are often driven by naturally occurring challenges or trigger events (Luthans & Avolio, 2003) to higher levels of integrity and greater capacity to exert transformational influence.

From such events, he argues, it is possible to derive an applied framework – called the Fundamental State of Leadership (FSL) -- that anyone can choose to employ. Here we elaborate the FSL framework. Table 1 highlights the four core dimensions that make up the fundamental state of leadership: intention, integrity, subordination and adaptability. In the sections below, we provide an overview of the framework by elaborating on its key elements and tying them to relevant academic literature. This link to the literature makes evident the central mechanisms and how they might relate to each other.

Table 1 goes about here

The Fundamental State of Leadership Framework

The Normal State

As human beings, we seek to reduce uncertainty and create conditions of equilibrium (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002; Langer, 2002). Under conditions of increased certainty and equilibrium, we tend to know how to do what we need to do. Any learning that is required tends to be incremental in nature, and we feel a relative sense of comfort and control. Under such normal conditions, relationships tend to be organized around assumptions of instrumental exchange (Blau, 1971). Under these conditions we develop conscious theories of status, role and identity and tend to employ self-interested strategies of resource acquisition. When we get feedback suggesting we need to make a significant change, we tend to resist making such a change to our existing concepts and theories (Langer, 2002). As the first line of Table 1 indicates, in this normal state we tend to

become increasingly comfort-centered, externally-directed, self-focused and internally-closed.

Comfort-centered. To be comfort-centered means we organize our lives to stay on the path of least resistance, to stay in our zone of comfort, to do that which we already know how to do (Fritz, 1989). We seek to avoid or reduce uncertainty to preserve our current mindset. Yet the world keeps changing, and this rigidity results in losing the very control we seek to preserve (Langer, 2002). We end up in a reactive orientation. The emphasis is on problem solving or the preservation of what is. It is not on the creation of new outcomes or contributions.

This pattern occurs naturally. To be comfort-centered is to be grounded in a hedonic perspective on life where individuals seek out comfortable and pleasurable experiences (Waterman, 1993). The hedonic perspective is common. It is a normal part of human nature for us to spend much of our time being comfort-centered and living reactive lives, while we claim to be pursuing the proactive creation of new outcomes. This is a normal self-deception. It is an erosion of personal integrity not only because it is deceptive but, because it a disintegration, or separation, of our potential from our contribution. We are not giving what we are capable of giving. And the inability to pursue a significant purpose may increase feelings such as futility and meaninglessness.

Externally-Driven. Under normal conditions, relationships are organized around assumptions of scarce resources, norms of exchange, and the exercise of hierarchical authority. Consequently, it is natural to pay great attention to those people who have more power and influence (Fiske, 1993; Kramer & Gavrieli, 2005). We imagine their assessments of our contributions and act upon those imagined assessments. This self-monitoring behavior is necessary to social life (Snyder, 1987). Yet, over time we may become increasingly concerned about the assessments of others. As we do, we become more externally-directed and cease to live by our own core values. We take on an increasingly external locus of control (Rotter, 1966). As we do, we may live in fear of enacting our core values and simply behave in ways that we assume the world expects.

We thus present an acceptable, common self and fail to enact our more authentic, unique, or best self (Roberts, Dutton, Spreitzer, Heaphy & Quinn, 2005).

This process is also normal. We tend to spend much of our time living as we imagine we are expected to live. We comply by espousing a particular perspective or engaging in certain behaviors while exhibiting limited commitment to the perspective or the behaviors (Argyris, 1993). In engaging this kind of normal behavior we experience the disintegration of our values and behavior, and we may experience feelings of insecurity and fear, causing us to become still more externally focused.

Self-focused. In order to survive, nature requires that we be self-focused *(*Kegan, 1994*)*. In a world of limited resources, we must pursue self-interested strategies. In social relationships, we must also engage in patterns of exchange that allow us to acquire needed resources. As we become focused on the acquisition of resources and the execution of self-interested exchange, we may also tend to exercise various forms of egocentric control. In doing so, we may tend to objectify others, see them as instruments to be manipulated for our ends. As a result, we are likely to lose the capacity to understand and honor their perspectives (Galinsky, Gruenfeld, & Magee, 2002). In exercising control without concern, we may gain short term compliance but build long-term resentment (Quinn, Spreitzer & Brown, 2000).

This process is normal. We spend large amounts of time being self-interested and attempting to negotiate and control. Yet the need to be in control may destroy trust and the willingness of others to engage in spontaneous contribution (Quinn & Spreitzer, 1997). Even as others comply, they send us tacit messages that they are withdrawing their emotional support. As we gain intuitive or conscious awareness of their withdrawal, the awareness may lead us to further increase our efforts at control (Mayer, Davis & Schoorman, 1995) and this may initiate a vicious cycle. This self-defeating pattern represents the disintegration of relationships (Dutton, 2003), and it may give rise to negative feelings such as isolation and loneliness.

Internally-Closed. In a world that is constantly changing there is pressure to adapt. While we may be comfortable with incremental or controlled adaptation, we tend to resist the process of deep change which requires the surrender of control and the risk of real time learning (Quinn, 1996). When we receive feedback that suggests we need to make deep change, we tend to engage in various forms of denial (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002). We distort the messages we receive, insisting that the world is still best represented in the images and categories derived from our past experience (Langer, 2002).

This process is also normal. External feedback that suggests we need to change is often met with the deployment of defensive routines (Argyris, 1993). As we protect our existing images and categories, we experience the disintegration or separation of knowledge and learning. We adhere to what we know and resist adapting to the changing world. As we do this we tend to experience feelings of defensiveness and stagnation.

In summary, the normal state is a condition of equilibrium in which natural, entropic forces tend to operate. In the normal state, we tend to become comfort-centered, externally-directed, self-focused and internally-closed. We tend to become increasingly disintegrated and self-deceptive and therefore hypocritical. Paradoxically, as we describe below, this seemingly negative sentence, is actually an identification of an enormous source of potential for transformational influence.

Entering the Fundamental State of Leadership

To enter the fundamental state of leadership is to increase personal influence. The approach taken here does not begin with trait-like leadership characteristics that are more stable (Bass, 1990), but on the state-like characteristics that are more amenable to change (Luthans & Avolio, 2003). It focuses in on our own current state of being. More specifically it focuses on a topic we prefer to avoid, our own current lack of integrity and virtue.

The capacity to learn in anxiety is a distinguishing feature of effective leaders (Hackman, 2005). Weick (2003: 68) indicates that positive organizing "occurs concurrent with

wading into circumstances and dealing with whatever unexpected events occur using tools that themselves were unexpected recombinations of existing repertoires." To lead is to be adaptive, to make personal change and to help others change (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002). Schein (1996) suggests that personal change happens when we unfreeze our defenses and look internally to determine what is ultimately important to us. Torbert (1987) suggests that the confidence to learn in the face of uncertainty is a function of integrity. He goes on to suggest that we build our integrity through the constant self-monitoring or increasing awareness of our lack of integrity.

The literature lends support to such assertions. In terms of awareness, research on self-change shows that people who effectively transform follow a pattern in which commitment to change is preceded by increased consciousness, increased awareness of alternatives, emotional arousal, and self-reevaluation (Prochaska, Norcross & DiClemente, 1994). In terms of integrity and confidence, the literature suggests that integrity is associated with increased self-esteem, self-regard, productive interpersonal relationships, teamwork and a positive climate (Cameron, 2003).

Following this line of thought, we assert that we can increase our integrity and virtue, by becoming more conscious of both our hypocrisy and our potential. Csikszentmihalyi (1991) suggests that how we develop is determined by how we allocate our attention. Here we identify four questions that can redirect our attention and elevate our current psychological state

It is important that the elements are posed in the form of questions. The process of asking ourselves questions has several important effects that stimulate a person to action. First, asking questions enhances mindfulness. Mindfulness is the ability to pay attention to an experience from moment to moment —without drifting into thoughts of the past or concerns about the future, or getting caught up in opinions about what's going on (Langer, 1990). Langer suggests that if we want to change things in our lives, we need to change the way we think about ourselves. These questions can help us change our self-perspective. And second, by asking ourselves questions, we move from a passive state to

a more active state. We could just tell people about the fundamental state of leadership, but the process of asking people a series of questions moves them to think about what the fundamental state of leadership means for them. The asking process puts people into an inquiry mode which enhances thinking and action (Torbert, 2004).

What result do I want to create?

To be comfort-centered is to move on the path of least resistance (Fritz, 1989). Fritz argues that this is the normal life stance and that it is inherently reactive. In a hedonic perspective, we are continually solving problems and fighting fires, trying to preserve equilibrium to increase our happiness and stay within our zone of comfort. In problem solving, we are trying to make something negative go away (Fritz, 1989). In contrast, the question "What result do I want to create?" is grounded in a eudaimonic perspective on psychological functioning and development (Fritz, 1989; Waterman, 1993). In simple terms, the eudaimonic perspective emphasizes that we seek to realize our full potential as human beings. Living in accordance with the daimon or "true self", this approach gives meaning and direction to our life. In answering the question, "what result to I want to create," we are challenged to think outside our comfort zone. Asking and answering this question moves us to a more eudaimonic state where we seek to make a contribution and make a different to the world. To ask the question, "What result do I want to create," is to put an emphasis on envisioning future achievements and triggering a shift in attention form actuality to possibility.

To ask and answer the question, what result do I want to create, is to identify something positive that we want to bring into existence. It creates a self-determined, positive discrepancy that may trigger transcendent behaviors (Phillips, Hollenbeck, & Ilgen, 1996). It is a shift from a reactive to a proactive orientation and is likely to result in an increase of positive feelings including sense of commitment, purpose and meaning. These may be associated with other positive characteristics such as intrinsic motivation and a tendency to persist in what we are doing (Csikszenmihalyi, 1991; Myers and Diener, 1995; Bateman & Porath, 2003). These in turn can take on characteristics of the self-fulfilling prophecy or virtuous cycle (Eden, 2003; Fredrickson, 2003).

With an elevated sense of purpose, we are more likely to engage in some of the behaviors associated with what Bass (1997) calls inspirational motivation. Because we are pursuing a creative purpose, we are more likely to be able to articulate a compelling vision, to challenge people, increase their sense of urgency, and help them find greater meaning in their work. Such behaviors are likely to surface hopeful aspirations and entice others to engage challenge. Doing so is likely to make their work more intrinsically rewarding (Ryan & Deci, 2001). In a group, such dynamics are likely to result in a sense of shared purpose. People may begin to develop a compelling personal vision of their own future (Bennis, 1989). Having a personal vision may also help people to find their tasks more interesting, challenging and important; they may also set higher goals and have higher trust in the leader (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996). These kinds of changes may infuse the group with hope (Snyder, 1994) and optimism (Seligman, 1998). Such feelings may result in greater dedication and persistence. It may also inspire awe in others increasing the possibility that one person's transformational influence may inspire others to change (Keltner & Haidt, 2003; Fredrickson, 2003).

Am I internally-driven? To be in the normal state is to attend to the expectations of others. As we do, we tend to drift towards an external locus of control and are likely to experience disintegration between our values and behavior, resulting in feelings of insecurity and fear (Spreitzer & Quinn, 1997). Such feelings tend to increase our need to impress and control others, and we may attempt to present ourselves as we imagine we are expected to act (Snyder, 1987). When we do this, others may sense a lack of authenticity and tend to distance themselves (Luthans & Avolio, 2003). The distancing may then further stimulate our insecurities, and we may accelerate the vicious cycle.

Here the question "am I internally driven" directs our attention to our fears and the need to clarify our values. To ask this question is to shift attention to the ways we are externally controlled and specify the need to take a more internal locus of control (Rotter, 1966). The shift requires value clarification (Quinn, Spreitzer, & Brown, 2000). Value clarification leads to a sense of personal growth and awareness that we are becoming the

kind of person we want to be (Prochaska, DiClemente & Norcross, 1992). We thus increase our sense of meaning (Ganz, 2005). In the process of value clarification and change, we reorganize our self-concept and become more self-aware and better able to regulate our feelings, thoughts and behaviors. We are more naturally able to present an integrated or authentic self (Luthans & Avolio, 2003). We are likely to feel an increased sense of integrity, courage and authenticity. These and other positive emotions associated with moral progress and growth are likely to increase our awareness of previously unnoticed resources and thus increase our sense of confidence or efficacy (Fredrickson, 2003). Increased self-efficacy is associated with increased willingness to accept a challenge, to invest effort and to persist in the face of obstacles (Bandura, 1997). Notice that the positive outcomes derived from asking this second question begin to overlap with the positive outcomes derived from asking the first question.

As we courageously act from our core values, we may infect others with feelings of strength and courage (Worline & Quinn, 2003). In this way, we stimulate increased collective awareness and realism (Goleman, Boyatzis & McKee, 2002). We are also more likely to engage in those behaviors associated with what Bass (1997) calls idealized influence. Free of external expectations and full of confidence, we are more likely to be spontaneous and model unconventional behaviors. As we more confidently pursue an intrinsically motivating purpose, we may insist on dealing with the reality hidden by political dynamics and thus engage others in the positive confrontation of ideas. This surfacing of conflict may offend some but inspire others. Increasingly honest and authentic communication may give rise to a shared sense of reality and increased accuracy in the work of the group or organization (Weick, 2003).

Am I Other-focused? It is normal to be self-focused. Yet self-focused behavior and "sham altruism" is readily recognized by others and leads others to withdraw their commitment and support (Messick, 2005). We then tend to experience the disintegration of the self-other relationship, and we tend to live with feelings of isolation and loneliness. To ask the question "am I other-focused" is to increase our awareness of our isolating self-interest and our need to operate from the good of the relationship, group,

organization or society. To do so is to recognize our interdependence and the fact we live in a social ecology. That which we put into the ecology tends to return to us. If we objectify others we are likely to be objectified.

The question thus challenges us to recognize our interdependence and shift from a self-focus to a more communal orientation (Spreitzer, Quinn & Fletcher, 1995). This means seeking to build a community in which everyone identifies with the group and puts the common good first (Hogg, 2003). Fletcher (1998) and Kegan (1994) emphasize the critical role that relationships and community play in moving people to higher levels of moral development and action. People in the fundamental state of leadership touch others' hearts by building deep, engaging relationships that go beyond the basic notions of exchange and self-interest (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002; Parker & Axtell, 2001).

In such a group we transcend norms of exchange and operate by norms of generalized reciprocity (Putnam, 2001). As we turn to such a communal and perhaps synergistic orientation we are more likely to experience the positive emotions of empathy and concern and increase the likelihood of feeling attachment, expressing love and engaging in sacrifice for others (Dutton, Worline, Frost, & Lilius, 2005). Such behaviors tend to build deep levels of trust and engagement (Greenleaf & Spear, 2002; Weick, 2003).

When we put the common good first we are more likely to engage in behaviors having to do with individualized consideration (Bass, 1997). These include providing support, encouragement and coaching so as to raise the confidence of others and entice them to engage in challenges that help them empower themselves (Spreitzer & Quinn, 1996). To be more other-focused is to thus attract others to live beyond assumptions of self-interest (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002). The group gains a shared sense of identity and the members of the group are more likely to engage in self-sacrificing and caring behaviors that attract still others to a collective focus, increasing harmony, and stimulating extra effort for the benefit of others (Bagozzi, 2003; Fredrickson, 2003). Hogg (2005) notes that when we develop such strong, empathic bonds and a common in-

group identity, it becomes nearly impossible for us to coerce or harm group members because doing so is nearly equivalent to coercing or harming ourselves.

Am I Externally-Open*?* To be internally-closed is to experience the disintegration of knowledge and learning. We may become so attached to what we know that we avoid the risk of learning that which might disconfirm what we know (Langer, 2002; Weick, 2003). This suggests the need for a high level of adaptive capacity (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002). To ask the question "am I externally-open" is to increase awareness of our closed state and the fact we are not moving forward into the anxiety associated with real time learning (Hackman, 2005). The question may thus increase our awareness of the need for constant adaptation in a world of continuous change. If we commit to move forward into uncertainty, we are usually forced to shift from an orientation of knowing, to an orientation of exploration; this shift may result in feelings of increased vulnerability, interest, alertness, and insight (Weick, 2003). We may gain the motivation to seek out the challenges that will extend our capacities for learning (Ryan & Deci, 2001). In exploration, we are also likely to recognize the necessity for interdependence and realize that our success is dependent upon giving and receiving accurate feedback (Avolio, 1999). By responding to feedback, we tend to increase trust (Ashford & Cummings, 1983). With increased trust, we are more likely to experience the emergence of the group mind and the increased capacity to improvise, strategize and co-create (Ganz, 2005; Weick, 2003). Again, notice how asking this question produces outcomes that overlap with outcomes stimulated by previous questions.

As we move through uncertainty, our learning is likely to generate new strategic insights and draw us to behave in new ways and to share our insights with others. We are more likely to engage in the behaviors associated with intellectual stimulation (Bass, 1997). Operating from an expanded consciousness, we are more likely to help others to discover new perspectives and develop new values and attitudes that then give rise to extra role behaviors (Tyler, 2005). Such shifts in values may alter our cognitive structures and put us in a condition in which we are better able to "imaginatively recontextualize" the environment and thus identify new resources and opportunities (Ganz, 2005). In doing

so, we are more likely to gain a shared sense of efficacy and increase collective resilience (Sutcliffe & Vogus, 2003).

Discussion

This paper argues that in social life there is a natural inclination towards comfort, external control, self-interest, and stagnation. In the normal state, the self is becoming increasingly less integrated and energized. It is dying. The fundamental state of leadership is a psychologically elevated state in which we experience an increase in creative intention, integrity, subordination and adaptation. This means we are striving to create something new, we have the courage to enact our truest feelings, we do so within the needs of the larger context and we do it with the humility to learn and grow. As we move towards this higher level of functioning, we experience a sense of self-repair, self-renewal, rebirth, reintegration or being made whole. It is a state of optimum balance in which normal polarities are transcended.

The fundamental state of leadership is a state of optimal balance in which we are more likely to challenge others to envision possibility, engage reality, build community and move forward in learning. The framework thus opens a connection between the literature on leadership and other areas such as peak performance, emotions and spirituality. The framework was originally derived from the analysis of people facing challenges that greatly exceeded their ability (Quinn, 2004; Spreitzer et al., 1995). The fundamental state of leadership is therefore a concept of episodic, peak performance. Like the concept of flow which was derived from the analysis of "just manageable" challenges (Csikszentmihalyi, 1991), it emphasizes, such things as engagement of a challenge, purposive focus, intrinsic motivation, reduced self-consciousness, attention to feedback, adaptive confidence, and increasing awareness. Yet the concept differs from flow in three ways. First, flow is an individualistic concept. There is no requirement of human relationship. The fundamental state of leadership is focused on self-alteration or the repair or reintegration of self while operating in relationships. It is about transformational influence. Second, the state of flow is amoral. The flow experience may derive from an ethical or unethical act. The fundamental state of leadership is more

ethically demanding. It requires increasing integrity on four dimensions including the integration of purpose and potential, values and behavior, self and others, knowledge and learning. Finally, the fundamental state of leadership integrates the state and the method for getting into the state. It is formulated around the four basic questions for transcending our normal hypocrisy and becoming a leader of transformational influence. It is, in this sense, simple and immediately applicable in any setting.

In our clinical work with executives, they often note that the four questions and the overall concept have spiritual undertones. In reflecting on this observation, we turned to the literature on spirituality and found clear support for our framework. In a review of the empirical literature on creativity in the emotional domain, for example, Averill (2002) discusses spirituality and the mysticism of everyday life. His discussion includes four elements which are very closely linked to our four questions. One is the integration of emotions with core beliefs and values. These are identified as true emotions as opposed to more spurious emotions. He notes that emotional truths that are realized in one situation are not necessarily stable and may lose their validity as the context changes. People are thus in need of constant self-repair. Consistent with our work, he indicates that true emotions are typically discovered during times of challenge and transition when values and beliefs must be modified. Confusion, depression and anxiety provide the context from which the true emotions emerge. Averill (2002) further suggests that true emotions are intensely felt and "reflect a state of clarification and resolve, an affirmation of values and self-worth" (our second question). Empirically associated with this condition of increased integrity and spirituality are three characteristics: vitality, meaning and connectedness. Vitality is a creative attitude in which a person is more adventurous and open to new experience (our fourth question). Meaning derives from a deeply felt experience that give rise to new interpretations and direction (our first question). Connectedness reflects an increased sense of union and harmony and may be associated with feelings of self-transcendence, being identified with something larger than the self (Our third question). These are in essence the same four dimensions that occur in our framework. They suggest that our four questions may be avenues to emotional self-repair and the elevation of interpersonal influence.

A next important step will be for researchers to test the framework empirically. A warning, however, is in order. In transcendent systems, normally differentiated positive categories tend to collapse (Munch, 1981: 1982). Normally polar, positive characteristics may become mutually reinforcing (Quinn, Kahn, & Mandl, 1994; Fredrickson, 2003; Weick 2003). As noted above, some of the outcomes called forward by one of the four questions may begin to overlap some of the outcomes called forward by the other questions. While the questions are different, they themselves are mutually reinforcing. In the study of transcendent people and groups, observers are likely to identify the presence of a particular positive characteristic and fail to notice the presence of a highly differentiated or paradoxical, positive characteristic (Bass, 1997:16; Schriesheim, House, & Kerr, 1976; Quinn, 2004: 89; Quinn, Spreitzer & Hart, 1992). Researchers are also likely to have difficulty with issues of discriminate validity because elements combine in a synergistic way. Therefore, more sophisticated methods, that can model the complex interpenetrations, may be necessary.

The framework is designed to assist people in elevating themselves and others to higher states of influence. This may be done by our asking ourselves the four questions or assisting others in asking themselves the four questions. Tools for facilitating this process can be found in Quinn (2005). Here, however, a warning is also appropriate. In our clinical work with executives, we find that it is not easy for them to ask and answer these questions. People think, for example, that in a given situation, they know what result they want to create. Their answers, however, tend to be superficial. Once they give their answer, we often ask them to ask "why" five times. In the process they eventually get to a greater state of clarity. When they do, their perspective begins to change. A similar dynamic holds for the other three questions. We suggest approaching the four questions mindfully and regularly. Practice with the questions greatly increases their utility.

In spite of these warnings, we believe that the fundamental state of leadership framework offers deep insight into how we can each better tap our transformational potential. The

framework challenges each of us to see our own possibilities for greatness. Many leadership theories look across people for attributes of greatness. This framework directs us to look for greatness within. The questions are designed to transform how we see ourselves and our context. They lead us to a more positive emotions, insights, behaviors and relationships. The increase the likelihood that we can influence our environment because in the fundamental state of leadership we better understand the nature of world and how we can change it by changing ourselves.

Table 1 Moving from the Normal State to the Fundamental State of Leadership

	Intention	Integrity	Subordination	Adaptability
It is normal to be:	Comfort Centered	Externally Directed	Self-focused	Internally Closed
Which may lead to disintegration of:	Potential & Contribution	Values & Behavior	Self & Others	Knowledge & Learning
Which may lead to feelings of:	Futility & Meaninglessness	Insecurity & Fear	Isolation & Loneliness	Defensiveness & Stagnation
Transformational question:	What result do I want to create?	Am I internally directed?	Am I other-focused?	Am I externally open?
The question may lead to:	Visualizing future possibility	Clarifying personal values	Recognizing interdependence	Recognizing the need to adapt
It may shift our focus form:	Reactive to proactive	External to internal	Self-focus to collective good	Certainty to exploration
Which may trigger positive feelings:	Commitment, purpose and meaning	Integrity, courage and authenticity	Attachment, empathy and self-sacrifice	Vulnerability, alertness and insight
Which may lead the actor to:	Pursuing a challenge	Modeling confidence	Building Trust	Sharing strategic Insight
And increase the frequency of transformational leadership behaviors:	Inspirational motivation: provide vision, enrich meaning of the work, increase challenge & urgency	Idealized influence: modeling unconventional behaviors, engaging reality, surfacing conflict	Individualized consideration: providing support, encouragement, coaching, raising confidence to meet the challenge	Intellectual stimulation: expand consciousness, create new perspective, develop new values
Creating in others a sense of:	Hopeful aspiration	Honest communication	Personal empowerment	Transcendent Understanding
And establishing a group with:	Shared sense of purpose and increased motivation	Shared sense of reality and increased accuracy	Shared sense of identity and increased cohesion	Shared sense of efficacy and increased resilience

References

Argyris, C. 1993. *Knowledge for action*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ashford, S.J., & Cummings, L.L. 1983. Feedback as an individual resource: Personal strategies for creating information. *Organization Behavior and Human Performance*, 32: 370-398.

Averill, J.R. (2002). Emotional Creativity: Toward "Spiritualizing the Passions." In Snyder, C.R., & Lopez, S.J. (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 172-188). New York: Oxford University Press.

Bagozzi, R. P. (2003). Positive and Negative Emotions in Organizations. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn, (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline* (pp. 176-193). San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Worth Publishers.

Bass, B. (1997). Transformational Leadership: Industrial, Military, and Educational Impact. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bass, B. (1990). Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership. New York: Free Press.

Bateman, T. S. & C. Porath (2003). Transcendent behavior. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn, (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline* (pp. 48-65). San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler.

Bennis, 1989. On becoming a leader. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Blau, P. (1971). *The structure of organizations*. New York: Basic books.

Cameron, K. S. (2003). Organizational Virtuousness and Performance. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn, (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline* (pp. 48-65). San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler.

Csikszentmihahlyi, M. (1991). Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience. New York: Perennial.

Dutton, J. (2003). *Energize your workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.

Dutton, J.E., Worline, M., Frost, P., & Lilius, J. 2005. Explaining compassion organizing competence. Ross School of Business, University of Michigan working paper.

Eden D. (2003). Self-fulfilling prophecies in organizations. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science* (2nd ed., pp. 91-122). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Fiske, S. T. (1993). Controlling other people: The impact of power on stereotyping. *American Psychologist*, 48, 621-628.

Fletcher, J.K. 1998. Relational practice: A feminist reconstruction of work. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 7, 163-186.

Franks, F. M. (1996). Battle Command: A Commander's Perspective. *Military Review*, May-June.

Fritz, R. (1998). *The Path of Least Resistance: Learning to Become the Creative Force in Your Own Life*. New York: Fawcett.

Fredrickson, B. J. (2003). Positive Emotions and Upward Spirals in Organizations. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn, (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline* (pp. 163-175). San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler.

Galinsky, A., Gruenfeld, D. & Magee, J.C. 2002. Power to action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83: 453-562.

Ganz, M. (2005). Why Davis Sometimes Wins: Strategic Capacity in Social Movements. In D. M. Messick & R. M. Kramer, (Eds.), *The Psychology of Leadership: New Perspectives and Research* (pp. 209-240). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. 2002. *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Greenleaf, R.K. & Spears, L.C. 2002. *Servant leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press.

Hackman, R. J. (2005). Rethinking Team Leadership or Team Leaders are not Music Directors. In D. M. Messick & R. M. Kramer, (Eds.), *The Psychology of Leadership: New Perspectives and Research* (pp. 115-142). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Harder, S. (2002). Authenicity. In Snyder, C.R., & Lopez, S.J. (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 382-394). New York: Oxford University Press.

Heifetz, R. & Linsky, M. 2002. *Leadership on the line: Staying alive through the dangers of leadership*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Hogg, M. A. (2005). Social Identity and Leadership. In D. M. Messick & R. M. Kramer, (Eds.), *The Psychology of Leadership: New Perspectives and Research* (pp. 53-80). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kegan, R. 1994. *In over our heads: The demands of modern life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Keltner, D., & Haidt, J . (2003). Approaching awe, a moral, spiritual, and aesthetic emotion. *Cognition and Emotion, 17*, 297-314

Kirkpatrick, S.A. & Locke, E. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership characteristics on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81: 36-51.

Kramer, R. M. & Gavrieli, D. (2005). The Perception of Conspiracy: Leader Paranoia as Adaptive Cognition. In D. M. Messick & R. M. Kramer, (Eds.), *The Psychology of Leadership: New Perspectives and Research* (pp. 241-274). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Langer, E. 1990. *Mindfulness*. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Langer, E. 2002. Well Being: Mindfulness Verses Positive Evaluation. In Snyder, C.R., & Lopez, S.J. (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 214-243). New York: Oxford University Press.

Lerner, H. G. (1993). *The Dance of Deception*. New Yourk: HarperCollins.

Luthans, F. & B. Avolio (2003). Authentic Leadership Development. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn, (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline* (pp. 241-258). San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler.

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 709-734.

Messick, D. M. (2005). On the Psychological Exchange Between Leaders and Followers. In D. M. Messick & R. M. Kramer, (Eds.), *The Psychology of Leadership: New Perspectives and Research* (pp. 81-96). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Munch, (1981). Talcott Parsons and the Theory of Action I: The Structure of the Kantian Core. *American Journal of Sociology*, 87, 709-739.

Munch, (1982). Talcott Parsons and the Theory of Action II:. The Continuity of Action. *American Journal of Sociology*, 88, 771-826.

Myers, D. G, & Diener, E. (1995). Who is happy? *Psychological Science*, 6, 10-19.

Parker, S.K.,& Axtell, C, (2001). Seeing another viewpoint: Antecedents and outcomes of employee perspective taking. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(6), 1085-2001.

Park, N. & C. M. Peterson (2003). Virtues and Organizations. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn, (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline* (pp. 33-47). San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler.

Peterson, C. & Seligman, M. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues. A handbook and classification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillips, G.M., Hollenbeck, J.R., & Ilgen, D. (1996). Prevalence and prediction of positive discrepancy creation: Examining a discrepancy between two self-regulation theories . *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5): 498-518.

Prochaska, J.O, DiClemente, C.C., & Norcorss, J.C. 1992. In search of the structure of change. In Y. Klar, A. Nadler, J.D. Fisher, & J.M. Chinsky (eds.), *Self change: Social psychological and clinical perspectives*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Putnam, R. (2001). Bowling Alone : The Collapse and Revival of American Community

Quinn, R. E. (1996). *Deep Change: Discovering the Leader Within*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Quinn, R. E. (2004). *Building the Bridge as You Walk on It: A Guide for Leading Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Quinn, R. E. (2005). Moments of Greatness: Entering the Fundamental State of Leadership. *Harvard Business Review*. Forthcoming July.

Quinn, R. E., Kahn, Joel, and Mandl, Michael, J. (1994). Perspectives on Organizational Change: Exploring Movement at the Interface. In J. Greenberg (Ed.) *Organizational Behavior: the State of the Science*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Quinn, R.E., Spreitzer, G., and Brown, M. (2000). Changing others through changing ourselves: The transformation of human systems. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 9(2), 147-164.

Quinn, Robert E., and Spreitzer, Gretchen M. (1997). The road to empowerment: Seven questions every leader should consider. *Organizational Dynamics*, 26(2), 37-51.

Quinn, Robert E., Spreitzer, Gretchen M., and Hart, Stuart. (1992). Challenging the assumptions of bipolarity: Interpenetration and effectiveness. In S. Srivastva and R. Fry (eds.) *Executive Continuity*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Roberts, Laura Morgan, Dutton, Jane, Spreitzer, Gretchen, Heaphy, Emily, & Quinn, Robert. (2005). Composing the reflected best self: Building pathways for becoming extraordinary in work organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(4).

Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. 2001. On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52:* 141-166.

Schein, E.H. 1996. Kurt Lewin's change theory in the field: Notes toward a model of managed learning. *Systematic Practice*, 9, 27-47.

Schriesheim, C.A., House, R.J., & Kerr, S. (1976). Leader initiating structure: A reconciliation of discrepant research results and some empirical tests. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 297-321.

Seligman, M. 1998. *Learned optimism: How to Change your Life and Mind*. New York: Free Press.

Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The Motivational Effects of Charismatic Leadership: A Self-concept Based Theory. *Organization Science*, 4, 1-17.

Snyder, M. (1987). *Public appearances/private realities: The psychology of self-monitoring*. New York: W.H. Freeman.

Snyder, C.R. (1994). *The Psychology of Hope: You can get there from here*. New York: The Free Press.

Spreitzer, G.M., and Quinn, R.E. (1996). Empowering middle managers to be transformational leaders. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 32(3), 237-261.

Spreitzer, G.M., Quinn, R.E., & Fletcher, J. 1995. Excavating the paths of meaning, renewal, and empowerment: A typology of managerial high performance. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 4, 16-39.

Sutcliffe, K. M. & T.J. Vogus (2003). In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn, (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline* (pp. 94-110). San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler.

Torbert, W. 1987. *Managing the corporate dream*. Homewood, IL Dow Jones-Irwin.

Torbert, W. 2004. *Action inquiry: The secret of timely and and transforming leadership*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Tyler, T. R. (2005). Process-Based Leadership: How do Leaders Lead? In D. M. Messick & R. M. Kramer, (Eds.), *The Psychology of Leadership: New Perspectives and Research* (pp. 163-190). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Waterman, A. S. 1993. Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness (eudaimonia) and hedonic enjoyment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64:* 678-691.

Watson, D. (2000). *Mood and temperament*. New York: Guilford.

Weick, K. E. (2003). Positive Organizing and Organizational Tragedy. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn, (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline* (pp. 66-80). San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler.

Worline, M. C. & R. E. Quinn (2003). Courageous principled action. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn, (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline* (pp. 122-137). San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler.

Yukl, G. A. (1998). *Leadership in Organizations* (4th Ed). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

