2009

Leadership and the other : ethical action through meaning in work

Rebecca L. Cisek

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

LEADERSHIP AND THE OTHER: ETHICAL ACTION THROUGH MEANING IN WORK

A Dissertation submitted to the
Department of Leadership Studies
Organization and Leadership Program
School of Education

In partial fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Education

BY
REBECCA L. CISEK

SAN FRANCISCO, CA
May 2009

This dissertation, written under the direction of the candidate's dissertation committee and approved by the members of the committee, has been presented to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of Education in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education. The content and research methodologies presented in this work represent the work of the candidate alone.

Rebecca L Cisek — April 15, 2009
Candidate — Date

Dissertation Committee

Ellen A. Herda — May 9, 2009
Chairperson

Deborah P. Bloch — April 15, 2009

Betty Taylor — April 15, 2009

Acknowledgement

To Dr. Ellen A. Herda,
For showing me a new way of teaching,
Leading, and being in the world.

Thank you so much for everything!

I would also like to thank my committee members,
Dr. Deborah Bloch and Dr. Betty Taylor,
Thank you for your guidance and encouragement throughout this journey.

This Dissertation is Dedicated To:

To Jennifer Cappuzzo,
For your many years of friendship, laughter, and love.

To my USF O&L classmates, my colleagues on this journey,
Particularly Kimberly Mendonca, EdD.
Thank you for the therapy sessions at Hukilau
And the marathon phone calls from 3,000 miles away.
I couldn't have done this without you!

To Ms. Gerri Hall, Dr. and Mrs. Frank Luth, Mr. Scott Powers, and Dr. Vincent Stilger,
For loving and guiding me all these years
As if I was your own daughter.

To the Cisek family, especially Paul and Jane.
Thank you for your love and support,
and for welcoming me into your amazing family.

To my brothers, Billy and Tony Liddle.
Thanks for never letting me forget that
I'm a little too bossy, a little too mouthy
And can never get rid of the *DI* gene!

To my parents, Bill and Louise Liddle,
For instilling in me an expectation for excellence,
For supporting me in every single dream I've ever dreamed,
And for giving me the confidence to see them all through!

And most of all to my husband, Ryan Cisek.
You have lifted me up through every step of this journey.
Thank you for your endless love and patience,
And for those perfect cups of tea!

I love you all so very much!!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE – RELEVANCE AND BACKGROUND 1
Introduction and Statement of Purpose 1
Background and Significance of Research Topic 2
Summary 4

CHAPTER TWO – REVIEW OF LITERATURE 6
Introduction 6
Concept of Work 6
Meaning in Work 6
Leadership 11
Traditional Approaches to Leadership 11
Ethical Leadership 13
Heroic Leadership 14
Authentic Leadership 15
Critical Hermeneutics 16
Narrative / Emplotment 16
Narrative Identity 18
Language as Being 19
Communicative Action 21
Praxis – Meaningful Action 22
Summary 23

CHAPTER THREE – RESEARCH PROCESS 24
Introduction 24
Theoretical Foundations of Research 25
Research Process 26
Introduction 26
Research Sites 26
Entrée to Conversation Partners 30
Margaret Finucane 31
Laurie Frantz 32
Jonathan Smith 33
Timothy Leary 34
Robert Kelly 34
Joseph Phillips 36
William Hogan 37
Michelle Etchart 37
Data Collection 39
Research Categories and Guiding Questions 40
Fusion of Horizons 40
The Communal Dimension of Identity 43
Ethical Action 44
Research Timeline 47
Text Creation and Data Analysis 47

Pilot Study 50
Conversation Partner 50
Pilot Study Analysis 50
Pilot Study Implications 52

CHAPTER FOUR – PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS 54
Introduction 54
Fusion of Horizons 54
Helping Others Come to New Understandings 54
Learning 58
Communal Dimension of Identity 62
Meaningful Work 62
Understanding Individual Identity in Relations with Others 63
Coming to a Shared Meaning 65
Hiring and Formation 70
Ethical Action 74
Communications Must Reflect Priorities 75
Evaluation and Promotion Must Reflect Priorities 77
Programs and Initiatives 78
Ethics vs Morality 82
Themes Common to All Research Categories 83
Trust 83
Language 85
Orientation to Leadership 86
The Leadership Journey 88
Summary 89

CHAPTER FIVE – SECONDARY ANALYSIS 91
Introduction 91
Fusion of Horizons 91
Communal Dimension of Identity 97
Ethical Action 104
Summary 111

CHAPTER SIX – INTERPRETIVE ASSESSMENT AND IMPLICATIONS 113
Introduction 113
Research Summary 113
Key Findings and Implications 116
Suggestions for Further Research 121
Reflections of Research Process 122
Conclusion 123

BIBLIOGRAPHY 125
Journals and Books 125
Internet Sources 128

APPENDICES 129
Appendix A – Internal Review Board Approval Form 129
Appendix B – Table of Research Participants 130
Appendix C - Letter of Participation in Research 131
Appendix D - Confirmation Letter to Participate in Research 133
Appendix E - Sample Thank You Letter 134
Appendix F – Pilot Study Transcription 135
Appendix G – Reflection on Conversations 146

CHAPTER ONE – RELEVANCE AND BACKGROUND

Power corresponds to the human ability
Not just to act, but to act in concert.
(Arendt 1970:41)

Introduction and Statement of Purpose

Members of just institutions who find shared meaning in work can appropriate a better way of being with and for others. In the daily grind of processes, policies, and protocols, it is easy to forget this aim. It is therefore important to examine how leaders in organizations strive daily to ensure that the organization as a community is moving through daily meaningful action towards a more just and humane world. Ricoeur (1992:180) describes the ethical aim as "aiming at the good life with and for others in just institutions." Leaders must strive towards a shared meaning and help foster the ethical aim through the daily actions of all individuals within an organization.

Jesuit universities are engaged in educating students to foster a more just and humane world. Jesuit leaders, in working daily towards the ethical aim, must recognize that it is impossible for any institution to be completely just. In spite of this understanding, these individuals should be fully oriented towards striving for justice through moral action. Those in leadership roles must emphasize the importance of a focus on meaningful action in the daily practice of organizations. How do these leaders appropriate new futures and develop a common purpose and shared understandings, helping others to find meaning in their work?

I sought to answer this question from a critical hermeneutic perspective by researching meaning in work as it relates to the ethical aim and the daily action of leaders as members of just institutions, focusing on selected leaders of Jesuit universities. This

study attempted to recognize how, through discourse, members of an organization can come to shared understandings and work together toward a shared meaning. I investigated leaders' understanding of oneself *as* another and imagined, with my conversation partners how this understanding may help members of organizations to act daily in moving toward a more just and humane world. The conversation partners for this study were administrators and faculty members from two Jesuit institutions of higher education.

Background and Significance of Research Topic

Though many strive for collaborative, honest, service orientations, the currently accepted frameworks of leadership still elicit the idea of a separation of self from the other. Additionally, they do not allow for interpretation, understanding, or imagination. Leadership involves more than simply possessing a given trait, exhibiting a certain behavior, or having charisma: leaders are beings in the world. Herda (1999:32) states that "If we believe we can change ourselves and help others set up the conditions whereby others can change with us, we act differently than if we are interested solely in producing facts or knowledge without considering the applications or implications of our actions." Stewart (1983:388) earlier offers a similar thought on approaching leadership and learning from the interpretive perspective, stating "the implications for teaching and learning include gaining perspectives on ourselves and others, increased understanding and comprehensive thinking, better senses of connection, and achievement of a fusion of horizons."

Exploring leadership from an interpretive, ontological stance may help us gain new understandings about the importance of oneself *as* another rather than oneself

leading another. Leaders do not exist in a vacuum, however. They cannot simply explore the meaning they find in work alone as individuals. For them, meaningful work comes in their ability to act in concert with others. As members of the same organization, it is important that all members of organizations find meaningful work in concert with one another.

Though an organization is not a being, and cannot have an individual identity, we can examine organizations as linguistic domains of interactions: as having a communal identity. Maturana and Varela (1987:189) state that social life enables organisms "to participate in relations and activities that arise only as coordinations of behaviors between otherwise independent organisms." They go on to state that "meaning arises as a relationship of linguistic distinctions…this is what it is to be human" (1987:211). In leadership, it is beneficial to gain an understanding of organizations as a linguistic domain of interaction. If we see ourselves as beings in the world collaboratively with others, we can appropriate new futures together through our discourse from which shared understandings emerge.

Leaders, in working towards the ethical aim, must emphasize the importance of a focus on meaningful action in the daily practice of organizations. Though one would hope this is already the case, research demonstrates this is not so. Begley and Stefkovich (2007:401) note that studies on ethics and leadership have "demonstrated that administrators tend to consciously employ ethics as a guide to action relatively infrequently and under particular conditions." Leaders are not always acting toward the ethical aim as a way of being with and for others. Instead, ethics is a tool in our toolbox,

something used in certain situations and then forgotten about until the next difficult situation comes along.

Just as individuals do not live in a vacuum separate from others, organizations do not exist separate from the larger society. We cannot isolate our schools, corporations, or other organizations from the greater communities in which we live. From governmental genocide to global terrorism, from widespread poverty to disparity of access to adequate healthcare, from lack of educational resources to racial discrimination, we are in need of a "refiguration of our existing worlds in our organizations and communities" (Herda 1999:1). Herda (1999:1) discusses the need for a new orientation to ethical action as members of organizations working in concert towards this refigured world:

> The nature of language, the responsibility for understanding, and the meaning of action are issues of increasing concern for social science researchers. In education, business, health and government institutions we see an intensifying need to approach problems collaboratively that moves beyond negotiations or coercive policies, intervention or implementation of a new program, or the latest technique. More importantly, we need to acknowledge and understand that humans have the capacity to live together in community and to address and solve problems together in organizations and social settings…we also need to develop ways in which we live out meaningful lives in our organizational institutions.

Once individuals have come to new understandings about leadership and meaningful work as members of just institutions, they must then act, purposefully and meaningfully toward the ethical aim.

Summary

Working with and for others, leaders will be able to come to shared understandings and can together appropriate meaningful action towards a better future. From this research, I hoped to come to new understandings about the connection between an individual's understanding of oneself as a being with and for others, the meaning

leaders find in their work, and the influence on the communal identity of the organization to which they belong. Only if members of organizations act to reach shared understandings, will organizational communities be able to move forward together, working toward a better world.

From the understandings brought forth by this research, leaders can begin to approach policy-making as a shared imagined future in just institutions. Implications include a new way of being for leaders and for policy makers in organizational development. I will discuss new possibilities in organizational leadership that were appropriated through my exploration of the ethical aim as it informs the daily actions of members of Jesuit institutions. The remaining Chapters of my dissertation include a review of relevant literature on both the topic at hand and critical hermeneutic theory; a description of the proposed research process; and a description of the pilot study, preliminary and secondary analysis of the data, and implications for organizational development and learning.

CHAPTER TWO – REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

From my exploration of self and the other through meaning in work, I have focused on several main points of interest related to my research in the following literature. I first discuss the relevant literature on meaning in work and leadership, and will then present the theoretical constructs in critical hermeneutics that are most relevant to my research.

Concept of Work

If we are to discuss meaning in work, we must first consider the term work itself. Michael Demkovich (Bloch 1997:53) describes work in the following manner: "Work or labor cannot be seen as merely monetary, a matter of money, but as part of the whole of human activity that constitutes the self, as a matter of meaning." Work is necessary for economic reasons, for survival. Once that need is met, however, work also serves other purposes. Working shows obedience to higher power, work helps in personal self-fulfillment, work allows for connection to society and others around the individual (Bloch 1997).

Meaning in Work

Because humans strive to find meaning in their lives and in their work, managers and leaders in organizations must be aware of this desire. Henry Ford once asked, "Why is it that I always get the whole person when all I really want is a pair of hands?" (in Sheep 2006:358). Contrary to Mr. Ford's wish, humans cannot be dissected into pieces, and an individual's identity as an employee cannot be separated from their identity as a

being. Lack of fulfillment in the workplace has prompted numerous authors to write on this important topic (Driscoll and McKee 2007, Howard 2002, Sheep 2006).

Sheep (2006) explores the concept of meaning and spirituality in work and concludes that there are four recurring themes that serve as principal dimensions of workplace spirituality. (Though I have not focused on an individual's spirituality in my research, the term spirituality is often discussed in conjunction with the literature on meaning in work.) Sheep's four dimensions of workplace spirituality are 1) self-workplace integration, 2) meaning in work, 3) transcendence of self, and 4) growth/development of one's inner self at work. Individuals spend substantial portions of their time at work and wish to be seen as beings, not workers. Sheep (2006:361) states that "the meaning of one's life must converge with the meaning of one's work in order for spiritual growth and development."

Anna Miller-Tiedeman (1997) also explores spirituality at work, noting that career involves more than simply what one does at his or her job. She defines *Lifecareer* as "the dynamic, lived-in-the-moment process defined by each person in individual moments" (1997:87). Bloch and Richmond (1998) examine the connection between spirit and work, and posit that there are seven themes to the meaning individuals find in their work. These are change, balance, energy, community, calling, harmony and unity. These themes are each pieces of the puzzle that comprise the complex nature of an individual's spirituality and the meaning one seeks at work. The balance of each dimension is vital in improving spiritual health.

In exploring the concept of spirituality and work, Richmond (Bloch and Richmond 1997:257) states that, "if spirituality is the life forces, the force that sustains and energizes, and if work is the energy spent in creation, whether human or divine, then spirit and work are one". The roles in an individual's life are all connected, individuals are connected to other individuals, and the Lifecareer of each individual is connected to something greater than each person and also greater than even a community of people (Bloch and Richmond 1997).

Mitroff and Denton (1999) explore the presence, or lack thereof, of spirituality in corporate America. For them, spirituality is "a perpetual process of becoming, a continual unfolding of the human spirit" (1999:185). They state that corporations take but do not give back to the souls and spirituality of the workers. The authors (1999:7) emphasize that if organizations do not acknowledge the importance of incorporating spirituality into the workplace and deal with these issues head-on, they will not "meet the challenges of the next millennium." When Mitroff and Denton surveyed workers on factors in finding meaning at work, a majority of those surveyed felt the most important factor in finding meaning at work was their ability to realize their full potential. For Mitroff and Denton (1999: 52) "The only thing that will really motivate people is that which gives them deep meaning and purpose in their jobs and their lives in general. Whatever you call it, it is spiritual at its base."

What should organizations offer to help improve spirituality and meaning at work? Rather than superficial items like increased benefits, higher pay, more flexible scheduling or vacation time, improved efficiency via increased technology, or a "Starbucks ® in the lobby area" (2006:360), Sheep posits that organizations should

instead provide a theoretical and practical basis for improving spirituality and meaning in one's work based on the four recurring themes described above. Driscoll and McKee (2007) note that there is little emotion ingrained in the daily discourse of organizations and that leaders must create a climate where employees feel safe to have discourse that can involve emotion, beliefs, and ethics.

Howard (2002:239) also recognizes the importance of discussing spirituality and meaning in work, stating "If leadership is ultimately a spiritual path then more attention surely needs to be paid to how a person integrates their life journey and life work." Though it may not be an easy topic to discuss because of the diverse sets of values and beliefs held by members of organizations, it is actually because of this diversity that discourse must be present in our organizations. Howard emphasizes that leaders should acknowledge and bring to the forefront those issues that can fragment an organization. He believes such discourse should include basic assumptions and personal history, fears, and deeply held beliefs. These conversations should also include the discussion of how language is not just used as a tool to describe the world; rather, language is a medium used to create new worlds (Howard 2002).

Driscoll and McKee (2007) engage in a rich discussion on storytelling and spirituality as a part of leadership and meaning in work. Though they do not write from a critical hermeneutic perspective, their discussion of storytelling offers an idea similar to Ricoeur's discussion of narrative, which I will discuss in the following section. They cite applications of organizational storytelling to include confirming shared experiences, generating commitment, renewing a sense of purpose, co-creating a vision for the organization, engaging emotions, driving strategic change, and facilitating sense-making.

Driscoll and McKee recognize that stories provide a way to understand and try to bring about change in the every day life of organizations.

Evaluating the presence of meaningful work, an integration of spirituality and values in the workplace, together with action that is in alignment with individual and communal priorities and a shared meaning, is essential in organizational development. For Mitroff and Denton (1999:128), however, empirical validation of the presence and value of meaningful work is not enough and is "almost beside the point." Mitroff and Denton emphasize that

> Important principles are indicative of a person's, organization's, or society's underlying beliefs, and instead of looking to validate them, to prove them "true" in the usual sense, one should determine whether they accurately reflect the organization's assumptions about the world. The place to look for confirmation of this is not in a company's statements of purpose and goals but in its day-to-day actions and activities.

Mitroff and Denton recognize that evaluation from a traditional, positivist approach may not provide meaningful data that truly reflects what is happening in the daily actions within an organization. They offer the important idea that other approaches to the research and evaluation of meaningful work in organizations may be fruitful in coming to new understandings on the subject. Still, these authors do use traditional quantitative approaches for the majority of their data collection and research on spirituality and meaningful work in corporate America. There is still a need for different methods of research and evaluation in organizational development.

Engagement in meaningful work in organizations is only possible if it is promoted by the leaders of an organization. Even if people need meaningful work, and would like to integrate who they are into what they do, leaders of organizations must provide an

atmosphere that not only allows for this type of work to occur, but must encourage, support and foster such environments. This leads us to an exploration of leadership.

Leadership

The concept of leadership is one that intrigues professionals in business, management, and education. What makes a leader successful? Because of this intrigue, the subject of leadership has received significant scholarly attention in recent decades. Since this research focuses on individuals in leadership roles in organizations, it is helpful to first explore some of the currently popular approaches to leadership.

Traditional Approaches to Leadership

Stone, Russell, and Patterson (2004) examined two of the current models of leadership: Servant and Transformational Leadership. The authors offer the following characteristics of leadership found in both models: influence, vision, trust, respect, risk-sharing, integrity and modeling (Stone 2004). Both theories are similar in that the leaders provide support, care and consideration for the needs of their followers. There is also similarity in that transformational and servant leaders seek to empower their followers to higher levels of motivation and achievement. Finally, both theories allow for an increased level of trust between leader and follower than many of the other leadership models (Stone 2004). The primary difference between the two models is the focus of the leader. Transformational leaders have a greater concern for encouraging their followers to achieve greater accomplishments in order to ultimately serve the goals and mission of the organization. In servant leadership, on the other hand, the primary focus of the leader is in serving the followers rather than meeting organizational goals or objectives (Stone 2004).

Transformational leadership has also been discussed in comparison to transactional leadership. Sama and Shoaf (2007:41) describe transactional leadership as being "founded on contingent rewards and management by exception, motivates followers to achieve the goal, and focuses on bottom-line results." Transactional leadership places emphasis on task and outcomes, "urging management to steer the way without reference to a moral compass" (Sama 2007:41).

Other discussions on leadership focus more on leadership as a way of inspiring and motivating others compared to the management of others. In his early discussion of leadership and management, Warren Bennis (1985:21) posits:

> The problem with many organizations is that they tend to be over-managed and under-led. They may excel in the ability to handle the daily routine, yet never question whether the routine should be done at all. There is a profound difference between management and leadership and both are important. To manage means to bring about, to accomplish, to have charge of our responsibility for, to conduct. Leading is influencing, guiding in direction, course, action, opinion….Managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing.

For Bennis (1985:43), leadership is a transaction between people. Through communication, leaders can create meaning for others. He states (1985:43) "It's the only way a group, small or large, can become aligned behind the overarching goals of an organization." For Bennis (1985:42) "Leaders can, by communicating meaning, create a commonwealth of learning, and that, in turn is what effective organizations are." Bennis offers a look at the shift from leadership being viewed in a traditional, more positivist light to a broader understanding of the term. In the sections that follow I discuss several more recent views of leadership that illustrate a shift toward a new paradigm.

Ethical Leadership

Recent literature on spirituality, meaning in work, and leadership have themes in common, including concepts of values, ethics, and ethical leadership. Begley and Stefkovich (2007:400) describe three ways in which values relate to leadership. First, values influence the cognitive processes of individuals and groups. They note (2007:398-399) that it is important for leaders to understand how values "reflect underlying human motivations and shape the subsequent attitudes, speech, and actions of personnel." The second way values relate to leadership is by serving as a guide to action. The third, more strategic and collective application for values and ethics involves the adoption of an ethical posture with a strategic organizational intent (Begley 2007).

Ethics, for Begley and Stefkovich (2007:400) are "normative social ideas or codes of conduct usually grounded in the cultural experience of particular societies." An understanding of ethics is not an end goal. Instead, the study of ethics should be:

> as much about the life-long personal struggle to be ethical, about failures to be ethical, the inconsistencies of ethical postures, the masquerading of self-interest and personal preference as ethical action, and the dilemmas which occur in everyday and professional life when one ethic trumps another (Begley 2007:400).

Ethical leadership, for Sama and Shoaf (2007:41), is derived "from a model of transformational leadership wherein the vision is one of achieving moral good, and the core values are those of integrity, trust, and moral rectitude." For Sama and Shoaf, ethical leaders are ones who inspire others in their organizations to behave ethically. These leaders "are persuasive in their communities to effect change in the direction of positive moral goals" (2007:41).

Begley notes that the concept of ethics can be so abstract and large that it may be challenging for leaders to promote ethical action. Begley (2007:403) notes that

philosophical discussion on ethics may not be appealing to professionals and recommends "speaking of ethical actions within a specific professional context or through the use of heuristic applications of ethical postures to a professional or personal context." Doing so, according to Begley, will provide relevance for members of the organizations.

When acting ethically within an organization, Begley (2007:404) also emphasizes the importance of the inclusion of dialogue stating, "when unexamined values are applied in arbitrary ways, they can be anything but ethical. The essential, and often absent, component that makes adherence to a value genuinely ethical is dialogue." Mitroff and Denton (1999:10) note that ethics cannot simply be a means to an end for profitable organizations, stating an "organization must be ethical for its own sake, not because it may lead to profits."

Heroic Leadership

Heroic leadership is another recent approach to leadership coined by Chris Lowney (2003), who explores the leadership practices of the early Jesuits. Though they did not specifically describe their Jesuit tradition and values as a "leadership style," Lowney states that for the Jesuits, educating leaders was at the heart of every aspect of their ministry. Four unique values of the Jesuit leadership tradition, according to Lowney (2003:5), are self-awareness, ingenuity, love, heroism. He notes that the Jesuits used these four values in an integrated approach to a unique way of living and working.

In the Jesuit's heroic leadership there is a link between self-awareness and leadership. Lowney (2003:5) notes that the principles of the Jesuits addressed "one's whole life and not merely one's work." He also posits that the Jesuits' principles are

rooted in the notion that "we're all leaders and that our whole lives are filled with leadership opportunities" and says that "a leader's greatest power is his or her personal vision, communicated by the example of his or her daily life" (2003:5,19).

Lowney comments that we can take the principles of leadership learned from the Jesuits and apply them to any organization, stating "We perform our best work in supportive, encouraging, and positively charged environments" (2003:5). Lowney does not talk about leading or managing as a tool, a task, or a transaction. Instead, he observes that for the early Jesuits leadership was an integrated approach to one's life. Another approach to leadership illustrative of the shift from a more traditional construct to an interpretive orientation is Authentic Leadership.

Authentic Leadership

Authentic leadership is a more recent term applied to the concept of leadership. Sparrowe (2005) examines the topic through a critical hermeneutic perspective, exploring leadership and the narrative self from the theoretical perspective of Ricoeur. He believes that using Ricoeur's framework will decrease the limitations expressed by other leadership theories. Sparrowe stops short, however, of making the leap from a positivist to an interpretative approach, and uses the terms leader and follower in a more traditional sense, trying to incorporate Ricoeur's theories into a more traditional paradigm.

Sparrowe's article begins to explore leadership from an interpretive stance; however, leadership viewed from a critical hermeneutic perspective requires that individuals within organizations must wholly participate in discourse that brings about new understandings on leadership as learning and being with and for others. Current leadership theories – including that espoused by Sparrowe - offer a limited view of

understanding authentic leadership. Rather than attempting to categorize people as leaders, which can be limiting, leadership must be viewed in a way that opens new worlds. Tobar (2006:iii) describes leadership from an interpretive stance, stating, "Leadership in this context is understood not as a singular role providing direction from above, but as a way of being that provides opportunities for others to recognize their ownmost potential." This research approaches leadership as a way of expanding the possibilities for understanding through the application of critical hermeneutics.

Critical Hermeneutics

The theories expressed thus far in this review of literature have reflected an traditional, epistemological orientation towards the topics of leadership and meaning in work. A critical hermeneutic approach, on the other hand, offers an ontological orientation for working with and for others. Several hermeneutic theories that provide a new approach to leadership and meaning in work are described in the sections that follow.

Narrative / Emplotment

Narrative plays a significant role in humans' understanding of self. Ricoeur (1982) describes that the action of narrating and following a story is to reflect upon the events in the story. Stories allow for understanding of experiences, emotions, our past, present, and futures. Narrative begins with the plotting of events. Ricoeur (1991) describes emplotment as synthesizing elements or pieces that separately may seem heterogeneous but in actuality share a common element with each other. Emplotment, as Ricoeur notes, is a dynamic integrative process rather than a static, isolated incident, resulting in a coherent story or narrative. And narrative, whether in fiction or history,

says Ricoeur (1991:427), “reveals the universal aspects of the human condition.” Narrative is also linked to time, according to Ricoeur, by mimesis: the imitation of human life (1990). Mimesis is important in understanding the link between narrative and time, and leads to our use of narrative to understand our world, our lives. For Ricoeur, mimesis has three parts. $Mimesis_1$ refers to the past: the values and preconceptions we bring to a situation. $Mimesis_2$ involves our life as we understand it: how we make sense of our life as it is in the present. $Mimesis_3$ refers to the future we hope to have. $Mimesis_2$ is the link between the past and the future world in which we hope to live.

Narrative, telling a story, will open new worlds for us. Ricoeur (1991:437) states, “Life is lived and the story is told.” To learn from the told stories and live with a new understanding involves the reader coming to the text or to the story with an openness to new interpretations. We bring our preconceptions, our beliefs, our prejudices and our values to a story. If we have an openness to new ideas, we may leave the encounter with a new understanding that will converge with our previous set of beliefs; in other words there may be meeting of what we knew to be true before coming to the text and what we now know to be true from a new interpretation of it. This synthesis of ideas or *fusion of horizons* – a term, coined by Gadamer (1975) - may result in a new or expanded understanding of the topic at hand. This concept - fusion of horizons – plays an important role in this research on leadership, and is further discussed in the theoretical foundations section that follows.

The concept of narrative is helpful in understanding leadership and meaning in the work setting. As members of institutions, leaders can use narrative to bring a new awareness to the members of organizations. The act of telling a story about a place of

business and those who work there can open new possibilities, helping all members of organizations to create just institutions and to live together within them. Leaders can use narrative to help themselves and those with whom they work find meaning in the performance of their daily job responsibilities. Leaders can also utilize narrative as a way of helping to create new shared understandings and imagining new futures within the organizational community.

Narrative Identity

As stated previously, it is human nature to interpret and understand. It is through a constant process of understanding of past and present that individuals can gain an increased awareness of identity. Leaders must continually explore their understanding of self as it related to the other. Shahideh (2004:37) states, "Our interactions are affected by and are driven by our knowledge of self, which is exercised through interpretation." Paul Ricoeur (1991) refers to this concept as Narrative Identity.

For Ricoeur (1991), narrative identity has two aspects. The first is *idem*, or sameness, and the second is *ipse*, or selfhood. Idem is the more permanent aspect of a person's identity. It is the constant characteristics, values, and beliefs that make a person's identity throughout their life. Ipse is the dynamic, evolving part of a person's identity. The ipse aspect of identity is more fluid and more open to new ideas and development. The ipse aspect involves a person's relationship to self as self and to self as another. Experiencing oneself as another opens new ways of being and seeing the world (Kearney 2002). During a process of interpretation, evaluation, and understanding, one must be aware of the idem and ipse aspects of identity as described by Ricoeur, for individuals cannot gain new understandings about themselves, others, and the world

without first recognizing this duality. For Shahideh (2004:40) Narrative Identity is "The illuminated part of one's identity which distinguishes ones character from others and acts as a basis for one's choices and actions."

The understanding of self - gaining insight into one's narrative identity - will help leaders of organizations come to further understanding of the other. As stated by Shahideh (2004:38), once we gain an understanding of self we will be able to "move to higher levels of understanding and communication with other." Understanding narrative identity will allow all individuals in just institutions to be active members of the institutional community. Shahideh states (2004:41) "It is crucial that in interpreting our identities, we do not view our experiences as solely ours, but rather view them as narratives that belong to one another." Leaders must be able to recognize their relationships with self and the other which are vital for members of organizations to thrive. Their increased understanding of the importance of language and the related improved communication with others will foster a creative, innovative, and cooperative communal environment. The significance of language to understanding will be explored further in the following section.

Language as Being

With language, the world is open to different interpretations, new ideas and possibilities. Language, rather than simply a tool, is the experience that provides new thoughts that allow humans to learn, interpret, and understand themselves and the world around them. Gadamer (1975) suggests that language, in opening new worlds of understanding, is itself understanding. He emphasizes that language has its true being in conversation, and asserts that only in the connection and understanding resulting from

two people in conversation do we have true language, and thus true understanding of new worlds and ideas. He states that communication "is a living process in which a community of life is lived out" (Gadamer 1975:404).

Linguistic domains of interaction between beings arise as a cultural drift in a social system (Maturana and Varela 1987). There is no pre-established design to these interactions. As humans, we do more than simply use language. We dwell in language as linguistic beings. Maturana and Varela (1987:210) state that "to operate in language is to operate in a domain of congruent, ontogenic structural coupling." They recognize the significance in the shared meaning that arises from our linguistic distinctions, noting that our history of recurrent interactions makes possible this non-planned ontogenic drift in our structural coupling, which takes place in the world we share because, through our interactions, we have specified the world we share. The implications for coordinated, meaningful action through these linguistic distinctions are vast. They note, "Because we have language, there is no limit to what we can describe, imagine, and relate" (Maturana and Varela 1987:212).

Understanding the relationship between language and being may allow leaders – through discourse – to acquire new insights that may inform the actions taken when making changes. This may not be an easy task for leaders to undertake. It may be challenging, but worth the hurdles to examine and interpret to create new possibilities for the self and for self as other. Shahideh (2004:46) states, "Those who interpret themselves are more powerful people because they have had the courage to examine, take action, and change in relation to others." Shahideh's ideas on action and change in relation to others,

moves the discussion to communicative action, praxis, and ethics, which will be discussed in the following sections.

Communicative Action

According to Habermas (1985), communicative action is a mutual approach to reaching an understanding through a dialogical relationship. In just institutions, and in order for humans to come to recognize their communal identity and shared meaning, we must be able to reach a mutual or shared understanding. Habermas posits that there are four validity claims or conditions that must be present for communicative action to take place. The first condition is comprehension and involves the speaker's form of expression. It must be intelligible so that the speaker and listener understand each other. Truth is the second condition: the speaker must be sincere in the communication and must have an honest intention of truth. The third condition for communicative action is trust. The listener must trust the conversation partner. The fourth condition for Habermas' communicative action is a set of shared values: the set of existing norms and mores held in common between both members of a conversation.

If all four validity claims are met, the stage is set for mutual understanding to be achieved (Habermas 1985). As members of linguistic domains, each individual in an organization must approach relationships and their related communicative actions with the intent of satisfying all four validity claims through dialogue. Both members of a conversation must have equal opportunity to express freely and both persons must participate with an openness to new ideas and an intention of reaching a mutual understanding. Leaders in organizations must provide the appropriate atmosphere that

allows for this type of discourse to occur, which may result in a sense of shared meaning and value in pursuit of the ethical aim.

Praxis – Meaningful Action

Praxis has been defined as meaningful, informed action in pursuit of the ethical aim (Bernstein 1983). Bernstein (1983) explains that praxis must be based on theoretical understanding or context. In other words, there must be meaning behind each action; otherwise there is not praxis, but simply a behavior. Bernstein (1983:160) states, "Praxis requires choice, deliberation, and decision about what is to be done in concrete situations. Informed action requires us to understand and explain the salient characteristics of the situations we confront." In describing praxis, Jervolino (1996:68) states "that everyone belongs to society, the nation, and mankind in the whole and is responsible to them all." Within our linguistic domains of communication, we come to shared understandings and we appropriate new futures through narrative and discourse. This, however, is not the last step. We must then act to bring these imagined futures into reality. Restating a theme from Arendt cited in Chapter One, acting in concert will help us take our shared understandings and the imagined futures that emerge from our understanding and interpretation to pursue theoretically informed action.

Praxis is an important implication of Ricoeur's quote on ethics for members of just institutions. People as narrative beings "will always be capable of ethically responsible action" (Kearney 2002:152). This research may help new understandings to emerge about how leaders, through discourse, ensure that all members of organizations work in concert and act with a sense of responsibility and meaning.

Summary

This review of literature has created a text, which may serve as a new medium for understanding leadership and meaning in work in organizations. The ideas brought forth from the created text illuminate the need for interpretive research on leadership and meaning in work in just institutions. Participatory research from the critical hermeneutics perspective allows us to explore, through the narratives of conversation partners and through fusion of horizons, new understandings and new futures. This research creates a responsibility towards action. Herda (1999:86) states, "learning here entails entering into moral and political discourse with a historical understanding of the issues at hand; risking part of one's traditions and current prejudices; and, at times, seeing the importance of community and social cohesiveness over specific desires of the individual." Chapter Three describes the research process, which includes the conceptual background, research guidelines, data collection, data analysis, text creation, the research categories and questions, a description of the pilot study, and the background of the researcher.

CHAPTER THREE – RESEARCH PROCESS

Introduction

I have chosen to pursue my research using a critical hermeneutic framework. Participatory research that is grounded in critical hermeneutic theory to investigate leadership and the meaning in work allows the both the researcher and the conversation partners to explore and imagine new possibilities. These imagined futures allow for new meanings about leadership and work and may promote future action. Herda (1999:1) notes that "participatory research in a critical hermeneutic tradition invokes language, understanding, and action."

A critical hermeneutic approach to participatory research provides several benefits specific to the exploration of the topic of leadership and meaning in work. This type of research not only addresses the need that individuals have to "live out meaningful lives in our organizational institutions," but also will obligate us to act toward refiguring "our existing worlds in our organizations and communities" (Herda 1999:1). These ideas of living out meaningful lives within our institutions as well as a refiguration of our existing organizational communities are two of the areas of interest in this study.

In this chapter, I describe in detail my research process, beginning with a discussion on the conceptual background that informs this investigation. I then discuss the research process itself, including data collection; research categories and guiding conversation questions; and then provide a description of my process for data analysis and text creation. Finally, I conclude this chapter with a description of my pilot study and the background of the researcher.

Theoretical Foundations of Research

Hermeneutics, according to Ricoeur (1982:88), is "wholly engaged in going back to the foundations, a movement which leads from epistemological question concerning the conditions of possibility to the ontological structure of understanding." Ontology, the study of being, provides us with a perspective in which to explore the concept of understanding. A hermeneutical-based inquiry examines and interprets texts and other communicative forms to gain an understanding of the world. Herda (1999) explains that humans have an interpretive nature; it is part of who we are to interpret and learn from our experiences; therefore as we live, we understand. She states, "Understanding does not take place in a culminating achievement but is an unfolding in time" (Herda 1999:57). We can learn and gain new understandings through participatory research, where the narrative of one conversation partner's life will allow the researcher to not only gain new understandings of that particular person, but will also provide understandings to the researcher about his or her own world.

Ricoeur (1991:427) writes that stories "reveal universal aspects of the human condition." It is because of this that participatory research can be so significant in its implications; from the stories of few we can learn about many. The researcher, in interpreting stories or texts with an openness to new ideas, also opens him or herself to new possibilities. Ricoeur (1991:430) notes that the meaning of a story, such as the stories told within discourse or a research conversation, "wells up from the intersection of the world of the text and the world of the reader." It is not just the content of the conversation, but the very pursuit of new understandings from this theoretical foundation that can open new worlds for the participants and for the researcher. In the following

section, I describe the research process I employed to explore ethical action and meaning in work in two selected locations, namely John Carroll University and Seattle University.

Research Process

Introduction

Herda (1999:86) writes that "in field-based hermeneutic research, the object is to create collaboratively a text that allows us to carry out the integrative act of reading, interpreting, and critiquing our understandings." This interpretative act serves to ground our actions. This medium for participatory research, according to Herda, is language: language used as communication between individuals and members of a community to gain understandings that may provide for unlimited possibilities for new ideas, new futures, and new understandings.

It is within the above research stance that my research was carried out and my data analyzed. The following sections provide a description of entrée into the research sites, the identification of conversation partners, and a description of the invitation letters that were sent to the research conversation partners. The following sections also include a description of the conversation process itself, including an outline of the research questions that served to guide my inquiry.

Research Sites

Eight conversation partners were identified from Seattle University and John Carroll University, both of which are Jesuit institutions. I chose to pursue my research at two Jesuit institutions because after working at a Jesuit institution for the past four years I have come to recognize that the mission of Jesuit education is grounded in meaningful work, a shared set of faith-based values, and an emphasis on community. Since these

ideals parallel my focus on leaders and meaning in work through just institutions, I hoped conversations with leaders in these Jesuit institutions would offer valuable insight into the ideas of ethical action through meaningful work. I hoped to come to new understandings about how leaders in two different institutions, acting from within the same basic guiding principles, are achieving their shared meaning and goals in different ways. Because Jesuit institutions are founded under the same basic set of guiding principles, I first discuss the guiding characteristics of Jesuit education.

Jesuit education, as described the John Carroll University website, assists "in the total formation of each individual within the community." Jesuit universities are inspired by the vision of St. Ignatius Loyola, who founded the Society of Jesus in 1540. Jesuit education is based on the basic principles as taught by St. Ignatius. The *Characteristics of Jesuit Education* was developed in 1986 to serve as a guiding set of values and ideals for Jesuit education. All leaders and educators in a Jesuit setting are urged to utilize this document as a set of guiding principles under which to educate in the Jesuit tradition. This document can be found on the Society of Jesuits website.

Jesuit education, also called Ignatian education, is a faith-based education grounded in the Jesuit Catholic tradition. The spiritual dimension of the education is intended to permeate throughout the entire educational experience of the students and educators. The Ignatian pedagogical paradigm can be understood in the light of the *Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius*, as explained in *Ignatian Pedagogy: A Practical Approach*, found on the Society of Jesuits website. The *Spiritual Exercises* illustrates the continual interplay of experience, reflection and action in the teaching and learning process in Jesuit education. The *Spiritual Exercises* are "rigorous exercises of the spirit wholly

engaging the body, mind, heart and soul of the human person." A fundamental dynamic of the *Spiritual Exercises* of Ignatius is the continual call for reflection. St. Ignatius urged reflection on human experience. Ignatian spirituality emphasizes reflection as a vital step in choosing meaningful courses of action that foster the growth of the self as a human being. Reflection is a pivotal point for Ignatius in the movement from experience to action in Ignatian spirituality and thus in Jesuit education.

Jesuit tradition focuses on educating a person in a value-oriented manner. Emphasis is placed on the students' active role in their education, through personal study, learning through service and action for another, and reflection. Jesuits also emphasize a life-long openness to learning, growing, and understanding others and the world.

Education in the Jesuit tradition also "seeks to form men and women for others," stressing community values and a focus on individual care and concern for each person. This focus on community is similar to Ricoeur's ideas on self as another (1992), which is another reason I chose Jesuit institutions for my research sites. Jesuits also place emphasis on an active life-long commitment to others, and to the preservation of justice for others.

Jesuits work not only to educate others, but to develop students to be leaders in their communities. Lowney (2003) notes that, from their inception Jesuits have worked to educate students to be leaders to promote a more just world. They may not have used the term leadership as we do today, but Lowney (2003:15) notes that Jesuits recognized that "we're all leaders, and we're leading all the time. Leadership springs from within. It's about who I am as much as what I do. Leadership is not an act. It is my life, a way of

living. I never complete the task of becoming a leader. It's an ongoing process." The early Jesuits, according to Lowney (2003:20) "referred often to *nuestro modo de proceder, our way of proceeding*…our way of proceeding flowed from a worldview and priorities shared by all members of the Jesuit team. Their way of proceeding was a compass, not a checklist." We can interpret this way of proceeding as a focus on oneself. The Jesuits did not, however, explore the idea of oneself in relationship to the other, a concept of critical hermeneutics I explore in subsequent Chapters.

Finally, the Jesuit tradition recognizes the need for a balance between a "system of schools with a common vision and common goals" with the openness for adaptation of means and methods so that each institution has the freedom to achieve its purposes most effectively. The Jesuits who developed the Characteristics of Jesuit Education recognized the importance of an over-arching set of values complemented by the ability to change on based on a set of norms that may change throughout time and across cultures. Lowney (2003:16) states that, rather than a procedure manual, Jesuits worked to give their recruits "the skills to discern on their own what needed to be done."

Each of the universities where I conducted my research conversations has developed a different shared meaning and primary focus related to the Jesuit tradition of education. Seattle University, according to the Mission stated on their website, is "dedicated to educating the whole person, to professional formation, and to empowering leaders for a just and humane world." According to the Mission stated on John Carroll University's website, John Carroll University "inspires individuals to excel in learning**,** leadership, and service in the region and in the world." Each university's shared meaning involves working toward a better future grounded in the spirit of the Jesuit tradition. The

language suggests striving toward an *ought*, rather than an *is*. And yet there is a freedom within the Jesuit tradition for individual Jesuit universities to come to a unique shared meaning as a community, with each organization coming to their own shared understanding and meaning of how to act ethically to move toward the *ought*.

Since my research focuses on theoretically informed action in pursuit of the ethical aim, I began the process with the hope that new understandings would emerge from speaking with different leaders working towards a common set of values and purpose. I entered this research from a critical hermeneutic orientation, which offers a new perspective on leadership and meaning in work. Whereas Jesuits approach education and leadership as a way to help others and to promote justice and humanity in the world, my research will explore leadership from the orientation of oneself *as* another. In the following section I discuss the entrée to the conversation partners who served as the participants for my research.

Entrée to Conversation Partners

I chose John Carroll University and Seattle University as my research sites due to my existing professional relationships with leaders at each institution. Through these contacts, I gained entrée into these research sites and obtained formal and informal conversation partners. I engaged in conversations with administrators, leaders, and faculty members at each university. I received approval to engage in my research from the University of San Francisco Human Subjects Committee prior to initiating my conversations (please refer to Appendix A).

I chose participants in middle and top leadership positions because I hoped to explore how leaders view their ability to work with others towards a shared

understanding and purpose and to see how these leaders articulate that shared meaning throughout their entire organization. I did not observe a significant difference in data between leaders in the middle versus top positions. Since one emphasis of my proposed research is to understand ethical action, I asked my participants to discuss the ethical action occurring in the workplace in addition to events of understanding, interpretation, and imagination.

Participants from John Carroll University

I met with three participants from John Carroll University. John Carroll University is a Jesuit institution located in the suburbs of Cleveland, Ohio. Dr. Margaret Finucane is the Director of the Center for Service and Social Action and a Professor of Communications at John Carroll University. Laurie Frantz is the Assistant to the President and Secretary of the Board of Trustees at John Carroll University. Dr. Jonathan Smith is currently the Vice President and Executive Assistant to the President of John Carroll University.

Margaret Finucane

Dr. Margaret Finucane was my first formal conversation partner. She is the Director of the Center for Service and Social Action and a Professor of Communications at John Carroll University. Dr. Finucane was raised in the Cleveland area, did her undergraduate work at John Carroll University, and completed her Masters degree at the University of Iowa. She was an instructor for several years and then completed her doctorate, returning to John Carroll as a faculty member in the Communications Department. Two years ago she was asked to lead the Center of Service and Social Action "to re-organize it and re-imagine what it could and should be to make service

more pervasive on the campus, and to increase the quality of the experience and engage more people in service." Dr. Finucane believes that she was basically raised by Jesuits. She used to say her father was an honorary Jesuit and there were Jesuits who regularly came to her house for dinner when she was a child. She noted that she had a strong identification with Jesuit education.

The conversation with Dr. Finucane occurred in her office in the Center for Service and Social Action. Looking back, I was quite nervous. This was the first official conversation of my research and I was anxious for it to go well. I could not have asked for a more enthusiastic, reflective partner to begin my data collection journey. Dr. Finucane was engaged, reflective, and eager to make the conversation a true conversation as opposed to an interview. I believe we were successful, for though my discussion with her occasionally felt like an interview, there were moments I believe a true conversation emerged: a real dialogue took place. I discuss these moments further in the data analysis.

Laurie Frantz

Ms. Laurie Frantz is the Assistant to the President and Secretary of the Board of Directors at John Carroll University. She has been at John Carroll for eight years, and began her tenure in education and allied studies on a grant project, working in this area for over a year. She then joined the staff of the University Mission and Identity office, working in that department with Father Grey for six years. Ms. Frantz recently moved to the President's office to begin serving in her current role as Assistant to the President. Prior to working at the university, she worked as a housewife, helped to run a family business, and has given a substantial amount of time and service to Habitat for Humanity. Ms. Frantz was not educated in the Jesuit tradition, but her children both are currently

attending Jesuit institutions. She, too, is enrolled in classes and hopes to eventually complete her Master's degree.

In reflecting upon my conversation with Mrs. Frantz, I find it interesting that her name was given to me in the first place. My participants were referred to me by Father Robert Niehoff, President of John Carroll University. I asked him to suggest leaders in the university. Many people would not have thought to suggest an administrative assistant as a leader of the university, which reflects Father Niehoff's leadership philosophy. I speak more about this further in the dissertation.

Jonathan Smith

Dr. Jonathan Smith is currently the Vice President and Executive Assistant to the President of John Carroll University. Dr. Smith grew up in North Carolina, went to Emory University for a Master in Divinity, and served for three years as a Parish minister in the United Methodist Church. He then returned to school to pursue his doctorate in industrial organizational psychology, and taught at several universities before coming to John Carroll. Dr. Smith first began his tenure at John Carroll as a Management Professor, teaching organizational and behavioral leadership. He then went on to direct the Leadership Skills program and become the Chairman of the Management Department. He moved into his current role a year ago.

Participants from Seattle University

Five of my research participants work at Seattle University. Seattle University is a Jesuit institution located in the heart of Seattle, Washington. Dr. Timothy Leary is the Senior Vice President at Seattle University. Dr. Robert Kelly is the Vice President for Student Development at Seattle University. Dr. Joseph Phillips is the Dean of the Albers

School of Business and Economics at Seattle University. He also serves as a professor in the department. Dr. William Hogan is the Director of Athletics at Seattle University. Ms. Michelle Etchart is the Director of Leadership Development at Seattle University. Both the Department of Athletics and the Department of Leadership Development are housed within the Office of Student Development at Seattle University.

Timothy Leary

Dr. Timothy Leary is the Senior Vice President at Seattle University. He attended the University of Vermont for his undergraduate work, began his career as an educator 30 years ago as a public school teacher, teaching for three years in a four-room schoolhouse in Vermont. He then pursued his Masters degree in Student Personnel Administration at Colorado State University and received his doctorate from the University of Maryland. Dr. Leary worked at the University of Maryland and Loyola College of Maryland (also a Jesuit institution), eventually taking a position at St. Joe's College, a small Catholic school in Maine. Seven years ago he moved back to the west coast to become Vice President for Student Development at Seattle University and assumed his current role as Senior Vice President three years ago. Dr. Leary oversees all departments that are non-academic, including Student Development, Finance, Advancement, Legal, Human Resources, Marketing and Communications. He has eight Vice Presidents who report directly to him.

Robert Kelly

Dr. Robert Kelly is the Vice President for Student Development at Seattle University. Raised in New Jersey and attending catholic school as a boy, he went to a Jesuit high school and then Loyola College in Maryland for his undergraduate work.

Though he did not purposefully choose a Jesuit institution, Dr. Kelly could not have been happier with his undergraduate experience. He said, "I think I had one of those experiences you hope every college student has." During his undergraduate work, he became heavily involved with service learning and leadership development. He went to the University of Vermont to pursue a Master's degree in Higher Education Student Affairs. While there, he was involved in Residence Life. Upon completing his graduate studies, Dr. Kelly took a position at Colgate University. He then decided to pursue his doctorate at the University of Maryland and did his internship in the Office of Academic Affairs at Loyola College in Maryland. After meeting his wife while at the University of Maryland, they moved back to Vermont, where they had both been offered positions at the University of Vermont. Having kept in touch with Timothy Leary since his undergraduate studies, Dr. Kelly learned of an available position at Seattle University, and three years ago was hired as the university's Assistant Vice President of Student Development. Soon after his arrival, however, the President of Seattle University re-organized the leadership structure of the university, and Dr. Kelly was promoted to his current role as the Vice President of Student Development. He has approximately 110 people within his department, including staff from the Department of Athletics, the Department of Recreational Sports, Counseling and Health, Resident Life, Leadership, and Activities.

Dr. Kelly exudes passion and energy. His enthusiasm is infectious. When I transcribed my conversations, they were clearly divided into two categories: those that were more formal and that conveyed a high level of energy. Dr. Kelly's was definitely

one of the high energy conversations. He was clearly passionate about his profession and finds his work meaningful.

Joseph Phillips

Dr. Joseph Phillips is the Dean of the Albers School of Business and Economics at Seattle University. He also serves as a professor in the department. Dr. Phillips worked at Creighton University for 19 years before coming to Seattle University. During that time he was a Business School faculty member and was promoted to Associate Dean, serving in that position for several years. He came to Seattle University to assume his current role as the Dean of the School of Business and Economics in July 2001, and still teaches one course every other year. Dr. Phillips oversees a large number of students, faculty and staff in his department, including almost 2,000 students, 60 full-time faculty, many adjunct faulty, and 28 staff members. Dr. Phillips was helpful in that he is both an administrator and faculty member, and his horizon is more expansive because of his dual roles. He recognized that people can be in agreement with the shared meaning of the institution but have very different views of what that should mean in daily practice.

My conversation with Dr. Phillips was my most challenging, and helped me recognize the importance of language in coming to a shared meaning. I'm not sure my research questions quite fit with his orientation to the world. He seemed at times to almost struggle with them, and I think he may have been trying to understand the intention of the questions I was asking. This was significant because it reminded me of how difficult it can be when people are not approaching a conversation from the same orientation. Leaders must use language that helps bring others along on the same

dialogic journey rather than leaving them behind. It is important to find a way of conveying ideas in a manner suitable to another's horizon: their scope of understanding.

William Hogan

Dr. William Hogan is the Director of Athletics at Seattle University. He received his undergraduate degree from Saint Joseph's College in Indiana, and then pursued his Master's in Business Education and a doctorate in Educational Administration from Bowling Green University. He then went back to St. Joseph's, serving as a professor, men's basketball coach, and Director of Athletics for many years. Dr. Hogan then went to the University of San Francisco (USF), serving as the Director of Athletics for 17 years. While at USF, he was also an adjunct faulty member in business administration and sports management. Dr. Hogan is in his third year as the Director of Athletics at Seattle University.

Compared to my other conversations, this one was unique because Dr. Hogan was the one participant with whom I was familiar, as he had been supervisor for two years when he was the Director of Athletics at the University of San Francisco. I noted right away how much easier it was to engage in conversation when there was already a rapport, a relationship. It is clear that for future interpretive research, the more time that can be spent developing relationships, the more fruitful the research may be.

Michelle Etchart

Ms. Michelle Etchart is the Director of Leadership Development at Seattle University. Originally from the Northwest, Ms. Etchart knew early on that she wanted to go into a service profession. She originally majored in sociology, and "fell into" Student Development for her graduate work. She also received a minor in diversity education

during her graduate studies. All of her education was in medium to large public institutions. After graduate school, Ms. Etchart moved to Arkansas to work at the University of Arkansas. She then worked at Colorado State, where she loved the work and the students with whom she was working, but found that her personal leadership framework was not quite fitting with the institution. She realized that either she was going to have to change her approach to leadership, which was "focused on social change and an inward out sort of framework…it wasn't fitting as well at a large school, which was demanding of me a more generic way of looking at leadership." She had a friend who had worked at a Jesuit institution, who recommended that she consider Jesuit education. She had never worked at a private institution and was hesitant. After exploring and gaining insight into the Jesuit education traditions, she realized it could be a good fit for her and her approach to leadership. She was offered a position at Seattle University and has been in her current position as Director of Student Leadership Development for five years.

Similar to the experience I had with my first participant, I felt that Ms. Etchart and I were often engaged in a true conversation. It is clear when you engage in open discourse with another individual: when both people enter the conversation with a sincere openness to new understandings. I was able to speak with her regarding different theoretical concepts relevant to my research, and we both left the discussion with a new way of understanding ourselves, our world, and ideas related to leadership, the ethical aim, and ethical action within our organizations.

I first sent Letters of Invitation to each participant to introduce the research topic and the researcher, and I also included the research questions that served to guide the

conversation (please refer to Appendix C). Upon receiving my partner's agreement to participate in my research, a Letter of Confirmation was sent to each conversation partner explaining in further detail the subjects of the research and the importance of their role as a participant (please refer to Appendix D). The confirmation letter also included a brief description of the interpretive participatory research process and an emphasis on the format of a conversation as compared to an interview. Providing my conversation partners with this basic understanding of interpretive participatory research was the first step in setting the stage for a true conversation to take place. The letter also served to confirm the dates and times established and to emphasize the nature of interpretive research.

Data Collection

With the prior consent of each participant, each conversation was tape-recorded. I then transcribed each conversation verbatim after the conversation. Transcribing each conversation personally allowed for more re-interpretation as I re-remembered the conversations. The transcripts were then sent back to each participant for their review. Accompanying this transcription, I provided a brief overview of the conversation that took place. The review of the transcript gave the participants an opportunity to read over what was said, and to amend, delete, clarify, or add to the transcription. Once each conversation partner reviewed the transcribed conversation and all modifications had been made and approved, the transcripts served as a text for data analysis.

After each conversation, a transcribed conversation along with preliminary analysis was sent to each conversation partner, thereby giving each participant the opportunity to read and reflect on the transcription and preliminary analysis. Each

participant had the opportunity to delete, add, or change what they said in the conversation. Additionally, a thank you letter was sent to each of the participants acknowledging their contribution, time and assistance in this research (please refer to Appendix E).

Research Categories and Guiding Questions

To ensure that my conversation partners and I engaged in discourse relevant to my research purpose, I developed three categories to serve as boundaries for my research. Each of these categories served to ground the ideas of leadership, meaning in work, and ethical action in just institutions in a critical hermeneutics context. In the following section I discuss the conceptual background that informs this investigation within the context of my chosen categories.

In this discussion, I also provide several questions within each category that were developed to guide the conversations. These questions served to help keep the discourse on topic. The questions listed were not necessarily the exact questions asked in each conversation, nor were they designed for a specific answer; rather, they were chosen to foster a conversation, to open up a world of new understanding for both conversation partners. The three research categories I chose to guide my research are fusion of horizons, the communal dimension of identity and ethical action.

Fusion of Horizons

We bring our view of the world, our beliefs, and our prejudices to the interpretation of a story. If we are open to new ideas, we may leave the interpretive experience with a new understanding that will converge with our previous set of beliefs; in other words, there may be meeting of what we knew to be true before coming to the

text and what we now know to be true from a new understanding of the text. This event, or *fusion of horizons* (Gadamer 1975), may offer a new interpretation proposing new worlds and therefore new action. Experiencing a fusion of horizons is important to the exploration, interpretation, and understanding of self, including the relationship of self with the other.

The historical aspect of Gadamer's view of horizon is a key aspect for understanding his fusion of horizons construct. He describes horizon as "the range of vision that includes everything that can be seen from a particular vantage point" (1975:301). Our beliefs, prejudices, and pre-understandings all begin from our ability to see our past within its own historical horizon rather than from our present horizon. This historical horizon, according to Gadamer, exists in the form of tradition. Our past, asserts Gadamer, is always in motion; therefore, our historical horizon can never be closed. Human life is constantly in motion and thus we are never in one static horizon, never bound in one precise standpoint or one finite point of view. Gadamer also posits that as humans always living in an encounter with our tradition, we are constantly experiencing tension between the past and present. We cannot, therefore, experience a horizon of the present without the horizon of the past. He posits (1975:306) that "in the process of understanding, a real fusing of horizons occurs – which means that as the historical horizon is projected, it is simultaneously superseded."

As mentioned earlier, we can appropriate new worlds through the examination of a text. Fusion of horizons, however, can occur from a variety of forms of texts, including discourse. Ricoeur (1991) notes that discourse with another person, and what we take to and bring from the conversation, can also result in a fusion of horizons. When a person

comes to a text the "awaited horizon and the horizon meet and fuse without ceasing" (Ricoeur 1991:430). It is essential to emphasize that we must be open to recognize what we uniquely bring to a conversation, our past experiences and our pre-understandings, before we can fully experience new understandings.

The following guiding questions were chosen within the category of fusion of horizons:

- To what extent do you feel your calling is to help others gain new understandings about themselves and the world?
- How do you help the people you lead come to these new understandings?
- What do you learn from the people with whom you work?
- Describe how your experiences within your work and your organization have led you to a different understanding of the world.

The fusion of horizons concept is applicable to the workplace environment where members of organizations each come to their work with their pre-understandings. We should not ignore or try to conceal this; rather, from a hermeneutical perspective, leaders in organizations should recognize that each individual's horizons are an important part of the linguistic domain of communication. Leaders who are aware of their pre-understandings will hopefully be more open to coming to new understandings as they seek to work together with other members of the organization. Furthermore, leaders should encourage opportunities and moments when fusions of horizons may occur through discourse. These moments may allow for a communal identity to emerge, a topic that will be further discussed in the following section.

The Communal Dimension of Identity

As Ricoeur (1990:247) discusses, we can take the concept of narrative identity and expand it to a collective dimension, from more than just oneself and the other as individual relationships, toward a community level. In Ricoeur's discussion of just institutions, he notes that institutions can be any community of people who have a "bond of common mores and not that of constraining rules" (1992:194). Kearney, in exploring Ricoeur's ideas on communal identity, notes that "subjects, individual or communal, come to imagine and know themselves in the stories they tell about themselves" (Kearney 1996:182). Barash (1999) states that memory can serve as the link between individual and plural identity. We can, through our memory and telling our story, recognize the cohesive nature of the life we have in common. Memory serves to provide a collective identity, which Barash (1999:34) describes as extending to "a group identity that takes the form of a more substantial autonomous reality."

With an understanding of our communal identity, we can more effectively work with and for others in our organizations towards the ethical aim. Ricoeur (1992:195) speaks of our ability to have power-in-common, a concept with two aspects: plurality and action in concert. We must move from simply understanding our selves and our individual and communal identities to now acting as a result of this understanding.

The following guiding questions were chosen within the category of the communal dimension of identity:

- To what extent do you believe your understanding of who you are makes a difference in how you relate to others within your organization?
- How is leadership being (identity)?
- How do you bring others along on the leadership journey?

Ruth Benedict (2005:16) states that "What really binds men [and women] together is their culture, the standards and ideals they have in common." If individuals are able to understand the common purpose and meaning of their organizations they will be able to foster new understandings and imagine new futures together. The concept of communal identity in organization is important to this research. In choosing this research category, I hoped to understand how the leaders of Jesuit organizations with whom I spoke recognized the collaborative nature and the ethical intention of the work they have in common with others: a subject explored further in the following section.

Ethical Action

Ricoeur (1992) believes it is ethically imperative to aim toward the good life with a sense of the well-being of the other; an aspect of ethical perspective he refers to as solicitude. Ricoeur (1992:179) observes that this statement may seem at first to be a paradox; aiming at the good life involves "the nebulous of ideals and dreams of achievements with regard to which a life is held to be more or less fulfilled or unfulfilled." Aiming at this good life seems almost selfish. How can one aim at the good life and fulfill personal dreams while also pursuing the same for others? Ricoeur does not see solicitude as playing a game of tug of war between self-esteem and esteeming others. Solicitude, the responsibility for the other, does not interfere with the search for personal ideals and achievements. Instead, solicitude "unfolds the dialogic dimension of self-esteem" (1992:180). Instead of one *or* the other, according to Ricoeur, in the ethical aim it is one *with* the other. He notes that neither self-esteem nor solicitude can be "experienced or reflected upon one without the other" (1992:180).

As beings in the world in service to others, leaders must not lose sight of the connection between self and the other, particularly in the daily action within organizations. Shahideh (2004:70) notes, "All human beings have the power to control the level and the magnitude of their disconnectedness from each other." In their leadership journeys, members of just institutions must seek to be men and women for others. This is not to say one cannot aim for the good life for oneself. Ricoeur notes that solicitude for others is impossible without self-esteem. However, one's horizon must always be expansive enough to include others. Gadamer (1975:269) notes that "a person who sees no horizon is a man who does not see far enough and hence overvalues what is nearest to him." We must recognize the interplay between self-esteem and solicitude in our aim for the good life. We must also keep our horizon - particularly in roles as educators or leaders - open enough to see what is around us, to see our relationship of self with the other, and to strive in our leadership capacity to achieve the ethical aim.

This aim, for Ricoeur (1992), serves as the encompassing umbrella for which beings can live the good life with and for others. Below this umbrella is the moral norm, which - for Ricoeur (1992) - is the moral judgment exercised for action in a given situation. The interplay between ethics and morality is important for understanding how leaders in organizations engage in meaningful acts. Are their daily actions based on an over-arching ethical aim? Do other members of the organizations follow suit? Ricoeur (1992:204) states, "The norm puts the wish to live well to the test." Leaders must examine their daily actions to critique just how well the norm measures up to the ethical aim. Engaging in such a critical examination of the norms and the ethical aim of an

organization offers significant insight into leaders' abilities to successfully engage in meaningful action while coincidentally reflecting their understanding of identity.

The following guiding questions were chosen within the category of the ethical action:

- How do the leaders in your organization come to shared understandings and a shared purpose? Does organizational history play a role in this?
- How does your narrative influence your work?
- Please explain ethics and morality.
- How do you promote daily action that works toward the ethical aim as a leader in your organization?

The narrative of a community or organization is informed by mimetic activity. Kearney (2002:132) describes mimesis as the "power to re-create actual worlds as possible worlds," and notes that we move from action to text and back to action again. He states (2002:133), "We move from a prefigured experience through narrative recounting back to a refigured life-world." We must, as a community, explore the context in which we live so that we can imagine our shared meaning, our shared future and act together towards the good life. Kearney states that "Narrative is an open-ended invitation to ethical and poetic responsiveness" (Kearney 2002:156). Rainwater (1996:104) links narrative with praxis stating, "Mimetic activity thus acquires an ethical and political significance that generates further action through recognition and persuasion. The power of narrative configuration to 'affect' us (catharsis) is also the power to persuade us." In my conversations, I explored the ability of my partners to utilize this concept of ethical action, hoping to gain insight into the responsibility associated with mimesis and narrative. In the following section, I describe the research process used in ascertaining the role that ethical action plays in the meaning my

conversation partners find in their work. Ethical action is the critical hermeneutic concept that most predominantly emerged from the conversations with my participants.

Research Timeline

Data was collected between June and September of 2008. All conversations took place at John Carroll University and Seattle University. Data analysis occurred during the period of August 2008 to November 2008.

Text Creation and Data Analysis

Critical hermeneutics allows for interpretation and understanding through discourse, text creation, text analysis, and appropriation of new worlds through interpretation of the text. Data analysis for this research followed the protocol for participatory inquiry delineated by Herda (1999:96-100) as outlined below:

- Research categories will serve to guide the conversation with the anticipation that some of the initial categories may be altered as new understandings emerge from the research process.
- Transcription of each taped conversation in order to fix the discourse.
- Examination of the transcriptions. Identification of significant statements in light of the theoretical framework of critical hermeneutics.
- Opportunities provided for follow-up conversations with participants and other contacts.
- Further review of the texts and other data to look for groupings of themes and sub-themes within each category.
- Identification of new understandings that emerged for the participants and the researcher as a result of participation in the research process.
- Review of the data for emerging implications for organizational leadership and for topics that might merit further research.

Data analysis, which is fully described in subsequent chapters, is divided into three sections: preliminary analysis, the secondary analysis, and the interpretive

assessment and implications. The preliminary analysis of data is primarily descriptive. This analysis tells the story of the participants, placing greater emphasis on data and less emphasis on theoretical discussion. The secondary analysis, a critical examination of the texts, is interpreted from the critical hermeneutic perspective. The final analysis involves a deeper level of critique and interpretation, allowing for new understandings to emerge and new possibilities to be revealed. Implications have emerged for a new way of being for leaders and for policy makers in organizational development.

An important aspect of data analysis and the appropriation of new futures in a critical hermeneutic orientation to participatory inquiry is distanciation from a text. According to Ricoeur (1981), once a text has been written there is no longer a world behind the text, only the world in front of the text. The author's original intention is no longer present; there is only the interpretation by the reader that leads the reader to new understandings. Ricoeur (1981:143) states, "to begin with, appropriation is dialectically linked to the distanciation characteristic of writing… Thanks to distanciation by writing, appropriation no longer has any trace of affective affinity with the intention of the author."

In interpretive research, the first text creation comes from transcribing the conversation. This fixed text allowed me to distance myself from the conversation. Herda (1999:127) states that in the process of transcribing "the discourse is fixed in writing; the speakers are separated from what they said. This is part of the distanciation process. The meaning of what is said surpasses the event of saying." An additional source of data for my analysis was the personal journal that I kept throughout the research process. In writing my ideas and reflections that emerge from my conversations,

I developed an additional source of data in the form of a text. Writing my thoughts and reflections on my conversations and experiences throughout the research allowed for distanciation of my own thoughts. The text of the conversation transcriptions and the text of my reflective journal both provided powerful data from which I could gain new understandings and imagine new futures.

The second textual creation occurs "when the researcher selectively presents from the transcription texts a story about the issue at hand, drawing quotes to ground the narrative" (Herda 1999:127). Once the conversation was transcribed, my analysis - the narrative of the important parts of the data - became its own text. Herda (1999:86) states "the task remains to make the text one's own after the act of distanciation takes place. This subsequent act is one of appropriation—an interpretive event." My analysis of the transcribed text allowed for interpretation and a new appropriation.

The third textual creation occurs as the researcher explores connections between the narrative of the conversation and critical hermeneutic theory, which will ground my data analysis in a theoretical foundation for understanding. Creating a narrative from a hermeneutic perspective allows us to recognize concordance in the discordance of many conversations. Theory allows us to understand our realities with a common vocabulary. The theoretical constructs will allow universal ideas to emerge from the text of the individual conversations. Herda (1999:127) states, "A deeper plot is discovered in a third text utilizing the second text and the critical hermeneutic literature in which narration reveals an order that is more than the actual events and conversations in the research."

Text creation and interpretation of the data are two key aspects of interpretive research. The texts enable distanciation, allowing the researcher to appropriate new

meanings, understandings, and imagine new futures. As the researcher, I bring my pre-judgments and pre-understandings to the research and, if I approach them with an openness to new ideas, the act of interpretation may result in a fusion of horizons. I may come to new understandings and appropriate a new future, as may other readers of the proposed research texts. The next section discusses a field study that was conducted to test preliminary research concepts on leadership and meaning in work and describes how data was analyzed, drawing from critical hermeneutic theory for the participatory research inquiry.

Pilot Study

Conversation Partner

Laleh Shahideh, the conversation partner for my pilot study, is currently the Associate Dean of Students at the University of San Francisco. She graduated from the doctoral program in Organization and Leadership here at the University of San Francisco and while completing her research, she pursued her dissertation grounded in a critical hermeneutic framework. She now works as an Associate Dean and Professor, making a difference every day in the lives of the many students (including me) with whom she works.

Pilot Study Analysis

Laleh's narrative of her experiences during our conversation helped me understand how she views the meaning she finds in her work. We never mentioned the word *meaning* in our conversation, but through her description of calling I was able to interpret how important the meaning in work and life is to her. Her detailed and lively descriptions of the two founding events in her life gave me new understandings of how

the different aspects of our identity cannot be separated. The fact that a move to a new country has changed her and that it affects every step she has taken since then illuminates that we cannot separate work from the other events in your life.

I learned from Laleh that self as another is not just an important part of leadership: it is leadership. I have come away from our conversation believing, truly, that leadership is being, not doing. Laleh never discussed the people who worked *for* her. She discussed about the people *with whom* she worked. She used 'we,' 'us,' and 'with' quite frequently in her discussion of her co-workers. Laleh's narrative of her understanding of self and her being in the world with others illuminates Ricoeur's (1992) ideas of sameness and selfhood in one's identity. It is clear that both her relationship with herself and the relationship with others are interwoven facets of her identity. Her ability to recognize that her understanding of self has helped her in her relationship with others shows me that the understanding of hermeneutic theory, if put into action, really will allow for new understandings, new possibilities, and new futures. Leadership cannot be about directing others, or managing others, or pushing others. It is about being in the world with others.

In her explanation of Gadamer's fusion of horizons, Herda (1999:5) notes that "although our horizons are open, they are also finite. It is up to each of us to change our horizon – the burden for understanding is on each of us." Laleh takes this burden, this responsibility, quite seriously. It is her understanding of self, and the humility that emerged as a result, that allows her to step forward with such openness. As she stated, she learns from the people with whom she works every day. I can only imagine that the trusting, loyal, caring, and open environment which she fosters is certainly contagious.

Without being aware of the theoretical terminology, I am certain that her colleagues experience this fusion of horizons from the energy, love, care, and openness that Laleh brings to her relationships with them. Please also refer to Appendix F for the complete transcription of my conversation with Laleh.)

Pilot Study Implications

Prior to my pilot conversation and reflection, my proposed work only focused on the first two aspects of Ricoeur's quote on ethical intention as aiming "for the good life with and for others in just institutions" (1992:180). Upon competing the analysis and reflection of my conversation I realized that the third part of his statement regarding just institutions needed to be added. Additionally, for my Anthropology of Education class I completed a project that led me toward my current dissertation topic. Though my conversations for that class project were not part of my original pilot study, in essence it was the pilot for my current research path, and was an important step in my dissertation journey. For this reason, I have included the data I collected for the class project as part of my pilot study. (Please refer to Appendix G for further details of my conversation with the USF Dean of Nursing and with a student in the nursing program.)

The Dean of Nursing spoke with enthusiasm about how she found meaningful work as part of an institution with which her personal beliefs and values were similar to that of the university's mission and values. She spoke passionately about the work being done in service to others throughout the university, and she noted that the mission and values of the university were clearly articulated by the top leaders. She shared the priorities of the university and noted the importance of the daily actions of faculty and staff in her department to work toward the shared meaning of the university. The student

with whom I spoke, however, stated that what was written in the mission and the values of the university was not what she heard and saw from her instructors on a daily basis. She noted a discrepancy between what the university was supposed to convey and what she – as a student – was seeing, hearing, and learning in her department on a daily basis.

As educators and administrators, we must provide students with opportunities to narrate their own stories, to interpret, and to critique in order to open themselves to new futures. We must also recognize that simply articulating the communal identity and shared meaning of an organization is not enough. We must strive to ensure that all members of our organization are daily working toward the shared meaning and acting in pursuit of the ethical aim. Only if we act, every single day as men and women with and for others, will we educate from that same orientation. Only if we educate from that orientation do we have the possibility of our students creating new futures for themselves and others. And finally, only if we act towards reaching shared understandings will we be able to move forward as an organization in pursuit of a better world. This is why I decided, after my pilot study and my other class project, to explore leaders as members of organizations rather than simply leaders as individual beings in the world.

In the following Chapters, I will analyze the data that emerged from my interpretation of the transcriptions. Chapter Four begins with a descriptive, preliminary analysis of the data. In Chapter Five, I provide a deeper, critical analysis of the data from an interpretive, critical hermeneutic perspective. Finally, I discuss key findings and implications in Chapter Six.

CHAPTER FOUR – PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

Introduction

Participatory research grounded in critical hermeneutic theory allows for a more revealing exploration of leadership and meaningful work, which can present numerous possibilities for leaders in organizations. In Chapter Four, I present a preliminary analysis of the texts created from the research conversations. This analysis is primarily descriptive in nature, focusing on the themes that emerged from my interpretation of the first created text, the text of the conversation transcriptions. A deeper, theoretical discussion follows in Chapter Five.

In the remaining sections of this Chapter, I discuss the themes that emerged from analysis of the conversations. I have chosen to discuss the themes as they relate to my three research categories: fusion of horizons, the communal aspect of identity, and ethical action. The organization of the preliminary analysis is by theme, rather than by either of the specific institutions. The communal aspect of identity and ethical action are the strongest concepts to emerge from the research conversations, and most of the data that I collected fell into one of these two categories. Less data emerged from the category of fusion of horizons, a point I discuss further in this Chapter and in Chapter Five. I begin the preliminary analysis with a discussion of the themes that emerged within the category of Fusion of Horizons.

Fusion of Horizons

Helping Others Come to New Understandings

A primary area of focus in my work is looking at leadership as a way of being with and for others, and helping others to gain new understandings about themselves and

the world. Several of my research participants did feel that their calling, at least to some extent, was to help others reach these understandings. For Dr. Finucane, one of her primary responsibilities was "getting people to critically examine their role, their own motivation and what the needs [of the institution and community] are." She spends a large portion of her time and effort helping faculty and staff come to new understandings about themselves and their role as members of their institution. Dr. Finucane specifically focuses on helping others look at service at the university differently. She has faced obstacles when promoting the idea of service-learning to faculty members. She stated, "For many of the faculty that's a difficult concept -- that someone else can teach." She helps faculty members "see the community as another kind of text." She noted that many of them are committed to Jesuit education, but may not see where their needs fit in with the commitment to service. She stated, "Although they are strongly committed to Jesuit education and understand service is part of that, it's still a little bit about 'what I want to do, 'what makes me feel good.' And we're working with them to shift to…what talents do I bring to meet these needs of the world?" She has recognized the importance of helping others reach these new understandings through relationship building, trust, and dialogue. She stated, "We try to help to shape the conversation gently…it's a lot of relationship building and building trust and trying to help."

Dr. Finucane recognized the challenge when what she values and finds important may not be what others prioritize as important stating, "It's hard sometimes, when it's your personal commitment…how much do I expect out of other people? What's fair to expect that other people will buy in?" She recognized that there are people in her institution that could never work in her office because they do not see service learning as

of value to them. But she realizes that "something brings each of these people to this office." She tries to recognize and value that, especially if it's a different motivation than hers. She tries "to nurture it, and help them grow in their knowledge of Jesuit education and the Ignatian pedagogy."

Dr. Finucane does not just focus on bringing faculty and staff to new understandings. She also helps to engage students in new opportunities to allow for new understandings of who the students are, and what role they have in their community, to emerge. She helps to facilitate the experiences for students, but she also engages them in reflection on the new understandings that emerged from the experience. She told me that she and her staff are constantly asking students, "What did you learn? How did it shape you? What are you going to do now? Did it change your vocation? Does it reinforce for you that this is what you wanted?" She described one student who went on a poverty and solidarity summer internship program. Before she went, the student was planning on going to graduate school in public policy. After participating in the internship, she decided to participate in the Teach for America program. In speaking of the student's decision she said, "She attributes it to that experience and realized, 'I had a lot to give, there's ways to do it, and I can do it now.'" The student had a fusion of horizons, resulting from a new understanding.

In Dr. Finucane's description of the student's new understanding, however, the student gained these new understandings from the experience of working with others rather than from the others themselves. A critical hermeneutic approach to leadership and service calls for recognition of a fusion of horizons from those moments with the other. Leadership and educating by serving others still reflects a positivistic approach.

Leading and educating others from an interpretive, ontological orientation, on the other hand, involves the orientation of oneself to the other. Only if we are open to the other, and not just to new experiences, can new understandings and a fusion of horizons be possible. I discuss this concept further in the secondary analysis of data.

Dr. Kelly also viewed helping others reach new understandings as a large portion of his responsibility as Director of Student Development stating,

> So much of my work is getting them to look at something from a different perspective… I find that a lot of it is interpreting what's going on and motivating people and that sort of thing…and then it's creating that vision for students, so that they can understand their own experience and make meaning out of their own college experience." He works with the students, helping them to engage in a discernment process. He urges them to ask themselves, 'What gifts do I have in the world? Am I any good at it? And does anyone care if I do it?'

Ms. Etchart offered a similar response to this question, viewing helping others reach new understandings as an important part of her work. She stated,

> I think a big part of my work with my students, that's really at the core, understanding who they are, what fires them up, what they've got to offer to the world….and getting into new situations. It's not until we're in a situation that we have not experienced before that shows us new angles and perspectives. And we realize, oh! I didn't know I'd react that way or, I didn't realize I thought that.

Ms. Etchart also mentioned discernment as part of the process of reaching new understandings. She said that at Seattle University they are "taking a vocational discernment lens. Where is your passion, how do you identify certain talents and gifts? How do you put those together?"

Dr. Leary had a slightly different response than those described above, although indirectly he agreed that helping others come to new understandings was important. First and foremost, he saw himself as an educator. Even though this may not at first seem to directly relate to the topic of helping others come to new understandings, I think it

reflects his approach to leadership. He views his role as a leader and educator to give others opportunities to gain these new understandings for themselves. He asked, "How is it that you reach people where they are and continue to challenge them to grow and develop? It's not an easy process …but what we try to do is allow people to try to figure that out for themselves, given all kinds of things that are happening at the university." Other participants responded similarly to Dr. Leary, emphasizing that their role was to provide others with opportunities for their own development and exploration. For example, Dr. Hogan said, "We don't teach you what to think, we teach you how to think." Dr. Smith also saw himself as providing opportunities for others to grow and develop.

Dr. Phillips, on the other hand, did not see his role at all as from the orientation of helping others reach new understandings stating, "I don't think that deeply. I think it's my job to allow faculty to do their thing, basically, to grow professionally…I just don't frame it that way. So it depends on how you look at it, I guess." His response offered a clear example that leaders may operate from varying orientations to what leadership is and should be.

Learning

Within the Fusion of Horizons category, we also discussed how and what my participants learn from the people with whom they work. This was not just about how they engage others in moving towards a fusion of horizons, but also to explore if they are open to experiencing their own fusion of horizons. Many of them stated that they learn every single day from the people with whom they work, and several noted that their learning involves gaining is a deeper understanding of who they are. Dr. Kelly stated, "I

learn more about the institution, I learn more about myself, I learn more about triggers…motivations, frustrations, hopes, joys, passions…I feel more connected with the realities of the world because that's what we're here for." Dr. Leary learned that each individual is unique in his relationships and interactions with him, stating, "I'm learning every day that what makes one person passionate about what they do and all the ways that you can engage them and work that challenges and supports them…I'm constantly learning how to be effective with one person is not the same way you're effective with someone else." He also recognized that in order to learn from the people with whom he works, he must actively listen to them, stating, "Part of my job is listening to what others are thinking about us and how we can best engage them." He noted the importance of a leader having a true openness to others, saying, "You have to have a style that allows people to walk in your door and share with you what they're really thinking."

For Ms. Frantz, learning is constant in her work. She noted learning "the nuance of different personalities, different management styles, prioritizing, and getting people behind you, and understanding collectively what's going on." For her, learning is about "being open-minded instead of just regimented, and this is the way it is and…learning is a lifelong process. You're learning how to live and to learn."

Ms. Etchart described her learning as both inner and outer experiences. She described the inner learning as, "I constantly learn things about myself by my experiences. Even, you know, whether it's in a situation and it's the inner biases or thoughts or tapes or whatever, that I have about myself…or I see it in a new way. I see it in a new lens." For her, the outward learning involved a new understanding of the world. She stated, "One of the things I really value is just being able to see the world through

different eyes and being able to view…I don't think we can ever completely take on another person's perspective? But it's…stretching the way I see the world."

The term fusion of horizons was not actually used in any of my guiding research questions, and – in retrospect – I wish I had actually used it more frequently in my conversations. Had I done so, I believe that more data may have emerged from this research category. I did speak to Ms. Etchart about the concept and, though she had never heard the term, the concept appealed to her as a way to approach leadership and education.

> RC: …A different theorist that we use has a term called Fusion of Horizons, which is everything I am now, coming into this room, my biases, my prejudices, my beliefs, my view of the world.
>
> ME: Mmmm.
>
> RC: And then we have this conversation. And it's not, the fusion is not between you and me. The Fusion is between the old me and the me that walks out this door.
>
> ME: Yeah, yeah.
>
> RC: And so that's exactly what you're talking about, that moment where, from whatever we've discussed or a book that I read or looking at that piece of art, my biases, beliefs and views have changed, if I was open to it.
>
> ME: Right.
>
> RC: And I love that idea of Fusion of Horizons. It's kind of what opened me to Hermeneutics in the first place. Because I thought, I can get that. And I think that's what education is about.
>
> ME: Right.
>
> RC: We are providing opportunities for these students to have their own fusion of horizons.
>
> ME: Right.

RC: And coming to new understandings. And like you said, though, hopefully so are we. It's not unidirectional.

ME: Right. I don't think we can be effective with students if we're not in it ourselves. It's very much a walking with students along their journey. Otherwise, there's just a level of artificiality. And students pick up on that, they know when we're inauthentic.

RC: Yes!

ME: I think it's interesting, going back to that Fusion, I think that's what drew me to education in the first place. I have always, just from my background, I have always been really interested in learning different perspectives and that, sort of, boundary-crossing experience and finding out, what am I going to learn from this? And trying new things on.

Ms. Etchart recognized from our conversation how experiencing a fusion of horizons can open new worlds for both herself and her students. Not many of my other participants spoke of coming to new understandings about themselves *from* others. Several spoke of learning about themselves from different life experiences, but not specifically from their relationships with others. Many of these Jesuit leaders approach leadership as serving others, but there was a lack of an understanding of themselves *as* others, and the importance of this orientation for them to experience their own fusion of horizons. Additionally, for several of them, their own learning seemed more positivistic and transactional rather than moments of new understandings truly emerging. I discuss this point further in my secondary analysis.

With new understandings of themselves and others come the possibilities of new imagined futures for my participants. In some form, each of my participants described part of their work as providing others with possibilities for reflection, growth, and development. In our fusion of horizons discussion, we focused on how they helped individuals come to new understandings on a personal level. Each of these individuals,

however, is also a member of their organization, leading us to the second research category, the communal dimension of identity. In the following section I discuss the themes that emerged from the discussion within the research category communal dimension of identity.

Communal Dimension of Identity

Meaningful Work

Though my research questions did not directly mention the idea "meaningful work," nearly all the conversations eventually focused on that topic. For several of the participants in particular, it was clear they felt engaged in meaningful work by the body language they used when they discussed their work. Dr. Finucane's eyes lit up when we talked about the work she was doing with the students and staff, and she was quite animated when talking about her ideas for the future of her department. When we talked about finding the meaning in work, we noted that it is a responsibility to use our gifts to meet the needs of others.

Mrs. Frantz offered a clear picture of the importance of doing meaningful work. When she spoke about her current role, she spoke simply and to the point, with little emotion. When she began describing her previous role in Mission and Identity, however, she became more animated. Her eyes brightened, she sat more upright in her chair, she spoke more quickly, and her tone was more energetic. It was apparent she had absolutely loved her previous role, but more importantly, she found it to be meaningful.

Other participants directly noted the benefit of being able to bring their values into their work rather than separating their identities, and keeping what they found meaningful in their personal lives separate from their job. Several participants stated that

Jesuit institutions embrace this integration. Dr. Smith noted that when you work in an organization that allows you to embrace your values and priorities it "adds a real enthusiasm to your teaching and to your work, to be able to do that." Dr. Leary mentioned a similar sentiment saying, "It's nice to not have to leave your values at the front door. It's the stuff that I feel the most committed to and passionate about."

Dr. Leary stated that the integration between one's work and one's identity was vital not just for him as an individual but in his work as a leader. He noted, "That's what I'm finding is really important, not discounting the individual identities and values, because that helps to enrich what we're doing, but coming back to the core values I think helps move people along." Dr. Leary's comment brings us to the importance of understanding our individual identities in relation with others as we move from seeing ourselves simply as beings in the world to beings with and for others in just institutions.

Understanding Individual Identity in Relations with Others

The participants' understanding of themselves was not important to each of them alike. Dr. Hogan, when asked about how his understanding of self helps him in relationship to others stated, "I don't think about myself that much. And I don't know why." He then went on to say, "I'm more interested in finding the right way than my own way." Dr. Hogan is so focused on serving those with whom he works that he has not focused on understanding who he is in relation to others. Yet in other parts of the conversation, he appeared quite reflective of past experiences, mistakes made, and lessons he had learned. I suggested to him that perhaps his ability to reflect on his own mistakes and to learn from his experiences was, in fact, a method he used to come to understandings about himself. He had simply been unaware of it because he felt that, as a

leader, he should be more oriented to thinking about the other. He agreed that perhaps I was right.

Ms. Etchart, in contrast, believed that understanding ourselves is at the center of leadership development, stating, "I think so much of leadership development…that's what it is, discovering and going deeper and getting more in touch with who we really are at our core." She also noted that we bring our identity, our core beliefs and values to every relationship and situation. Ms. Etchart observed:

> I think the core of who we are, we bring that to any situation and any relationship we're in. So for me it's always part of the equation I'm thinking about. Who am I bringing to the table in this particular situation? Who am I called to be in this particular situation? And I think a lot of who I am and how I act in the world comes from where I've been and the experiences that I've had and my history and my family and all that.

Other participants recognized the importance of gaining an understanding of oneself in relationship to others. In my conversation with Dr. Leary, we discussed how important an understanding of oneself is because you cannot separate your identity from your job. For us, identity was simply "how you're oriented to everything you do." Dr. Smith has also reflected on how his relationships and experiences have shaped his identity. He noted three immersion trips to El Salvador that had particularly shaped him. He also recognized how he changes as he engages in different relationships, stating, "As I establish relationships with people I become far more dynamic…I spend a great deal of energy evaluating my strengths, evaluating what going on around me, evaluating the environment."

Dr. Kelly and Ms. Etchart also spoke of the relationship between individual identity and meaningful work as a member of their organization. Dr. Kelly spoke of how important he feels it is for him and his staff to get to know each other on a personal level.

He invites his staff to participate in a monthly lunch series called "What Matters to Me and Why?" Each month one member of his staff is the speaker during the lunch, and simply shares with the rest of the group what is important to them and their identity as individuals. He felt that this type of exercise helps people come to new understandings about each other, providing a setting for deeper appreciation of each other's identities, and opportunities for meaningful discourse, closer relationships, and thus more meaningful work.

Ms. Etchart recognized the value of finding significance "at an organizational level what I think is important at an individual level – knowing who we are and being authentic to that." She described working at another institution when her personal priorities were not fitting well with the organizational priorities, as quoted previously. She remembered, "A friend suggested I consider Jesuit education. I though it might be a good fit. [I thought] maybe there could be a place for me that would free me up and appreciate the way I'm trying to approach leadership."

Coming to a Shared Meaning

The two campuses where my research conversations were conducted – John Carroll University and Seattle University - were each in a state of transition and reflection regarding their communal identity. At John Carroll University this was true because of a recent change in leadership, whereas Seattle University had recently focused on recreating their shared meaning. In all of my conversations, it was apparent this issue was complex and the focus of on-going discussions at both universities.

John Carroll University recently appointed a new President, and in the past two years almost the entire top tier of leadership has changed. Dr. Finucane recognized that

with new leadership, comes new rules to the game. She told a story of an old Vice President who said that the new President had completely "changed the rules." She noted that it was all in a positive direction, but change can still be unsettling for people. She mentioned that the new President had a strong focus on collaboration between departments, and she recognized that this emphasis was new and involved numerous challenges. She observed that, "All the rules of the game have changed…it turned everything upside down for all of them" [the Vice Presidents]. Because the rules had changed, the leaders had to "re-group and think differently" about their leadership practices. As we discussed the topic, it became clear to me that the expectations articulated by the leaders of an institution may play a large role in how aligned the daily actions of individuals in an organization are with the shared meaning of the institution.

In discussing the shared meaning and the communal identity of her organization, Dr. Finucane said that just because there is a shared meaning does not mean that every individual in the organization supports it. In her department, she has had a challenging time getting faculty to embrace service as an important aspect of their work. She has worked diligently in the past two years to gain the trust of her faculty and to help them come to new understandings about how service could fit into their curriculum. She stated, "It's been a process of reaching out and building bridges and trying to find ways to get everyone at the table to see it is about student learning and about the student experience, and not about what is yours and mine." She cited a colleague who talked about the need to "meet people where they are and help them get to where we want them to be." Dr. Finucane said that she has come to recognize that she must provide people

with opportunities and resources to be successful in what she is asking them to do, and she believes this is a primary focus of her work.

For Ms. Frantz, coming to a shared meaning must involve a reflection on the history and tradition, not only of John Carroll University specifically, but Jesuit education in general. She noted the importance of discourse in coming to these shared meanings, and stated, "You want to have that debate and openness, and to come together to gain an understanding through dialogue and debate and also by studying history and the humanities and so forth." For her, institutional history played an important role in members of an institution coming to a shared meaning; there could also be, however, drawbacks to members having organizational history. She noted that for some members of the organization, particularly, it seemed to her, faculty members, "They've established their careers and that's how they've always done it and that's the way it should be done, period!"

Dr. Smith, my third conversation partner from John Carroll, noted the importance of the leadership's priorities regarding the communal identity of the university. Though there are many Jesuit schools with the same Ignatian history, traditions, and core values, he believed each university must choose the main areas of focus and priority for that institution. Dr. Smith noted the tension that may be perceived between the mission of an institution and the importance to maintain academic freedom, stating:

> It's a fine line any educational institution walks between how to promote its core values and its mission and how to maintain academic freedom. You have two kinds of reputation you're working on. One is, Who Am I? Who are we? And the other is, and how does that fit in the overall academic scheme?

I noted that another important point in coming to a communal identity is how does the question 'Who am I?' fit with 'Who are we?'"

The conversation partners from Seattle University could all clearly articulate the shared meaning and the primary areas of emphasis for their organizations. Seattle University is focused on integrated Jesuit education for leadership. Ms. Etchart described it as "thinking about leadership in a staged way of how students identify their identity as leaders. Looking at, as students are developing, their sense of agency and change and the ability to impact change." Seattle University's leaders have been engaged in a strategic approach to developing the shared meaning and focus. Dr. Leary described the strategic planning process, saying top leaders in the university held focus groups on five different topics of interest. The purpose of this, according to Dr. Leary, was to make "sure we touch base with those that represent the culture, the place, the day-to-day operations."

Though this philosophy was articulated, Ms. Etchart believed there was still a sense that some of the decisions were top-down in nature, and this did not please University faculty and staff. She stated, "I think because we're an academic institution that culture sort of rubs up against that sometimes, particularly from the tradition of academic freedom. I think as an institution we're much more comfortable with things that bubble up." She did note that there was a concerted effort to get people involved, even if it was to a limited extent. In discussing the integration of leadership development into the core curriculum she stated, "Part of the beauty of this process is that there has been probably 50 people, at one point or another in different phases, involved…so it's definitely…we're building some energy and synergy and we're incorporating lots of people's ideas." She then went on to say that, though the top leaders may be leading the process, there are conversation being held throughout the university to help faculty and staff engage in exploring their roles in bringing the shared meaning to life. She noted:

> It's the leadership inspiring the main concept. We search for a way to capture integrated Jesuit education for leadership. We know that's what we're aiming towards. And so folks in various areas looking at [it], within [their] sphere of influence…so what does that mean in our sphere and then putting that all together and seeing where the overlaps are…that's the process we're in right now.

Ms. Etchart commented on the importance of bringing others to the planning process, allowing a larger group of individuals to help create and shape the shared meaning and identity of the university. Dr. Leary also noted the importance of helping others see their role in the bigger picture, in the communal identity of the institution. He described one of the Vice Presidents who reports to him as doing "a great job bringing people together on a regular basis, around critical issues, and how it is that they in their own particular job, are part of the whole thing here and what we're trying to do."

Bringing individuals with their distinct identities together and coming to a shared communal identity is not a simple task. Dr. Leary recognized the challenges associated with developing a mission and communal identity. He saw them as being positive for the university and the people who are working daily to live out the mission. He asked, "Would you rather have a mission that challenges you to be a better person and to work for these issues or one that had lower expectations of you and wasn't present in what's happening?"

For several of the participants at Seattle University, institutional history can also play a role in coming to shared understandings and a shared meaning. Dr. Phillips noted that there are challenges when people agree on basic principles of the university but come to these conclusions through different processes. He discussed that there seems to be "cafeteria values selection going on" regarding the values and aspects of the mission that they like, but that there are some other aspects of the university's mission and values that

they do not share. In our discussion of institutional history's importance in the shared meaning for both individual and communal identity, Dr. Hogan recognized some positive and negative aspects of individuals having institutional history. He felt it was sometimes difficult to re-interpret and re-imagine when he had been at one place for such a long time. It was not just challenging for him personally, but for others to re-imagine him. He said that when you have been at one institution for a long time, your mistakes may haunt you. Even if you have learned from them and try to move on, others may not forget those mistakes you have made. He noted that institutional history may make it difficult for others to come to new understandings about you. He stated, "Sometimes that it's really good to change, to get a new look at things because mistakes you made from previous jobs you learn from those and you're not held prisoner by them." Ms. Etchart noted that institutional history offers one benefit in that "trust has had time to develop."

Hiring and Formation

Most of my participants and I discussed whether or not hiring and formation should play a role in realizing a shared meaning and developing a communal identity. Each person had a unique view on just how important, if at all, mission and the shared meaning of the institution should be in hiring faculty and staff. For Dr. Leary, "Hiring good people is at the heart of all this…I mean people who say 'this is where I'd rather work.' If the mission isn't a good fit, people probably aren't going to be happy because they're constantly looking for something that the university doesn't stand for or doesn't offer." Dr. Smith, of John Carroll, felt that there didn't need to be a commitment to the mission. Rather, there needed to be receptivity. Mrs. Frantz was more insistent than my other participants that new faculty and staff must agree with the basic principles of the

Mission stating, “If you don’t buy into it, go somewhere else.” For Dr. Hogan, the communal identity of the institution was why he chose to work at Seattle University. He felt the institution needed to hire people with the mission in mind saying, “We’re distinctive…You don’t want to be everything to all people.”

For Dr. Kelly and Ms Etchart, both from Seattle University, finding faculty and staff who fit the communal identity had more to do with what the mission and identity of the university did for those candidates. Ms. Etchart stated, “This is our identity, these are our values, this is our purpose, and this is the direction that we’re going. And if this fits for you, and you can support this and be passionate about it, then I think that’s a mission-fit.” And perhaps most in tune with a hermeneutic approach to leadership and the communal aspect of identity, Dr. Kelly approached mission fit as, “So you read it, can you re-interpret it and then does something else come alive in you? What else comes alive in you that encourages you to do your work differently or more deeply?”

Dr. Finucane brought another perspective to the topic of considering mission in the hiring process, recognizing the importance to first and foremost hire people open to new ideas. Dr. Leary shared a similar sentiment, except he focused on the need of current members of the organization to be open to new ideas stating, “If an organization is open to how new members change the organization, then I think you’re more likely to succeed and move forward on issues. The Jesuit focus is…we look forward to how you’re going to challenge us to be better and do what we do differently.”

When I asked Dr. Finucane if the top leaders in the university emphasize the consideration of mission when hiring new faculty and staff she stated, “It’s inherent in whom they choose to participate in the hiring…it was something that for the people on

the committee, it was so much a part of who they were that I think the way we asked question and the questions we asked got to it." She did note a "perceived tension between hiring for mission and hiring for academic excellence," and recognized the importance, and difficulty, of balancing the two. She asked, "How do you balance that so that people feel we've got the absolute best researcher and teacher, but someone who knows and values mission?" Dr. Smith also commented on considerations that need to be taken when hiring faculty stating, "You're talking about people who have dedicated a tremendous amount of time, energy, and resources, a large portion of their lives, to learning a discipline, learning a profession…what is crucial is the selection of the person that is…in tune with the Mission of the university."

Dr. Finucane recognized the difficulty in evaluating for mission with candidates who have not been exposed to the Jesuit traditions. She noted this difficulty was not simply in hiring staff, but in considering students for scholarship applications and other opportunities. She said that public school students "don't talk about service in the same way. They don't have the language…and yet the commitment is there."

For many of my participants, however, considering mission during the hiring process was not enough. They believed that leaders of the university need to engage new faculty and staff in another step: a formation process to further learn about Ignatian tradition and the history and shared meanings of Jesuit institutions. Ms Frantz was insistent on a mandatory, formal formation process for all new employees. She stated, "One of the first things I did was take a class, because I thought it will help me in my job." This formation class helped her bring who she is as an individual to the mission and communal identity of the university. She said that in the class, "we bridged it into

our own lives and how effectively it works." She believes she is well-suited to the institution, stating, "I feel like I'm a good fit with the university because I care about other people and I care about the bigger picture."

Ms. Frantz described several formation opportunities offered by John Carroll University for faculty and staff to learn more about Jesuit education. One program is Ignatian Day, a day of reflection on some aspect of the Jesuit tradition. A second university program is the Ignatian Colleagues program, a formation program for leaders at Jesuit institutions. This program involves monthly workshops focused on different aspects of the institution. Given the opportunity to participate, however, Ms. Frantz saw that many staff and faculty were reluctant. She has personally participated and was resolute in her belief that all staff should participate, believing that this would help others gain new understandings about what it means to be a member of a Jesuit institution to help bring them into the shared meaning of the university.

The other participants from John Carroll also noted formation programs at the university designed to engage faculty and staff in a deeper understanding of Jesuit education. Dr. Smith described a variety of formation and development programs, including seminars at orientation, brown-bag lunch conversations, book discussions, half-day formation programs, mass, student service experiences, and the Catholic studies program.

My participants from Seattle University also spoke on a variety of formation opportunities offered at their institution. Dr. Leary discussed their Division of Mission and Ministry, which included Campus Ministry and an office called Magis, which works with graduates of the university and those from other Jesuit institutions. Additionally,

Campus Ministry offers a program called Colleagues, which is "for faculty and staff to deepen their understanding of the mission." For Dr. Leary, "training and development is a really important piece. I think you have to emphasize, everywhere you go, just the importance of the mission and what we're about."

Ethical Action

Those aspects of my research conversation that centered on ethical action led to my participants and me exploring very concrete, practical approaches to living-out the communal identity and shared meaning in our day-to-day work. Dr. Leary recognized the opportunity leaders in high positions within an organization have in articulating the shared meaning and in helping members of the organization act in pursuit of the shared meaning, noted here:

> I think I have the opportunity to take the mission and to articulate it clearly so that people can understand it in their own positions, and then to give them an opportunity to make…take efforts to live that out. Or to make sense of it in their own work-life and then to not only provide opportunities for them to do that but to provide incentives for them to do the kinds of work we think are most important for all of us to be doing. There's no question that the higher that you are in the food chain the more opportunity you have to actually animate that mission.

For Ms. Frantz, in each day-to-day decision, the focus always needs to return to the big picture, the heart of the institution – the students. In collaborating and decision-making, she said that the members of the institution needed to come back to the formation, to the shared meaning, stating, "It's ok that we disagree but let's remind ourselves of what we're really here for and what we're about." Ms. Etchart saw action toward the ethical aim in a more philosophic sense, returning to the concept of how one's individual identity fits with the relationships with others noting, "it is acting in that congruent manner between what we feel our values are and our personal integrity, and

acting in a way that's congruent externally so that others experience us in the same way we view ourselves." Ms. Etchart noted that this is not a simple endeavor, that it "takes practice and attention." For leaders in organizations and for educators, she notes, "It's about teaching the practice."

Dr. Hogan offered a unique view of putting the ethical aim into daily action. Since I had recently worked in athletics, I felt there was often a conflict between the daily action of members of the institution and the shared meaning of the institution. As the Director of Athletics, I asked him how he articulated the importance of alignment of actions with the ethical aim, and how he personally lived it out as a leader. He said frankly that it is not easy and that there often seems to be hypocrisy or a disconnect. He discussed the uneasiness he felt when he had to consider firing a coach who was a wonderful proponent of the mission of the university but who wasn't winning games. He stated that it is just not black and white; rather, trying to live out the ethical aim and the shared meaning of the institution in every action can at times be very difficult.

Within the research category of ethical action, several themes emerged from my research conversations. They are: Communications Must Reflect Priorities, Evaluation and Promotion Processes Must Reflect Priorities, Programs and Initiatives, and a discussion on Ethics and Morality. I now discuss each theme in turn.

Communications Must Reflect Priorities

How did my participants believe they could live out the ethical aim in their day-to-day work? This question received a variety of answers. For Dr. Kelly this is done by "repetition and habit." For him, ethical action has to be "built into the fabric of what we do." For Dr. Leary, "It all begins with modeling." He spoke of the need for persons in

leadership roles to act in a way that was in alignment with the shared meaning of the university. He stated that at Seattle University "We've set a tone where people can challenge each other, but we're all committed to the bigger picture." He also spoke of the importance to "hold up those folks who can really create work, ethical work, at the institution." He suggested publications and year-end recognition as a way to honor individuals at the university.

Communication played a big role for many of my participants in living out the ethical aim within the institution. Dr. Kelly suggested creating smaller communities where people could ask questions and reflect on the bigger picture. He also noted the importance of clearly articulating the focus and shared meaning, rather than assuming the message is being received through modeling, stating, "We need to say it…otherwise people may not get what is important."

My participants offered several ways in which the leaders of their universities communicate priorities and the shared purpose to the entire university. Dr. Phillips described the various small groups that meet periodically to discuss university issues. He stated that all the deans meet annually in Deans' Council Meetings. Additionally, he stated that the President of Seattle University communicates through a variety of mediums. The president uses the pulpit and publications, as well as making sure priorities and the shared meaning is included in the curriculum. Additionally, the School of Business and Management has the Center for Leadership Formation. For Dr. Phillips, "You have to have it in print, but you also have to be living it and talking about it."

Ms. Etchart echoed Dr. Phillips' description of methods top leaders use to communicate priorities to the rest of the university. When I asked Ms. Etchart if the

shared meaning was only articulated at the top levels of the university leadership or if the priorities were being communicated throughout all levels of the university she stated, “I have a copy of the annual report so I can show you we’ve been talking a lot about …people at my level are talking about that. I think even in working with students we’re talking about that.” She noted that the President “talks about [mission] a lot, with students, with staff at every level. She stated, “I think it’s in the practice of that where there might be some disagreement or various ideas.”

Coming from a background of organizational development, Dr. Smith offered another perspective on communicating the shared meaning of the institution. He suggested that leaders of organizations evaluate how much of the communication, including formal, informal, and even electronic communication, is spent talking about the values of the organization. On what else are we spending our time communicating? For him, “That’s probably what people are picking up is important.” He also discussed staff meetings as an important formal way to communicate the shared meaning of the organization and to encourage others to explore, develop, and live-out the communal identity of the organization stating, “Staff meetings need a purpose. Email has taken away the need for routine meetings. Notice I didn’t say they made meetings go away! But meetings become important if they become formats for discussion. Or they become a forum for developing a common consensus or common understanding.” Ms. Frantz also commented on the role of committees in communicating the shared meaning of the organization, suggesting more discourse and creativity and less reporting. She recognized the value of creativity and dialogue saying, “I see a lot of the committees – there’s a lot of reporting. There’s not a lot of dialogue or discussion.

Evaluation and Promotion Must Reflect Priorities

In my discussions of daily action that works toward the ethical aim, evaluation, promotion, and tenure processes were frequently mentioned. For Dr. Finucane, evaluation plays a large role in aligning the shared meaning of the organization with the daily action. She felt that the tenure, promotion and evaluation documents at John Carroll do not reflect the university's commitment to service. She noted that since service is not part of the promotion and tenure process for the faculty at John Carroll, faculty members could actually be punished in the end for spending time on service experiences rather than on academia or research. Dr. Kelly noted a similar view stating, "It must be rewarded or people aren't going to expend the time on it." Dr. Phillips had a different approach to the promotion and tenure process stating that tenure is strictly about academic excellence but stated you would "never put someone on tenure track who you thought wasn't mission compatible."

This comment raised an important issue for me. There may be a disconnect between the stated priorities of the institution and the means by which people are evaluated on their performance. Dr. Finucane and I agreed that making changes in these areas would reflect the commitment of the university to service that is being articulated but not actively demonstrated.

Programs and Initiatives

When we discussed articulating the shared meaning, I was pleased that many of my participants were able to cite numerous examples of programs and initiatives of the university that were in alignment with the university's mission, purpose, and values. All

three of my participants from John Carroll gave examples of the ethical aim in action within their institution.

Dr. Finucane first gave examples of how her department at John Carroll is doing so. She has students who have participated in a service-learning experience develop a presentation to give to fellow students about their experience. Their narratives help give others new understandings about the importance of service in Jesuit education. When she told me this, I asked her if she had ever considered having these students give the same presentation to faculty and staff groups since some of the faculty were struggling to see how service could be a text. I suggested that these narrative may help some of the faculty come to new understandings as well. She was interested in this idea, and jotted a note to herself. She stated that in all discussions she tried to constantly return the conversation to "what we are supposed to be about – the students." I thought the students' presentations would be a great way to remind the faculty and staff of that shared meaning. After the conversation, I reflected on this example. I think they could take these presentations a step further, and perhaps have a student and a staff member who were both part of the same service experience share their reflections and narrative individually. Using different voices to tell the same story, hearing different narratives, may allow for new understandings to emerge.

Another example of John Carroll's policies reflecting their purpose and values as an institution was the Ohio Access Initiative. They have developed a large number of scholarships for Ohio students who cannot afford to pay for college. These students receive full tuition. In exchange, they must engage in several service activities each

semester. This is a perfect example of an organization putting their priorities into reality within the organization. All three participants described this program.

Additionally, Ms. Frantz discussed a Poverty and Solidarity Summer Internship program offered at John Carroll, various scholarships designed to reflect the importance of service to the university, and a faculty reading group focusing on Ignatian education. She also stated the new President had recently established a new mission, core values, and strategic initiative statement. The President and top leadership had involved the entire campus and Board of Directors in this process. Though these are all positive actions that support the shared meaning, she felt more could be done to put the shared purpose into action. As stated previously, she suggested that required formation events should be built into all faculty and staff contracts.

The participants from Seattle University were equally able to cite numerous programs and initiatives offered by the university to support the shared purpose of the institution. Dr. Leary described a campus-wide program designed to involve multiple departments of the university in a project that engages many people in a program that is in alignment with the university's mission:

> We are looking at a whole new initiative on the southeast side of Seattle. It's going to be an institutional response to youth, particularly those living on the margins. In order for us to get faculty engaged in that kind of thing, which is a direct connection to our mission, we need to provide incentives, and in some cases financial resources, in some cases research opportunities, in some cases recognition for jobs well done. We see the Southwest Initiative as a direct relationship to how to take our mission and then animate it in our daily lives.

Dr. Leary also described grants for staff to do service-related activities, book groups, and an effort to give staff time off to participate in these kinds of activities. "The hope," he said, "is that you can try to permeate almost everything people do with

mission-related kinds of things." Dr. Leary noted the importance of the involvement of the leaders of the university in these types of programs. He believed that when members of the university see leaders at important events they will recognize that "this is clearly something the university values… The message is clear."

When I asked Dr. Phillips about inter-departmental programs going on in the university he stated, "There's some collaboration. There could be more. I think most schools are in the mode of doing their own thing." He stated that as the head of his department, he feels the importance of attempting to "balance that in terms of what you need and what the university needs." Dr. Phillips also spoke of the message that can be sent from the university leadership regarding allocation of resources. He stated that the leadership can really articulate the priorities of the university through the allocation of resources to different programs, and discussed "putting your money where your mouth is, in terms of resources to certain programs that get students out there to really experience…"

Dr. Hogan's view on bringing the shared purpose of the institution to life offered a comparison to a previous Jesuit institution in which he had worked, stating,

> I learned more about Jesuits here in one year than I learned at San Francisco in 15 years. They just really take it seriously and they all live and breathe it and they talk about it. You have people who are at the highest levels...you have a Vice President of Mission. You feel that there's a deliberate effort – a budget attached to that – that someone is saying this is important.

Additionally, Ms. Etchart offered several more programs offered at Seattle University for both students and staff. First, she discussed the focus on integrating leadership into the core curriculum. The goal of persons in leadership positions is to "know that every Seattle U student is getting it." Ms. Etchart also described the Arrupe

Seminar – a year-long seminar that staff and faculty can take on Jesuit history, the formation of the society, Ignatian spirituality and pedagogy, etc. An additional program that promotes daily action that works toward the ethical aim is their two-day first year leadership initiative. Prior to orientation, students can attend a retreat to increase their understanding of integrated Jesuit education for leadership that is the focus of Seattle University. Finally, in her own department Ms. Etchart is focusing on a specific program or school each year to develop a target initiative that helps to bring the shared purpose of the university to life in a way that integrates the focus of that specific program.

Ethics vs. Morality

My research category of ethical action included a discussion on the differences and similarities between ethics and morality. Several of my participants admitted they had no insight into the difference. As my partners and I worked through the idea in our conversations, a number of relevant ideas emerged.

In my conversations with Dr. Finucane and Dr. Smith we discussed the difference between ethics and morality. For Dr. Smith, it was simple. Morals, for him, are more rule-bound, and ethics are more spirit-filled. For Dr. Finucane, the difference was not so easily defined. As we discussed the intention of our daily actions and the difference between ethics and morality, I began to view leadership as a part of the ethical aim as described by Ricoeur. This could be the bigger picture, the shared purpose, the "what we're all about" in the organization. I began to consider that the idea of morality as described by Ricoeur might be more in alignment with the traditional view of management: the day-to-day decisions we make that should act in concert with the ethical aim. This was something I contemplated and discussed with a number of my research

participants. After reflecting on ethics and morality, I do not see a parallel between morality and management. A traditional view of management, as discussed previously in Chapter Three, involves assigning and completing tasks, getting jobs done, and conducting business (Bennis 1985:21). Management does not take into account a moral *or* ethical dimension. It is more transactional in nature and ends there.

During my conversations at Seattle University, I heard some different ideas. For Dr. Kelly, ethics involves using "the lines of universalizability. If it's right in Situation A is it going to be right in Situation A every time?" For him, morality is "nuanced given the situation and the…the who's there and the people, the players involved, that sort of thing." For Dr. Leary, "ethics is an approach to behavior. It's aligning your values with the organization you work." The next step, for him, is the action and how closely you align your values and your action. He stated, "It's not only aligning your values with your skills, your competencies, and your knowledge, but it's your action orientation of it." Clearly, there was a variance in the answers to this question, a concept I discuss further in the secondary analysis.

Themes Common to All Research Categories

Throughout my eight conversations, several common themes emerged that can be viewed in light of my three of my research categories: trust, language, and a new approach to leadership as a way of being. I discuss each of these concepts in the following sections.

Trust

A common thread of relationship-building and trust emerged upon my reflection of my conversations. The subject of trust was specifically discussed in six of the eight

conversations. Dr. Finucane stated that the top leaders in the university have clearly articulated the importance of collaboration throughout the university, stating, "There's been clearly a top-down message: 'you need to play together well.' That helps." Because so many of the staff are new, particularly in leadership roles at the university, Dr. Finucane recognized that it will take a while for collaboration and a shared purpose to be fully realized. Trust must first be established between departments.

For Dr. Leary, organizational history can be important in developing a shared meaning and shared understanding because there has been time for trust to build. He observed that the tenure of Father Steven Sundborg, President of Seattle University, has allowed Father Sundborg time to build relationships and develop trust with his colleagues within the campus community. Dr. Leary noted, "From the group he's working with they have a history with him, they know who he is, they trust him. He can move that group to a place that a new President can't. That's just the reality of it." Dr. Smith also noted the importance of trust in developing a communal identity and acting toward the shared purpose and the ethical aim stating, "Mutual trust is needed…that trust is also fed by communication."

Ms. Etchart, on the other hand, cited an example of the difficulty of coming to shared understandings when there is not yet a trusting relationship. She has had five supervisors in the past three years. We discussed the difficulty of building trusting relationships and coming to shared understandings when she has had so many supervisors in such a short period of time:

> RC: …And we were talking that that is one good thing about institutional history, is when trust has had time to develop.
>
> ME: Right.

RC: And the relationships have had time to develop. How can you trust, as you said, you have to sell your ideas AGAIN, and there's no trust yet, there can't be. That can be really difficult to try to move forward I'm sure.

ME: Oh, yeah. So the first six months with my supervisor was really about healing that…healing that wound.

Ms. Frantz and I also discussed that trust takes time to develop during periods of change. In the midst of substantial change in the top leaders of the university, Ms. Frantz recognized that trust wasn't immediately a given, but that she had observed an environment of trust being fostered by the new leaders of the university.

RC: And I think that people have to be given the …um…they have to feel some trust to be creative and I think that I noticed when we had some new people come in to my department. Some people didn't want to be stagnant, even people who had been there a long time. It wasn't that they were living in the olden days only, but did they trust the new administration enough that they could come with some crazy ideas and not get shot down?

LF: Mm hm.

RC: And I think a mutual trust has to be built so that people feel that there's an openness to imagine new things. Do you think that's coming, or being attempted?

LF: I do think so because there are some new initiatives that are happening that I think are heading in the right direction. And Father is very supportive of people being entrepreneurial, I would say, as long as they're being collaborative.

Language

The importance of language was discussed in several of my conversations. Dr. Finucane stated that the language used by leaders in an organization is quite important, and that it is vital that leaders recognize this. Our discussion of language also included the discussion of text. Dr. Finucane stated that many faculty members believe students must learn by reading and discussing words from their textbooks. She has worked to help the faculty gain new understandings of text, which, for her, is more than words appearing

on a page. She says that the experience of service learning can also serve as another text from which the students can learn, and has tried to emphasize this concept, helping faculty to realize that in service-learning, the students are not simply giving. They are learning and receiving from the text of experience.

Dr. Finucane additionally recognized the importance of language in articulating the communal identity and shared purpose of the organization, stating, "We are less attentive to language these days. We need leadership that's attentive to that and recognizes what's said is important, how it's said is important, and what's not said is important!" In my conversation with Dr. Kelly, he noted the importance of language in simpler discussion. Dr. Kelly said, "All we really have are our words." During our conversation I responded with the idea that language is being, suggesting to him that in language, "what I say is who I am."

Orientation to Leadership

Throughout my conversations, the participants' various orientations to the concept of leadership emerged. Leaders and leadership can be discerned in anyone in any role at a university. Ms. Frantz offered a poignant example when she said that she did not view herself as a leader in the traditional sense. She said she does not have a formal leadership role in the university, but has so much institutional history and has formed so many relationships with others on campus that she serves others as a leader in informal, one-on-one situations. Perhaps this is why she came to Father Niehoff's mind as a leader of the university, even though many would not have chosen her because she is an administrative assistant. Ms. Frantz also emphasized her sense of responsibility to speak up about what is right and what is not, and as she spoke she reckoned that perhaps this was another way

she was a leader. She stated that often negative thoughts become infectious and are not constructive or helpful in working toward the shared purpose, and noted the importance of leadership opportunities in those informal settings. Ms. Frantz felt that people who do not officially serve in leadership roles could and should nevertheless act as leaders, specifically in one-on-one moments, "helping people go about [things] in a different way or approaching [things] in a different way."

Dr. Leary spoke about the need for leaders to give everyone a voice. He cited an example that he experienced as a graduate student, when his professor invited several administrative assistants to serve on a panel about what makes someone a good leader and what makes a person someone for whom you want to work. Dr. Leary said he has never forgotten the significance of that discussion on his approach to leadership. He recognizes the importance of valuing all members of an organization and ensuring that everyone has the opportunity for their voice to be heard.

Dr. Finucane stated that leadership does not need to simply be from a top-down direction. She observed that prior to the new President coming to John Carroll, there was a "wave rising up" from the middle management of the university, who were ready to collaborate and were anxious to act together. She stated this was more of a leadership from the middle rather than a top/down message, and said that, prior to the new President coming to the university there was a clear calling for collaboration and change within the "middle" of the university. She remembered this "swell was coming up of, we want to work together!" She also noted the importance of leadership through presence. Dr. Finucane stated that the new President was making a concerted effort to be out-and-about on campus. She felt that it is vital that leaders be present as much as possible, and they

must be visible to all members of the organization. Other participants expressed similar ideas regarding symbolic leadership and the importance of presence in leadership.

In our discussion of symbolic leadership and its role in communicating the shared purpose of an institution, Dr. Leary also explained his belief that it is vital for the top leaders of an institution to be visible to the rest of the institution. Since two or three people cannot be everywhere all the time, he felt it is important that he and the President make appearances at events that have been articulated as a top priority for the university. He gave the example of the Service Day that is held by the university in the fall. He takes his children and he helps plant trees and rake mulch. He stated that it may not be important that he, as one person, actually planted a tree that morning. The importance, however, lies in the fact that other members of the institution saw the Senior Vice President actively participating in the Service Day activities. His participation serves as a symbol that the leaders are serious about the priorities of the institution. Dr. Hogan also expressed the importance of leaders being present to be observed by others in the campus community.

The Leadership Journey

For Dr. Finucane, leadership "is about the idea of presence and engagement…the commitment and willingness to be present and to do what you're asking people to do." For Dr. Kelly, bringing people along on the leadership journey is about trying "to get everyone to see an aspect of what they do as leadership. If you can see that, then I think you can see yourself as an educator." For Dr. Leary, bringing people along on the leadership journey involves recognizing the leader in others even if they do not see that in themselves. He stated, "I will probably see the leadership potential in someone else

before they see it in themselves, particularly if they are people who are coming from outside the traditional group that is constantly affirmed for who they are." He also noted that many individuals do not see themselves as leaders because their understanding of being a leader is limited to formalized management roles. Dr. Leary engages others in new understandings of leadership and brings them along on their own leadership journey. For him, "it means reaching out and engaging people, bringing people into the process that we have…believing in people …before they believe in themselves." He said, "It has to begin with your notion of leadership…that is inclusive. You…bring people into the conversation that don't see themselves as leaders that will begin to."

Others viewed bringing people along on the leadership journey somewhat differently. For Dr. Smith, this involves "a belief in their capability and their goodness." For Dr. Phillips, "bringing people along on the journey simply involves giving others opportunities to take on a leadership role." Dr. Hogan noted the importance of understanding, and getting others to understand, that "we can all make the world a better place. One person can make a difference."

Ms. Etchart added an observation about the leadership journey that no other participant made. She discussed the importance about having "a deep human connection to those that you lead because you have responsibility for them, to them." She added, "I don't think we can be effective with students if we're not in it ourselves. It's very much a walking with students along their journey."

Summary

From these conversations, several themes have emerged relevant to meaningful work related to the ethical aim in just institutions. This chapter served as a preliminary,

descriptive analysis of the data. I have explored the themes that emerged from the conversations, creating a secondary text from the text of my journal and the conversation transcriptions. A secondary analysis involving a theoretical discussion of the data follows in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER FIVE – SECONDARY ANALYSIS

Introduction

Chapter Four presented a description of the data, focusing on common themes that emerged from the conversations held with my participants. The preliminary analysis served as the second text created as part of an interpretive research process. In this chapter, I create a third text as I explore connections between the narrative of the conversations and critical hermeneutic theory. This third text, a critical examination of the first two texts created from the preliminary analysis of data, is a re-interpretation of the data from the critical hermeneutic perspective, which serves to ground my data analysis in a theoretical foundation for understanding and for new ideas and possibilities of new futures to emerge. In this secondary analysis I discuss concepts that emerged from the interpretation of the data from within my three research categories: fusion of horizons, the communal dimension of identity, and ethical action.

Fusion of Horizons

Educators and leaders must be able to be open to new understandings about ourselves and our world. Leaders must help those whom they serve as leaders to gain new understandings about themselves and their world. Gadamer (1975:269) speaks of one's horizon and says that "A person who sees no horizon is a man who does not see far enough and hence overvalues what is nearest to him." Rather than simply acquiring new information and passing knowledge, leaders must foster safe open environments for innovation, discourse, and understanding.

Many of my conversation partners believed that to some extent their calling was to help others gain new understandings about themselves and the world. Several of the

participants noted that Jesuit education embraced their personal identities, beliefs, values, etc. The leaders of their organizations did not ask them to check their individual identities at the door; rather they were encouraged to integrate how they saw the world into their work. This parallels critical hermeneutics and the concept of fusion of horizons. As explained earlier, this is Gadamer's (1975) theory on the transition of our understanding before an interpretive event to a new understanding after an interpretive event. Individuals who are open to new ideas may leave the interpretive experience with a new understanding or horizon that will converge with our previous set of beliefs. There may be a meeting of what one knew to be true before coming to the text and what one now knows to be true from a new understanding of it. Fusion of horizons involves understanding the past and its role in creating the current horizon.

For several of my participants, helping others come to new understandings is a significant focus of their work. Most of my participants provided faculty, staff, and the students with whom they work opportunities or situations to gain new understandings. The participants, however, stopped short of a critical hermeneutic approach because they were merely providing an opportunity. Approaching these opportunities from a critical hermeneutic perspective involves interpretation of each event, coming to new understandings from working with the other, and getting as much from the other as giving to the other. In none of the conversations described above did my participants mention what the other, in each instance, gave to them.

The extent that participants were experiencing new understandings appeared related to how they orient themselves to their work. Several saw their roles as leaders as guiding others towards new opportunities where a fusion of horizons may occur. One

participant, Dr. Phillips, did not see his role as helping others come to new understandings. As quoted previously, he stated, “I think it’s my job to allow faculty to do their thing, basically, to grow professionally…I just don’t frame it that way.” His answer offers an example of a person in a leadership role who is oriented from a more traditional, positivist tradition of leadership. His description of his role parallels Bennis and Nanus’ (1985) discussion of management, discussed in Chapter Two, rather than a hermeneutic orientation to leadership.

Dr. Philips was not alone in approaching leadership from a more positivist orientation, however. Though participants like Dr. Leary, Dr. Finucane, and Ms. Etchart all noted the importance of helping others learn and giving others opportunity to gain new understandings, their descriptions of these events were still more linear, as from a positivistic orientation, rather than circular, as from an interpretive stance.

Fusion of horizons involves interpretation. Each of my participants is a leader in an institution of higher education. Leadership, viewed through a hermeneutic lens, can be viewed as providing moments of interpretation, moments of coming to new understandings, moments of learning. Habermas (1984:100) states, "the interpretative task consists in incorporating the other's interpretation of the situation into one's own in such a way that in the revised version 'his' external world and 'my' external world can -- against the background of 'our' lifeworld --be relativized in relation to 'the' world." Leaders may be more effective in promoting ethical action in organizations if they approach leadership as learning and interpretation, particularly from a hermeneutic stance. For Gallagher (1992:35) learning takes place in moments of interchange, the interchange between a person and a text, between teacher and student, or between the

student and another student or other individual. He notes that "this interchange is an interchange of interpretations rather than an exchange of information" (Gallagher 1992:38). Interpretation, for Gallagher, is not simply limited to learning experiences. For him, "Interpretation is a universal feature of all human activity" (1992:40).

Interpretation and understanding are circular in nature. They are also linked with our tradition. Gadamer (1975:293) describes these relationships here:

> The circle, then, is not formal in nature. It is neither subjective nor objective, but describes understanding as the interplay of the movement of tradition and the movement of the interpreter. The anticipation of meaning that governs our understanding of a text is not an act of subjectivity, but proceeds from the commonality that binds us to the tradition. But this commonality is constantly being formed in our relation to tradition. Tradition is not simply a permanent precondition; rather, we produce it ourselves inasmuch as we understand, participate in the evolution of tradition, and hence further determine it ourselves. Thus the circle of understanding is not a "methodological" circle, but describes an element of the ontological structure of understanding.

Discussing the connection between tradition and interpretation, Gallagher (1992:12), notes that "an inescapable condition of any interpretation is that it is biased in some way. These prejudices may be productive or non-productive aspects of the interpretation process." Gadamer (1975) suggests that we cannot know which prejudices are productive and which are nonproductive, and that we should not simply disregard or pretend these prejudices and biases do not exist. He notes,

> If a prejudice becomes questionable in view of what another person or text says to us, this does not mean it is simply set aside and the text or the person accepted as valid in its place….Only by being given full play is it able to experience the other's claim to truth and make it possible for him to have full play himself (1975:298-299).

Ms. Etchart noted the realization of her own beliefs and prejudices through her experiences and relationships with others. She remembered having moments "when I

think, oh wow! I've never seen it that way…Or my initial [reaction is], I completely disagree with you but I really want to think about this."

In order for learning to occur, and for one's horizons to continue to evolve, individuals must reflect on one's prejudices, as suggested by Ms. Etchart, to help in interpretation and understanding. Several participants recognized that the opinions of others allow them to learn more about themselves: how they think, how they respond to others, how they learn. Ms. Etchart offers an example of the participants' learning stating, "I constantly learn things about myself by my experiences…whether it's in a situation and it's the inner biases or thoughts or tapes or whatever, that I have about myself…or I see it in a new way. I see it in a new lens…it's…stretching the way I see the world." Learning about herself and seeing the world differently may be an example of Ms. Etchart experiencing her own fusion of horizons in her work with others. This is important in a new orientation to leadership.

Additionally, leaders may experience a true fusion of horizons if they are open and oriented to the other. The orientation to the other, in experiences or events such as described above by Ms. Etchart, may allow for greater understandings to emerge and a more meaningful fusion of horizons to occur. Working with and for others in institutions striving to engage in ethical action involves each individual recognizing how important these moments, these fusion of horizons, are in coming to new understandings and in coming to shared understandings as members of our organizational community.

Working with and for others from an interpretive stance must be reflected upon and embraced by leaders so they do not lose sight of the value for themselves in their work as leaders and educators. Herda (1999:18) states, "Critical thinking skills only refer

to one type of thinking skills, namely analytical. Unless there is a reflective and historical dimension to our thinking, it will not change how we reason and how we live out our lives." Ricoeur (1981:112) also speaks of how interpretation can lead to new ways of imagining new lives, new futures stating, "What is to be interpreted in the text is a proposed world which I could inhabit and in which I could project my ownmost possibilities."

From most of my conversations, I did not discern a sense of reflective and historical dimension in my participants' thinking. I also did not observe any interpretative aspect to their work. The majority of these Jesuit leaders clearly are oriented to serving to others, but what was missing was the interpretation and new understanding gained from that work with others. Though having the most honorable of intentions, my participants have not made the leap from a positivist approach to working with others to an interpretive approach of oneself *as* another. The assumptions that these leaders bring to their work comes from a more traditional approach to leadership as a way of acting or working, rather than leadership as a way of being with and for others. Without an interpretive dimension, these leaders are restricting the possibilities for gaining meaningful understandings about themselves and the world.

From an interpretive approach, however, fusion of horizons allows leaders to constantly interpret and re-interpret themselves and their world, allowing for new understandings to emerge. With these new understandings come the possibilities of new imagined futures. Herda (1999:90) notes, "If we bring to light our prejudices and fuse our present horizon of understanding with new understandings from histories of others, we are in a better position to make policy, curriculum, and management decisions." If

leaders orient themselves to leadership as a process of learning, interpreting, and gaining new understandings, they provide others with endless possibilities for reflection, growth, and development, both individually and collectively. This leads us to the second research category, the communal dimension of identity. In the following section, I discuss both personal identity and communal identity as it relates to members of an organization.

Communal Dimension of Identity

As stated previously, it is human nature to interpret and understand. It is through our constant process of understanding of past and present that we gain an awareness of self and our identity. Some of my participants noted that they do not spend a lot of time focusing on them; rather, they put their attention on those with whom they work. As described previously Dr. Hogan stated, "I don't think of myself that much. And I don't know why." Dr. Hogan does not recognize that our own identity always includes the other, for one must see oneself in relation to the other. Without first understanding our own individual identity, individuals will never be able to come to understandings about the other. Shahideh (2004) demonstrates that in order to interact with and relate to the other, one must understand oneself through reflection and interpretation. She notes the importance of examining the past in order to act in the present and to create a new future. Not only is examination of the past essential, but continued efforts to re-examine and re-interpret will open more worlds of understanding, and the possibilities for being. She states, "Our interactions are affected by and are driven by our knowledge of self, which is exercised through interpretation" (Shahideh 2004:37). She goes on to say, "often, not too many people reflect upon their way of being, or question their purpose as they go through their everyday lives…only a minority welcome the dynamics of the interplay between

change and action, and use them as guidelines for reflection, self-discovery, and purpose (Shahideh 2004:68-69).

Humans use narrative as a way to understand life and as a way to understand self. Taking the concepts from plotting, whereby distinctive and perhaps unrelated events are linked to create a single narrative, humans can examine the plot of their own lives to gain an ontological understanding. Dr. Kelly's narrative offers an example of coming to new understandings through the telling and re-telling of his story. He originally went to college to become a lawyer, and described having such a positive experience in his undergraduate work that he chose instead to work in Student Development. In reflecting on his own story, and in telling his own story, he gained a new understanding of himself and his work. He explained,

> Here's the kind of experience I had in college and I want everyone to have that…all these things come up constantly in who I am and what I do…[the students will] get the nuts and bolts of their classroom education…But it's the degree to which they enjoy it, the degree to which they have a connection, an affinity towards the institution, that's my job.

He came to these understandings from examining his past and present and coming to new understandings about his future.

Dr. Hogan also narrated a story from his past, and discussed how reflecting on this story helped him gain a new understanding of what was important to him in his work, and what type of work environment he wanted to provide for those with whom he worked:

> BH: And everybody has to work hard. There's no such thing as people schluffing off. At some point, I think there's a sense of devotion by the staff. I think any staff like this, they feel like it's a…well, a quick example. There was a point, about four years ago, where my supervisor did not like having kids in the department around. And you know, I thought to myself if you go anywhere else on campus and there are kids running around, little kids, it's probably disruptive.

RC: Uh huh.

BH: But I thought that kind of made our jobs…a little bit more unique. And I thought that it sort of added more than it took away.

RC: Yes, definitely!

BH: And so we banned them. We said hey, don't bring your kids around. So we'd be professional all of a sudden. And I think we lost our soul when that happened.

RC: Mm hm.

BH: And even our staff here, no one abuses it. But you know what? Little kids come in and I have a jar of chocolate chip cookie dough back here and they come in here to get chocolate chip cookie dough. And it sort of gives you…gives us life. But also I think it helps the parent who's a staff member or a coach here, they have the chance to bring their kid to work…and daycare's expensive for one thing…but they bring their kid to work occasionally and they're not disruptive, everybody loves them and they get used to them being around.

RC: Right.

BH: So I think that's part of this bigger Jesuit picture, that it is…we are all connected. And when you can connect with the family you can find more levels of productivity.

As he told this story, Dr. Hogan was able to re-interpret and come to new understandings about how his own sense of what was important – his individual identity – came together with the communal aspect of the Jesuit identity.

As we examine our past and present and learn to explore our identity, we ourselves are the third person; we are able to tell our story, for ourselves and for others. Ricoeur (1991:437) describes this in narrative terms saying, "We learn to become the narrator of our own story without completely becoming the author of our life." He emphasizes here that one can examine the storyline of where I have been and where I am, and can then describe these in the language of one's own identity, and yet one still does

not directly plot their future. Rather, in this examination and understanding of self one can elicit change and create more possibilities for the future.

Coming to an understanding of our narrative identity can help individuals find meaningful work in their horizon of possibilities for the future, work that integrates one's values, priorities, and traditions. Many of my participants noted that they are doing or have done the work they feel called to do, work that reflects their life's ideals. Most of them also noted how much easier it was to work in an organization that encouraged and embraced their employees' ability to find work that was informed by their identities. Ms. Etchart stated that in comparison to her current position, she had worked at a university that did not encourage her to integrate her personal orientation to her work. She noted it felt "like an itchy sweater." Her work did not feel comfortable to her when she was part of an organization that did not reflect her ideals. Dr. Smith also noted, "What I have loved about John Carroll is the ability to talk about values, the ability to talk about what's important in life…because that is not something that is valued or appreciated at a public university." Dr. Finucane had a similar statement on working as a part of an organization that encouraged work informed by their identities stating, …"going through Jesuit education, I found a strong identity…when I think about it I would not leave John Carroll or Jesuit education. I think it speaks clearly to who I am."

Herda (1997:33) states that "When our work marks a calling in our lives, rather than merely a job, and provides a medium for meaning, it is less separated from our private lives." She goes on to relate meaningful work to one's identity, stating, "A concept of self informed by one's identity in relationship to others provides a medium for

purposeful work" (1997:34). For Ricoeur (1992:178) meaning in work involves "adequation between the choice of a practice and our life's ideals."

Recognizing the relation of self with another is vital for individuals to thrive as members of their communities. By learning to reflect on and understand our own narrative identity, and the relationship of one's narrative identity to the communal identity of which one is a part, individuals will be able to understand themselves in community. When members of a community have meaningful conversations, each person brings with them their identity that has been determined by the ipse and idem (Ricoeur 1991). Portions of our identity are stagnant, but there is that part that allows for change, interpretation, understanding and growth. When people have meaningful discourse, a new viewpoint or understanding of the world may emerge for each participant of that conversation. Dewey notes, however, that our role as members of a community can shape our individual narrative identity, stating, "In accord with the interests and occupations of the group, certain things become objects of attention, others of aversion" (1966:20). Dewey states here that individuals may espouse certain standards and focuses of our social group, such as an organization, and that these objects of attention may lead us to new biases, new understandings of the world and others.

Ricoeur notes that the concept of narrative identity can be applied to the concept of a communal identity (1990:247). When he discusses the concept of institution in his articulation of the ethical aim he describes an institution as "the structure of living together as this belongs to a historical community" (Ricoeur 1992:194). The ideas of community and communal identity can be used when considering the shared meaning and shared understandings of any organization. As an organizational community, the

members have what Ricoeur describes as “power-in-common, the capacity of the members of a historical community to exercise in an indivisible manner their desire to live together” (1992:220).

Individuals come to belong in this community, to share its communal identity by passing “through the interpretation of the signs, works and texts in which cultural heritages are inscribed and offer themselves to be deciphered” (Ricoeur 1981:62). Ricoeur’s ideas on creating a communal identity, a shared meaning, parallel my participants’ ideas on the importance of a formation process: learning and understanding the history and tradition of the community of which they are now a part. As mentioned previously, institutions, for Ricoeur, are characterized by the “bond of common mores and not that of constraining rules” (Ricoeur 1992:194). Dr. Smith, spoke on this topic, noting that there are many Jesuit schools that come from the same history, traditions, and core values of the Jesuit tradition. It is up to the leaders in each university, however, to choose the main areas of focus and priority for that institution. He reflected Ricoeur’s notion in explaining that the traditions of Jesuit education served to bond organizational members in a common, shared meaning and understanding. Rather than being bound or restricted, the shared purpose developed by the institutions freed them to pursue the good life together in a way that fit the organization’s focus and priorities.

A communal identity is not a fixed entity, however. Kearney (2004:104) tells us that “Historical communities are ultimately responsible for the formation and re-formation of their own identity.” Organizations must constantly re-imagine their identity, their shared meaning and purpose, and their possible futures as a community. My participants from both universities spoke to this issue. Both universities have been in

existence since the late 1800's and both were created within the Jesuit tradition, which was created in 1540. Their communal identity, the shared purpose of each organization, was determined over 100 years ago. Yet at the time of my research conversations, both universities were undergoing a time of change. John Carroll University's new President had recently led a re-evaluation, re-interpretation of the mission and values of the university. Seattle University, though they had not experienced significant change in personnel, was also going through a similar re-imagination of the focuses and priorities of the organization. The leaders on both campuses have recognized the importance of reflecting on the past, the traditions of their institution, and imagining new futures for them.

Herda (1999:2) states that "by virtue of people working together to uncover shared meanings there is opened in front of the text the possibility of a different and presumably better world." This process of re-imagining and coming to new shared understandings and new shared meanings by all members of the institutions may help the individual members of the organization realize how their personal identity fits in with the communal identity. It is not simply enough to come to shared understandings and a shared meaning in the organization. Individuals must then act towards that shared meaning.

Ricoeur (2005) observes that with the evaluation of our world through relationships with others comes responsibility to act to ensure freedom to pursue our ideal, what ought to be. Individuals need to recognize that with their freedom comes a responsibility to act, a responsibility to more than just the individual, but rather to the community. Ricoeur (1992:173) also states that "once each has posited an end, he then

examines how and by what means he will realize it, deliberation concerning the choice of the most appropriate means." Herda also notes the importance of acting from an orientation of self to the other here:

> A full and mature sense of self does not stem from a developmental process grounded in individualism but instead arises from a recognition that in one's relationship with others there resides a possibility of seeing and understanding the world, and therefore one's self differently. When I change, the rest of the world changes (1999:7).

These ideas can help individuals in organizations understand how narrative identity and communal identity relates to demonstrating the ethical aim through the sieve of the moral norm.

Ethical Action

Ethical action is more than behavior; it is action grounded in the continual interpretation and understanding of our world. As stated previously, the ethical aim for Ricoeur (1992:180) is to "aim at the good life, with and for others in just institutions." Ricoeur believes it is ethically imperative that our actions remain mindful of the well-being of the other; an aspect of ethical perspective he refers to as solicitude. We interpret our world, and these interpretations allow us to critically examine our actions in pursuit of the good life. Action can be viewed, according to Ricoeur, as a text. He states (1981:208) "like a text, human action is an open work, the meaning of which is in suspense. It is because it 'opens up' new references and receives fresh relevance from them, that human deeds are also waiting for fresh interpretations which decide their meaning." He then goes on to say, "All significant events and deeds are, in this way, opened to this kind of practical interpretation through present praxis" (Ricoeur

1981:208). We cannot forget that ethical action involves action "done on behalf of others and out of regard for others" (Ricoeur 1992:189).

In our discussions of action that is oriented toward the ethical aim, my participants and I explored the ideas of ethics and morals. Ricoeur (1992:170), in his discussion on ethics and morality, describes ethics as "the aim of an accomplished life." My participants shared similar ideas to that of Ricoeur. For them, the concept of ethics was more "spirit-filled" and more universal. It was about alignment of individual values with action and work performed. Ethics was the bigger picture. After reflecting on ethics and the ethical aim, I posit that the primary focus of leadership from a hermeneutic orientation is the ethical aim. Leadership, as discussed previously, should be seen as a way of being with and for others, as a way of helping others come to new understandings about themselves and the world, as a way of moving toward the ethical aim.

Morality, for Ricoeur (1992:170) is "the articulation of this aim in norms characterized at once by the claim of universality and by an effect of constraint." For my participants, morality was more specific to nuances, to given situations. Morality played a bigger role in the day-to-day situations occurring in the organization. After reflecting on my conversations, I view morality as the day-to-day awareness on whether we are living up to the ethical aim. Do our actions reflect our communal identity? Do the daily policies and procedures, the staff meetings, the one-on-one interactions all align with our communal identity, the values and mission of the organization, and the ethical aim? Our daily actions demonstrate moral intentions implemented under a much larger ethical umbrella. Ricoeur states that ethics is "enriched by the passage through the norm and exercising moral judgment in a given situation" and that "it is necessary to subject the

ethical aim to the test of the norm" (1992:203). In organizations leaders, therefore, cannot try to engage and promote daily action that works toward the ethical aim without taking into account the moral implications of the actions.

Examining morality should involve looking at how one lives out the ethical aim within the social mores of the community of which one is a part. For my participants, their community was their institution. Herda (1999:5) has written that a moral act "involves another person as we undergo a particular situation together…where we make a judgment that mediates between universal ideas and particular contexts." Here, we take the shared meaning and shared understandings and put them into action toward the ethical aim. As noted by Ms. Etchart, even if the shared meaning, the articulation of the communal identity, may be communicated clearly, consistently, and at every level of the organization, it can be "in the practice of that where there might be some disagreement or various ideas." Leaders in organizations need to therefore do more than simply examine the ethical dimension of the mission statement. Leaders need to instead focus on the day-to-day real life implications of a shared purpose within each department.

It is not simply enough to spread the message about the communal identity, the shared purpose and priorities, and say nothing more. Discussions on how the shared meaning is put into action, the moral dimension, must also occur. Standards of excellence may need to be articulated to help clarify, as Dr. Finucane put it, "the rules of the game," the how rather than just the "what" or the "why." Ricoeur (1992:176) describes standards of excellence as "rules of comparison applied to different accomplishments, in relation to ideals of perfection shared by a given community of practitioners." Practices, for Ricoeur (1992:176), are "cooperative activities whose

constitutive rules are established socially; the standards of excellence that correspond to them on the level of this or that practice originate much further back than the solitary practitioner." Leaders who focus on helping others come to understandings about the standards of excellence and the practices that are expected within the organization may see a more integrated, cohesive set of actions that more collaboratively promote the ethical aim and the shared purpose of an organization.

My participants were able to share numerous ideas of how leaders can articulate the mission and shared purpose of the university. First, it begins with the daily actions of the leaders themselves. Ms. Etchart noted that leaders must act "in that congruent manner between what we feel our values are and our personal integrity and acting in a way that's congruent externally so that others experience us in the same way we view ourselves." Leaders in organizations need to not only act ethically and morally, and in a manner which is in alignment with the shared purpose and the ethical aim, they must also teach the practice of acting congruently, clearly articulating the importance of ethical and moral action. Dr. Leary took the idea one step further, noting the importance of not only articulating it "clearly so that people can understand it in their own positions," but to also "give them an opportunity to take efforts to live that out." He noted that leaders of the organization need to encourage and recognize those members of the organization who are engaged with work that is aligned ethically with the shared purpose. He suggested publications and year-end recognition as a way to "hold these people up" for the university.

Communication played a big role for many of my participants in realizing the ethical aim within the institution. My participants offered several examples of how the

leaders of their universities communicate the priorities and focus, the shared purpose, to the entire university. Suggestions included smaller communities focused on reflection, discussion and action on a specific topic, and staff meetings that provide opportunities "for developing a common consensus or common understanding." Additionally, my participants suggested speeches and publications that reflect the priorities of the institution, and the need to integrate the organization's priorities into the curriculum. Evaluation, promotion, and decisions made on the allocation of resources such as scholarships, grants, and incentives also play a role in illuminating the commitment to the organization's shared purpose. Finally, programs and initiatives that involve multiple departments and inspire collaboration and community within the organization, such as Seattle University's initiative on the southeast side of Seattle, create an atmosphere where many members of the institution can work together in community toward the shared purpose of the organization.

A key part of each of the programs and initiatives described above, from a critical hermeneutic perspective, is language. In speaking of language, Herda (1999:11) notes that "in the structuralist framework, language is thought of as something that structures our world. In the hermeneutic tradition it is thought of as an event." She goes on to state (1999:24), "Language does more than enable us to comprehend or represent this world and our understanding of it. Language plays a generative role in enabling us to create and acknowledge meaning as we engage in discourse and fulfill social obligations, which have, in turn, been created through language." Gadamer (1975:443) posits that language "has its true being only in dialogue, in coming to an understanding." Linguistic communication in organizations opens new worlds. Gadamer (1975:443) states, "The

world is a common ground… uniting all who speak with one another. All forms of human community of life are forms of linguistic community."

I did not specifically ask about language in my guiding questions. A few of my participants, however, spoke of the importance of language in promoting the ethical aim through daily action, noting that the focus, the mission, and the shared purpose must be ever-present in the day-to-day lives and discourse of members of the organizations. Leaders can play an important role in this. For Dr. Finucane, leaders need to make sure members stay focused in all discussions on "what we are supposed to be about." For Dr. Leary, leaders should try "to permeate almost everything people do with mission-related kinds of things." Dr. Finucane recognized the importance of language in articulating the communal identity and shared purpose of the organization, stating "We need leadership that's attentive to that and recognizes what's said is important, how it's said is important, and what's not said is important!"

Approaching leadership and education from an interpretive orientation would allow language to open these new worlds, and would give leaders a common basis for shaping communal identity and acting purposefully and meaningfully together toward the ethical aim. However, simply asking people to attend staff meetings will not be enough. As discussed in Chapter Two, Habermas (1984) notes that communication may bring about new understandings and new ways of being in the world only if four validity claims are met. These are comprehension, truth, shared values, and trust. If all four claims are met in communication, the stage is set for mutual understanding to be achieved.

My conversation partners emphasized the importance of trust in not only coming to a shared purpose and developing a communal identity, but in living out the shared

purpose and acting toward the ethical aim. Dr. Finucane recalled how difficult it was to move forward with new ideas when there was a lack of trust between different departments. She noted that the new leadership at John Carroll was promoting an atmosphere of collaboration and trust, which was helping people move in the direction of building that trust. Dr. Smith, also from John Carroll, additionally noted the importance of trust in an organization, stating that leaders need to encourage an atmosphere where it may be fostered. If leaders want to see creativity and imagination from the members of the organization, they need to create an environment where people are comfortable imagining new ways of being and acting. Drawing upon the experiences of my participants, I can affirm that it is essential for leaders to provide an atmosphere that incorporates Habermas' four validity claims.

In order for conversations to allow new possibilities to be imagined and new futures to emerge, organizational communities must move from understanding, to interpretation, to action and back again. Kearney (2002:133) states that "we move from a prefigured experience through narrative recounting back to a refigured life-world." Was this happening for the participants at either university? From the analysis of my research conversations, it did not appear that interpretation was reflected in their work processes. As discussed previously, my participants approach learning from a more positivistic orientation. Instead, leaders should approach leadership and education as interpretative events that allow for constant understanding, interpretation, and new understandings to emerge.

Leaders of organizations need to provide opportunities for new futures to be figured and re-figured, new futures for the individual members of the organization and

for the organization itself. Leaders can provide these opportunities by encouraging discourse. For Herda (1999:72), "A conversation is an event during which several things may take place: we evaluate ourselves and others, we tell and retell our story, we see the past, and we pose possibilities for the future." For leaders in organizations, I would take Herda's idea one step further: leaders should pose possibilities for *our* future. Orienting ourselves towards looking at *our* future as opposed to *the* future may help leaders engage other members of their organizations in the discussion of, and the action toward, the shared purpose of their institution. Imagining the future as *our* future may help members come to new understandings of their place in the world, in the community, and in the communal identity of their organization.

Summary

Herda (1999:79) states, "In practice and reflection individuals can collaboratively determine the value and meaning of lives affected by programs…The ultimate evaluation comes in whether or not we live our lives in moral, economic, and political community, a community that is always on its way." Members of an organizational community must explore the context in which they live so that they can imagine their shared meaning, their shared future and act together towards the good life. Leaders must always act with a sense of responsibility and meaning, allowing one's relationship with the other to guide our actions. Through relationships, through learning and gaining new understandings of ourselves and others, members of organizations can begin to act ethically in pursuit of the good life for ourselves and others.

This chapter served to provide a deeper critique and re-interpretation of the data grounded in critical hermeneutic theory. From this analysis, new understandings of

leadership, meaning in work, and identity as members of organizations have emerged. In the final chapter of my dissertation, I discuss the major findings that emerged from my data analysis, the new possibilities that have been revealed for organizational development and leadership, and suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER SIX – INTERPRETIVE ASSESSMENT AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

The major purpose of my study was to investigate leadership and meaning in work through conversations with members of Jesuit institutions. This study attempted to recognize how, through discourse, leaders appropriate new futures through creating a shared meaning and shared understandings, while helping others to find meaning in their work. The final analysis in Chapter Five presented a deeper level of critique and interpretation grounded in critical hermeneutic theory, allowing for new understandings to emerge and new possibilities to be revealed.

Implications have emerged for a new way of being for leaders and for policy makers in organizational development. In this concluding chapter of my dissertation I summarize the research process, discuss key findings that emerged as new understandings for the participants and the researcher, describe implications for organizational development and leadership, offer reflections on the research process, and make suggestions for future research.

Research Summary

I began this research process hoping to explore the meaning leaders find in their work, a journey that actually began much earlier. My first glimpse into interpretive research and a new orientation to leadership occurred in my first class on critical hermeneutics, Sociocultural Foundations of Education. This is truly where my research process began. In my masters thesis I performed quantitative research, and did not enjoy the research experience. I knew that for my doctorate I wanted to try a new methodology. Interpretive research seemed to provide a more meaningful research

experience, which was exactly what I was seeking. As I gained new understandings about the critical hermeneutics tradition and interpretive research, I knew this was the type of investigation I wanted to pursue.

I was intrigued by what I observed in my daily work as an educator and an administrator. I felt that, though my colleagues might be able to articulate the Mission and Vision of the university, so often it seemed people lost sight of the true meaning of their work in the daily politics, policies, and overall demands of their jobs. I rarely saw my leaders leading. More often, I saw people focused on completing their job rather than engaging in meaningful work. From my introduction to critical hermeneutics and several other courses, I was certain that members of organizations who could find shared meaning in their work could appropriate a better way of being for themselves and for others. I therefore set out to examine how leaders in organizations strive to ensure that their institution as a community is engaged meaningful action in pursuit of a more just and humane world on a daily basis.

I chose to speak with members of Jesuit institutions because of the Jesuit tradition of educating others to foster a more humane world. Though no organization can be completely just, in the Jesuit tradition I saw an orientation toward justice through moral action. My conversations with people in leadership roles explored if and how these individuals emphasized the importance of a focus on meaningful action in their daily organizational activities. Did these leaders see an important role in their work helping others to come to new understandings and engage in meaningful work? How were these leaders appropriating new futures and developing a common purpose and shared understandings for those with whom they worked? I sought to answer these questions

from a critical hermeneutic perspective. In order to recognize how, through discourse, members of an organization can come to shared understandings and work together toward a shared purpose, I investigated leaders' understanding of oneself *as* another. I imagined with my conversation partners, how this understanding may guide the daily actions of members of organizations to help create a more just and humane world.

I was fortunate in gaining entrée to research participants, who, for the most part, were eager to engage in discourse and were open, both to giving an honest narrative about themselves and those with whom they work, and to new understandings that might emerge for themselves as a result of participating in the research. Most of the conversations were comfortable, and true reciprocal exchanges rather than interviews. Two or three were particularly engaging and true conversations.

My research categories of fusion of horizons, communal dimension of identity, and ethical action, provided the appropriate amount of guidance to create meaningful discourse that focused on the topic at hand. At least one relevant finding or implication emerged from each research category, and will be explained in the text that follows. Though each conversation may have emphasized different aspects of my research categories, every one of them was a text in which new understandings emerged as a result of their interpretation. Each conversation has helped me imagine new possibilities for leadership and meaningful work. Several participants were truly engaged in deep discourse and reflection during and after our conversation. I am pleased that I was able to engage in research that was meaningful, relevant, and allowed for important themes about leadership and organizational development to emerge. Such themes included the importance of the meaning leaders find in their work, the connection between one's

understanding of oneself as a being with and for others and the shared meaning of an organization, and the importance of moral action that promotes the ethical aim and the shared meaning of an organization.

Exploring leadership from an interpretive, ontological stance has allowed for new understandings about the importance of oneself *as* another rather than oneself *leading* another. For leaders, meaningful work is derived from their ability to act in concert with others. From the understandings brought forth by this research, we can begin to approach policy-making as a shared imagined future in just institutions. In the remaining sections of this chapter, I discuss the key findings and implications that emerged from my research, as well as exploring additional ideas for future research.

Key Findings and Implications

Several key findings emerged from the interpretation and analysis of the texts that were created throughout this research process. In this section I discuss each key finding that emerged from the research process and the implications for organizational development and leadership.

1. **Finding:** *Leaders are still approaching leadership from a traditional, positivistic stance that limits possibilities for understanding and imagined futures.* Though my participants expressed ways in which they approach leadership differently from more traditional views of leadership, moving past the traditional top-down approach, my participants still have not experienced paradigm shift in their orientation to leadership. Leadership was not seen as a way of being with and for others. Leadership was approached as a way to inspire, to drive, to get things done. Though my participants clearly cared for the people they led, hoped to inspire them by serving them, and

indicated the value of looking for leaders at different levels of the organization, these approaches still stopped short of being truly interpretive. In seeing leadership as a transaction between people, we miss the opportunity to come to new understandings and create new futures for ourselves, those whom we lead, our community, and our world. This research approaches leadership as a way of expanding the possibilities for understanding. **Implication:** *Leaders must move from a traditional, narrow view of leadership to an interpretive orientation to leadership as a way of being with and for others.* We must consider a new orientation to leadership. Rather than managing or directing others, leaders should focus on meeting others where they are and helping others come to new understandings about themselves and the world. Leaders should help others engage in their own exploration of their narrative identity, helping others reach new understandings about themselves, their world, and the type of work that is meaningful to them.

Once leaders approach leadership from this orientation, new possibilities may emerge for themselves and those with and for whom hey lead. Leadership should be seen as a way of helping others learn, interpret and reach new understandings. This orientation can also lead to finding new moments of leadership within organizations: in individual moments between two colleagues collaborating toward a shared purpose, and in moments between people not in formal leadership roles, and at any level of the organization, who are serving others and helping them along their journey. Leadership moments can be found in formal leaders empowering others to work toward the shared purpose. Leadership moments can also be found in providing others with opportunities to

reflect on their gifts, talents, and passions, and helping others to engage in activities that inspire them to work toward the ethical aim.

2. Finding: *Meaningful work can take place best in a community (organization) that encourages its members to integrate their individual identity with the communal identity of the organization.* Leaders of organizations need to encourage opportunities for members to learn with and from one another in order to come to shared understandings and a communal sense of identity. Each member of the university needs to be given the opportunity to play a role in interpreting and reinterpreting the communal identity.

Implication 1. *During the hiring process, the communal identity and shared meaning of the organization should be considered.* There are existing tensions in organizations between "hiring for mission" and hiring candidates who bring new ideas and possibilities for new understandings to the organization. As mentioned previously, Ricoeur (1992:194) expresses that a community is characterized by the "bond of common mores and not that of constraining rules." The traditions of an organizational community should serve to bond organizational members in a common, shared meaning and understanding. Rather than being bound or restricted, the shared meanings developed by the institutions should allow members of the organization to pursue the good life together in a way that is in alignment with the organization's shared meaning and priorities. It is important to hire individuals who are inspired implementing or interpreting the mission or the shared meaning. It is also important to foster an environment where new employees are encouraged to bring their own individual identity, their traditions, values, and beliefs, into their work. This may allow for new interpretations and new understandings to emerge.

Implication 2. *Organizations should provide formation opportunities for new employees.*

These formation opportunities will allow new employees to gain an understanding of the history and tradition of the organization, allowing these staff members to experience a fusion of horizons and become part of the community through interpretation and new understandings of themselves and the institution of which they are a part.

3. Finding: *An organization's communal identity is not finite. The understanding of the communal identity, which may include the mission, values, shared purpose, and organizational priorities, should be circular in nature, allowing for interpretation and re-interpretation to occur. It should be constantly changing as members of the organizational community move together from understanding to interpretation and back to understanding.* As stated previously, understanding and interpretation are circular. Organizational communities have power-in-common (Ricoeur 1992:220); rather than being bound or restricted, the shared meaning and the communal identity of institutions frees them to pursue the good life together in a way that fit the organization's focus and priorities. Organizations must constantly re-imagine their identity, their shared meaning, and their possible futures. **Implication:** *Organizational leaders must foster environments of trust and dialogue so that the communal identity can be re-interpreted and re-imagined. Leader should also provide specific opportunities for interpretation and imagination among members of the organization to occur, and should encourage members to engage in such opportunities for reflection and re-interpretation regularly.* This can be in both formal and informal settings, including retreats, staff meetings, or one-on-one interactions. Members of the organization must be given opportunities to re-imagine new possibilities and new futures, both for themselves as individuals and as members of their organization. Through these opportunities,

organizational communities can continue to act in concert, meaningfully, and toward the ethical aim.

4. Finding: *The communal identity should be articulated through discourse so that all members of an organization have a clear understanding of how their daily actions fit within the ethical framework and the communal identity.* Leaders must articulate not just the "what" and the "why" as it relates to the shared meaning of the organization. Leaders must also focus on modeling and articulating the "how," speaking to the moral implications of action that promotes the ethical aim and the shared meaning. Leaders must recognize the importance of language and their ability to articulate the shared meaning and promote ethical and moral action. They must also foster an atmosphere of trust within the relationships of the organization. **Implication 1.** *In promoting daily action that works toward the ethical aim, organizational leaders should re-examine their evaluation processes, focusing on whether these processes reflect the shared meaning of the organization.* Evaluations must reflect priorities so that members clearly recognize what is important to the organization. If service is a priority to the organization, for example, the assessment of service activities participation must be included in the evaluation process. **Implication 2.** *Communications must also reflect the communal identity, shared meaning, and priorities of the organization.* Organizational leaders should examine to what extent email, verbal, and written communications reflect the communal identity of the organization and the strive toward the ethical aim. Members will interpret what is important from the forms of communication and the language used by the leadership; therefore, all forms of communication must be consistent with the communal identity and the ethical aim.

Suggestions for Further Research

The scope of the topics of meaningful work and leadership that promotes the ethical aim is expansive. We are only limited in research by our ability to be open to new ideas, new worlds, and new imagined futures. My research focused on leaders who were all members of one type of organization. Each participant was a leader of a non-profit, Jesuit university of higher education. Future research could explore the narratives of leaders in other types of organizations, including different types of non-profit organizations, corporate settings, and government institutions. Additionally, leaders in different types of communities, such as familial heads and tribal leaders, may provide different insights into meaningful work and leadership that promotes the ethical aim.

It is also important that we examine how we are specifically educating students on the concepts of leaders and leadership as it relates to the ethical aim. My study focused on the leaders of organizations who happened to work in educational settings. I did not explore how we educate students who will become our future leaders. Our orientation to our future world may be dependent on the orientation of educators to the subject of leadership in general, and to their orientation on how to educate others on leading and leadership. To re-imagine our world as a better world, a more just world, we must consider who will be the future of our world.

A final suggestion for future research is a more in-depth longitudinal study of one or several organizations. Though I was fortunate to have engaged in interviews that had moments of meaningful conversation, more ideas may have emerged and more opportunities for fusion of horizons to occur if the research was conducted over a full year, or if the researcher actually became a member of the organization being studied.

Reflections of Research Process

Reflecting on this journey is overwhelming. I see the light getting quite bright at the end of the tunnel, and I know that I am extremely close to achieving my goal of completing my doctoral degree. I'm not sure I'm ready for this journey to end! It has indeed been a life-changing experience, and an adventure that I will always treasure.

My experience at the University of San Francisco has been a founding event for me. From my new understandings of myself, the work that I find meaningful, and my new understanding of leadership and education, my career path has taken a different turn as a result of this journey. I hope to help others, using the information gathered during this research and from my future work, to come to new understandings about their identity, their way of being in the world with and for others, and the meaning they find in work. I hope to help others imagine new futures for themselves and their communities.

As discussed earlier, Herda (1999) explains that the researcher's orientation toward the research event places the researcher in a mode of reflection and toward imagination. It is not just my orientation to research that has changed; my entire way of being in the world is different. I have myself experienced many fusions of horizons throughout my educational and research experience. After pursuing an interpretive participatory research process, I cannot imagine returning to a traditional, positivist approach to anything I do as I move forward on my journey. Instead, I will continue on my journey as a wife, mother (soon, we hope!), daughter, friend, educator, leader, as a being in the world with and for others: a world that is interpretive, reflective, and imaginative.

I am awed by my new horizon, by what I have learned about myself and others, and by the ways I've been challenged emotionally, physically, spiritually, and philosophically. I am grateful for the many amazing people who have entered my horizon and have helped me to gain new understandings of the world, including my classmates, my professors, and my participants. It is a humbling experience to engage in this type of research, and I am thrilled to have engaged in such meaningful work throughout this journey. This experience and the people who played a part, are each a part of my narrative. My new understandings and the memory of this founding event will remain in my heart as I continue on my journey of understanding, interpretation, and imagination.

Conclusion

From the understandings brought forth by this research event, new ways of being for leaders within organizations can be appropriated, as well as new ways of approaching policy-making as a shared imagined future working together in our communal identity in just institutions. I hope that, from this research, leaders may gain new understandings of oneself as another. It is my additional hope that, from reading this text, leaders and members of organizations may gain new understandings of the power we have when we act ethically in concert with others.

Acting daily to promote the ethical aim, as men and women with and for others, will allow us to lead from the same ethical orientation. Only then can we imagine new futures together and reach shared understandings in our organizations. Once individuals have come to new understandings about leadership and meaningful work as members of an organizational community, they must then act toward the ethical aim.

Additionally, individuals must see themselves as part of more than just an organizational community. We must also refigure our existing world in the greater context of the social realities of our communities and act, purposefully and meaningfully, toward a more just world. I cannot imagine a more appropriate way to conclude my dissertation than with a quote from the woman who has opened my mind and heart to new ways of teaching, leading, and being in the world. Dr. Ellen Herda (1991:131) states, "In the end, it is our responsibility to think differently, to learn, and to act differently."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Journals and Books

Arendt, Hannah
1970 On violence. New York: Harvest Books.

Barash, Jeffrey
1999 The politics of memory: Reflections on practical wisdom and political identity. *In* Questioning Ethics: Contemporary Debates in Philosophy. Richard Kearney and Mark Dooley, eds. London: Routledge.

Begley, Paul and Stefkovich, Jacqueline
2007 Integrating values and ethics post secondary teaching for leadership Development: Principles, concepts, and strategies. Journal of Educational Administration. 45(4):398-412.

Benedict, Ruth
2005 Patterns of culture. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Bennis, Warren and Nanus, Burt
1985 Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper and Row.

Bernstein, Richard
1983 Beyond objectivism and realism. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.

Bloch, Deborah and Richmond, Lee
1998 Soulwork: Finding the work you love, loving the work you have. Palo Alto: Davies-Black Publishing.

Demkovich, Michael
1997 Work as worth: money or meaning. *In* Connections between spirit and work in career development. Deborah Bloch and Lee Richmond, eds. Palo Alto: Davies-Black Publishing.

Dewey, John
1966 Democracy and education. New York: The Free Press.

Driscoll, C and McKee, M.
2007 Restorying a culture of ethical and spiritual values: A role for leader storytelling. Journal of Business Ethics. 73:205-217.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg
1975 Truth and method. New York: Crossroad.

Gallagher, Shaun
1992 Hermeneutics and education. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Habermas, Jurgen
1984 The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and the Rationalization of Society. Vol. 1. Thomas McCarthy, translator. Boston: Beacon Press. (Original 1981).

Herda, Ellen A.
1997 Global economic convergence and emerging forms of social organization. *In* Worldwide Multiconference on Systems, Cybernetics, and Informatics.
1999 Research conservations and narrative: A critical hermeneutic orientation in participatory inquiry. Westport: Praeger.

Howard, Sue
2002 A spiritual perspective on learning in the workplace. Journal of Managerial Psychology. 17(3):230-242.

Jervolino, Domenico
1996 Gadamer and Ricoeur on the hermeneutics of praxis. *In* The Hermeneutics of Action. Richard Kearney, ed. London: Sage Productions.

Kearney, Richard
1996 Narrative imagination. *In* The Hermeneutics of Action. Richard Kearney, ed. London: Sage Productions.
2002 On stories. London: Routledge.
2004 On Paul Ricoeur: The Owl of Minerva. Boston: Ashgate.

Lowney, Chris
2003 Heroic leadership. Chicago: Loyola Press.

Maturana, HR and Varela, FJ
1987 The tree of knowledge: The biological roots of human understanding. Boston: Shambhala.

Miller-Tiedeman, Anna
1998 The lifecareer process theory: A healthier choice. *In* Connections between spirit and work in career development. Deborah Bloch and Lee Richmond, eds. Palo Alto: Davies-Black Publishing.

Mitroff I.I. & Denton E.A.
1999 A spiritual audit of corporate America: A hard look at spirituality, religion and values in the workplace. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rainwater, Maria
1996 Refiguring Ricoeur. *In* The Hermeneutics of Action. Richard Kearney, ed. London: Sage Productions.

Richmond, Lee
1997 Epilogue. *In* Connections between spirit and work in career development. Deborah Bloch and Lee Richmond, eds. Palo Alto: Davies-Black Publishing.

Ricoeur, Paul
1981 Hermeneutics and the human sciences. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press.
1982 The narrative function. *In* Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences. John B. Thompson, ed. Pp. 274-297. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1990 Time and narrative volume three. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
1991 Life: A story in search of a narrator. *In* A Ricoeur Reader: Reflection and Imagination. Mario J. Valdes, ed. Pp. 425-437. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
1992 Oneself as another. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
2005 The course of recognition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press

Shahideh, Laleh
2004 The power of Iranian narratives: A thousand years of healing. Dallas: University Press of America.

Sheep, Mathew L.
2006 Nurturing the whole person: The ethics of workplace spirituality in a society of organizations. 66:357-375.

Sama, Linda and Shoaf, Victoria
2007 Ethical leadership for the professions: Fostering a moral community. Journal of Business Ethics. 78:39–46.

Sparrowe, RT.
2005 Authentic leadership and the narrative self. The Leadership Quarterly. 16:419-439.

Stewart, John
1983 Interpretive listening: An alternative to empathy. Communication Empathy 32:379-391.

Stone, AG, Russell, RF, and Patterson, K.
2004 Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 25(4), 349-361.

Tobar, Jaqueline
2006 Heeding the call of care: A hermeneutic exploration of care in community based healthcare leadership in Guatemala. Ed.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of San Francisco.

Internet Sources

Characteristics of Jesuit Education. Electronic document, http://www.sjweb.info/education/doclist.cfm, accessed March 11, 2008.

John Carroll University Vision, Mission, Core Values and Strategic Initiatives Statement. Electronic Document, http://www.jcu.edu/about/vmc.htm, accessed April 29, 2009.

Ignatian Pedagogy: A Practical Approach. Electronic document, http://www.sjweb.info/education/doclist.cfm, accessed March 11, 2008.

Seattle University Mission. Electronic document, http://www.seattleu.edu/home/about_seattle_university/mission, accessed April 29, 2009.

THE JESUITS - The Society of Jesus. Electronic document, http://www.jcu.edu/about/jesuits.htm, accessed March 11, 2008.

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Internal Review Board Approval Form

From	irbphs <irbphs@usfca.edu>
Sent	Thursday, April 24, 2008 8:20 am
To	"rcisek@usfca.edu" <rcisek@usfca.edu>
[redacted]	[redacted]
Bcc	
Subject	IRB Application # 08-037 - Application Approved

April 24, 2008

Dear Ms. Cisek:

The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS) at the University of San Francisco (USF) has reviewed your request for human subjects approval regarding your study.

Your application has been approved by the committee (IRBPHS #08-037). Please note the following:

1. Approval expires twelve (12) months from the dated noted above. At that time, if you are still in collecting data from human subjects, you must file a renewal application.

2. Any modifications to the research protocol or changes in instrumentation (including wording of items) must be communicated to the IRBPHS. Re-submission of an application may be required at that time.

3. Any adverse reactions or complications on the part of participants must be reported (in writing) to the IRBPHS within ten (10) working days.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRBPHS at (415) 422-6091.

On behalf of the IRBPHS committee, I wish you much success in your research.

Sincerely,

Terence Patterson, EdD, ABPP
Chair, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
---
IRBPHS University of San Francisco
Counseling Psychology Department
Education Building - 017
2130 Fulton Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1080
(415) 422-6091 (Message)
(415) 422-5528 (Fax)
irbphs@usfca.edu
---
http://www.usfca.edu/humansubjects/

Appendix B – Table of Research Participants

Name	Title	Organization	Age Range	Length of Time In Role	Promotion History
Michelle Etchart	Director of Leadership Development	Seattle University	20-35	5 years	Hired into current role
Margaret Finucane	Interim Director, Center for Service and Social Action, and Assoc. Professor, Dept. of Communication & Theatre Arts	John Carroll University	35-50	2 years	Promoted within university
Laurie Frantz	Administrative Assistant to the President	John Carroll University	35-50	2 years	Promoted within university
William Hogan	Director of Athletics	Seattle University	Above 50	2 years	Hired into current role
Robert Kelly	Vice President, Student Development	Seattle University	35-50	3 years	Promoted within university
Timothy Leary	Senior Vice President	Seattle University	Above 50	3 years	Promoted within university
Joseph Phillips	Dean and Professor, School of Business	Seattle University	35-50	7 years	Hired into current role
Jonathan Smith	Executive Assistant to the President, Associate Professor, Management, Marketing & Logistics	John Carroll University	Above 50	1 year	Promoted within university

Appendix C – Letter of Participation in Research

Date
Participant's Name and Title
Organization
Address

Dear Mr. /Ms.:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my doctoral research. The major purpose of my proposed study is to foster an understanding about leadership and meaning in work as members of just institutions. I will investigate leaders' understanding of oneself as another and imagine how, through this understanding, members of organizations engage in actions that move them toward a more just and humane world. I hope that from my research, new ways of understanding about leadership, meaning in work, and organizations will emerge.

In addition to agreeing to have a conversation with me, I am also requesting your permission to both record and transcribe our conversation. In this type of research, the transcription of the conversation will serve as data for analysis. Once I have transcribed the conversation, I will provide you with a copy of the transcription for you to review and approve. You may edit any part of the conversation transcription at that time. Once I receive your edits and final approval, I will use the transcription of our conversation as a text for analysis. It is important to understand that in interpretive research, none of the data used will be kept confidential. All data that you contribute, in addition to your name and position, may be used as part of the data analysis. Your participation in this research is contingent upon your signing a consent form, a copy of which you will keep. By signing, you will be granting me permission to audio record and transcribe our conversation(s).

While the conversations and transcripts in this research are collaborative, the writing that comes from them will be my product, and may include some of your editing. You acknowledge that you have been given complete and clear information about this research, and it is your option to make the decision at the outset about whether to participate or not, and can withdraw at any time without any adverse consequences.

Below you will find a series of proposed questions. These questions are intended as guidelines to direct our conversation(s). I would like to emphasize that I am seeking stories that reflect your personal history and experience with the topic at hand. My hope is that our conversation will provide an opportunity for us both to reach new understandings.

Please consider these questions in light of your experiences:

- To what extent do you feel your calling is to help others gain new understandings about themselves and the world?
- How do you help the people you lead come to these new understandings?

- What do you learn from the people with whom you work?
- Describe how your experiences within your work and your organization have led you to a different understanding of the world.

- To what extent do you believe your understanding of who you are makes a difference in how you relate to others within your organization?

- How is leadership being (identity)?

- How do you bring others along on the leadership journey?

- How do the leaders in your organization come to shared understandings and a shared purpose? Does organizational history play a role in this?

- How does your narrative influence your work?

- Explain the difference between ethics and morality.

- How do you promote daily action that works toward the ethical aim as a leader in your organization?

Again, thank you for your willingness to meet with me. I look forward to our conversation.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Cisek
Researcher, Doctoral Student
University of San Francisco School of Education

Appendix D – Confirmation Letter to Participate in Research

Date

Participant's Name and Title
Organization
Address

Dear Mr./Ms.:

Thank you once again for agreeing to participate in my doctoral research. I am writing to confirm our that our conversation will still take place on _____. Please let me know if you need to change our arranged place, time or date.

With your permission, I will record our conversation, transcribe the tapes into a written text, and submit the text for your review. After your review, I would like to discuss the conversation we had and review your changes (if needed). Please remember that the data for this research are not confidential.

The object of participatory research is to create collaboratively a text that allows us to carry out the integrative act of reading, interpreting, and critiquing our understandings.
The experience of discourse provides new thoughts that will allow us to learn, interpret, and understand themselves and the world around them. The exchange of ideas in conversation as the format, allows for both my insights and your insights to serve as data for the research. This type of research allows us to engage in a more open form of bi-directional discourse rather than a one-way interview. This type of research also allows you to comment, add, or delete the transcript. This process will not only allow you to correct anything stated in our conversation but it also allows you the opportunity to reflect on our conversation. Only after your approval will I look at the text of the conversation that we had, gather new ideas, and possibly adjust my area under investigation and continue my research.

Once again, thank you and I look forward to meeting you.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Cisek
Researcher, Doctoral Student
University of San Francisco School of Education

Appendix E – Sample Thank You Letter

Date

Participant's Name and Title
Company or Organization
Address

Dear Mr./Ms.:

Thank you for taking the time to meet with me on _____. I appreciate your willingness to participate in my research project. I am grateful for the insights you provided me.

Please take a moment to read through the attached transcript and to add the changes or clarifying comments you feel are appropriate. I will contact you in two weeks to discuss any changes that you might have made. As discussed previously, I will be using the approved transcript for data analysis for my research on self as another through meaning in work.

I look forward to speaking with you in a few weeks. In the meantime, please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns. Thank you once again for your participation.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Cisek
Researcher, Doctoral Student
University of San Francisco School of Education

Appendix F – Pilot Study Transcription

Laleh Shahideh and Rebecca Cisek
November 18, 2007

LS: I am the Associate Dean for Student Academic services in the College of Arts and Sciences. Basically, I am the Dean of Students for the College of Arts and Sciences and everything that is related to students, from recruitment, preadmission, to graduation and alumni after they graduate somewhat falls under me.

RC: Wow.

LS: We are the largest college, we have about 3700 students, about 3000 undergrad, 700 graduates, and that's it, that's my position.

RC: How long have you been here?

LS: I've been here for 20 years.

RC: Oh my gosh!

LS: Yes, that's a long time.

RC: Always in the same capacity?

LS: No, actually I started in 87 to be exact and I started in, at that time we were building a clinic at USF and we didn't have St. Mary's. So I started at the counseling center, and then I was the office manager, kind of quality assurance coordinator. I was involved in contracting and building a clinic. So we built a clinic, we merged the counseling center and St. Mary's, no, Counseling Center and the new clinic. We hired doctors, Nurse Practitioners, etc., etc. But, that was about years, we don't want to go there. That's another whole research project for you. And then I moved to academics, to Arts and Sciences I think in either 89 or 90. So most of the time I've been there. But I started as the assistant to the Associate Dean. And then I got promoted to the Coordinator. Then I got promoted to Director, then I got promoted to the Associate Dean. I am actually the first female, non-Jesuit, because all the previous Associate Deans in this capacity have been Jesuit. To be honest with you, I can see why it was, because although I don't have a degree in counseling, but you are dealing with a lot of sensitive issues, that need a lot…you know, like people really confide in you about a lot of issues that are very personal. So I think that's why historically priests were very suited for those positions.

RC: Wow. Is that in all the schools here at USF, or just in Arts and Sciences.

LS: In Arts and Sciences. I think each school has an Associate Dean, but there functions are different.

RC: Gotcha. So you kinda know that whole department from the ground up!

LS: Yes, I know! Where all the bodies are!

RC: That's fantastic. We talk about in the theoretical constructs that I've been working with, one is a founding event, which I'm sure since you have a background that you've heard of that before. And we talk about a founding event as an event that is pivotal to your life that, you know, made a difference in your path. So I wanted to see if you could describe a founding event in your life? Doesn't have to be related specifically to your job right now, just a founding event that you think, uh, sticks out in your mind.

LS: Yes, a founding event, what I can say would be the Iranian Revolution. Because that basically put our lives upside down. That was in 1978-79. As a result of that, basically we lost everything. We had to immigrate to a different country and start all over again. Basically, when I came to the United States with my sister, um, we…I was making, just to give you comparisons…I was working in the Italian foreign ministry. I had a very high level position. I was making about 6 or 7,000 dollars at that time. Then I came here. Everything for me went from up here to down here and then I had to work myself back up again. And then we had to basically leave everything behind. You only came with two suitcases of clothing. You were not allowed to take anything valuable out of the country. I remember the jewelry that I brought back...those are the things that really change you for life. I remember I had one gold necklace that I really liked and they sewed it in my, my aunt un-sewed that thing were you put my jeans, and then they sewed it inside and re-sewed it. And they search you, a really thorough search at the airport. And I've never forget how my heart was pounding! Later, I was thinking it wasn't important, but you know, there are some things…so that was the changing event. And I remember that was very…in retrospect when I think back, it was very hard, I came here and I was working 7 days a week, three jobs, for at least the first four to five years to make it.

RC: How old were you around that time?

LS: I was in my 20's.

RC: And how many years were you here before you came to USF?

LS: Just almost immediately.

RC: Oh, so those three jobs were including here?

LS: It was my USF job and then I was doing other jobs on the weekend to have money.

RC: Wow. You here the term calling, he was called to do that, and I wanted to see what your thoughts are, as far as, what does that really mean when someone has a calling to do something?

LS: It's funny that you use that, because I use that all the time. I always tell my students that I strongly believe that we all come to this world for a reason, that we have a calling. Only those of us who find that calling are the ones who really lead a happy life. And unfortunately, I mean I haven't done research, but just from the observations that I have of people around me, or the students that I see on campus, about 70-80 percent of people, I don't think they really find that fulfillment in their lives. Because they just get so wrapped into every day survival and making money and doing this and that and so I am a strong believer of calling. I feel that my calling in many ways is what I'm doing with students. And I never planned for it, but I believe in the universe, the energy of the universe. I believe if you know yourself and leave yourself open, things come to you.

RC: Absolutely. I see that too, working with the students in a different capacity…you just…I'll say to them, what do you want to do? I don't know. What's your major? Such and such? Well, why did you pick that? I don't know. And I worry, not that do any of us necessarily find our calling at the age of 20, I'm not sure about that. It took you a long time, like you said, to follow that path. But you hope they're at least somewhere on the right path because I think there are so many people that don't seem very fulfilled.

LS: And I have to tell you that the other thing that was a changing event in my life, which I also believe things that don't happen without a reason. The other thing was the fact that I studied Hermeneutics and I met Ellen Herda. Had I not had one class canceled when I was doing my doctorate, I would've never pursued this. It was complete administrative error. Somebody called me on a Friday at 4:00 and said, your Saturday morning class was canceled. And I was so upset! So, had that class not been canceled, I would've not taken Hermeneutics, my life would've completely changed.

RC: What class did you end up taking from her?

LS: I think it was Legitimation of Power, something like that.

RC: But you had taken the Sociocultural Foundations class?

LS: With her, no! I had never had her. And I was in the middle, exactly, of my degree. Because if I had taken that class and somebody else would've said, switch to Hermeneutics, I would've said, no I don't want to delay my graduation. But it happened exactly at the right time."

RC: Were you working with students before you were in this program?

LS: Yes, I've always pretty much worked with students.

RC: Great.

LS: In your capacity with students, do you think that you kind of subconsciously use these theories?

RC: I know that I consciously use these theories! I think it's both. I actually taught my Sports Medicine students – we do a weekly in-service – and I taught them some of, like, the quickest overview in the world of interpretation, understanding…and I don' think I even used the word Hermeneutics until the very end, because I didn't want them to go, I don't know what that means, and stop listening! But we talked about narrative, understanding, interpretation, imagination, and it was so fantastic. And I did it on Halloween night, so not all of them were really paying attention, but within the next few weeks I've had a couple of them come up to me and say, I thought about what we had talked about and it helped me in that conversation with my roommate or, something else.

LS: Oooh, how powerful is that?

RC: Right, and then I just had a couple of our injured student-athletes talk to my students about what they go through psychologically when they're injured. And I had originally, and I still plan, to have one of the psychologists come and say, here's the stages of … and I think that , through Hermeneutics, it's helped me to understand the athletes' story is so much more of a powerful way to get those ideas and so the students just loved it.

LS: How fascinating! What happens to them psychologically?

RC: The textbook is, whenever you go through a loss, denial, anger, bargaining, depression, acceptance. But…in anybody who has experienced a loss, you can go, oh yeah, I've experienced that. And it's the same type of thing with a major injury. For many of these people, athletics is their identity. They don't know what else they're going to do. For some of them it's their career. We have a kid who was going to try out for the Olympics, and then he blew out his knee. So it's very interesting to look at how much more complex it is, and so we have these three athletes talk about to our students. I said, tell me your story, of what it's been like. And one of the guys, his roommates are teammates, and they are resentful of him, so they are not really talking to him right now. And yeah, it's unbelievable, he was a leader, he was the Captain, and I think they see it as their season would've been better if he hadn't gotten hurt. He didn't do anything wrong, it wasn't like he did it on purpose! And then one of the guys hasn't been out but has had pain for the last three years in a row, and the students said it was so rich, the information. They realized , it's not just about this kid coming in, doing their exercises, they seem a little grumpy because their knee hurts, and they leave, it's everything else going on.

LS: That's amazing!

RC: Yes, and I think I never would've thought to do that if it hadn't come from this stuff. And I think that I'm glad I kinda tag-teamed it with the lecture I did with them on understanding, narrative, because I think it brought it into application for them.

LS: You should use that for kind of an orientation for the new athletes!

RC: Yes, exactly, and I think that's what I would like to do. And I think that every class I teach in sports medicine I will definitely have my students come…it's been fantastic.

LS: Have them do a video.

RC: That's a great idea!

LS: You can use clips of your conversation. Because they might not be there, and it always makes a difference when you can talk about it and you can show snaps of their conversations.

RC: That's a great idea! And I was just thinking…because, you know how we talk about, the guy in your book who said, I'll never be anything other than who I am, regardless of who I become. I love that! And I was thinking, if I did the same thing in another five months, they'll be in totally different places in their recovery. And if I had them do the exact same thing, tell me your story, how different it would be! If I had both…

LS: And then you could ask them, what did they learn about themselves through this breakdown? And then that makes them think…they often may not think about what they learned about themselves.

RC: Absolutely, and it was great because the athletes and the students who will be their therapists learned so much. It was really fantastic.

LS: You are on to something big!

RC: It's really exciting, it really is! And it's funny how you start incorporating it into your everyday life and you don't even think that you're doing it until later, you're like, I know where that came from, a little fusion of horizons there!

RC: This one, actually…kind of what we were just talking about with my student athletes, um, do you believe your understanding of you, who you are, makes a difference in how you relate to others, whether it's your students, your co-workers, etc?

LS: Definitely.

RC: How do you think that understanding does make a difference?

LS: Well, first of all, I think when you really know yourself, if you are honest and open, you know your strengths and weaknesses. One thing that I notice that I do, I have become more patient, kind of more fair, and objective when it comes to my relationship with others. Laughs, I'll give you a funny example. It was an evening, I was very tired, I went to pick up some medication for my Mom. I had had an emergency in the office, I had left early, my foot was hurting, everything was happening, I had done more shopping. Because of the emergency in the office… I was trying to put things in the car and my cell phone goes off, so I just open the back door of my car, not the driver's, but

the back door. The cart that I had…[demonstrating] so this is my car, and this is the car that was, it was actually one of those SUV's parked next to me. So the cart…I kind of left the shopping cart in the middle, I opened this door, I dropped everything and I sat down because I was trying to get my phone out of my purse. And I had my keys still in my hand, the phone, one foot out and I start to get the phone call. All of a sudden I see the SUV is backing up and is hitting, not me, but the cart! So I just drop everything, I get up, the first thing that I do by that time, the back window had reached past me. So I knock on her back window to make her stop. She stops, she gets out. And I said, Oh my God, you almost hit the cart! And she says, I know, I saw that, but it was not necessary for you to do that. I said, to do what? She said, you gave me the finger!

RC: Oh my gosh, and you just went like this [demonstrating]…

LS: Because I was holding my keys like this, apparently to her it appeared…so she said, you gave me the finger! That was very rude! And for a second, I was going to lose my temper. I said, I have no idea what you are talking about! I said, I was just trying to help you, so much for helping others! And then she says, I saw it with my eyes! And I'm like, I realized how I was holding the key…but it was the funniest thing! So that was just a silly example, but I think it happens, people tell me all the time: they say, how can you handle all this pressure and stay so even-tempered and then you don't let people get to you? I think part of it is my knowledge of myself. And because I don't have insecurities about myself, as a result of doing that work. So when somebody does something stupid, which in her case was really stupid…but other people kind of come in with their baggage and they have all this pre-prejudices or this and that, I have been able to detach myself from the situation and not take it personal.

RC: That's one thing I've been working on as someone newly as the Director of Sports Medicine. I'm so glad that I'm in these classes while I'm doing that. Because, I think you can be passionate about your job…or I'm finding it hard to stay passionate about my job and not let my passion make me take it personally. You know, if someone comes in and wants to be mad about one of my staff members, I immediately go, Whoa, and I wanna take care of my staff members and make sure I'm supporting them. But, I think I agree that these classes have helped me in the same way, of just… I can see the urgency in it, and I can help work through it, to solve it, but I don't need to get so personally invested in it. I think that's so important as a manager these days or you'll be worn out! Because everyone comes to you with an urgent issue that must be solved.

LS: And, I think another thing that I notice in myself, you become a better listener because you are really trying to understand what happened. And that already calms them down. Because when people are upset all they really need is somebody to affirm their feelings and say ok I am hearing what you're saying.

RC: Yes, you have reasonable things to say.

LS: Yes, even if they are not reasonable, I'm just going to listen.

RC: How do you bring others, not just with your students, but as an Associate Dean, you are in a formal leadership role, and probably in other aspects of your like, not so formal roles…how do you bring others along on the leadership journey?

LS: I think encourage them to be the best they can be. And I believe in them. I give them lots of freedom. I think what has made me in my position successful is, I select the people that work with me carefully to have…to stand for the things that I stand. So I don't really look for superficial things. I really look for some fundamental values in a person. Once they have that work ethic…and obviously they are bright people, and they have that passion or compassion to help others. Those are some criterion that you can't really put in a job requirement. But I always look for that… and a testimonial to that… I have seven direct reports under me. Three of them…one has been with me for 17 years, the other one for 12, the other one for eight years. They have been offered double or triple, they have been offered $20,000 raises in other divisions and they have not left.

RC: Oh my gosh, that does say a lot!

LS: And they would say, we will leave when you leave.

RC: Wow! You're not leaving any time soon are you?

LS: No! [laughs] I love my job! But it's funny because that is something that rarely happens, and I think they love their job. Because they take off…I mean it's like, I have to be the one who says, we have so little time, slow time, this is our opportunity to leave early. Leave early! Take turns and leave early! They don't. They're like, I have things to do! I cannot believe it! I'm like, if I tell anybody they won't believe it, you are telling your staff to leave and they won't leave.

RC: That's when you know that they believe in what they're doing.

LS: The other thing, one of the things most people don't do in leadership positions. One of my rules is I treat them they way I always want to be treated. I never leave my office without asking my assistant and everybody else, is it ok if I leave?

RC: Oh, that's wonderful!

LS: Yes. And they say, oh! Of course! But I think, why should they ask me if it's ok if they leave? I'm not asking their permission, but I'm saying…you know, is it ok if I leave? And that small question means a lot to them. And the other thing is, I never, never take credit for their work. And I always praise them for the wonderful job that they have done, publicly. I see a lot of people in leadership positions, they have great staff who do all these overwhelming, wonderful projects for them, and then they take off with it and they don't even mention… So those are the small things that may seem small but they matter.

RC: Absolutely.

LS: And I'm always telling them…well, the ones that have been with me for the longest, they know me so well, the others, that are kind of more new. I always tell them, I don't have an ego. If you think that something could be improved, just because it has been done in a certain way, I want you to feel completely comfortable to tell me, no, this shouldn't be done this way. And they do it. And you know what? I'd rather my staff feel comfortable to look me in the eye and to say we don't think that's a good idea. But how many people in the staff meetings they all go behind the scene and are like, oh there she goes again and are like blah, blah ,blah…but you know what? You have to be secure about yourself.

RC: Exactly, because they're not questioning you. They're questioning a little procedure, not you!

LS: Right, and it could be actually my idea that they are challenging, but I welcome it. And then I say, well no the reason I'm saying do it this way is because of that, and then they see where I am coming from, but the dialogue is open. I think that's the key. There is tremendous trust among us. There is nowhere else. I think trust and loyalty… any of us can leave and not be at work for months, and people will cover for you. They are going to take on your job, they are not going to backstab you…vs. the American culture is so competitive, that half of the time employees are so afraid of taking more than a week off, because once they come back someone has taken over their job and it's gone!

RC: Sounds like you've been fortunate, but also because of the way you hire people, you have found those people who have those shared values. And I think a lot of people, who would want to have those shared values, they think that they're alone in the world and it's kill or be killed so they can't really act on those. I think that's fantastic. And there's obviously there, as you said, if people are staying…and it sounds like it's mutual loyalty because you've stayed for a really long time.

LS: Yes. And that's another thing, I never expect them to do more than I do. Because I see some people in high positions and their staff are doing everything and they are going to long lunches and coming and going at their leisure. And that brings down the morale. So, if they are working so hard that they are not taking lunches, I'm going to be the first to not take lunches.

RC: That's fantastic. Um, what do you learn from the people with whom you work?

LS: Oh god, I learn every day!

RC: Could you maybe just give me a couple examples that you can think of?

LS: Do you know Marvela?

RC: No, I don't know her.

LS: You should see her, everybody knows Marvela! Marvela handles our front desk, but she basically handles the entire university, I say! I am actually amazed you don't know her. I learn from her every day, because she is just so intelligent, so loving and caring but yet so humble, so wise…I mean…I learn from my staff every day I think. Those are the things that I think to name a few. You can be so loving and giving and just happy. She is genuinely happy because she cares. She is very smart, very smart!

RC: Has she been with you a long time?

LS: 17 years.

RC: Wow! And it sounds like you learn…you were saying that because you have fostered an open and safe environment just from the conversations in the staff meetings of, oh I have a different idea…I have worked with people and I think, especially it's hard when you've been in one place for a long time, I think we are creatures of habit… and you have been in your position for a long time and so it's wonderful that you fight that habitual nature we have in all of us! I think we've all worked with bosses that say, I've been here 22 years, and this is the way I've always done it and it's tough…

LS: Oh yeah, and we are just making major changes all the time.

RC: That's fantastic! Do you feel part of your calling is to help others gain new understandings about themselves and the world, especially now that you've gone through some of these classes? Is that part of your calling, would you say?

LS: Not necessarily gain a better understanding, well, maybe…I think part of my calling is to basically help people… whether that's with…ideally, they have to get to know themselves better in order to evolve and become stronger or happier people. But I don't necessarily put my focus on that particular issue.

RC: What do you put your focus on?

LS: I just…most of the time…maybe it is getting to know themselves…appreciating their potential, loving who they are, and accepting who they are. It's ok to be who they are. A lot of time there is so much pressure…you know I often use, because I see them and in our conversation…you should try it. When you say to a student "I'm so proud of you," their face lights up, they have not heard that. And they are craving that from the society, from their parents. There is such a mentality of you have to be perfect, super hero that looks good, has a 4.0, has extra-curricular activities and they are going to go to graduate school and they're going to achieve all these things and if they are any less than they have failed.

RC: You're right, even in our own staff, and in my own students. I'll say great job today, thank you so much, and I try to say thank you at least once a day, and they are surprised, especially when they first start working with me. And it's like, hasn't anybody

else told you thank you for doing your job? And one of my assistants said, well I'm just doing they job you hired me to do and I said, but I still want to thank you for doing that job!

LS: So who are you exactly working with? Debi?

RC: So Debi is my…well, we just hired an Associate Athletic Director, Desiree, so she's my immediate supervisor and Debi is over her. So Debi is the overseer of the entire Athletics Department. And then I'm the Director of Sports Medicine so every athlete that gets injured or ill, for whatever reason, they come see us. We do all of their rehabilitation and all of their treatment. We're the first person that assesses them if they get injured during practice or a game. We travel with the teams. And I have three staff members under me. And…that's funny because even as I say that, under me… that's such a positivist way to think of it! And it's funny how I'm still thinking that way but I'm catching myself thinking that way. But it's so funny, to hear myself as I'm typing…it's a journey, right? We're all on a journey! That's why my working title is "Leadership Journeys."

LS: That's great. I think something huge is going to come out of it.

RC: I think so too! Even just talking with you, I'm thinking, I don't need to say my assistants work under me! They don't! They do their own thing! But, it's, so I work with student-athletes and I work with my assistants and then I also work with our students…we have some students in Exercise and Sport Science that are doing…it's kind of a voluntary internship program that we made up and actually I'm going to be working with Jeremy Howell, to see if we can do maybe like a recurring practicum experience because they do one internship for their entire career in academics and Jeremy recognizes that maybe some other internship practicum-type of opportunities would be great. I have students that have been working and volunteering and learning for four years now, and they don't get any credit, they don't get paid, they just get the experience of working in a clinical setting.

LS: They should get credit!

RC: Yes, so we're talking about working to get something like that. But it's fun working with all those different people and…

LS: You know who else is a great motivational speaker? Is Jeremy's wife.

RC: Yvonne? Yes! She works with some of our student-athletes. It's such a small world! We're all interconnected! But it's fun because there are ways you can work with all this stuff and I work with so many different people that need so many different things, that's the part that I've liked learning, and I hear that from you too because you have so many different students…how many students did you say?

LS: 3600 students.

RC: That's a lot of different people, with all different stories, I'm sure.

LS: Yes, and I end up seeing some business and nursing students occasionally when they have problems in core courses.

RC: Are you part of the President's leadership team?

LS: No leadership team is basically my boss, Jenny Turpine, the one that I said you should interview – I mean, have a conversation with!

RC: Dr. Herda, you don't have to hear that!

LS: She'd be like, WHAT?!?...It's going to be Margaret Higgins, Jennifer Turpine…who else? Jim Wiser, and all the other deans, Jeff what's his name, the one in Law School, and then Mike Duffy, so all the Deans. ….That sounds exciting!

RC: Yes, it is. Well, I think that is pretty much it.

LS: Good luck to you. It was great.

RC: Thank you, it was my first one, I'm a little rusty…

LS: No, no! I think that's great! See if you can, as Herda says, see if there is some meat in it!

----- *End of Transcription* ----

Appendix G – Reflection on Conversations

In order to gain understandings about if and how the shared values of the leadership team of the University of San Francisco had filtered throughout the organization, I had two conversations. The first was with Dean Judith Karshmer, PhD (November 20, 2007). We first talked about Dean Karshmer's journey as a Nurse Educator. I asked about her experience when considering the USF Dean of Nursing position. She stated that when she was looking into USF, the mission "spoke" to her. She wondered, prior to her interview, was it "real?" She felt when she met Father Privett and other members of the administration that the mission and the people carrying it out did seem "real." After being here almost two years, she still feels that it's real. She mentioned the feeling of collaboration among the deans rather than competition. She feels that the deans share in the successes of each other, and this was a noted contrast to her previous places of work.

Dean Karshmer and I then spoke about her experience on the retreat to Guatemala. One item that amazed her was that they did not talk about work at all while they were there. They were truly there to get the experience. Their days consisted of numerous activities, followed by an evening spent with the group in reflection on what they had experienced that day. Dean Karshmer noted her surprise that "Steve wasn't the President, he was Steve." She commented that she wasn't sure she would have the ability to do that. When I asked what she had brought with her from the experience, she mentioned that she was interested in, and already begun pursuing, providing opportunities for her students to go on similar trips. She noted that a colleague asked her

if she had thought about similar trips for her faculty, and she noted she had not. She wasn't sure she had the ability to "just be Judith."

Our conversation moved to the daily application of the values at USF. She believes that many people do strive daily to live out the USF vision, mission, and values. She noted several examples. First, she noticed that on USF's letterhead is our motto "educating Minds and Hearts to Change the World." She noticed that the University of Florida's letterhead simply says, "Go Gators!" That spoke volumes in her mind regarding what USF is really about. She also discussed her monthly leadership team meeting, led by Father Privett. Every month he has them all read something, an article or story, etc, and then they all discuss their thoughts to begin the meeting. Dean Karshmer marvels that Father Privett takes the time to do this, and she mentioned thinking how great the idea was. When I asked if she implemented anything similar in her own staff meetings, she admitted rather sheepishly that at this point she had not. She did emphasize that she wanted to and planned to.

Our conversation moved to what she did do in her department to foster the culture of USF. She offers monthly dinners for her faculty and staff at her house. She has also implemented "Dessert with the Dean" twice a semester to gain opportunities for her to meet with students and weekly she has morning coffee to facilitate discourse with her and her faculty.

We then talked about her thoughts on being a leader. Though, this may not seem to directly pertain to my study on culture, I have an interest in how people see themselves as leaders. I am interested in gaining insights from people in various leadership roles. I also believe that the way a leader goes about working with others affects how they pass

on the mission and values. Dean Karshmer said it is so easy to set yourself apart as a leader, even though that is not the best thing to do. She feels it's the norm so it's easy to have it happen and that people in leadership roles must work hard to not let that happen. She stated, "You can think you're not letting it happen and it is happening."

She also believes in shaking things up, particularly during a time of transition or change. When she came to USF she established "100 Days of Progress" within her department, an initiative to make significant changes quickly. She stated that she doesn't want to settle for status quo until you get to where you want it to be.

When I asked her about her role as a leader within the nursing department, she stated that she believed it was her role to support the faculty so that they could do their jobs. She noted that some of her staff felt may feel that she puts faculty over staff but she feels as Dean her priority is her faculty. She finally stated that if you expect people to be reasonable they usually are. She told me several stories that occurred throughout her career when she hoped to move forward on an innovative change. Many would tell her, Oh you can't ask for that, they'll never approve it! And on multiple occasions she just asked, explained the necessity and got the approval. Status quo, for her, is the hard stuff, not the change.

Conversation: Undergraduate Nursing Student

My next conversation was with a female undergraduate nursing student who was a junior in the program. We spoke on November 17, 2007. This student is strong academically, and has given consistently quality academic performances. We began the conversation with me asking her why she chose USF. Her main reason was the she had several cousins who had attended USF in nursing and had been told it was a really good

program. They have an extremely high pass rate on the nursing exam. She also noted in looking at the school on the internet that the university had similar mission and values to her high school. She had attended a private, faith-based high school. She also grew up in a family with strong attention to religion and values, and this was important to her. Interestingly enough, she did not visit USF until after gaining acceptance to school, even though she lived only an hour away.

We then began discussing her perception of the USF nursing program. She used the term "factory"; she feels the program is designed to "get us in and get us out." She mentioned that she does enjoy the content and the material in her classes but doesn't always enjoy her classes. She often gets frustrated because she feels she is taught only the interventions without the underlying Why, the disease processes. As our discourse progressed, we both came to the understanding that perhaps she is frustrated with the profession of nursing almost as much as the culture and atmosphere of the program here at USF.

We moved on to discuss her perception of support by the nursing faculty. She said she only felt supported by one faculty member and also by her Clinical Instructor. She feels that other instructors are "weeding out the weak." She felt that the instructors portray more of a condescending tone than a positive energy or passion about the students learning the material. She noted a considerable difference between the passion and enthusiasm of nursing instructors compared to instructors she has had from other departments. She does believe that some new initiatives that have been implemented by Dean Karshmer may help.

My partner then noted that she does not feel a regular reinforcement of the values. She feels she particularly notices a contrast from her high school experience, where the values and mission were reinforced and emphasized on a daily basis throughout the entirety of her education there. In contrast, she feels here in her program and at SF in general, that she is expected to know the material to pass, rather than to know it to help others. She says that she just doesn't "feel it" here.

We concluded our conversation on the topic of community. When I asked if she notes a true sense of community in her department, her response was, "we have a saying in nursing, that nurses eat there young." She was taught this saying by one of her professors! I was taken aback; I couldn't imagine a more vivid example of the absence of a feeling of community! She noted there was a high level of competition among the students. This did not make sense to me, or her, because there is not a maximum number of people who can pass the exam, nor is there a limited supply of nursing jobs anywhere. It was surprising that there wasn't a sense of community or family atmosphere among the students so they could support each other to pass their classes and succeed. Though there is a student organization that facilitates community-building activities, she feels there is not a true sense of community among the students.