

Chapter 19 Four Voices of Leadership Participation



Summary Presentation of the Four Voices

Z DIMENSION is Dialog of four levels of participation in leaderly and organizational decision-making and ethical discourse.

I think there are at least four voices in the theatre of leadership: ¹

First Voice - In bureaucratic theater, there is mostly monologue; other voices are there on the stage but forbidden to speak, or they can whisper, or are unhearable, drowned out by the official narrator authorized to take center-stage. In bureaucratic theatre, autocratic leaders speak with one voice, and a compliant audience of followers listens to the monologue, not expected to reply. For any other voice to speak would be an act of bureaucratic espionage; certainly for the secretary to speak would be unthinkable rebellion. Overtime followers forget to listen or speak; they nod. Do we really hear another's voice? Is there really any dialog at all? So-called dialogs of participation are rhetorical, with the leader speaking and answering their own questions.

¹ 4 voices of leadership, based on published article in New Mexico Outlook (publication of the college) Boje 2005

<http://bbrs.nmsu.edu/nmbizoutlook/showarticle.php?articleID=50113> and based on is based on book review (2000) for *Management Studies Journal*.

<http://www.leader-values.com/Content/detail.asp?ContentDetailID=970>

<p>1st Voice -</p> <p>Bureaucratic theater, the monolog, one voice speaks for all and too all.</p>	<p>2nd Voice –</p> <p>Dialogic Theater, a leader speaks to other actors, and listens to them, as well.</p>
<p>3rd Voice -</p> <p>There is an internalized 3rd voice, what Adam Smith proposed as the internalized spectator and others have called ethics.</p>	<p>4th Voice –</p> <p>This is the voice of the voiceless. Sometimes it is an aesthetic sense, or a spiritual listening, or tuning into nature.</p>

Figure One: Four voices of Leadership

Second Voice – There is an internalized dialog of First Voice and an internalized Other, at least empathetically and mostly stereotypically. Second Voice leadership is when one’s whole family, community, nation are invisible members of the inner dialogue. The problem here is that leader chooses which Others, their age, gender, education, etc. to invite into inner dialog. Much of what passes for stakeholder theory, is the manager as agent, imagining a dialog in their head, in which the manager tries to think and feel as all the relevant stakeholders might express themselves. Second Voice is a projection of us onto Other stakeholders, who do not speak for themselves. The stereotype inner voice of the Other substitutes for that face-to-face meeting with the flesh-and-blood other. It is an easy step from stakeholder dialogs inside the leader’s head, to the dialog between two human bodies. Dialog does not exist! It’s an illusion of the rhetor! Ask any married couple; dialog is a rhetorical gesture; dialog is two people speaking without listening; tuning in and out, mostly out of it. There is rarely reciprocity, symmetry, no equal voices in dialog; instead there is only closed sessions, closed door meetings, more clandestine agreements, more hidden agendas. A better dialogic unit for leader-follower is friendship (friends are engaged in symmetric dialog; not always, but sometimes).

Third Voice – What happens when we add a third sort of voice to dialog? Adam Smith (1723-1791), the father of capitalism, posited a Third, an ‘internal spectator,’ the voice that speaks to us while observing the First and Second (Other) rehearse their dialog, on the stage in our mind's eye. Smith believed it possible to combine the impossible: ethics with profits. Smith (1759) called the voice of the internalized “impartial spectator”; some call it conscious or ethical voice. This impartial spectator would not only look at the dialog between leader and follower, but buyer and seller.

Smith (1759, Part I, Chap 4 # 2) “In all such cases, that there may be some correspondence of sentiments between the spectator and the person principally

concerned, the spectator must, first of all, endeavour, as much as he can, to put himself in the situation of the other, and to bring home to himself every little circumstance of distress which can possibly occur to the sufferer.. After all this, however, the emotions of the spectator will still be very apt to fall short of the violence of what is felt by the sufferer.

Adam Smith says we feel the gaze of our internalized spectator, yet this is not an “impartial spectator” there are selfish motives of the leader (1759, Part I, Ch 5, Part II, Ch 2). Immanuel Kant (1785/1993) distinguishes between the ethics of “practical reasoning” and the ethics of “categorical imperative.” Categorical Imperative means to be ethical even if it does not lead to your own happiness; treat humanity as an “end” unto itself, not a means to avoid punishment or as means to attain profit, happiness, etc. Practical reasoning ethics, on the other hand, is about “means” to some end; when a leader treats workers or customers as “means” to gain “profit” “power” “prestige” that is “practical reasoning.” “And one must ask ‘is there any [Ethical] voice at all?’” (Kirkeby, 2000: 153, addition, mine). Dialog is Ethical when it does not manipulate, does not lie, does not make false promises, and does not corral others into the silence of rational consensus. Let’s be honest with one another here! Such dialog does not exist. Corporate advertising, for example, is a strategic dialog between firm and the marketplace; it is asymmetric dialog, a seduction, not a balanced dialog. (Un)Ethical dialog of an executive permeates the dialog of the entire organization; “he or she set the tone, influencing the behavior of the next tier of executives, and down the line to rank-and-file employees, although there may be an occasional exception or whistleblower” (Hartley, 1993: 310). Smith’s answer was that the internalized gaze of impartial spectator, oftentimes, requires the assistance of a flesh and blood impartial spectator to join in the conversation. **Fourth Voice** - This is the voice of the voiceless, of silence, a voice present by its absence. Fourth Voice leader hears the silence, the absence of voice, the pauses, blanks, the between-the-lines; examples: animals, human, or environment that is unable to speak; those humans punished for speaking. Can the leader hear voices that are silent? Fourth Voice is the voice that dare not speak, that is fired for speaking. Finally Fourth Voice denotes the future” (Kirkeby, 2000: 58). The future is the voiceless silence of our children’s children, on to the 7th generation; what will be left by us for these stakeholders? Are we not voiceless, speaking to leaders who never listen, rarely comprehend, and only pretend to listen to our stories? Just keep silent; what good is dialog if it does not exist? Leaders fear the voiceless will come out of the shadows and speak back to power. So how do you as leader hear the voiceless; you would need to co-experience their sense of oppression, understand the kinds of games of power and domination that keep people, for example, silent, afraid to speak.

How does participative style relate to voices of leadership? The four voices tell us about the level of participation and ethics that a given leader or organization enacts. There are so many more consultants running about these days with simplistic workshops on dialog, how to make the bureaucracy into a conversation. Dialog is the illusion foisted by the consultant selling “how to dialog” programs; or how to get your inner dialog (self talk) to match your outer dialog (verbalized talk). Consultants sell dialog therapy, but keep to an asymmetric relationship of managerialist (First Voice) ruling over all other

voices. One must ask if there is much “real” dialog going on at all? Is dialog impossible? Is dialog an illusion, mostly a monologue inside the head pretending to be a dialog? Is dialog two people talking without listening to each other? Is dialog with Other two monologs pretending to be a dialog? The Four Voices of Leadership can extend the managerialist concept of shareholder. In the managerialist model, the manager is to take the 1st voice view, in 2nd voice internalize an Other without actually listening to them; in 3rd voice the ethics can be rhetoric moves; and 4th voice listening to voiceless can degenerate into 1st voice monolog. The Managerialist Stakeholder Dialog Model is hierarchical; other views are silent or marginalized to nothingness. The Managerialist Stakeholder Dialog Model has too much reverence for functionalism (managers function as surrogate owners; managers speak for workers (1st & 2nd Voice). The Managerialist Stakeholder Dialog Model is a “stakeholders of the mind,” a dead-end romantic idealism Leaders are magically divining the experience, preferences, choices, and ideologies of other stakeholders (employees, community, Mother Nature, etc.) without even talking to them. It is the fantasy that participation is taking place. The so-called “learning organization” and the “Knowledge organization” claims it is polyphonic, yet, it is one more managerialist stakeholder model holding out the fantasy of consensus. An alternative is possible.

Polyphonic Stakeholder Dialog Model – Bakhtin’s (1973, 1981) posits polyphonic dialogism as fully embodied voices of what we call stakeholders, each with their own ideology or worldview. Rather, polyphonic stakeholder dialogue is a centrifugal movement of renewal, not a rational ruse to achieve managerialist consensus. Inner dialog and outer dialog are not the same; the inability of the inner self to express what it knows tacitly when speaking in the outer world of dialog is the crisis of contemporary leadership. Dialog worships Polyphony (multi-voiced dialog) but power orchestrates dialog into something between silent reverence for monolog and a cacophony that can not change balances of power; rarely is there a balanced dialog among equals; mostly power insures that dialog is asymmetric.

TWO STAKEHOLDER MODELS: The Four Voices of Leadership extend the primitive concept of shareholder to that of stakeholder. It is time for an even more radical move, to move from “**managerialist**” model of “*dialog of stakeholders*,” to a “**polyphonic**” model of stakeholder dialog.

Managerialist Stakeholder Dialog Model - It is hierarchical, with the managers and executives doing the bidding of the owners (shareholders), while in the middle are the technocrats, and at the bottom are the marginalized stakeholders (customers, public, community, environment, & the other voiceless ones). Three critiques:

1. The Managerialist Stakeholder Dialog Model is hierarchical: the managerialist view of the world of bottom line greed dominates; the other views are silent or marginalized to nothingness. Many 4th Voices (environment, consumers, public, etc.) completely voiceless (& coerced, punished if they speak). The “target of managerial efforts” is to construct an asymmetric relationship between manager’s system of knowledge, and worker’s tacit knowledge of their craft (it is dialog of

- deskilling, subjection & wage enslavement). Hypothesis: the more irreplaceable the worker's knowledge, the more asymmetric the dialog with the leader (Kirkeby, 2000: 148, para).
2. The Managerialist Stakeholder Dialog Model presupposes a universal framework of values and language-concepts. The next model does not posit this naïve assumption of universalism.
 3. The Managerialist Stakeholder Dialog Model has too much reverence for functionalism (managers function as surrogate owners; managers speak for workers (1st & 2nd Voice); system functions to deskill workers tacit knowledge in order to lower wages, etc.) and zero concern for ethics (for Third or Fourth Voice).
 4. The Managerialist Stakeholder Dialog Model is a “stakeholders of the mind” dead-end romantic idealism and delusion. Managers are supposedly capable of divining the experience, preferences, choices, and ideologies of other stakeholders (employees, community, Mother Nature, etc.) without even talking to them. It is pseudo-participation, the fantasy that participation is taking place, when only 1st Voice and some stereotypical 2nd Voice dialog is happening in the mind of the leader.
 5. The Managerialist Stakeholder Dialog Model holds out the rational communication model of consensus dialog. It is a managerialist consensus, a consensus of the powerful over the less powerful; it is asymmetric dialog (the hierarchy rules). Habermas posits a rational-consensus model of communicative competency, a way to fulfill the undelivered promises of Enlightenment.

Polyphonic Stakeholder Dialog Model – Mikhail Bakhtin's (1973, 1981) posits polyphonic dialogism as fully embodied voices of what we call stakeholders, each with their own ideology or worldview. We cannot “co-experience” the oppression or memory of another stakeholder (Bakhtin, 1991); the memories of other stakeholders are inaccessible. Writers such as Dostoevsky were able to enact polyphonic dialog, characters with different ideologies, each voicing their independent world views, resulting in centrifugal (deviation-amplifying) forces of that never moved toward consensus. The so-called “learning organization” and the “Knowledge organization” claims it is polyphonic, yet, it is one more managerialist stakeholder model holding out the fantasy of consensus. Rather, polyphonic stakeholder dialogue is a centrifugal movement of renewal, not a rational ruse to achieve managerialist consensus.

In the 4th Voice, leaders have the most problems, how to hear and tune into the voices of the voiceless.

Main point: all the scripts of dialogue that we enact, to what extent do we put on the dialogic act, and when do we participate in its construction. People, who work in dialogic organizations, participate in decisions, they are not voiceless, their voice is not

imagined in the head of 1st voice autocratic leader. They are not just told to speak their lines and turn their brain off. They bring their ethics (3rd voice) to work. The main point I want to make is about ethical dialog; when does the person act from their ethical voice in the here-an-now in time and place with others. When do they stand up for ethics of the voiceless (4th voice). When is it not dialog (here-and-now face-to-face or phone-to-phone) and is dialogic across times and spaces (such as me and Georgie or Edward's native wife & children, whom I never met, was not allowed to know about, until secrets were unleashed)?

In metatheatre, finding your ethical voice, listening to that third voice (the internalized spectator) can be quite difficult. We will define metatheatre, then look at the Enron case, where the 3rd voice (the ethical voice) was not being heard; and people followed scripted dialogues (were not allowed to speak), scripts made by others without much ethical reflection, or did not care about ethical considerations. Next we look at Enron and our post-Enron world, where every corporation tries to look ethical, to be transparent about its numbers and overseas practices, etc.

George MacGregor Burns (1978) Model of Transactional and Transformational Leaders

Burns bases his theory of transactional and transformational leadership on Kohlberg's stages of moral development and Weber's (1947) theory of leadership and authority.

- For a leadership paper on Nike Corporation applying Kohlberg's moral stages of reasoning, please see [Boje \(2000c\)](#).

Table Two: George MacGregor Burns (1978) Model of Moral, Transaction & Transformational Leaders

MORAL VALUE LEADER - emerges from, and always returns to, the fundamental wants and needs, aspirations, and values of the followers (p. 4). For Burns his project is to "deal with leadership as distinct from mere power-holding and as the opposite of brute power" (p. 4).

1. is lead to have a relationship not only of power but of mutual needs, aspirations, and higher values
2. in responding to leaders, followers have adequate knowledge of alternative leaders and programs and the capacity to choose among those alternatives
3. leaders take responsibility for their commitments - if they promise certain kinds of economic, social, and political change, they assume leadership in the bringing about of that change.

Burns sets up a duality between amoral and moral leaders, and only the moral leaders with higher purpose can be transactional or transformational leader. Thus Burns' theory of morality drives the duality. The hierarchy is as follows: amoral leaders are coercive with a strong will to power, transactional leaders have the moral means to lead, and transformational leaders add to transaction what is lacking, the moral ends of leadership.

THE AMORAL LEADER is for Burns neither transactional or transformational. Amoral leader is for Burns and oxymoron. First, he rejects the "naked power wielding coercive" dictators and fascists are rejected as being "true" leaders (1978: 20). "For Burns (1978: 20, italics mine) *"naked power-wielding can be neither transformational nor transactional; only leadership can be."* Second, to be a moral leader, for Burns is to be sensitive to the needs and motives of potential followers. Third, the "crucial variable" for Burns is the "purpose" (p. 19) of the leader. Fourth, Burns rejects the "gee whiz" personality cult of celebrities as an elitist theory of power (p. 1, 22). Finally, Burns rejects the kinds of Traditional Legitimizing rulers (or Sultans) that Weber (1947) writes about. This serves to appropriate Weber's charisma as transformational, bureaucratic as transactional, but exorcises traditional (feudal) authority and leadership as being outside the duality of amoral, moral-transactional (means), and moral-transformational (ends) leadership. Burns, therefore uses us moral/amoral theory of leadership and power to reject the following persons as non-leaders:

- Mussolini
- Hitler
- Stalin
- Nehru

- Also rejected is Gandhi (the question is why?).

THE MORAL VALUE LEADER is both transactional and transformational but in different ways (but never amoral).

Transactional Moral Value Leaders - lead with modal values (the means over ends). Modal values include:

- Honesty
- Responsibility
- Fairness
- Honoring one's commitments

Princes are less honest, responsible, fair or willing to honor a commitment that gets in the way of their power. Bureaucrat leaders define themselves by the modal values, unless they become Princes.

Transformational Moral Value Leaders - lead with transcendent values (the ends over means). Transcendent values include:

- Liberty
- Justice
- Equality
- Collective Well Being

Heroic charismatic leaders

THE TWO MORAL LEADER SUB-TYPES

Transactional Leader

approaches followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another: jobs for votes, or subsidies for campaign contributions.

1. Opinion
 - McCarthy
 - Roosevelt
2. Group
 - Whyte's Street Corner Society

Transformational Leader

"recognizes and exploits an existing need or demand of a potential follower... (and) looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower" (p. 4).

1. Intellectuals
 - Rousseau
 - Locke
 - Madison
 - Bentham

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Party <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jefferson ○ Lenin 4. Legislative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Johnson 5. Executive <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ de Gaulle ○ Roosevelt 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mill 2. Reformers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Grey ○ Alexander 3. Revolutionaries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Luther ○ Mao ○ Castro ○ Lenin ○ Louis XVI 4. Heroes (Charismatic) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Moses ○ Joan of Arc ○ Muhammad ○ Kennedy
---	---

In Table Two (above), Burns' (1978) theory is summarized. Amoral values drive people who can wield power but are not by Burns' definition, leaders. Moral values (means versus ends) drive the transactional and transformational leadership differently than the "evil: and brut power" of the amoral ones (p. 10). In short, Burns sets up a duality, a dichotomy between "saints" and "sinners" (p. 10).

Table Two includes lists of leaders mentioned by Burns to exemplify his typologies of subsets of transactional and transformational leaders, as well as the excluded amoral "evil" sinners. It is important, however, to note, that the leader can embrace different kinds of leadership (subsets of either transactional transformational categories, such as Lenin) as the situations, times, and conditions merit (such as Roosevelt's treatment of the senior Kennedy). Hitler, Gandhi, and Roosevelt seem to fit all the categories in different situations, each able to be transactional, appealing to the varied interests and norms of groups, or transformational, staging spectacles of heroism with charismatic speeches. In short the leader wears many masks. Yet Roosevelt, but not Hitler and Gandhi actually get written into the transformational and transactional theory of leadership. For Burns Hitler is easy to reject as a simple despot, "Hitler... was no leader, he was a tyrant" (p. 2-3). To me, this sets up an incredible mystery: why is Gandhi marginalized by Burns, and left out of his recitation of transformation and transaction leadership?

The Forgotten Moral Dimension of Burn's Model - Burns (1978) studied the stories of great and lesser leaders to develop a taxonomy of amoral (power wilders) and moral (transactional and transformational leadership), and only moral leaders are admitted to his typology. The typology is a duality in that amoral leaders are not admitted to be "real leaders," and the real leaders are either transactional or transformational. Further transformational has hierarchical position over transactional, transformational being defined as being "more potent," "more complex" and of "higher moral" agency than transitional (p. 4). The hierarchy is Transformational is more than transactional, and these

more than amoral uses of power. For example, Hitler's death camps and "holocaust of terror" disqualify him as leader, as does the gulag of Stalin's prisons, an "apparatus of power" (p. 9). Nehru is also rejected, since she "jails her political adversaries" (p. 9). Burns rejects their naked power as the will to power of the dictator.

The transactional and transformational choices of leaders in Burns' typology do not include naked power wielders. And the transformational ones have modal (means over ends) motives, while the transformational leaders make means consistent with attaining higher ends. The amoral leaders also lack the intent to bring followers to a higher level of moral reasoning (as in Kohlberg's or Maslow's hierarchies). Many readers miss the fact that for Burns, leadership, be it transactional or transformational was about moral values, and amoral power-wielders did not qualify as leaders (p. 20). In this sense, the duality and hierarchy of amoral, transactional-means, and transformational-ends is based on Burns' theory of power and psychological motives. "All leaders are actual or potential power holders, but not all power holders are leaders" (p. 18). And psychological the power wielders are distinguished from leaders, because the former "treat people as things" and real "leaders do not obliterate followers' motives" (p. 18). At the top of the leadership pyramid is the transformational leader who "converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents" (P. 4).

For transactional leaders, the negotiation of resources and transactions was monitored by *modal values*, "that is values of means - honesty, responsibility, fairness, the honoring of commitments - without which transactional leadership could not work" (Burns, 1978: 426). Transformational leadership was more about *end-values*, such as "liberty, justice, equality" and collective well being (p. 426). For Burns both transactional and transformational leadership have moral implications. Burns sought a moral use of power, and looked at the transactional and transformational resources of power holders responding in power relationships within some collective. Leaders and followers were in exchange relationships, based in power and moral values.