4

ENGAGEMENT AND LEADER LOGICS

> Freethinkers are those who are willing to use their
> minds without prejudice and without fearing
> to understand things that clash with their own
> customs, privileges, or beliefs. This state of mind is
> not common, but it is essential for right thinking.
>
> —*Leo Tolstoy*

Too many change plans are downright harebrained and silly. How do they get so offtrack? It often comes down to leaders' not understanding the importance of readiness in planning and implementing change. We once worked with an organization whose future-state picture of itself was so dramatically different from its current reality that we asked its leaders how they planned to develop such new capability. In response, they showed us a spreadsheet that proved they had enough head count. Sorry. Head count does not equal talent. Availability is not a skill. Amid excitement about big stretch goals, leaders sometimes confuse aspiration and capability.

But what exactly does transformation require from you and other senior leaders?

First, as this chapter explains, it requires *you*. No change effort gets off the ground without leader engagement. By *engagement* we mean a deep Inside-Out process. Engagement is not telling; it is asking. It is including others as equal, collaborative inquirers mutually engaged in the process of figuring out how to address complex challenges. As we illustrated in Chapter Three, Inside-Out is a

human experience of interpreting vagueness and ambiguities for oneself through the process of dialogue. Engagement is rarely happening when one person is talking to or at another through scripted speeches, e-mails, or training programs that merely convey information for assimilation. That's Outside-In. Although engagement can and should include Outside-In activities, those alone do not constitute it.

Second, we will explore where you are on the staircase of leadership logics that we discussed in Chapter Three relative to the level you intend to reach. If you're now at level one (Dependent-Conformer leadership logics), you are not ready to jump to level three. And if you and other leaders are still personally using individual leader logics of level one, you can't expect your next change effort to whisk you up to be a level three Transformer.

In Chapter Three, we introduced the cases of Technology Inc. and Memorial Hospital. In this chapter, we revisit those businesses and introduce several more.

Engagement

Consultants often propose a simple, step-by-step program for transformation—the recipe for the perfect cake—that any disciplined organization is supposed to be able to follow.

Cookbook approaches assume that your organization is a predictable environment. Don't believe it. Organizations are composed of people, and people are complex. The world surrounding your organization is also complex. Transformation is therefore also complex. Formulas sell books and fuel uncounted seminars, but they never provide reliable pathways of organizational transformation.

Don't get us wrong: some research-based, step-by-step process advice draws attention to things that need to be done. Paying attention to those is necessary, but it is not sufficient to bring about change. For that, you need to be engaged and truly ready

to change. No matter how appealing in simplicity and design, a step-by-step process doesn't give you the multidimensional engagement and discovery-based learning you'll need to leverage in transforming your organization.

Nor can step-by-step processes anticipate the kind or level of engagement you need. By *engagement,* we mean the connectedness that determines how people interact with each other, how people learn or don't learn together, and whether there is mutuality in defining and solving problems that are both ambiguous and uncertain. Using both Inside-Out and Outside-In perspectives is required, but the Inside-Out perspective is the essence of engagement. Engagement is genuine, creative, authentic, multilateral, and multilevel. When the whole group is engaged, interactions are both personal and public. They support speaking from one's inner core, and they welcome sharing from the wellspring of the spirit—the group's hopes, aspirations, fears, values, and beliefs. Engagement is the process by which leaders work with leaders, leadership teams work as teams, and the leadership community connects to advance mutual learning as a central dimension of the change process. At the core, engagement is how direction gets set, alignment occurs, and organizational commitment is achieved.

Levels of engagement tend to vary with levels of leader logics. The earlier the stage of logic, the less engagement is likely to occur, and the later the stage of leader logic, the more engagement is likely to occur. Dominators and Moderators are

Voice of Change

Engagement matters. People do not like being manipulated by sheer force. They prefer to be engaged. Would you rather be engaged in a participative human process or manipulated like a cog in the wheel? As a learner, do you prefer to participate in the process or have it dictated to you? Do you value learning in a mutually supportive environment or being told what to get done? There is power in engagement. It invites curiosity, imagination, possibility, and the potential for new belief.

mainly concerned with control over others and self and therefore less likely to share deeper Inside-Out thoughts and feelings, doubts and concerns, especially multilaterally. Collaborators and Transformers are concerned with the advancement and good of the human system and operational systems overall. And since they also possess high levels of self-awareness and tolerance for ambiguity, they are much more likely to engage multilaterally with others in Inside-Out work.

Your challenge is unique to your organization. You're going to have to learn and discover your own way to lead change. Unpredictability means that your and your other leaders' engagement is key. But ultimately what is essential is the engagement of folks who carry no management title but are nevertheless much involved in creating the outcomes of direction, alignment, and commitment.

Consider the following two moments from the case of Technology Inc. Technology's general challenge was to change from a traditional hierarchical manufacturing environment to a flat, process-centered organization (PCO). Its long-term goal was to develop a leadership culture to support transformation from a primarily Dependent-Conformer leadership culture to one that was more Independent-Achiever, with pockets of Interdependent-Collaborator. Technology's leaders anticipated that ultimately the pockets of Interdependent-Collaborator culture could be leveraged to move the whole PCO into a mostly Interdependent-Collaborator leadership logic.

"I Do My Eight"

It is now the third day of a Technology Inc. retreat, and twenty people sit in a circle in the anteroom of a golf club. Collectively, we and they have already talked about the difference between leading and managing and have spent a lot of time defining the new roles that would be required to transform the company into a PCO. The conversation has been difficult, but everyone has gotten through it so far with a lot of urging, coaching, coddling,

Photo 4.1 How a Group at Technology Inc. Defined Differences Between "Lead" and "Manage"

LEAD	MANAGE
ENGAGE	Direct
INFLUENCE	Control
Question	LISTEN
LEARN	INSTRUCT
MOTIVATE	Dominate
Integrate	SEPARATE
	~~Dependent~~
MULTIPLE RIGHTS	I'm Right
DIALOGUE	ARGUE
INVITE	COMMAND

persuading, inviting, and a little pushing. Photo 4.1 captures the group's many hours of figuring out new roles and working hard to understand how much would be required of people to shift those roles from less managing to more leading.

Everyone in the organization who had gathered in this circle had been steeped for years in a traditional manufacturing shop floor role. One machinist, whom we affectionately dubbed Joe Sixpack, summed up the culture: "I do my eight, and I hit the gate." Joe said he did what he was told to do. He was a fine machinist, but he had no interest in participating in a customer-centered process that required his active engagement with others.

Like Joe, every other company person in the room worked in a hierarchical organization in which the senior team set direction and supervisors told shop floor employees what to do. To them, we looked like supervisors too, even though we were there to facilitate conversation. True to form, they all waited anxiously for us to tell them what to do. But we weren't telling; we were asking. We wanted them to talk to each other.

To get everyone involved and thinking about the organization's change initiative, we introduced the idea of role play. We planned to play one part and asked for volunteers to play another. We expected some reluctance, but we didn't expect an excruciating delay while people "tied their shoes with their eyes." No one said a word for a full five minutes! No one wanted to connect with us and engage.

Connectedness

Fast-forward several quarters to a later Technology Inc. retreat. Most of the same people are in the room, and there are a few new faces. On everyone's mind is the absence of a former key player, Jim. Everyone knows Jim is gone, but no one is saying what happened to him.

Finally, Kim asks. At first, the group turns its back on her, a common group tactic. It wants to avoid an uncomfortable topic. But Kim is having none of that: "I want to know what happened to Jim, why he's not here, if he's been fired or if he quit, and I want to know why."

Bart, the company owner, slides off his chair and sits on the floor in the middle of the circle. "Kim," he says, "I'll tell you what you can know and what you cannot know about Jim. Jim left the company in a way that binds us by law to keep confidential. Exactly why and how he left, we do not have a legal right to discuss. Period."

"But," Bart continues, "we can talk about anything else you want to discuss about Jim. We can talk about why you think he's

gone, what you and we observed about his work performance while he was here, and what you think and feel about him not being here. So we can talk about anything that has to do with Jim leaving except for that which is restricted by law—the purpose of which is to protect Jim and the company."

Kim then spoke about how Jim had seemed unplugged, not really showing up fully at work. At that point, Frank and Susan entered the conversation, saying how Jim's disengagement affected them. Soon the door opened on a lively group dialogue about learning—how one person can disrupt the flow of learning and how important it is for everyone to be as connected to the learning process because it has become core to the company's manufacturing process. Almost everyone was in on the dialogue, heads were nodding when others were talking, and body language conveyed openness and a feeling of shared understanding.

As the talk died down, a new group member who hadn't attended the first retreat said, "Kim, when you first brought that up—that Jim had left and no one was talking about it—that really scared me. I don't know why, but it did. Then, when we all started to make it okay to talk about, I was really relieved that we could discuss tough things without freaking out. It may still be a tough issue, but that it's okay to inquire almost about anything—that's pretty amazing."

As we defined it earlier, in a leadership culture, engagement is the connectedness that determines whether and how people learn or don't learn together. The kinds of connections leaders make as they lead groups shape the kinds of leadership practices that others in the organization will value and engage in too. How that engagement or connection between individual leaders works in the leadership collective is the function of a leadership culture.

Engagement and Leadership Logic

Take a moment to think about the degree of engagement you are most comfortable with at work.

Do you seek a formal, professional environment with strict protocols?

Or do you prefer a more open environment where people let their guard down and go into depth about issues?

These differences correspond to different styles of engagement. Each of the three leadership logics or cultures we have introduced also implies its own kind of engagement and its own kind of distribution of power. Table 4.1 (which builds on Table 3.1) should be a useful reference for you as we discuss the engagement style of each.

Dependent-Conformer Engagement

In the first Technology Inc. retreat we described, the individuals were following Conformer norms. They were embedded in honoring a code of dependent and predictable conduct. Members of a union shop or military or law enforcement personnel generally engage in this way. Belonging, maintaining order, and respecting the command-and-control hierarchy are earmarks of such leadership cultures, and this kind of engagement can create close cohesion (giving you protection in a firefight, for example).

Table 4.1 Leadership Logics (Cultures), Leader Logics, and Organization Roles

Leadership Logics	Leader Logics	Organization Roles
Interdependent- Collaborator	Transformer Collaborator	Future Generator Big-Medium
Transitional	*Freethinker Rising*	
Independent- Achiever	Freethinker Performer	Innovative Facilitator Practical Adapter
Transitional	*Specialist Rising*	
Dependent- Conformer	Specialist Moderator Dominator	Supervisor Paternalist Authoritarian

On the negative side, it can also raise fears of being excluded from the pack when you do not conform. In Conformer organizations, mistakes can get you punished or excluded, and so covering them up becomes important. People in these cultures avoid risk. Knowledge is held by those at the top, who can be secretive about what they know and closed to sharing it with others.

When boundaries are strictly drawn between what is okay to do and what is not, then mutual, balanced engagement isn't possible. People may appear to be engaged in a flurry of activity like constant reactive fire drills or reorganizing business functions, for example. But do not confuse lively activity with significant engagement. Engagement leads to change, but mere continued amplification of activity usually does not produce much real change in ideas or outcomes. Open arguments and expressions of conflict can also look like engagement, but that's not what they really reflect unless there is the actual possibility of dissent that leads to some mutual learning and new outcome. The use of force is not engagement either. In a Conformer leadership culture, engagement is mostly restricted to the avoidance of deeper contact and fosters the appearance of engagement. The top leadership structures engagement to control it and focus on predictability of behavior in the rank and file and the maintenance of power in the hands of the few. Expectations for secrecy, loyalty, and obedience shape engagement in a Conformer culture.

Independent-Achiever Engagement

In a leadership culture of Independent-Achievement, engagement looks like success on steroids. Leaders can be obsessed with execution; every action is honed to a competitive edge. Winning doesn't just matter; winning is all there is. In an Achiever culture, in order for the team to win, there is mutual engagement, and Inside-Out learning can occur because it is good for me and the team. Engagement focuses on performance. When legendary football coach Vince Lombardi famously said, "Winning

isn't everything, it's the only thing," he exemplified engagement in an Achiever culture. Risks are commensurate with rewards, and knowledge is power. There can be a lot of internal competition, but there can also be a fair amount of cooperation when it is mutually beneficial. The atmosphere is entrepreneurial. Jack Welch's GE had a look and feel of an extreme form of this kind of engagement. Execute, win, share learning, cut the deadwood, expand the opportunities, and succeed. Period.

Achiever engagement centers on individuals. Unlike the Conformer who is embedded in the code of the group, Achiever culture individuals push deeply into themselves. They explore and expand their own space and time to prove themselves and succeed personally. Their Inside-Out leadership logics are about competing and winning, while their Outside-In interpretation is about execution and calculated risks. Engagement between such individuals yields a range of behaviors and outcomes. On one end of this range, goals may be limited to individual success, and friendly foes may abound. Closer to the middle of the range, cross-functional teams often find it hard to make progress because members carry the independent agendas of their primary group. At the other end of the range, successful teams form and begin to cooperate with other teams for their mutual benefit. Engagement in this culture is largely motivated by self-interest of self and a primary group.

Interdependent-Collaborator Engagement

Interdependent-Collaborative engagement gets beyond individual achievement to a point where both successes and failures are shared because both are equally regarded as knowledge. Collective learning is highly valued, and mistakes are regarded as opportunities from which to learn. An individual's competency is viewed as talent, skills, knowledge, and behaviors that make the individual and the organization successful simultaneously. Win-win is the mind-set. Mutual assistance is valued. Collaborative engagement means exploring how you, I, and the whole organization and its partners can win.

Collaborative engagement is complex. Many agendas are operating simultaneously, yet they are seeking mutual integration. Individuals are engaged in their own deeper cycles of learning. And at the same time, group interaction centers on opening up the subject at hand and reaching multiple right answers that can be advocated, integrated, and prioritized.

Our CCL colleagues speak of "putting something in the middle" as part of collaborative process. This is a method of turning a problem into an opportunity by placing the subject of discord or confusion in the middle of a dialogue and therefore objectifying the inquiry for a more conscious, reflective result. Signaling that the subject is being put in the middle indicates that the interchange will be one of sharing and inquiry rather than debate and advocacy. Our colleagues also see the value of striving for an emergent, interdependent leadership logic even while the overall organizational culture is in a Conformer-to-Achiever transformation (Palus and Drath, 2001).

As we said earlier, you don't necessarily need to be at the top Interdependent-Collaborator level of leadership logics. But your leadership culture and logic does need to be at whatever level is right for implementing your new business strategy. A leadership culture can't pull off a strategy that is beyond its level of ability to engage and learn.

Engagement and a Leader's Logic

The second column in Table 4.1 lists the logics that individual leaders can adopt and groups them in the three broad cultures and the transitional stages between them. The seven leader logics are Dominator, Moderator, Specialist, Performer, Freethinker, Collaborator, and Transformer. A good way to see how these leader logics connect to engagement is by considering a few examples, mainly drawn from other cases we have studied and will be introducing here. We gratefully acknowledge the work of Rooke and Torbert (2005), reflected throughout this section on the seven leader logics.

The Dominator

Although Dominators are a small percentage of all leaders, they are common in many organizations. Think about the "kiss up and kick down" leader, or the one whose only style is command and control. These leaders are opportunists; their primary motivation is their own advancement and retention of power. They often espouse ideology and usually demand strict secrecy, loyalty, and obedience from others. At the core, they are authoritarian. There are many such leaders in governments today from which you can choose your own example. One will also show up below as a problematic character in our discussion of the Freethinker.

Dominators engage from a perspective of demonstrating and protecting their position to get others to perform in a predictable, determinate way. Engagement is very rare, always in private, and shared with only a select few with whom they share power or with those few who are doing their bidding.

The Moderator

Global Electronics is a worldwide electronics design, development, manufacturing, sales, and service company with billions of dollars in revenues. For six years, the business strategy called for the double-double (a doubling of revenues every two years)—and for six straight years, revenue had stayed flat as a pancake. Although the business gave an appearance of powerful activity, with boundless hustle and bustle and responses to one serial crisis after another, in fact it was lifeless.

The CEO of Global Electronics, Dawson, is a prototypical Moderator. Dawson was extremely animated and interested in meeting and solving the challenges facing Global Electronics. He said that he really wanted to launch an effective change initiative and was going to lead a transformation. For Dawson, engagement was all about appearances and pleasing others as a technique to legitimate his power and influence. He assured us he wanted

to engage with us and with his team and the larger community of workers to make a difference. His modus operandi, however, was all about maintaining his position through the approval of others.

In getting to know members of the senior team, we found several disturbing signs. There was a vice president of strategy on the senior team, but by all accounts, there was no coherent business or organization strategy. A new corporate university was being designed and launched, but we saw no evidence of any commitment to organizational learning. There was no organizational vision. Fear in the rank and file was high, trust and morale low. According to Dawson, although the annual layoffs were cranking up again and there was rampant dissatisfaction among the senior team with the results of multiple interventions with Dawson and the team by some well-known consulting firms, this change effort was going to be different.

The day after Dawson agreed with us on a planned pathway for transformation, we received word (from someone two layers beneath him) that he was no longer interested. Apparently one or two members of the senior leadership team had approached Dawson with misgivings about the arrangement, and he had cancelled the plan on the spot. He had waffled under the influence of the last person to see him. His internal motivation to appear a good listener, a good leader, and a team player had led to yet another false agreement to engage.

As a Moderator, Dawson had no strong commitments to real engagement within the organization beyond his own diplomacy to maintain his position. The logic driving his actions was to please others in the moment, for which he needed only the appearance of engagement and activity. Our brief experience with Dawson and Global Electronics only hinted at what it must be like to work where constant crisis management replaces strategy and credibility is often absent. From an engagement perspective, members of this leadership culture were constantly wondering which was the real Dawson. Others expressed concern about leadership that put pleasing colleagues ahead of

achieving business goals. The importance of being just one of the gang was seen as disingenuous by others who shared their experience of this culture as being one of continually asking, "What is real?" "What is my role?" and "What are the real values, beliefs, and assumptions held by leadership?"

The Specialist

Liam was the senior leader of NuSystems, a public service institution. Telephone inquiries revealed that Liam and the NuSystems leadership culture epitomized Specialist logic. Over the years, their pattern had been to approach the subject of organizational leadership development and then inevitably avoid deeper engagement. But according to Liam, this time seemed different. In the midst of a changing industry, succession management at NuSystems had become a big problem—because it had none. Years of insular freedom from significant external competition had left the company without development systems. Now competition was pressing in, NuSystems' leaders felt confused, and the organization's influence seemed to be waning.

In conversations, Liam freely confessed needing help because talent systems and culture were not in the organization's expertise. He said that its leaders were very hard working and extraordinarily dedicated, but he acknowledged that was not enough. His board of directors agreed with him and shared a sense that a crisis was brewing.

As a generally conservative, bureaucratic research organization, NuSystems was prone to analysis paralysis. Its leaders approached every problem with a study and then championed the findings of the study as though the study itself was an organizational outcome. Consequently, the company's leaders rarely made any decisions of any import other than to delay serious action for seriously mounting problems.

In NuSystems' Specialist culture, experts were lauded. Being right was often more important than being successful. Conflict

was avoided, and both disagreements and genuine dialogue were forced underground. A large and disgruntled underground of employees said that appearance was deemed more important than results and that a corporate trust had been broken. In general, employees had diminishing confidence that their leaders could meet emerging challenges.

When Liam brought us in, he pledged that he and his team would support the culture work. As the process unfolded, however, there were warning signs that Liam was not entirely ready to be the instrument of change. For example, he insisted that all ideas pass through him before they were explored with others. The effect was to narrow the issues that could be explored within the executive team and beyond with the leadership culture in general. Moreover, the executive team frequently took significant issues and their pursuant questions off the table as undiscussable. There were few indications that Liam and his team were open to developing bigger minds and advancing beyond the Specialist logic dominating the leadership culture.

As we continued to use discovery information from internal sources, Liam increased his concern that messages be nonthreatening and noncontroversial. Liam needed to be assured that he was in control of the organizational messages. When we indicated that leadership culture change work was not amenable to risk-free guarantees, he asked for "no surprises." Liam's Specialist leader logic, which often displayed Moderator elements, drove his actions related to engagement, even though he frequently cloaked his aspirations for engagement in the language of a Performer and Freethinker.

NuSystems formed a change leadership team from across its operations. The team convened a series of meetings to cultivate exploration, and it identified several sources of the organization's difficulties. A series of action development teams formed, and the change work proceeded.

We noticed a great deal of interpersonal contact and willingness for interaction, so we thought NuSystems was advancing

toward significant progress. We were wrong. Following the deep analysis and discovery work, the team abandoned the powerful groundwork it had completed, and the change platform it had assembled evaporated. The team's analysis of the issues met the focus of this particular Specialist logic, but advancing into the actual work of change did not inspire the same collective interest.

Eventually we disengaged, since it was clear that there was no commitment to real engagement on the part of Liam and several of his key supporters. Rather, they would encourage vigorous exchanges among experts with competing points of view without demanding authentic mutuality in goals, Inside-Out disclosure, or public learning. The team was active, creating the appearance of progress, but it hardly engaged around outcomes of substantial change and development. Such as it was, the engagement showcased only actions that would mollify the various constituencies through an appearance that good-faith efforts were being made.

Our brief experience with the organization only hinted at what it must be like to be an employee where appearance trumps substance and activity replaces strategic priority. The Specialist logic limits the degree of engagement to the nature of its specialty. In this example, the specialization of analysis limited advancement to surface expressions of commitment where appearance triumphs over in-depth, Inside-Out exploration. Any hints of deeper questions raised of the Specialist's direction, alignment, and commitment are either suppressed or dismissed as the mutterings of a few unhappy, untrustworthy outliers.

The Performer

Recall from Chapter Three that Performer logic is that of independent, self-possessed leaders who have generated their own values and standards. A Performer likely has mastered technical skills and can make what appear to be rational, independent

judgments. His or her drivers are success, achievement, and individual competence. Thus, the Performer's mode of engagement is to connect around issues of execution and outcomes driven by the application of expert knowledge. Performers emphasize a technical Outside-In approach—a powerful, necessary, compelling, data-driven method.

As an example, consider Adam, the CEO of Professional Services Inc. (PSI), a company with roots in media management. When Adam came to us, he had been at PSI about a year. PSI was a century-old company with a strong culture of entitlement. Its market approach was, "If we build it, they will come." It emphasized internal harmony in relationships and relied on control systems to drive the business. But with Adam, all that was going to change, as "execution" became the focus and the word. With Adam at the helm, one might even say PSI was now obsessed with operational execution: it ate accomplishment for breakfast, thought accomplishment all morning, breathed it all afternoon, and slept with it all night.

PSI certainly faced a challenge. Through mergers and acquisitions, it had expanded into multiple product lines, but in a dynamic industry environment, its own results had been stagnant for a number of years. Changes at the board level had led to Adam's hiring, and the new board had empowered him to lead the company in a new direction, competing more aggressively. The business strategy was to integrate divisions, create efficiencies through shared systems, and differentiate in each of PSI's markets. The leaders would execute this strategy flawlessly even if success in one segment undercut success in another.

PSI executives had gone through a senior leader development program. We were called in to help them discuss and focus on the collective leadership culture, but whenever we introduced the subject, executives immediately refocused on operational execution within each division. Every instinct was to "make it happen" in their own divisions, whatever the costs. The leaders were absolutely engaged, but only to drive the success of their

own divisions. And learning to increase their leadership logics together was not on their agenda; nor was there any sustainable sense of collective will to advance in such a way. Expertise ruled over innovation in their interactions, and independence over-ruled all. Each division leader was expected to use that expertise to pull off victory for that division. There were exceptions—a few Freethinker team members who tried to influence the group toward a healthy, cohesive company.

In the end, the Freethinker voices were drowned out, suc-cumbing to the driving Outside-In perspective on execution, market pressures, and financial performance. The goals expressed were very effective in PSI's near-term operations. But ultimately these performer orientations resulted in selling off business units in order to sustain the one unit in which Adam had the greatest personal investment.

As we suggested, Adam was a Performer; for him, it was all about achievement and financial success. He knew what he wanted to be (the CEO), but he wasn't sure what he wanted to do beyond make each division's numbers and return shareholder value—an important part of the game, but not the whole game. The logic behind his actions was to please Wall Street, but he was not strategic in his long-term plans. He looked little beyond quarterly results. In other words, like many other performers, Adam's engagement was limited to success in the short term.

The Freethinker

A Freethinker knows that reality can be constructed from one's own perspective. He or she understands the logics of others and knows how to facilitate groups, but can also make up new rules and organizational orders.

As an example, recall Glen, the CEO of Memorial Hospital. Glen knew his leadership needed deep change and to become more customer friendly if it had any hope of making and keep-ing the hospital's services competitive.

He was unsure exactly how to proceed, but he was certain the solution was going to be in organizational leadership, and he was committed to following through. More than anyone else at Memorial, Glen had called for change, had invited it, had pushed for it, and had summoned others to take risks and change their beliefs toward a more customer-focused hospital. But he had a tough call to make. A strong and powerful member of his team was actively undermining the change progress. This vice president was a Dominator who intimidated the people below him, knowing that others would not follow if he did not change as well. As a result they were reluctant to participate in the transformation efforts. Clearly Glen had to step up and do something about this vice president.

Glen was steadfast in a way that wasn't always obvious to others, some of whom thought he was dragging his feet regarding the disrupter. He remained stalwart in his support of Memorial's change leadership team. He remained devoted to the work with us and said so repeatedly in public. And when it came time for him finally to deal with the problem on his team, he was firm and swift. As a Freethinker, Glen was well aware of the problem vice president's leader logic; still it was a tough political problem for him to solve. He needed and took time to disentangle the myriad issues that needed to be addressed in order for his decision to have the impact it needed.

When he did make the decision, Glen engaged the hospital's entire leadership culture, calling it together to make sense of the damage done by this disruptive figure and inviting them to engage fully in the journey going forward. His demonstration of personal vulnerability and public learning was not only courageous but also highly effective for the long run. His engagement with the leadership culture created credibility, collective learning, and an undeniable foundation of trust. Everyone there honored his lead and stood up with him.

The logic behind his actions was to initiate change and construct new orders of health care with benefit to all. He knew

how to communicate that in words that people with other logics would comprehend. He knew that operational achievement was only a step toward the next phase of work and stage of excellence for the organization. His deep and abiding purpose was customer-focused care. As a Freethinker, he assumed that to overcome the arbitrary constraints in an environment with many Specialists and Performers, he needed to fully engage all of these logic holders in an active dialogue and in action development with each other and with him. He knew that achieving DAC was not going to be easy and was going to take time.

The Collaborator

Whereas the Freethinker can master multilateral communications required for engagement, the Collaborator takes engagement to the next level and continuously takes actions and forms agreements that bring about continuous organizational change. Collaborators have their heads in the clouds and their feet on the ground. Both visionary and practical, they see organizational walls as building materials that can be disassembled, discussed, and rebuilt in new forms that serve the organization's future.

We use Bart at Technology Inc. as an example of Collaborator because of his deep intentionality (which we discuss in Chapter Five) to advance the development of his company, his leadership culture, and himself toward that level. The process-centered organization that he envisioned and is still engaged in creating is the ultimate Collaborator environment. Interdependent collaboration initially exceeded his own capability, and so he set about to advance toward it collectively with the leadership culture.

At least as much as any other senior leader we've worked with, Bart is simultaneously visionary and practical, and so he has a range of leader logics to draw on as situations require. (Recall that each stage both includes and transcends previous stages.) Bart can move across Specialist, Performer, and Freethinker logics with ease, and his extraordinary strategic

vision supports his rise up into the Collaborator logic that he practices. Although he would never say this of himself, he creates recurring states in which he expects to rise into advanced stages of fulfillment, which he then translates into new organizational realities. Since we have worked with him, he has taken on increasingly personal Inside-Out risks, and his openly public learning has disassembled barriers and created an environment of experimentation with new human systems and operational practices. Practice makes perfect, and Bart practices with clarity of direction, courage, and commitment to advancing potential through human ingenuity and spirit.

The Transformer

Whereas the Collaborator can generate many possibilities and outcomes as an effective agent of change, Transformers go beyond that with an ability to consistently explore, learn from, and integrate multiple perspectives into ever unfolding and increasingly bold transformations. They have the extraordinary ability to reinvent themselves and their organizations in breakthrough, and sometimes historic, ways. They are, in effect, organizational wizards. We found an example of one in Roger, the CEO of Credlow, who told us he wanted to develop his culture and individual leaders simultaneously.

Credlow finances the purchase of used cars, specializing in doing business with North American car buyers with bad credit. Credlow intentionally broke old stereotypes about used car dealers preying on customers. Selling and financing used cars in an underserved market that was viewed by most as an economic cesspool required both the right business model and the right culture.

The change drivers for Credlow were dissatisfied customers and increased competition for clientele. Roger was committed to leading a transformation. To that end, he and his senior leadership team went through a leadership culture workshop

together. The collective learning from this workshop was that interdependence at Credlow had to build from a foundation of independence (Performer plus Freethinker logic). The senior leaders committed to deliberately pursuing both independence (up from dependence) and interdependence as a way of moving the whole organization and its culture forward.

But Roger himself was a Transformer, dedicated to the idea of Credlow's building a nationwide network of local service agencies. He was constantly switched on. Business meetings seemed chaotic. He would require a profit report from Region A, interrupt the presentation when his cell phone rang, then return his attention to the reporting out. As he did so, he might transform that moment into a learning event, calling his chief information officer willingly front and center for groupwide, Inside-Out learning.

In typical Transformer style, Roger was a ringmaster, orchestrating all three rings of the circus and yet not really in charge of any. He was taking on one hell of a challenge: raising the leadership logic of his leadership collective to his own. A straightforward truth teller, he expected and got the same treatment from his company managers. The engagement of most Transformers is like that of Roger. They are alchemist-like, constantly transforming opportunities, situations, conflicts, and people from one form of system and business and consciousness to another. Their imagination knows few boundaries. Like Roger, they have very big minds. At the same time, they are just as vulnerable to feelings and experiences as anyone else in the organization, and they know that these experiences are the essence of life as they have come to know it. They see everything as development, and they construct new orders of being and doing in constant motion.

Moving Forward

In this chapter, we've fleshed out the meaning of engagement as it applies to leadership logics and the leader logics that tend to

go with them. Engagement is about your willingness to accept your current leader logic and the leader logics of the senior team members and to set course for developing the leader logics appropriate to achieving your business strategy. Now let's connect engagement to overall readiness for cultural change by attending to some critical personal factors in leader readiness to drive change and transformation. This is the focus in Chapter Five.

Exercises

Questions

- What kind of engagement is required for your organization's future?
- What one or two beliefs does your senior leadership team need to hold in order to change?
- As a senior leader, why do you have to stand up first to yourself and then to your team's culture in a change process?
- Review the seven leader logics and supporting case materials. Which seem most like your own?
- Using this same reflection, what leader logics are present in your senior team?
- What are the implications for engagement within the team and between the team and the larger community of workers in your organization?
- What ideas do you have on where you need to develop?