ON INTEGRATION: THE RESURGENCE OF MARY P. FOLLETT AND THE UNCELEBRATED CONTRIBUTION OF JOSEPH SMITH

MARK E. MENDENHALL
J. Burton Frierson Chair of Excellence in Business Leadership
College of Business Administration
University of Tennessee, Chattanooga
615 McCallie Avenue
Chattanooga, TN 37403

W. JEFFREY MARSH
Associate Professor of Ancient Scripture
College of Religious Education
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah 84602

Abstract

ON INTEGRATION: THE RESURGENCE OF MARY P. FOLLETT AND THE UNCELEBRATED CONTRIBUTION OF JOSEPH SMITH

The post-war literature has yielded important insights regarding developing collaborative leadership competencies in managers and collaborative leadership systems within organizations. However, the work of pre-World War II scholars and practitioners in this area has largely been overlooked. Based on our review of their work, we propose an extension of Raelin's 2006 framework of collaborative leadership and discuss implications of their work for current management development efforts associated with developing collaborative leadership in organizations.

Keywords: Collaborative Leadership, Management Education, Leadership Development, Mary Parker Follett, Joseph Smith

Toward a Model of Collaborative Leadership Learning:
Mary P. Follett and Joseph Smith Revisited

Raelin (2006) has observed that in the past decade there has been an increase in interest on the part of both scholars and practitioners in better understanding both the dynamics of collaborative leadership and how to assist organizations to develop and institutionalize collaborative leadership competencies and processes. Post-war scholars and practitioners have defined and described the concept of collaborative leadership in many ways: participative leadership, democratic management, power sharing, joint decision-making, empowerment, and consultation (Drath & Palus, 1994; Raelin, 2003, 2006; Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958; Vroom & Yetton, 1973; Yukl, 2006), yet according to Raelin, all of the manifestations of the phenomenon in the literature share a common, under girding axiom:

> When people who have a stake in a venture are given every chance to participate in the venture, including its implementation, their commitment to the venture will be assured…collaborative leadership requires true participation in leadership and decision-making at all levels and in multiple decision processes (p.155)

Raelin (2006) also notes that attendant principles to the above axiom include: 1) the condition that all discussion in a group is based on a collective position or stance of "nonjudgmental inquiry;" 2) that input from group members is freely offered to the group for critical evaluation, discussion, and analysis; and 3) that group members enter collaborative discussion with the express view of creating something new or unique from their interaction that "could reconstruct the participants' view of reality." (Raelin, 2006: 155)

While the above principles offer useful directionality of focus for scholars and practitioners, they do not illuminate the philosophical constructs upon which collaborative leadership is based nor the experiential reality of the phenomenon; in short, they approach, but do not fully delineate a full understanding of collaborative leadership—what it *is*. In an attempt to more fully delineate the dimensions of collaborative leadership, Raelin (2006) proposed four "operating perspectives" or conditions that must occur for the establishment of collaborative leadership in a group or throughout an organization.

The first dimension Raelin terms, *Being Concurrent*, which involves tolerance of more than one leader operating simultaneously at any given moment in a group. While position leaders exist in a collaborative leadership context, they share leadership by allowing others in the group to offer leadership through a wide variety of behaviors, sharing power and influence in the ongoing process of the group.

The *Being Collective* dimension reflects group behavior where individual group members operate *in tandem* as leaders. In other words, leadership radiates out of the dynamics of group sub-systems and not necessarily from a single individual or a few individuals engaging in solitary influence attempts on the group as a whole. The third condition or dimension of Raelin's framework is that of *Being Mutual*. This reflects the right and the tendency for all group members to have the autonomy to

> … advocate a point of view that they believe can contribute to the common good of the organization. Although they might be assertive at times, they are equally sensitive to the views and feelings of others and consider their viewpoints to be equally valid. They thus seek to engage in a public dialogue in which they willing open their beliefs and values to the scrutiny of others. They also understand the

difference between collaborating as a pretense versus becoming fully involved. (Raelin, 2006: 156).

Raelin's final dimension or condition for collaborative leadership is that of *Being Compassionate* wherein: 1) there is a commitment to all stakeholders of the group, 2) all views are considered before a decision is made, 3) each member of the group is granted dignity, and 4) "all viewpoints are considered regardless whether they conform to current thought processes." (Raelin, 2006; 156). Additionally, within this dimension is the shared understanding of group members that collaborative leadership is worthy of dignity and protection as a value inherent in itself (Raelin, 2006).

Raelin's 2006 framework of collaborative leadership reflects a distillation of the theoretical and empirical findings of post-war scholars and practitioners into a descriptive model of the phenomenon.   However, in addition to post-war scholarship, others have carefully studied collaborative leadership. In the 19th century, and in the first two decades of the twentieth century, Mary P. Follett and Joseph Smith thoughtfully addressed collaborative leadership in their writings and in their work. The implication of their work on the field of management education, and collaborative leadership in particular, has remained unnoticed by post-war scholars.

We will argue that their thought and work usefully inform the current field, especially in terms of explicating the philosophical constructs that underlie collaborative leadership processes, conceptualizing the experiential reality of collaborative leadership in management development training, institutionalizing organizational structures that preserve collaborative leadership systems across time, and designing learning systems that educate managers how to become collaborative leaders. Based on our review of their work, we propose an extension

of Raelin's 2006 framework and discuss implications of their work for current management development efforts associated with developing collaborative leadership in organizations.

LEARNING FROM THE PAST: MARY P. FOLLETT

Follett's work has remained largely unknown by most management and organizational behavior scholars for over seventy-five years despite being highly influential in the first two decades of the 20th century. However, slowly, over the past two decades, an increasing number of scholars and practitioners have discovered—and in some cases rediscovered—her work and have found it compelling and powerful. (Bennis, 1995; Drucker, 1995; Graham, 1995; Kanter, 1995; Lawrence, 1995; Mintzberg, 1995; Tonn, 2003) She has been hailed by no less than Peter Drucker as being "the Prophet of Management" (Drucker, 1995) because her ideas both predated (Kanter, 1995) or directly influenced (Bennis, 1995) the fundamental constructs and processes that have emerged in the field of management over the past six decades (Eylon, 1998; Feldheim, 2004; Graham, 1995; Mendenhall, Macomber, & Cutright, 2000; 1995; Tonn, 2003).

One proposed rationale for the burial of her work was due to the lack of fit of her ideas with the political and academic climate that emerged shortly after her death in 1933 (Drucker, 1995; Feldheim, 2004; Miller & O'Leary, 1989; Waldo, 1984). Tonn (2003) also noted that because of Follett's gender she was not able to obtain a graduate degree, and thus was not able to operate from the secure foundation of a university. This societal bias blocked her from obtaining research grants, drawing upon university resources for research assistance to empirically test her ideas, and developing a coterie of graduate students to disseminate her ideas (Lawrence, 1995; Tonn, 2003). Though her books and writings were often widely-

acclaimed in her day, she was usually viewed as an intellectual outsider, a kind of freak of nature, and when she was gone the attractiveness of her ideas went with her.

Perhaps being on the outside of academe was a blessing in disguise for Follett, as it forced her to apply her innate genius to organizational processes unhindered by the expectation of "paradigm compliance" so ubiquitous in academe. Her ideas were thus developed unfettered by institutional demands, and were honed and refined in her modus operandi of participant-observer—for most of her adult life Follett actively worked in not-for-profit organizations, served on boards, and observed with a keen eye the workings of both business and political organizations. (Tonn, 2003) Her theoretical work ranged across all aspects of social organization, often from a systemic view that embraced mutually causal interrelationships between multiple variables, across differing levels of analysis (Mendenhall, et. al., 2000). Perhaps the aspect of her work that has attracted the most attention by current management scholars and practitioners (Davis, 1991; Drucker, 1995; Feldheim, 2004; Fry & Thomas, 1996; McKersic & Walton, 1992) is that of integration: the collaborative combining of differences among group members to invent new realities, which according to Raelin (2006), is a process that lies at the core of the collaborative leadership.

Mary P. Follett's Framework of Collaboration

To understand Follett's views on collaborative leadership, it is necessary to first comprehend her view of fundamental social behavior. She argued that "subject" and "object" in any social interaction are interdependent, and thus the interaction between both are mutually-causal; that is, both stimulate and respond to each other, and influence each other to produce behavioral outcomes. Follett's basic assumption was that "in the behavior-

process, subject and object are equally important and that reality is in the relating of these, is in the endless evolving of these relatings." (Follett, 1951: 55).

Follett thus departed from the paradigm of the majority of social scientists of her day (and ours) who in their research designs divide subject from object (independent variables from dependent variables); in her view, the disciplines of history, economics, political science, law, and psychology all erred, by seeing "reality either in subject or in object," for she contended we cannot "run fast enough from one to the other to keep ourselves within the region of truth" (Follett, 1951: 54).

This "process in which the various factors in a situation not only are constantly evolving but also are continually influencing each other" (Tonn, 2003: 326) she termed, "circular response."   For her, it "formed a basic truth of all the social sciences" (Follett, 1951: 63).   Follett describes the synergistic process of circular response thusly:

> The most fundamental thought about all this is that reaction is always reaction
> to a relating . . . I never react to you but to you-plus-me; or to be more
> accurate, it is I-plus-you reacting to you-plus-me . . . that is, in the very
> process of meeting, by the very process of meeting, we both become
> something different. It begins even before we meet, in the anticipation of
> meeting. . . It is I plus the-interweaving-between-you-and-me meeting you
> plus the-interweaving-between-you-and-me, etc., etc. If we were doing it
> mathematically we should work it out to the nth power. (Follett, 1951: 62-63)

Thus, the constant interweaving of behaviors form "the evolving situation" to which those involved act as creators. The notion of circular response, she believed, "is pregnant

and important for the social sciences because it makes us think of our problems in terms of process and not of 'pictures'" (Follett, 1951: 90).

Circular Response and Integration

In applying the principle of circular response to group interaction, she argued that groups continually create new realities from their internal interactions. An important dimension to this creating was how groups handle intra- and inter-group conflict. To her, this was a key to the level of functionality or dysfuncationality of a group's collaborative leadership at any given moment in time. Follett argued that the most common ways of dealing with conflict in groups was through domination—"the victory of one side over the other"—and compromise, where "each side gives up a little in order to have peace…in order that the activity which has been interrupted by the conflict may go on" (Follett, 1925: 2). She proposed a third method, one that is rarely used but that is more robust for ending conflict: integration.

Follett held that conflict was nothing more and nothing less than the simple manifestation of difference between people; conflict in her view was difference (Follett, 1925). Because differences flow together and create the evolving situation via circular response, Follett felt it important to study processes by which evolving situations could be facilitated into functional, creative, and useful states of being (Follett, 1925). She held that difference between peoples' views—conflict—"could be made constructive and that joint, interpenetrating responsibilities could be created if ways were found to integrate differences rather than dealing with them through domination or compromise" (Tonn, 2003: 98).

Integration involves applying collaborative principles within the evolving situation that allows the desires of all parties to find a place in the solution (Follett, 1925). For Follett, "conflict is a moment in the interacting of desire [and] the moment of the appearing and focusing of difference may be a sign of health, a prophecy of progress" (Follett, 1925: 4). The key to conflict resolution is to apply principles to the "conflict moment" such that a new, functional and efficacious solution is invented. "Compromise," she argued, "does not create, it deals with what already exists; integration creates something new" (Follett, 1925: 4-5). "Only integration," she concluded, "really stabilizes. But by stabilization I do not mean anything stationary. Nothing ever stays put. I mean only that that particular conflict is settled and the next occurs on a higher level" in an ever ongoing series of "progressive integratings" (Follett, 1925: 6).

The Principle of Openness

Follett suggested than in order to achieve integration individuals in a group setting had to apply principles associated with collaboration. Her first principle of collaboration is to:

> …bring the differences into the open. We cannot hope to integrate our differences unless we know what they are. . . The first rule, then, for obtaining integration is to put your cards on the table, face the real issue, uncover the conflict, bring the whole thing into the open" (Follett, 1925: 7; 9).

The antithesis of the principle of openness is suppression of differences. Follett held that the leader "has to get underneath all the camouflage, has to find the real demand as against the demand put forward, distinguish declared motive from real motive, alleged cause

from real cause, and to remember that sometimes the underlying motive is deliberately

concealed and that sometimes it exists unconsciously" (Follett, 1925: 9).

Bringing differences into the open allows group members to see the issue at hand

from the multiple perspectives of all group members. As each individual shares his/her

perspective or desire regarding an issue, a collective understanding emerges as to what the

issue truly looks like and a collective awareness of its variables and parts is enhanced.

Follett called this collective understanding the "field of desire" and argued that

> …a business should be so organized … that full opportunity is given in any conflict
>
> . . . for the whole field of desire to be viewed. Our employees should be able to see,
>
> as we should be able to see, the whole field of desire; …many conflicts could, I
>
> believe, be prevented from ending disastrously by getting the desires of each side into
>
> one field of vision where they could be viewed together and compared (1925:10).

The Principle of Revaluation

If a manager is successful in bringing differences into the open, Follett found that a

natural result is that a *revaluation* occurs within each group member. Revalution involves

changing one's perspective and/or changing one's demands based upon a richer

understanding of the collective desires and perspectives of the group (Follett, 1925). Follett

observed that:

> This conception of revaluation of desire is necessary to keep in the foreground of our
>
> thinking in dealing with conflict, for neither side ever "gives in really, it is hopeless to
>
> expect it, but there often comes a moment when there is a simultaneous revaluation of
>
> interests on both sides and unity precipitates itself…Integration is often more a
>
> spontaneous flowing together of desire than one might think…the revaluing of

interests on both sides may lead the interests to fit into each other, so that all find some place in the final solution (Follett, 1925: 9-10).

Revaluation occurs within individual members of the group as they carefully compare their views in relation to the multiple views of their fellow group members. Yet, as individual revaluation occurs, to the degree that each member's revaluation is in harmony with that of the others', a united collective revaluation slowly evolves. Ideally, then the group is able to arrive at a united, shared understanding regarding the nature of the reality of the problem, issue, or topic that is under their consideration as a group.

The Principle of Breaking Wholes

As a collective revaluation evolves into focus among group members such that all group members are "seeing" the issue the same way, Follett stated forthrightly that "taking the demands of both sides and break[ing] them up into their constituent parts . . .is the way you deal with [solving] business problems" (Follett, 1925: 11). *Breaking up wholes* is the approach whereby group members arrive at integrative solutions via collaboration through intense analysis of each aspect of the field of desire, and of the demands and desires of those with whom one is in conflict. (Tonn, 2003)

Breaking up the whole of a demand requires differentiating the demand into its constituent parts and probing for understanding for what is truly motivating the demand or desire. For example, in management-labor wage negotiations Follett observed that:

We can say, at the very least, that the workman does not "really want" wages above the point that will keep the factory open; that the employer does not "really want" wages low enough seriously to impair the productive power of the workman. The

first question then is always: What is the demand a symbol of? (Follett, 1924; 168-169)

Thus, when one finds what is behind the demand, often an integrative solution is more quickly and easily reached. Breaking up wholes also applies to better understanding the systemic dynamics of an issue once it has been brought clearly into the field of desire and a collective understanding of it exists in the group at a gross level. Taking the issue apart after there is agreement as to what the issue is, is prerequisite in Follett's view to the invention of an integrative solution. In other words, the process of breaking up wholes in a truly collaborative process precedes and naturally causes invention.

Follett was no Pollyanna. She conceded that it is not possible in all situations to achieve integration, but that integration could occur much more often if managers developed the collaborative leadership skills and abilities necessary to facilitate it. She understood the obstacles that managers face in facilitating integration through collaboration, and bemoaned the lack of training managers received in collaborative leadership techniques in their education (Follett, 1925), and as a result they did not have the following perspective:

This is the most important word, not only for business relations, but for all human relations: not to adapt ourselves to a situation—we are all more necessary to the world than that; neither to mould a situation to our liking—we are all, or rather each, of too little importance to the world for that; but to take account of that reciprocal adjustment, that interactive behavior between the situation and ourselves which means a change in both the situation and ourselves. . . We should never allow ourselves to be bullied by an "either-or." There is often the possibility of something better than either of two given alternatives. (Follett, 1925: 19)

Follett grounded her ideas for practice on axiomatic principles of fundamental human behavior that are compelling and powerful. We will argue that her writings can provide a firm theoretical and philosophical foundation upon which to construct a collaborative leadership learning system for any team or organization. We will discuss these issues later in the paper when we propose how her work can be integrated into Raelin's framework of collaborative leadership, but before we undertake that venture, we first introduce a 19th century case of long-term institutionalization of collaborative leadership within an organization in order to draw insights from it for modern management development efforts.

LEARNING FROM THE PAST: JOSEPH SMITH

Like Follett, Joseph Smith was well known, and often widely acclaimed (even by those who counted themselves his enemies) while he lived as having a genius for developing and applying creative and powerful organizational principles and processes. However, beyond a general recognition of his name and that of the church he founded—The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints—perhaps more commonly known to many by its nickname, The Mormon Church—few know much more about his life than these general facts.

Although he only lived to be 38 years of age, Smith lived a full life. He was a lieutenant general of an army, mayor of the city of Nauvoo (which at the time of his death was the largest U.S. city west of Chicago), city designer/planner, architect, linguist, translator, author, publisher, organizer and first president of a new religion, and at the time of his assassination, a candidate for the U.S. Presidency. *The New York Times* said of Joseph Smith on September 4, 1843:

> "This Joe Smith must be set down as an extraordinary character—a prophet-hero, as
> Carlyle might call him. He is one of the great men of this age, and in future history

he will be ranked with those who, in one way or another, have stamped their impress strongly upon society."

Despite the growth and success of the church under his leadership, due to socio-political and theological disagreements that eventually flamed into physical persecution by the majority of settlers who shared territory with Smith's followers on the western frontier of the United States in the 1840s, it became critical for him to look for an area of the North American continent where his organization could relocate and thrive without persecution (Bushman, 2005).   At the time of his death Smith was planning to relocate his organization to the Rocky Mountains, and it fell upon Brigham Young, his successor, to accomplish that task. Young went on to lead the church that Smith founded on an exodus to Utah and continued to lead the church there for the next thirty three years.

Like Follett, with Smith's passing so passed the interest in what he said and what he had written and accomplished. The animus of those who felt passionately that Smith's ideas were dangerous to American society fell squarely upon Brigham Young, and slowly, Joseph Smith's organizational accomplishments were largely forgotten, or were discarded out of hand as the work of a charlatan or demagogue.

However, Smith's core organizing framework was passed from generation to succeeding generation of leadership at the highest levels of the church, and thus survived as the administrative cornerstone of the church after his death. These organizing principles established by Smith have been one of the prime drivers in sustaining an organization that is often assessed as being among the fastest growing churches in the world on a yearly basis, and a new world religion by others (Bushman, 2005; Stark, 1984).   That, in and of itself,

deserves organizational scrutiny from management scholars and practitioners alike, if the idea of "best practices" has any utility to it at all.

The year 2005 marked the 200th anniversary of Joseph Smith's birth, and with the distance of time has come a waning of the sense of social threat inherent in Smith's ideas on the part of many scholars and organizational observers. The subsequent success of the organization he founded, along with its widespread acceptance as a contributing element of American society (and to societies wherever it has taken root around the world) has generated an interest on the part of many social scientists and historians to know, "how did Joseph Smith do it?" and "how do Mormons continue to do it?" (Bloom, 1992; Bushman, 2005; Davies, 2003; 2005; Ostling & Ostling, 1999; Remini, 2002; Stark, 1984).

Notable non-Latter-day Saint scholars such as Robert V. Remini (2002) have observed, among other things, that Joseph Smith was "unquestionably the most important reformer and innovator in American religious history" while Harold Bloom concluded that, "I also do not find it possible to doubt that Joseph Smith was an authentic prophet. Where in all of American history can we find his match? . . . In proportion to his importance and his complexity, [Joseph Smith] remains the least-studied personage, of an undiminished vitality, in our entire national saga." (1992: 95).

Like Follett, Joseph Smith was an outsider and had no access to the accepted institutions of his day. There was no possibility of his attending a theological seminary or university because of his theological views but primarily because of his lack of formal education—he completed only two years of formal schooling (Bushman, 2005). Smith's organizational behavior, management, and leadership acumen was refined through active application of his insights to the organization that he formed, unencumbered by the

traditional paradigms of the institutions of his day. Smith offers current scholars and practitioners a concrete example of an elegant, flexible organizing framework founded on principles of collaborative leadership that has stood the test of time for almost two centuries.

Joseph Smith's Framework of Councils

Bushman observed that "Mormonism succeeded when other charismatic movements foundered on disputes and irreconcilable ill feelings partly because of the governing mechanisms Joseph [Smith] put in place early in the Church's history…Almost all of his major theological innovations involved the creation of institutions…Joseph [Smith] thought institutionally more than any other visionary of his time, and the survival of his movement can largely be attributable to this gift." (2005: 251).

Very early on in the church's existence Smith began using councils, collaborative leadership groups, as the primary means by which decision-making was conducted to govern the church. These early councils were usually made up of an average of eight church leaders, and Smith did not always moderate or take the lead in these groups. Instead, he rotated the moderator role, giving others the chance to manage the leadership decision-making process. Over time, this created multiple cadres of individuals in multiple communities who could form councils when needed to address any problem or challenge that might arise. The consequence of this was that Smith's presence was not needed to govern local congregations—they instead were governed by groups of individuals through the aforementioned council format.

Three months before his death, Joseph Smith taught a select group of individuals how to integrate different perspectives to produce efficacious, unified decisions in leadership teams. Smith had taught these principles throughout his tenure as president of the church

(Bushman, 2005), but his teachings are more particularly recorded in the minutes and journals of those who were part of the church's council known as the Council of Fifty (Ehat, 1980). The Council of Fifty was a quasi-political organ of the church (Ehat, 1980; Quinn, 1980) made up of the leaders who had responsibility for the current and future temporal affairs of the church and its various communities. Because there were fifty men appointed to this governing body, they came to be known as "the Council of Fifty" (Ehat, 1980; Quinn, 1980).

Joseph Smith invited a sub-committee from the Council of Fifty to create a constitution from which the governing body would operate. Drafting a constitution for such a group proved to be a daunting task, and a member of the committee, John Taylor (who would later succeed Brigham Young as president of the church), reported to the group that the committee assigned to do so had "worked & strove to get up such a constitution as would suite our feelings" but that they had failed in their attempt. After their report was given, Smith told the group that he had sensed that the committee would not be successful in their efforts, and that he had inquired of God for help regarding the matter.   He stated that in answer to his petition, he had been given the constitution for the group via divine inspiration. It was an unusual constitution. It reads in full (Ehat, 1980:7):

> "*Ye* are my Constitution and I am your God and *ye* are my spokesmen…
>
> therefore from henceforth keep my commandments."

This simple, yet profound, statement stunned the members of the group. John Taylor recorded his views of this constitution in his journal in the following words:

> These words are pregnant with meaning & full of intelligence . . . It is
>
> expected of us that [we] can act right . . . That we should consider we are not

acting for ourselves, but we are the Spokesmen of God selected for that

purpose in the interest of God & to bless & exalt all humanity. . .There is

peculiary [sic] significance to these things which needs some consideration.
(Ehat, 1980: 6)

Orson Pratt, another member of the Council of Fifty, and who would later become a

leader in the church in Utah, reflected in his journal (Ehat, 1980) that the Constitution was a

"living constitution," (p. 6) one that required the members to *be* a certain way in their hearts.

Thus, the constitution, or foundation, that Smith provided this group with was not one that

would guide so much by a large set of rules, but rather by a vision of their personal

responsibility to God, to each other, to the community, and to all humankind.

Essentially, the implication of the constitution was that when the council convened,

members needed to subordinate their egos and should not seek to dominate or act with

compulsion in order for their personal ideas to be accepted by the group. One's own view

may not be what is best for the corporate group, thus humility and a desire to listen to

different views, with the only concern of accepting the best one (or the best synthesis of

diverse views) , and the realization that one's own view may or may not be the best one was

a paramount requirement for the successful operation of councils.

After the constitution was adopted, nine parliamentary rules that were numerically

labeled were established on April 18, 1844 (Ehat, 1980). Seven rules were procedural in

nature, involving such issues as, who convenes the council, how members should sit, the

nature of the clerks' duties, how motions should be presented, the elements of the attendance

policy, and how committee assignment is to be undertaken. The two other rules, however,

presented a whole new way of organizing, of decision-making, and of governing to these

individuals. For purpose of discussion, Rule 5 will be divided into its three conceptual

elements.

Rule 5a: The Principle of Unanimity

Rule Number 5 began with the following pronouncement: "To pass, a motion must

be unanimous in the affirmative. . ." (Ehat, 1980:6) The overarching principle in Joseph

Smith's teachings regarding leadership, decision-making, and administration in the Church of

Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was that the decisions of leadership bodies must be

unanimous in order to be efficacious. Previous to the organizing of the Council of Fifty, on

March 28, 1835 Joseph Smith organized the church into a variety of leadership bodies called

"quorums." In each quorum the process of decision-making was to be the same:

> And every decision made by … these quorums must be by the unanimous voice of the
>
> same; that is, every member in each quorum must be agreed to its decisions, in order
>
> to make their decisions of the same power or validity one with the other…Unless this
>
> is the case, their decisions are not entitled to the same blessings… (Doctrine and
>
> Covenants 107:27-29).

Unanimity was for Smith the desired outcome of every decision making process in

every quorum or leadership unit within the church's organizational structure. However,

unanimity can easily be replaced by a "Potemkin Village" mentality where façade,

groupthink, and compliance replace integration and unity.

Rule 5b: Principle of Openness

This danger was anticipated in the second element of Rule 5, and it essentially is the

same principle as Follett's "principle of openness" and is congruent with Raelin's dimension

of *Being Mutual*. To foster the type of collaboration needed to create decisions that were

truly unanimous, the second part of Rule 5 stated: "If any member has any objections he is under covenant to fully and freely make them known to the Council." (Ehat, 1980:6)   In order for decisions to be unanimous, and not just a reflection of compliant agreement on all parties, Rule 5b was necessary: all concerns, opinions, knowledge, facts, and perspectives from all the members needed to be shared, discussed, and then an emergent decision forged through the process of mutual counsel.

Members of the Council of Fifty thus were expected to be orderly in their discussions and to listen intently to better understand each other and the issue under discussion.   Twelve years earlier, in another setting, Smith taught his followers that in groups where discussion and learning was taking place members should

"let not all be spokesmen at once; but let one speak at a time and let all listen unto his sayings, that when all have spoken that all may be edified of all, and that every man may have an equal privilege" (Doctrine & Covenants, 88:122).

Smith taught that if the council process produced something less than a true unanimity (which it did sometimes in the church then as it does sometimes in the modern church, Ballard, 1995) the efficacy of the decision is diluted.

In order for Rule 5b to operate and function, the Constitution had to be internally abided by each member of the group. Without the correct attitude or perspective, the process that aims toward unanimity and integration is aborted. Smith taught on another occasion to other leadership units that

The decisions of these quorums [leadership units] . . . are to be made in all righteousness, in holiness, and lowliness of heart, meekness and long suffering, and in faith, and virtue, and knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness

and charity; Because the promise is, if these things abound in them they shall not be unfruitful in the knowledge of the Lord. (Doctrine & Covenants, 107:30-31)

The record of a council that Smith moderated provides a view into how these principles were actually applied in the church in the 1840s. Bushman summarizes the processes of that council, which considered the case of a member of the church whose behavior was contrary to the teachings of the church: "During the course of [the] hearings, twenty-eight men spoke their minds, some as members of the council, others as observers in the meeting. By the end of the hearings, all sides having spoken, Joseph could say, 'I now swim in good clean water, with my head out." (2005: 251). The perspective of each person was listened to and respected, and slowly the full issue came into view, such that the decision was clear to Smith (the leader of this council) and to all who were in attendance.

Rule 5c: Principle of Sustaining

The final element of Rule 5 is the glue that holds the continuing existence of the council together over time; it reads:

But if he cannot be convinced of the rightness of the course pursued by the Council he must either yield or withdraw membership in the Council. Thus a man will lose his place in the Council if he refuses to act in accordance with righteous principles in the deliberations of the Council. After action is taken and a motion accepted, no fault will be found or change sought for in regard to the motion (Ehat, 1980:6).

Once a collaborative solution emerged it was expected that the members would trust the process and accept and support the decision of the council. This is natural when the process works the way it should (through openness, revaluation, and then clarity as the decision is forged through respectful group interaction and discussion). However, Rule 5c

anticipates human nature: that unanimity will not occur in every situation. If the collaborative leadership process has been facilitated correctly—or at least with sincerity— much harm can be done to future deliberations if a few members dig in their heels and refuse to sustain the result of the group's deliberations and efforts. Thus, Rule 5c ensures respect for collaborative leadership processes and for the continuance of the council in the case of rebellion. It also provides for the exit of individuals who would poison the collaborative leadership process over time, and is a reminder that in collaborative leadership processes one is not superior to the collective contributions and thinking of the group. It is a reminder of the need for individual humility and a warning against hubris. In his analysis of the Council of Fifty, Ehat (1980) observed that:

> Without any question rule number five was the most important one to members of the Council. All the perplexing questions raised about government in general and theocracy in particular were answered by this rule. It eased their own anxiety regarding Joseph Smith's intentions in establishing a theocracy. . .Because of this rule Council members did not feel that they were bound to the "fanciful Revelation of Joe Smith, whether right or wrong," as anti-Mormons claimed. This rule satisfied members of the Council that they were involved in a theodemocratic republican from of government and not a theocratic tyranny. (p. 10)

Rule 6: Principle of Covenant

Entering into the Council of Fifty was done by covenant. Inherent in the covenant was an agreement to abide by the principles of the Council's collaborative leadership framework, and the constitution upon which it was based. Entry into the council was governed by Rule Number 6, which stated:

…When invited into the Council he must covenant by uplifted hand to maintain all things of the Council inviolate agreeable to the order of the Council. Before he accepts his seat he must also agree to accept the name, constitution and rules of order and conduct of the Council. (Ehat, 1980:7)

As stated before, in order for integration to occur it is necessary that individual observations, input, knowledge, and opinion regarding an issue be shared: what Follett would call, *bringing the entire field of the issue into the open to be analyzed as a whole.* To heighten the probability that this—and the other principles associated with collaborative leadership—were applied consistently in councils, Smith felt that placing individuals under covenant to abide by such principles was necessary. This covenant reinforced in the minds and hearts of the individuals that what they were entering into was no small thing, but rather an important governance process that would require their best efforts.

Ehat (1980) summarizes Smith's view of the Council of Fifty's governance process thusly: "According to the theory, if fifty men seek in candor and order to put self and represented interest in perspective with all other points of view and are committed to find the locus where the best interests of all converge, then the Council will have found the will of God" (p. 264). In other words, if the Council functioned according to correct principles of collaborative leadership, the members not only acted as co-creators of decisions with each other, but also as co-creators with the Divine.

Over time, the Council of Fifty slowly faded as a governing organ of the church, but the principles of its decision-making process were retained in subsequent evolutions of the church's administrative structure. As in Joseph Smith's era, today there is no full-time

ministry in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints: all church leaders are volunteers,

are not trained professionally to be church leaders, and govern the church through councils.

The principles of collaborative leadership that Smith institutionalized in the 1830s and early

1840s holds for every organizational unit in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints

across all hierarchical levels of organization today—from the presidency of the church down

to individual family councils that are held in homes of members of the church across the

world.   It is perhaps the starkest case of an organization that attempts to govern itself via

collaborative leadership.

Smith perhaps best summarized his approach of collaborative leadership in a

statement that he made to Stephen A. Douglas the prominent Senator from Illinois who

would later lose to Abraham Lincoln in the presidential election of 1860. Douglas once

visited Joseph Smith, who at the time was mayor of the city of Nauvoo and president of a

church with now over 50,000 members world-wide, many of whom were emigrating to the

U.S. Nauvoo had become a melting pot of cultural diversity with converts living there who

were originally from many parts of the U.S. and the British Isles. Douglas inquired of Smith

"how he managed to govern a people so diverse, coming from so many different countries

with their peculiar manners and customs." (Jesse, 1977).   Smith answered: "I teach the

people correct principles and they govern themselves." (Taylor, 1851).

Implications and Discussion

In this section of the paper we will discuss how Follett and Smith's contributions shed

light and perspective on collaborative leadership generally, and propose how these

contributions provide further insight into, and can be integrated with, the organizing

perspectives set forth by Raelin (2006). These relationships are illustrated in Figure 1, in which we propose an extended model of collaborative leadership learning.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Criticality of Internalization of Power Sharing

The internalization of the value of power sharing in the individual(s) in whom power naturally resides, we argue, is the critical prerequisite phase of the establishment of collaborative leadership processes in any group or organization (See Figure 1). The members of the church and communities that he founded looked to Joseph Smith for both personal and collective guidance and protection (Bushman, 2005). Smith had the power and opportunity to place himself in a condition of absolute power within his organization's structure; yet, he organized the church he founded on principles of *group* versus individual governance, placing checks and controls on his and others' ability to wield absolute power. The council system would govern the church, not Joseph Smith acting arbitrarily alone.

The individuals selected to govern in these councils were ordinary people—the vast majority had no sophisticated theological or organizational training, no set of competencies or experiences that would particularly qualify them to govern well except for the training given them by Joseph Smith regarding collaborative leadership. Smith taught them that the decisions of these councils of which they were members, when done according to correct principles had the same status as if God had revealed something to Smith personally; that is, the decisions of these councils were viewed as being revelations from God through a collective instead of an individual mechanism (Bushman, 2005). Interestingly, at

. . . the moment when Joseph's own revelatory powers were at their peak, he divested

himself of sole responsibility for revealing the will of God and invested that gift in

the councils of the Church, making it a charismatic bureaucracy." (Bushman, 2005: 257-258.)

Socialization for Collaborative Leadership

After an internalization of shared power exists in position leaders, it is then possible to socialize other group members to adopt the philosophy, principles, and practices necessary for them to engage in collaborative leadership. Raelin (2006) observes that individuals are often not ready to engage in power sharing for a variety of reasons (tradition, fear, lack of skills, ignorance, etc.), thus a comprehension of the critical aspects involved in socializing people to prepare them to engage in collaborative leadership is critical. Follett and Smith both offer us important insights into what the key aspects of a successful socialization process for collaborative leadership would consist of: 1) use of transformational pedagogies; 2) principle-binding structures; and 3) commitment rituals (See Figure 1).

Use of Transformative Pedagogy

From the work of Follett and Smith, it can be derived that the training of people to engage in collaborative leadership is not analogous to adding new skills to their managerial repertoires. It does not involve an incremental addition to their knowledge base. Rather, it involves a transformation of worldview. They both understood the necessity of the heightening of the inner person in order to carry out collaborative leadership, and that normal people, behaving normally, do not naturally facilitate or engage in collaborative leadership.

For Follett and Smith, to truly participate in collaborative leadership one must first *be*—or be actively trying to *become*—the type of person who can pull it off. When

individuals engage in collaborative leadership, they must be consciously aware that they are doing something special—something that is far removed from the mundane.

To accomplish such a mind-set shift, nontraditional training approaches will no doubt be necessary, thus we agree with Raelin (2006) that pedagogies based on action learning are most likely to facilitate this type of cognitive and emotional shift (for a review of how action learning can influence the learning of collaborative leadership competencies, see Raelin, 2006); however, action learning programs must be based on a visible philosophy to which the participants can continually turn to for reference and for an understanding of *why* and *how* they are trying to learn principles and techniques associated with collaborative leadership. We can think of no more powerful text upon which to house the conceptual foundation upon which action learning efforts should be built than on the writings of Mary P. Follett.

Not only did Follett delineate the axioms, constructs, and processes associated with integration, she employed numerous examples from her observations of organizational life to describe in rich detail what collaborative leadership is, how it occurs, what it looks like, what it feels like, and what people can actually do to bring it about. Follett undertook to take the reader into the actual collaborative leadership process through analogy, experience, exposition, and invitation. After reading Follett one almost feels as if one has actually experienced the phenomenon. When addressing politicians regarding challenges that the Canadian government was facing in a speech he gave in 1992, Mintzberg (1995) stated why he included many passages from Follett's writing in his speech:

> I did not quote Mary Parker Follett that day just because the ideas and the metaphors fitted so well. I quoted her because the eloquence and the inspiration of her words set the tone for a people who had lost their way. I know of nothing written before or

since that comes anywhere close to this. I recount all of this here to show how relevant Mary Parker Follett's writings are to today's problems—really, to *every* day's problems (1995: 202).

Follett did not try to convince her readers—she attempted to transform them through the power of her writing to be the kind of people who could enact collaboration and achieve integrative decision-making. While Follett's focus was secular, it also was not "anti-spiritual"either—indeed, some in her day felt as if they were being proselytized, for unlike the technical writing style used in academe, Follett wrote with passion. It would be prescient on the part of current organizations to consider basing their management education curricula associated with collaborative leadership on Follett's writings, for they call for a new way of approaching team interaction, one that is based on a philosophy that is intellectually engaging and draws one to a deep sense of collective responsibility and individual respect. As has been stated by many writers cited in this paper, the essential skills she covers in her writings are not necessarily new; however, her unveiling of the philosophy upon which those skills are based causes the skills to come alive, imbuing them with new validity and power.

Most organizations do not have as part of their training mentality that an intra-personal transformation of mindset and worldview is required in order to work at high levels of performance in teams, but Follett and Smith did. A lesson that can be learned from both their work is the necessity of focusing on the front end of team performance, that collaborative leadership requires transformation of individuals, and that when this is not honestly addressed in initial team start-up training mediocre team performance should be expected.

Principle-binding Structures

Behaviors associated with Raelin's dimensions of *Being Mutual* (the right and the tendency for all group members to have the autonomy to advocate points of view that they believe can contribute to the common good of the organization) and *Being Compassionate* (where all views are considered before a decision is made, each member of the group is granted dignity, collaborative leadership is protected as a value, and all shareholders are respected) cannot be taught, learned, and practiced in a vacuum. Such behaviors are taught, learned, and practiced within an organizational structural context that ranges in the degree to which it is in philosophical and cultural congruity with these behaviors (See Figure 1).

Principles and practices associated with collaborative leadership, powerful and edifying as they might be when properly understood, will dissipate in their attractiveness and their power to trigger power sharing if they are not securely bound to some type of intra-cultural norm system or institutional policy. If philosophical congruity is low between desired behavior and structural context, collaborative leadership within group members inevitably wanes, often producing bitterness, cynicism, and lowered organizational commitment in individuals who have been shown a "better way" and then feel unable to apply what they have learned.

Joseph Smith proved that a simple, yet elegant structure imbued with collaborative leadership principles can sustain collaborative leadership processes over long periods of time. Principles of collaborative leadership can be taught in theory, and initially must be through the use of transformative pedagogies, but true learning of collaborative leadership must come about via action learning processes—and such learning requires that rules be housed in structures that embody them. Thus, a large part of the socialization process involves enacting

principles of collaborative leadership within a context or structure that in turn is based upon those same principles.

One hundred and sixty three years after the death of Joseph Smith does the ideal of collaborative leadership always occur within all levels of the councils of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints?   As was stated before, the principles associated with councils have been passed down from the original set of leaders that Smith taught throughout the presidencies of the highest governance councils in the Church across time to the present. However this rich understanding of the warp and woof of collaborative discourse that has been common in the highest leadership councils in the church has sometimes been lacking in many of the local councils in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints from 1844 to the present (Ballard, 1995). Being socialized in varying educational and business cultures, current members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints have as much baggage as anyone else to shed in order to engage in collaboration in their councils. Yet, due to the institutionalized doctrine and policy regarding councils and their attendant principles that Joseph Smith forged, the idea of councils as a reference ideal in efforts at church governance exists in the rank and file members today.

Being a lay church, members are constantly engaged in local organizing efforts— thus, their "eyes are always on the prize" of councils—but many of them are not familiar enough with the skills of collaboration to consistently live in accordance with their internalized ideal (Ballard, 1995). Collaboration occurs frequently enough in local lay councils to reinforce the ideal, and the ideal in turn acts as a continual reference point by which leadership behaviors are evaluated by rank and file church members.   Thus, the principles of collaborative leadership that Joseph Smith bound to structure and doctrine

remain an organizational "polar star" to the broad membership of the church, ensuring repeated attempts are made to achieve collaboration despite the personal weaknesses of many individuals that limit their abilities to fully do so.

Perhaps part of the legacy of Joseph Smith's genius is that the right structure, one that is bound to principles of collaborative leadership, has staying power and can generate and protect standards of collaborative leadership such that even if the ideal is not always attained, the behavior expended to attempt to gain it is adequate to sustain the long term viability and health of the organization. Additionally, his framework shows that if the ideal is internalized in top management that the on-going manifestation of collaborative leadership within top management teams can act as a continual reinforcer to individuals lower in the organizational hierarchy to continually attempt to strive for higher levels of collaborative group performance.

Commitment Rituals

To ensure the consistent existence of a commitment to collaborate in every member of a council, Smith established a covenant ritual in his organization. To engage in collaboration in Smith's framework, one had to promise, by covenant, to live according to the commandments of God in order to place oneself in a mindset (charity, humility, justice, mercy, patience) that is ready to engage in the collaborative process and to apply the principles inherent within that process. Thus, Smith linked the vision of the necessity of becoming a new person in order to participate in collaborative leadership with the temporal symbol of a covenant. This motivated those who joined these councils to take the work and process of these groups very seriously—in other words, they took an oath that they would engage in sincere power sharing.

Another contribution of Joseph Smith to current scholars and practitioners is the insight that perhaps we have not gone far enough—or deep enough—in preparing individuals to work in high performance teams from a basis of collaborative leadership. While organizations may focus on many team development processes, Smith's approach would argue that organizations may be unwittingly setting up teams for failure because they do not educate team members regarding what it is they are truly embarking on—a commitment to a higher way of interacting with other human beings—and that they do not require formal commitments from their people to achieve this expectation.

The use of commitment rituals is not unique to Smith's framework of collaboration; however, Smith provides us with an important perspective on the relationship between commitment rituals and principle-binding structures (See Figure 1). It is clear that Smith sensed that there is a mutually reinforcing relationship between commitment rituals and the organizing structures that house the group's interactions. The degree to which structures are principle-bound enhances the efficacy of commitment rituals, and the degree to which these rituals evoke significant commitment within group members reinforces the efficacy of structures to ensure collaborative leadership over time. Commitment to act in accordance with new principles of governing is weakened when no strong organizational scaffolding exists to keep the principles safe and in place. Smith has shown that when the principles and philosophy of collaborative leadership have been adequately socialized, and when structures are in place that are in congruence with the spirit of the principles and philosophy of collaborative leadership, formal commitment rituals are powerful, and have staying power.

Being Concurrent/Being Collective as Outcomes, and the Reinforcing Role of Innovation

In Figure 1 we illustrate our view that Raelin's collaborative leadership organizing dimensions, *Being Concurrent* and *Being Collective,* are in reality outcomes produced from the process of internalization of power sharing by initial position leaders, subsequent socialization of group members in power sharing philosophy and principles, and commitment rituals that bind members to structures formed around principles of power sharing. Without these processes occurring it is unlikely that more than one person will consistently step up and perform leadership behaviors in addition to the position leader (*Being Concurrent*) or that members will systemically interact and as sub-systems evince leadership behaviors (*Being Collective*). The successful deployment of the three dimensions of the management education process described thus far ultimately leads, we propose, to the internalization of power sharing within group members (See Figure 1). When this internalization occurs through the action learning processes inherent in the socialization dimensions outlined in Figure 1, collaborative leadership on the part of group members without clear position authority begins to manifest itself.

We also propose that one of the primary variables that continually lubricates collaborative leadership as an on-going process is the final output of the system: invention, creation, discovery, and innovation (See Figure 1). Follett held that being an integral part of a group creative process triggers high levels of intrinsic motivation, provides people with a deep sense of purpose and accomplishment, and motivates them to continually stay in a process that produces such outcomes:

> Give *your* difference, welcome *my* difference, unify *all* difference in the larger
>
> whole—such is the law of growth. The unifying of difference is the eternal process

of life—the creative synthesis, the highest act of creation, the at-onement…that richer

joy which comes from having taken part in an act of creation . . . (Follett, 1918: 40).

For Follett, the outcome of collaborative leadership is integration: the creation of a

new reality that has been impregnated with the desires, perspective, and wisdom of all group

membership; in other words, the final outcome of the collaborative leadership process is

invention, creation, inspiration, discovery, innovation.

Similarly, Smith's framework of councils holds this same view, yet from a different

context. In Smith's framework the group's purpose is not to simply solve a problem; rather,

it is to ascertain what God's will is regarding the problem by inventing a collaborative

solution. Smith held that the Divine is inherent in the collaboration process itself; thus,

members not only become co-creators with each other in the development of solutions or

plans, they also become co-creators with God when they abide by the principles of

collaborative leadership—they experience collective revelation.

While many scholars and practitioners have observed that high performance teams

produce innovation, and that the process of producing innovative outcomes enhances

intrinsic motivation, from Follett and Smith we gain a clearer picture of the relative

importance of this variable in relation to collaborative leadership. From the writing of

Follett, and from the historical analysis of Smith's organizing efforts, creation and innovation

shift from ground to figure in terms of the valence of its role in sustaining and maintaining

the existence of collaborative leadership processes.   They argue that being part of a process

that is involved with creation and innovation is no small thing to the human soul and that this

reality should be addressed head on in management education efforts. One of members of

the Council of Fifty described his feelings of intrinsic motivation in his journal after being

trained by Joseph Smith regarding principles of collaborative leadership on 18 April, 1844 in these words:

> "Much precious instructions were given, and it seems like heaven began on earth and the power of God is with us." (Ehat, 1980: 13)

What Follett and Smith attempt to evoke in their perspectives on collaborative leadership is a process that enthralls the human soul. Perhaps managers have unwittingly diminished this critical aspect of collaborative leadership in their management development training designs due to fears of appearing too emotional, too spiritual, too non-scientific, or perhaps too soft. However, this element may be the engine that drives the process, thus shying away from it in training programs or during action learning processes may wind up diluting the potential for individuals to internalize power sharing.

In conclusion, we aver that knowledge gained from further exploration into the frameworks of Mary P. Follett and Joseph Smith engenders new and important insights in understanding how to better socialize, train, and educate managers regarding collaborative leadership processes. The degree to which their contributions can be efficacious to management educators of the 21st century cannot be fully known, of course, until the isolation of their contributions is lifted and a critical mass of scholars and practitioners begin studying and applying their work and thought. We hope that this introduction to their work and thought will engender that process, and lead to more efficacious processes and approaches for developing collaborative leadership in individuals and within organizations.

References

Ballard, M.R. 1995. *Counseling with our councils*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Publishing Company.

Barclay, N.J. 2005. Following in the footsteps of Mary Parker Follett: Exploring how insights from the past can advance organizational justice theory and research. *Management Decision*, (43) 5: 740-760.

Bennis, W. 1995. Thoughts on the "Essentials of Leadership." In P. Graham, P. 1995. *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of management*: 177-182. Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.

Bloom, H., 1992. *The American religion: The emergence of the post-Christian nation.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Boje, D.M. & Rosile, G.A. 2001. Where's the power in empowerment: Answers from Follett and Clegg. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, (37)1: 90-117.

Box, R.C. 2001. Pragmatic discourse and administrative legitimacy. *American Review of Public Administration,* 32 (1): 20-39

Bushman, R.L. 2005. *Joseph Smith: Rough stone rolling. A cultural biography of Mormonism's founder.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Davies, D.J. 2003. *An introduction to Mormonism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, D.J. 2005. *World religion: Dynamics and constraints.* Paper presented at the conference, "The Worlds of Joseph Smith," Library of Congress/Brigham Young University, May 7, 2005.

Davis, A. M. 1991. In practice - Follett on facts: Timely advice from an ADR pioneer. *Negotiation Journal,* 7 (2): 131-138

Doctrine and covenants of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. 1989. Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Dooley, K. 1997. A complex adaptive systems model of organization change. *Nonlinear Dynamics, Psychology, & Life Science,* 1(1), 1997, 69-97.

Drath, W.H., & Palus, C.J. 1994. *Making common sense: Leadership and meaning-making in a community of practice.* Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Drucker, P. 1995. Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of management. In P. Graham, P. 1995. *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of management.* Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press: 1-9.

Ehat, A. F. 1980. "It seems like heaven began on earth" Joseph Smith and the constitution of the kingdom of God*. BYU Studies,* (20) 3: 253-279.

Elliot, E. & Kiel, L. D. 1996. *Chaos theory in the social sciences: Foundations and applications.* Ann Arbor: University Of Michigan Press, 1996.

Eylon, D. 1998. Understanding empowerment and resolving its paradox: Lessons from Mary Parker Follett. *Journal of Management History*, (4) 1: 16-28.

Feldheim, M.A. 2004. Mary Parker Follett lost and found—again, and again, and again. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, (7) 3: 341-363.

Follett, M. P. 1951. *Creative experience.* New York: Peter Smith.
Follett, M.P. 1925. Constructive conflict. Paper presented at the Bureau of Personnel Administration. Reprinted in P. Graham. (Ed.) 1995. *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of management:* 67-95. Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.

Follett, M.P. 1918. The new state. Longmans, Green & Company. Republished in 1998 by The Pennsylvania State University Press: University Park, PA.

Fry B.R., & Thomas L.L. 1996. Mary Parker Follett: Assessing the contribution and impact of her writings. *Journal of Management History*, (2)2: 11-19.

Graham, P. (Ed.) 1995. *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of management.* Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.

Gregersen, H.& Sailer, L. 1993. Chaos theory and its implications for social science research. *Human Relations*, 46(7): 777-802.

Holland, J. H. 1995. *Hidden order: How adaptation builds complexity*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley. 1995.

Hurst, O.K., Rush, J.C., & White, R.E. 1989. Top management teams and organizational renewal. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10 (Special Issue): 87-105.

Jesse, D. 1977. Howard Coray's Recollections of Joseph Smith. BYU Studies, 17(3): 1-5

Kanter, R.M. 1995. Preface. In P. Graham, (Ed.) 1995*. Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of management.* Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.

Lawrence, P.R. 1995. Epilogue. In P. Graham, (Ed.) 1995*. Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of management.* Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.

Kiel, L. D. *Managing chaos and complexity in government*. San Francisco, Ca: Jossey-Bass Publishers. 1994.

Lawrence P. R. (1995). Epilogue. In P. Graham (Ed.), *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of Management* 291-295. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Lichtenstein, B., & Mendenhall, M. 2002. Non-linearity and Response-Ability: Emergent order in 21st century careers. *Human Relations*, 55(1), 5-32.

McClarney, C., & Ryno, S. 1999. Mary Parker Follett: Visionary leadership and strategic management. *Women in Management Review*, (14)7:

McKersic, R., & Walton, R. A. 1992. Retrospective on the behavioral theory of labor negotiations." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *Special Issue: Conflict and Negotiation in Organizations: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, 13 (3): 277-285.

McSwite, O. 1995. Humanism and pseudo-critique: The danger of missing the postmodern moment. *Organization: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Organization, Theory, and Society*, 2 (2): 233-240.

McSwite, O. 1996. Round #3: On the necessity of admitting the idea of the unconscious into any post-rational model of public administration. *Administrative Theory and Praxis*, 18(1): 51-52.

Mendenhall, M., Macomber, J., & Cutright, M. 2000. Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of chaos and complexity. *Journal of Management History*, 6 (4): 191-204.

Miller, P., & O'Leary, T. 1989. Hierarchies and American ideals, 1900-1940. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(2): 250-265.

Mintzberg, H. 1995. Co-ordination. In P. Graham, (Ed.) 1995**. *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of management:* 199-204. Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.

Ostling, R.N. & Ostling, J.K. 1999. *Mormon America: The power and the promise.* San Francisco: Harper.

Parker, D. & Stacey, R. *Chaos, management and economics: The implications of non-linear thinking.* London: The Institute of Economic Affairs. 1994.

Parker, L.D. 1984. Control in organizational life: The contribution of Mary Parker Follett." *The Academy of Management Review*, 9 (4): 736-745.

Parker, P. 1995. Most quoted - least heeded: The five senses of Follett. In P. Graham (Ed.), *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of management*, 282-290. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Quinn, D. M. 1980. The "Council of Fifty" and its members, 1844 to 1945. *BYU Studies*, 20:2:163-197

Quinn, D.M. 1997. *The Mormon hierarchy: Extensions of power.* Salt Lake City: Signature Books.

Raelin, J. 2006. Does action learning promote collaborative leadership? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5(2): 152-168.

Raelin, J. 2003*. Creating leaderful organizations: How to bring out leadership in everyone.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Remini, R.V. 2002*. Joseph Smith*. Viking Press.

Salimath M.S. & Lemak, D.J. 2004, Mary P. Follett: translating philosophy into a paradigm of lifelong learning. *Management Decision*, (42) 10: 1284-1296

Schilling, M.A. 2000. Decades ahead of her time: Advancing stakeholder theory through the ideas of Mary Parker Follett. *Journal of Management History*, 6(5): 224-242.

Smith, J. (1991) *History of the Church, Volume 6* (reprint edition) Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company.

Stark, R. (1984) The rise of a new world faith. *Review of Religious Research*, 26(1):

Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W. 1958. How to choose a leadership pattern*. Harvard Business Review,* 36(2): 95-101.

Taylor, J. 1851. The organization of the church," *Millennial Star,* Nov. 15: 339

Tonn, J.C. 2003. *Mary P. Follett: Creating democracy, transforming management*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Vroom, V.H., & Yetton, P.W. 1973. *Leadership and decision-making.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Waldo, D. 1984. *The administrative state (2nd ed.).* New York: Holmes and Meier.

Yukl, G. 2006. *Leadership in organizations (6ᵗʰ ed.)* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Figure 1: Collaborative Leadership Learning Framework

Internalization of Power Sharing in Position Leader(s)

Use of Transformational Pedagogy

Principle-binding Structures

Being Mutual

Being Compassionate

Use of Commitment Rituals

Internalization of Power Sharing in Group Members

Outcome: Concurrent Collaborative Leadership

Outcome: Collective Collaborative Leadership

Invention, Creation, Discovery, Innovation