THE EFFECT OF INTENTIONALITY ON LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT: A SINGLE-SUBJECT CASE STUDY

by

Joel Bryant

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education in
Educational Leadership

Charlotte

2012

Approved by:

_____
Dr. Corey Lock

_____
Dr. Lisa Merriweather

_____
Dr. James J. Bird

_____
Dr. William C. Gay

ABSTRACT

JOEL BRYANT. The effect of intentionality on leadership development: A single-subject case study. (Under the direction of Dr. COREY LOCK)

The purpose of this single-subject case study was to examine the effect of intentionality on leadership development, employing the theoretical frameworks of Positive Organizational Scholarship and Multiple Realities. The two fundamental research questions that drove this study were: 1) What happened in the intentional leadership workshops that caused or did not cause a change in the anticipated behavior of informants? 2) What effect did the intentional leadership training workshops have on informants and their organizations? Data were collected according to the protocols of case study design, and were analyzed deductively.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all the researcher would like to thank his parents for their guidance and

encouragement over the course of his life. Other family and friends are also appreciated

for their support during this process. The researcher also acknowledges a deep debt to the

direction and counsel of committee Chair Dr. Corey Lock as well as that of the

committee members, UNC-Charlotte's Department of Educational Leadership for

proving GASP and opportunities to serve as a graduate assistant. The researcher

expresses a special thanks to Dr. Bill Gay for his mentorship as the researched moved

from the Master's stage into the Doctoral process. The researcher also wishes to thank

UNC-Charlotte's librarian, graduate school and other faculty members that made this

project possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF CHARTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of intentionality on leadership development using a single-subject case study methodology (Alasuutari, Bickman, & Brannen, 2008; Woodside, 2010; Yin, 2003) using the theoretical frameworks of Positive Organizational Scholarship –POS (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003) and its strengths-based approach along with Schutz's (1962) notion of Multiple Realities, both of which are discussed later in this chapter The fundamental research questions that drove this study were:

1. What effect did the intentional leadership training workshop have on informants and their organizations?

2. What happened in the intentional leadership workshops that caused or did not cause a change in the anticipated behavior of informants?

Answering these two questions is important in order to clarify contemporary understanding of what factors promote leadership development. Clarity is especially critical in an age where the demand for capable and even exemplary leadership has increased. Moreover, today's organizations find themselves competing in a hyper-global climate and therefore need an effective means of producing and re-producing the kind of leaders that can ensure and sustain organizational success, because much ambiguity and outright contradiction still surrounds the phenomenon of leadership development.

In this regard, the results of this inquiry revealed for the researcher what happened in the intentional leadership workshops that influenced or did not influence behavioral

changes in informants, and how these changes impacted their organizations, suggesting accordingly the effect of intentionality on leadership development. Central to this study was analysis of how organizational climate and dynamics influenced leadership development. This concern with the influence of organizations was validated in the literature, Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS) and its strengths-based approach (Cameron, Dutton & Quinn, 2003), for example, Bolman & Deal (2008) along with the work of Olivares, Peterson & Hess (2007). By exploring the research questions the researcher hoped to understand the effect of intentionality on leadership development in this symbiotic relationship. Before operationalizing definitions the section below outlines the significance of this study.

<div align="center">Significance of Study</div>

The significance of this study is that it adds to the knowledge base in the field of leadership development, especially concerning intentional leadership. While the study's results may not be transferable, various elements are applicable beyond the immediate research context (Ezzy, 2002; Marshall & Rossman, 2006). For example, leaders committed to leadership development can practice the element of intention communication, using moment-to-moment interactions with others as opportunities to learn, encourage, console and to inspire them accordingly.

The same holds for the element of intentional leadership that deliberately makes space for others to show up as great. This space can be created by heralding and highlighting their success and contributions to the overall success of the organizational mission. In doing so, leaders demonstrate another element of intentional leadership by encouraging others to be purpose-driven versus ego-driven; likewise with themselves and

their leadership approach. In this regard, leaders do not need a background in counseling

as does the primary informant in this study to be successful in practicing intentionality to

enhance their leadership development. Nor must they be accomplished in employing a

therapeutic approach. On the contrary, all that is required is for leaders to be conscious of

others and present to themselves to employ these elements individually or symbiotically

to enhance the effect of intentionality on leadership development.

Definitions

- Intentionality/Intentional leadership: A conscientious approach to leadership and leadership development that is designed to accomplish specific goals based on one's belief in one's self-efficacy despite existing barriers and emerging obstacles.

- POS: Positive Organizational Scholarship is a strengths-based approach to leadership development and organizational life that highlights what is right, virtuous and flourishing about organizations and their members (Cameron et al., 2003.

- Multiple Realities: A notion that recognizes the created nature of the social world and thus posits that persons who act with intentionality can change both its course and character accordingly (Schutz, 1962).

- Center for Intentional Leadership: The leadership development firm founded by the primary informant that teaches leaders and organizations on how to assume an intentional approach to leadership development by creating a strengths-based culture.

- Default Self: An individual's unconscious way of behaving, conventionally called *personality*, which intentionality is designed to make one aware of and help change accordingly based on one's peculiar goals.

Positive Organizational Scholarship and Multiple Realities

Positive organizational scholarship focuses on organizational behaviors that

promote virtues such as positive deviance (bypassing organizational norms, cascading

vitality (attitudes that have a ripple effect of creating upward emotional spirals, etc.), and

transcendence. These spirals often inspire organizational members to go beyond --

transcendence-- what they would have done in an environment that was not strengths-based or was intolerant of mistakes. Organizations that practice POS, for example, embrace the notion of seeing organizational tragedies as learning opportunities which, rightly appropriated, increased leadership development and organizational efficacy (Cameron et al., 2003).

Characteristically, organizations oriented around the ideals of positive organizational scholarship highlighted what was right, flourishing, thriving and virtuous about organizations, their members and leaders alike. In this climate, behaviors occurred and are encouraged that would most likely not be encouraged or occur in organizations that highlighted human and individual deficits, dysfunctions and incapacities.

In this regard, positive organizational scholarship aligned with the elements of intentional leadership, which believed in the ability of individuals and organizations to transform themselves because it recognized the created nature of reality. As an out-growth of positive psychology, POS scholars deviated from the deficit-based approach to persons and organizations that prevailed for much of the 20th century (Cameron et al., 2003) to emphasize positives instead.

Multiple Realities, in contrast, highlighted the created and constructed nature of the self and the world, which allowed percipients to act to alter both accordingly. Leaders with this perspective tended to conceive options and alternatives that others did not because they acted in ways that were intentionally designed to transform that portion of reality they focused on. Characteristically, such leaders were intentional and highly autonomous. They believed in their self-efficacy and that of their organizations also.

Leaders that embraced Multiple Realities inspired and engaged others to envision alternatives by declaring new realities, and then created appropriate structures and strategies to achieve these. Leaders with this paradigm rejected the permanence or imperviousness of reality and acted deliberately and diligently to change its course and character. More will be said about POS and Multiples Realities in the Methods section of this study.

Meanwhile deductive analysis (Pope, Ziebland & Mays, 2000) was used to analyze and interpret findings. Conceptually, deductive analysis provides a means of organizing data thematically, categorically via coding, indexing, mapping, and through detailed and descriptive accounts of the phenomenon under study.

However, the researcher chose to display findings derived from this study on a thematic analysis chart and seven tables rather than employing these other analytical methods because these methods were deemed to be most salient in assessing the impact of intentionality on leadership development. Detailed accounts of data provided by both the primary and the three key informants were described and depicted as descriptively as possible in order to portray the dynamics of the intentional leadership workshops and their effect on leadership development. Following the table below that depicts characteristics of Positive Organizational Scholarship is a discussion of the study's limitations, delimitations, and assumptions along with a summary and conclusion.

Table 1.1: Characteristics of Positive Organizational Scholarship

Quality	Feature
Trustworthiness	Social relationships and interactions are characterized by compassion, loyalty, honesty, respect and forgiveness.
Excellence, thriving, flourishing, resilience, and virtuousness.	Seeks to understand and encourage positive states as well as the dynamics and outcomes associated with these states, gratitude, e.g.
Organizational Virtuousness	Organizational practices enable individuals to craft meaningful work through fostering individual "callings"…and understanding how building on strengths produces more positive outcomes.
Courage	Emotional strengths that involve the exercise of will to accomplish goals in the face of opposition, external or internal.
Equity	Fair dealing within the organization.
Positive Organizing	Endeavors to reinterpret failures, disappointments and organizational tragedies.
Resilience	The maintenance of positive adjustment under challenging conditions…which allows flexible functioning in the face of challenges
Intrinsic Motivation.	Involves feelings of enjoyment, interest & challenge…arises when people face challenges that match or somewhat exceed their abilities, and when certain conditions such as autonomy hold.

Delimitations

The findings derived from this study focused on a single case and were therefore
not meant to be transferable though they are applicable in other situations. The researcher
purposely chose this design partly because the study's goal was to understand what
dynamics of the intentional leadership workshops contributed to leadership development
based on data gathered from one primary informant and three key informants. The
researcher also chose to restrict the use of deductive analysis by highlighting the elements
that categorize data thematically and describe it vividly to determine its relationship to
the two research questions, as opposed to employing the mapping and coding elements of
deductive analysis, for example. It was believed that this approach would provide greater
insight into understanding the effect of intentionality on leadership development.

Limitations

Moreover, the researcher's original intentions were to conduct interviews with the
three key informants after an initial interview with the primary informant to better situate
the framework for understanding intentionality and its effect on the three key informant's
leadership development. However, because of a variety of scheduling conflicts the
reverse occurred.

Thus, two of the three one-time 90-minute interviews with two of the three key
informants had already been completed before the initial interview occurred with the
primary informant. It was during this initial interview that the eight elements of
intentional leadership were described by the primary informant. Thus, only one of the
three key informants had a chance to assess their validity or to associate their claims with
the improvements they noticed in their leadership lives.

Generally speaking, the data derived from inference in reference to the eight elements confirmed the claims of the primary informant and that of the one key informant who responded to the relevance of these elements directly. Thus inferences were drawn from the responses of the other two key informants responses based on the eight elements outlined by the primary informant. Moreover, the second interview with the primary informant was conducted over the telephone rather than in person as originally intended.

The consequences of this change in format can only be conjectured based on a comparison of the two in-person interviews. No noticeable or appreciable difference in the way the primary informant conducted the one phone interview in comparison with the two in-person sessions were observed by the researcher. Thus, the researcher believed that the results derived from this study were sound and sufficient in helping other researchers understand the effect of intentionality on leadership development. The section below outlines the researcher's assumptions and is followed by a conclusion.

Assumptions

The researcher believed that the primary informant as well as the three key informants would be exemplary sources of data to help understand the effect of intentionality on leadership development. The primary informant, for example, had spent the last fifteen years teaching and learning intentional leadership, as the founder of the Center for Intentional Leadership. In additional to the leadership development component, his firm also assists organizations to move from what could be called conventional organizations, which highlights deficits (consciously or unconsciously), to cultures that highlight an organization's positive components instead (Cameron et al., 2003; Bolman & Deal, 2008). Such a shift to a strengths-based approach to

organizational life and leadership development aligned with the ideals of intentional leadership. The researcher believed that studying a strengths-based approach to these phenomena provided the necessary conditions to answer the two research questions stated above.

The researcher also believed that because all three key informants stated that they worked in a strengths-based culture was also critical to the success of this study's goals. Moreover, at least one senior leader from their respective organizations had completed the culture-changing component of the primary informant's workshops. Thus, the researcher believed that these leaders were more likely to support behaviors that reflected a strengths-based approach to leadership development. The three key informants themselves had also completed at least one of the Quests for Personal Leadership (QPL) workshops, which focused on teaching the value of intentionality as a means of leadership development. These assumptions were the primary considerations that guided the research process and product. The conclusion below summarizes the goals, design and aims of this current study.

Conclusion

The primary goal of this study were driven by two research questions, which sought to understand what happened or did not happen in intentional leadership workshops to cause a change in informant's anticipated behavior. The second question sought to understand how these changes in behavior affected or did not affect the three key informant's organizations. These questions were important because of the increased demand for capable and competent leadership to lead today's diverse organizations.

More importantly, scholars and practitioners both need to understand what conditions contributed to or detracted from leadership development. Thus this study asserted that a strengths-based approach to leadership was more likely to enhance leadership development than a deficits-based approach which prevailed for much of the 20th century (Cameron et al., 2003). It was also believed that intentional leaders who employed Schutz's (1962) notion of Multiple Realities were also more likely to enhance their leadership development.

Central to the success of the goals of this study was a research design that would enable its two primary questions to be answered. Thus the researcher chose to conduct a single-subject case study with one primary informant and three key informants to gather data in conjunction with analyzing archival data written by the primary informant. The researcher further chose to use elements of deductive analysis to analyze the data, depicting it on tables and a chart in some cases. In other cases, data were described as richly and objectively as possibly narratively.

Guided by the research questions, this study strove to identify the elements and corresponding dynamics of intentional leadership to answer the research questions within the context of existing literature on leadership development, intentional leadership especially. This study also sought to enrich contemporary understanding of the effect of intentionality on leadership development. Fidelity to the protocols of case study research increased the likelihood that scholars and practitioners both would gain additional insight into the phenomenon of leadership in general and in understanding the effect of intentionality on leadership development in particular. The next section provides a comprehensive review of the literature. This review is intended to provide a

comprehensive scan of contemporary literature on leadership development and

intentional leadership.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Arrangement of Literature Review

This literature review begins with a discussion of leadership in general and then provides a rationale for the chapter outline before discussing the review's main purpose. After which, it provides a historical overview of previous approaches to leadership studies, including what leadership scholars currently know as well as what they need to know while discussing the role of studies in advancing knowledge, theory and practice. The importance of mastering intentional communication and intentional goal setting are also discussed. A table appears at the end of this review that details its main components, including a section that addresses gaps in the literature, which provided the necessary support for this current study.

The review ends with a table that highlights major contemporary leadership models, including their characteristics. Another table displays the qualities of effective leaders based on an interdisciplinary study conducted by leadership scholars (Goethals & Sorenson, 2006). The goal of this chapter is to give readers a sense of the significance of this present study in a context that encompasses previous efforts to understand the process of leadership development while attempting to understand the effect of intentionality on leadership development.

Specifically, this study seeks to understand what happens or does not happen in the intentional leadership workshops that causes or does not cause anticipated changes in

the behavior of informants, and how these behaviors influence or do not influence their organizations. The section below briefly addresses the impact of leadership as a prelude to an extended discussion of intentional leadership later in this present section.

<center>The Impact of Leadership</center>

The impact of leadership is pervasive and affects virtually every area of life regardless of one's orientation or outlook. Moreover, effective leadership is one of the greatest of contemporary needs in a continuously changing and challenging society, as witnessed by the number of studies and the diverse approaches of these studies (Bass, 1981; Bass, 2008; Bennis, 2007; Burns, 1978; Covey, 1991; Covey, 1994; Day, 2001; Goethals & Sorenson, 2006; Hackman & Johnson, 2006; McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004; Mellon, 20111; Northouse, 2010; Williams, 2008), each of which indicate ongoing attempts to understand what factors foster leadership development. Below is an outline of the purpose of this review.

<center>Purpose of Literature Review</center>

The purpose of this review is to survey the literature on various leadership models that have evolved historically, as scholars, practitioners and laypersons sought to understand, describe and articulate the elements that comprise the dynamic and often dense phenomena of leadership development in order to identify its essential characteristics. After which, the review embarks upon an extensive treatment of the effect of intentionality on leadership development by analyzing its eight elements. Below is a rationale for how the sections are outlined.

Outline of Sections and Rationale

The review is arranged to provide readers with a rationale for connecting the evolution of leadership development as it has advanced historically with contemporary attempts to further understanding of the leadership development process. Included in this review are those references most relevant to this current study in. Omitted are those references unrelated to understanding the effect of intentionality on leadership development based on their peculiar aims.

This current review relates to the researcher's study because it provides a framework for examining the effect of intentionality on leadership development by addressing related topics (e.g. leadership effectiveness, previous approaches and paradigms to leadership development, leadership studies, intentional communication, etc.) in a context that is informed yet not impeded by these previous approaches. The review also addresses the influence of organizational climate and dynamics on leadership development to further frame how the features of intentionality does (or does not) effect leadership development. Each section synthesizes the preceding one in order to provide the review with continuity. Thus the section below provides a historical context for studying leadership development based on previous approaches.

Overview of Historical Approaches to Leadership Studies

The scientific approach to understanding leadership began about the time of the industrial revolution and "added rigor to attempts at precise measurement to other already-existing views about leadership development" (Nahavandi, 2000, p. 41). However, other studies adopted a qualitative approach (Addison, 2009; Cooper, Scandura & Schriesheim, 2005; Brown & Trevino, 2009; Ezzy, 2002; Ottenritter, 2006; Parry-

Proctor, 2002). Contemporarily, this difference in methodology is manifested in the complexity of approaches adopted by today's researchers (Bass, 2008; McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004; Nahavandi, 2000; Northouse, 2010).

For example, some studies focused on the actions of leader, others focused on their attitudes or the obstacles leaders faced. Other researchers combined these approaches yet without adequately delineating their relevance, importance or priority (Avolio & Luthans 2006). Thus this study strove to refine contemporary understanding and current reflections on the effect of intentionality on leadership development to determine its elements more clearly and comprehensively by observing workshops as they were facilitated, and then interviewing three key informants to obtain their interpretation on why they felt as though these workshops did or did not have an effect on their leadership development. In inquiring so, the researcher believed that future research on intentional leadership would have a more solid basis for pursuing additional studies, thereby filling gaps in the literature accordingly, clarifying the concept appropriately.

This theoretical narrowing provides a nexus to negotiate deeper and more beneficial discussions on the subject of intentionality's effect on leadership development. Characteristically, the approaches to studying intentional leadership are almost as diverse as are the titles yielded from a comprehensive search of the literature related to intentional leadership and intentionality. As mentioned earlier, some of these methods were empirical, popular, autobiographical, philosophical and metaphysical (Calloway et al., 2010; Campbell, 2009; Dyer, 2004; Langseth, Plater, & Dillon, 2004; Shaw, 2005).

Some researchers employed anecdotes, examples, exhortation and stories to illustrate the effect of intentionality on leadership development (Calloway et al., 2010;

Jue, Amato, Bodam, Boyle, & Coleman, 2007; Lum, 1992; Shaw, 2005). The range of

disciplines deployed were equally diverse, covering such fields as education, business,

psychology, healthcare, religion, spirituality, politics, anthropology, sociology, military,

etc. (Addison, 2009; Forman, Jones, & Miller, 2007; Hannum, Martineau, & Reinelt,

2006; Hoover & Valenti, 2005; McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004; Novakowski, 2008;

Richards, 2000; Ronch, 2003; Trafton & Marentette, 2010; Weiner & Ronch, 2003;

Zovak, 2005).

Most studies sought to provide practical advice and guidance via a variety of

analytical strategies and research methodologies, some more rigorous than others, but all

were beneficial in contributing to this current study. As would perhaps be expected,

leadership handbooks (Bass, 1981, Bass, 2008, McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004;

Northouse, 2010) provided the richest and most rigorous examples of leadership

development, including case studies and a number of other research designs and

theoretical frameworks that informed the direction of this study's attempts to understand

the effect of intentionality on leadership development. Contributions were also made by

sources and studies that didn't address intentionality specifically (Campolongo, 2009).

Traditionally most leadership scholars (and studies) reside in and emerge from

schools of business or have typically confined themselves to their individual disciplines

(psychology, education, sociology, etc.) and interests, which often omits the role of

followers in understanding the leadership development process and the impact of

organizational climate and dynamics which contributes to or detracts from leadership

development (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Cameron et al., 2003; Goethals & Sorenson, 2006;

Riggio et al., 2008; Rost, 1991; Shamir et al., 2007).

The effects of this intellectual confinement cripples scholar's collective efforts to offer an account of leadership that grounds it theoretically and practically in fields beyond their immediate focus or professional proclivities (Goethals & Sorenson, 2006; Rost, 1991). Such a one-dimensional approach prevents the collaboration necessary to understand the complexities of leadership, forfeiting in route opportunities to share findings and shape theories that are more inclusive and comprehensive (e.g. the role of followership in the leadership process and the influence of organizational culture/climate, etc.) (Riggio et al., 2008; Shamir et al., 2007).

This crisis of collaboration limited possibilities and produced complaints from leadership scholars during the early days of leadership studies (Bass, 1981; Burns, 1978; Goethals & Sorenson, 2007; Nahavandi, 2000; Rost, 1991). For example Burns (1978), Shamir et al. (2007), Riggio et al. (2008) see the theoretical and practical disconnect of leadership (and followership), as being responsible for "breeding elitism" (Burns, 1978, p. 3), thus clouding conceptions of leadership development in general and what is effective leadership in particular, as well as understanding in what contexts descriptions apply and what prescriptions are promoted (Bennis, 2003; Cashman, 2008; Covey, 1989; Covey, 2005; Koestenbaum, 1991; Nahavandi, 2000; Olivares, 2007).

Like Shamir et al. (2007), Brown and Trevino (2009) also addressed dimensions of the leader-follower dynamic in their efforts to analyze the relationship between the congruence of leaders' values, focusing primarily on charismatic leadership, which some scholars use interchangeably with transformational leadership (Northouse, 2010). Leaders, according to Brown & Trevino (2009, must understand their own values and

how they "influence their leadership styles and behaviors" in conjunction with the values and behaviors of others (Desjardins, 2008; Nahavandi, 2000, p. 51; Verbos et al., 2007).

These claims and findings reinforce the need for leaders to lead intentionally in their moment-to-moment interactions with followers (Calloway et al., 2010; Campbell, 2009; George, 2003; Northouse, 2010; Sprietzer, 2006), because of the degree of engagement necessary for them to effectively motivate employees to achieve organizational objectives even as they challenge organizational constraints, which POS deems as positive deviance (Cameron et al., 2003).

Hence, the importance of extending contemporary definitions and understanding of leadership and its essential elements, including the influence of organizational climate and dynamics and the role of studies in advancing contemporary understanding of their symbiotic relationship. The section below completes the discussion of other approaches to discussing leadership development before discussing intentionality in practice followed by a section that addresses what leadership scholars currently know and what they need to know regarding leadership development.

Additional Approaches, Developmental Models and Intentional Leadership

Other models of leadership development include trait theory (Allport), contingency theory (Fielder), servant leadership (Greenleaf), situational leadership (Hershey & Blanchard), transformational/charismatic leadership (Burns), authentic leadership (George), transactional leadership (Bass), leader-member exchange theory and a variety and host of others (Avolio, Walumbwa & Weber, 2009; Bush, 2008; Calloway, Feltz, & Young, 2010; Cameron, Dutton & Quinn, 2003; George, 2003; Ilies, Morgeson & Nahrgang, 2005; Liedtka, 2007; Luthans & Avolio, 2009; May, Hodges, Chan & Avolio,

2003; McBride, 2001; Nahavandi, 2000; Northouse, 2010; Rost, 1991; Schriesheim & Danserreau, 2008; Shaw, 2005; Spreitzer, 2006; Toor & Ofori, 2007; Verbos et al., 2007; Yammarino, Dionne, Schriesheim, & Dansereau, 2008).

Some of these models emphasize the personality and character of the leader (e.g. transformational/charismatic/trait theory). Others highlight leaders behavior, the environments in which they work, the shifting dynamics (contingency theory/situational leadership) and the ability of leaders to positively impact organizational outcome using an assortment of approaches and strategies structured to achieve both leadership and organizational objectives (Cameron et al., 2003; Cawthon, 2002; Northouse, 2010; Pounder, 2008; Rosenbach & Taylor, 2001).

Despite substantial and sustained efforts much remains to be done to develop empirically grounded leadership models that serve the unique and often changing needs of twenty-first century organizations, while employing the peculiar talents, tendencies and strengths of leaders in an environment that nurtures rather than annuls these, even as leaders assume greater responsibility for developing their followers leadership potential (Avolio, Walumbwa & Weber, 2009; Begley, 2005; Buckingham & Clifton, 2001; Cameron et al., 2003; Cashman, 2008; Covey, 2004; Goethals & Sorenson, 2006; Ilies, Morgeson, & Narhgang, 2005; Luthans & Avolio, 2009; Luthans & Avolio, 2006; Owen, 2007; Riggio et al., 2008; Rosenbach & Taylor, 2001; Shamir et al., 2007).

In this regard, intentionality is another potentially valid construct to help researchers understand the dynamics that influence leadership development, whatever models and modifications particular approaches (and persons) prefer (ethical, transformational, transactional, etc.). One of the primary differences between the above

models and the orientation of intentional leadership, especially as conceived by the primary informant, is its admittedly existential element (Olivares, Peterson & Hess, 2007). More will be said about this existential approach later in chapters four and five. The section below discusses what researchers already know and what they need to know regarding leadership development.

<p align="center">Leadership: What Researchers Know, and Need to Know</p>

Despite an explosion in leadership studies there has yet to emerge a general conception of leadership that satisfies and incorporates its most salient and sustainable features (Avolio, Walumbwa & Weber, 2009; Bass, 2008; Northouse, 2010; Van Velsor, 2004; Williams, 2008). In fact Rost (1991) quoted Burns as having said that for all of the efforts of leadership studies, "leadership is still one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (p. 5).

Leadership scholars concluded that leaders who came across as more intentional were also more in tune with the needs of their followers and their organizations (Caza & Caza, 2008; George, 2003; Karakas, 2011). In being conscious of employee needs intentional leaders were also more apt to adopt, for example, communicational stances that connected with employees meaningfully, more so at least than if they were emotionally detached and disengaged, which effected their development and effectiveness with followers.

Consider, in contrast, authoritarian leadership (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2008; Northouse, 2010; Wendorf-Heldt, 2009) with its emphasis on leader directives rather than on follower desires and needs and whether this climate encourages intentional relationships between leaders and their followers, as well as its implications on leadership

development (Cameron, Quinn & Dutton, 2003). In being intentionally in tune with

follower needs intentional leaders were deliberately proactive in establishing authentic

relationships, fluid processes and protocols that anticipated problems before they

occurred; they were also more apt to be responsive and innovative when problems did

occur (Calloway et al., Cameron et al., 2003; Caza & Caza, 2007; Covey, 2004; Shaw,

2005). Characteristically, they saw what others leaders didn't and thus devised solutions

that they couldn't, which suggests the value of Multiple Realities which enables leaders

to implement creative alternatives to current practices. The section below discusses

efforts to implement intentionality in practice.

<div align="center">Intentionality in Practice: Developing Instructional Leaders</div>

According to Michael Putnam (2010), the impact of No Child Left Behind

legislation (NCLB) created an opportunity to appropriate intentionality as a model for

helping leaders and teachers meet its stringent performance demands. In fact the

Intentional Teaching Model (INTENT) was created specifically to provide a template that

educational leaders could use to aid them in their professional development programs,

particularly those aimed at changing the instructional practices and perspectives of

teachers (Putnam 2010). Characteristically, INTENT was based on the concept of

intentionality, which is characterized by the display of contextually specific behaviors

designed to reach personally relevant short and long-term goals, echoing

characteristically elements of situational leadership.

In a school setting that subscribed to INTENT intentionality assumed the guise of

demonstrating deliberate changes in teaching practices to reach short term objectives via

action-oriented teacher learning, (e.g. improving student's fluency rates and subsequent

long-term objectives, and improving reading achievement scores) (Putnam 2010). For

Putnam (2010) intentional leaders are "change agents" (p. 22), equipped with "multi-

tasking capacities and excellent communication skills, capable of adopting the role of

coach, cheerleader, or mentor" (p. 22). Yet weak leadership on the part of the *change*

agent along with failure to challenge teachers to grow beyond their current comfort zones

undermined the creation of intentionality in teachers, and diminished their image and

ability to be seen as instructional leaders within their organizations and by their peers

(Putnam 2010).

Key elements to the successful implementation of intentional leadership in the

INTENT model were: 1) individual theory articulation, which required that beliefs be

examined, questioned and reframed to embrace the potential of the new paradigm by

constructive questioning of previous practices, 2) Preparation, required that the

instructional environment limit anxieties because of the necessary learning curve that

occurs when persons are exposed to perspectives and practices that contradict their

previous experiences and behaviors; hence the importance of leaders in offering moral

support and practical guidance to enhance and accelerate teacher competence and

acceptance in the pursuit of a shared vision, 3) whereby teachers become active change

agents (Putnam, 2010, p. 22).

Active change denoted an action phase whereby teachers deliberately

implemented the elements of INTENT as they endeavored to develop their leadership

skills in their efforts to become instructional leaders. (This process also involved three

sub-elements: action, evaluation, and reformulation of goals). The fourth element of the

INTENT model is sustainability, which was characterized by a consistent demonstration of behaviors aligned with pre-established goals.

In being so, motivation is sustained and "practices are perfected by improved student performance and staff morale" (Putnam, 2010, p. 24-25). In this regard, intentional leaders seek opportunities to demonstrate their "capacity, concern and commitment to service, growth and well-being of the community as well as to themselves" (Callahan, 2009, p. 1; Cameron et al., 2003; Campbell, 2009; Caza & Caza, 2007; Karakas, 2011).

Effective leadership and leadership development required that leaders approach every interaction with attention, (asking, "what are the needs of the person with whom I am speaking," intention, ("what can I do to connect and to understand, decision," ("will I choose to take the initiative to establish or deepen this relationship"), and action ("will I take the necessary steps to make this connection") (Callahan, 2009, p. 1). The challenge, however, is in measuring these actions, such as could be done with an instrument like the Transformational Leadership Questionnaire (Bass, 2008), which is based on follower feedback. Thus far, though, the researcher knows of no such instrument especially designed to measure the effect of intentionality on leadership development.

Undoubtedly the most effective leaders model the self-questioning qualities outlined above, some more so than others. Generally, however, such self-critical reflectivity is present in various leaders to varying degrees, and enables these leaders to develop in ways that leaders who are less intentional about being reflective don't. Olivares (2007) outlines the benefit of reflectivity thusly, saying, "Reflectivity allows one to make meaning of actions and to guide future actions" (p. 538).

When practiced persistently, reflectivity enables the realization of Olivares' (2007) assertion, which says, "Intentionality and forethought create purposeful and foresightful behavior; self-reactiveness, however, guides and regulates actions; thus, self-reactiveness links intentions and thoughts to actions" (Olivares 2007, p. 532-533). Such foresight is crucial to sustaining leadership development, follower efficacy and organizational success regardless of one's leadership style. The section below discusses the proliferation of leadership studies.

<div align="center">Leadership and the Proliferation of Studies</div>

Despite an explosion in leadership studies, (over 36 million hits in response to the phrase *leadership development*) (Bass, 1981; Bass, 2008; Bennis, 2003; Bowers, 2010; Calloway, Feltz & Young, 2010; Cashman, 2008; Covey, 2001; Covey, 2004; Day, 2001; McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004; Mitra, Hsieh & Buswick, 2010; Northouse, 2010; Putnam, 2010), there has yet to emerge a general conception of leadership that satisfies and incorporates its most salient and sustainable features (Day, 2001; Goethals & Sorenson, 2006; Northouse, 2010; Williams, 2008).

In fact Burns (Rost, 1991) states that for all of the efforts of leadership studies, "leadership is still one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (p. 5). This current study endeavored to enhance contemporary understanding of leadership development by building on previous work done in the field, and by employing a research paradigm that enabled the researcher to better understand the effect of intentionality on leadership development. Characteristically, studies stir the advancement of knowledge and clarify understanding of social phenomena in general and

of leadership in particular when done properly. The section below addresses the keys and requirements of leadership development.

<div align="center">Keys and Requirements of Leadership Development</div>

The High Impact Leader (Luthans & Avolio, 2006), for example, provided a comprehensive summary of meta-analyses of leadership studies designed to understand, and identify the practices that enabled leaders to accelerate their development and achieve exemplary results simultaneously without having to wait on rare and proverbial defining moments, which are often referenced retrospectively as turning points in a leader's development (George, 2003).

Luthans' and Avolios' (2006) efforts highlight the importance of and need for additional studies to advance contemporary understanding --theoretically and practically-- of the leadership development process; likewise with the work of Bass (2008), Burns (1978), Bennis (2003) and other leadership scholars. The value of these studies and their relationship to this study is that it provides a historical framework in which to embed an understanding of the effect of intentionality on leadership development, building on (and borrowing) relevant ideas to uncover components that might otherwise be ignored.

Much work remains to be done if scholars and practitioners are to understand the essential elements of leadership development, whether these efforts involve developing a general theory, such as envisioned by Burns (Goethals & Sorenson, 2006), one that includes the various domains, dimensions, disciplines and approaches that practitioners and theorists alike can align themselves with or if scholars merely content themselves with understanding contemporary leadership models for their merit. Such a quest was the goal of Goethals and Sorenson's (2006) interdisciplinary efforts, which yielded no

general theory but rather a set of qualities which can be used as a framework for leadership development, and which is outlined later in a table in this review.

In contrast to seeking a general theory of leadership, Addison (2009) examined the experiences of eight principals at two Australian schools and the attendant context, employing theoretically a Bourdiuean framework that saw leadership as embedded in social spaces with conflicting and contesting interests, thus determining how leadership was defined and perceived for its development and effectiveness. According to Addison (2009), "Leadership and organizational theory should not be viewed in isolation" (p. 328). POS scholars and other organizational theorists make similar claims (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Cameron et al., 2003). Olivares (2007) added that leadership development was an evolutionary process that occurred in a socio-historical context. This claim conveys the difficulty of developing a general theory of leadership, as Burns envisioned it because of the global nature of contemporary leadership and the innumerable and often imperceptible factors that influence its development.

Central to the recognition of context in effecting leadership development and leadership effectiveness is an understanding of the influence of an organization's culture and climate, which the emergence of Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS) addresses. Positive Organizational Scholarship emphasizes a strengths-based approach to organizational life, expounding such concepts, for example, as "organizational tragedy and positive deviance", as devices to enhance leadership development and effectiveness (Cameron et al., 2003, p. 4) in contrast to conventional approaches based upon and built around organizational deficits and individual dysfunctions and pathologies.

POS's approach is believed to be more effective in enhancing leadership development, effectiveness and increasing follower commitment to achieving organizational objectives by making the climate more conducive for growth, experimentation, expansion and learning (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Cameron et al., 2003; Rath & Conchie, 2009; Senge, 1994; 2006). POS will be discussed in more detail in the Methods portion of this project along with Schutz's (1962) Multiple Realities and Deductive Analysis (Pope et al., 2000).

The promise of Positive Organizational Scholarship and its strengths-based approach, employment of Multiple Realities and Deductive Analysis are rich and suggestive in how intentionality can be better understood as an emergent leadership model, one that positively effects leadership development adding to the extensive studies already conducted on leadership development, as this study intends to contribute. The section below discusses the role of studies in advancing knowledge, theory and practice before reviewing the role of organizational climates and dynamics in influencing leadership development. After which, begins a discussion of the promise and possibilities of intentional leadership and its prospects for effecting leadership development.

The Role of Studies in Advancing Knowledge, Theory and Practice

Despite Burn's lament of the lack of a general theory of leadership amid a proliferation of leadership studies (Goethals & Sorenson, 2006), studies are still the predominant means of exploring social phenomena in order to understand its elements and the corresponding dynamics. Thus researchers of all veins are vigorously engaged in ubiquitous efforts to unpack leadership particulars to enhance contemporary practice, understanding and to refine existing theories in order to understand the effects of

intentionality on leadership development (Avolio & Luthans, 2006; Avolio & Luthans, 2007; Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009; Bass, 1981; Bass, 2008; Brown & Trevino, 2009; Burns, 1978; Buttner, Lowe & Billings-Harris, 2007; Campbell et al., 2010; Campolongo, 2009; Glynn & Dowd, 2008; Hackman & Johnson, 2009; Koestenbaum, 1991; May, Hodges, Chan, & Avolio, 2003; Mazutis & Slawinski, 2008; McCauley & Van Velsor , 2004; Miller, 2007; Nahavandi, 2000; Nemanich & Vera, 2008; Northouse, 2010; Rost, 1991; Shaw, 2005; Yammarino, Dionne, Schriesheim & Dansereau, 2008).

Without rigorously executed studies, whether qualitative or quantitative, constructivist or positivist, scholars and practitioners are left with uncritical assumptions upon which to construct their understanding of leadership development rather than basing their understanding on rigorous and critical analysis, which can be scrutinized to determine the efficacy of a particular leadership model (Alasuutari, 2008; Bennis, 2003; Cashman, 2008; Ezzy, 2002; Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Woodside, 2010; Yin, 2003). Thus this current study continues the epistemological tradition of striving to determine the nature (and nuances) of leadership development by analyzing the effect of intentionality on leadership development.

McCauley and Van Velsor (2004) summarize the importance of studies in the advancement of knowledge thusly, saying, "As in any discipline, the field of leadership development advances its understanding and practice by examining and reexamining fundamental questions" (p. 1). The goal of this current study was to extend this tradition by examining the effect of intentionality on leadership development, thereby enhancing contemporary understandings of its usefulness as a valid means of leadership development.

Advancement of understanding in leadership development through studies is also important because it helps scholars to better define leadership contemporarily, and to determine when a leader is being effective, as well as to determine how organizational conditions influence development and effectiveness. As outlined in the Introduction and reiterated in the Methods section later of this study, the researcher is confident that Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS) provides the optimal atmosphere for leadership effectiveness when combined with the ideas of Multiple Realities and Deductive Analysis. The section below provides an introduction to the impact of organizational climates on leadership development followed by a discussion that highlights the role of organizational dynamics and their relationship to leadership development.

The Impact of Organizational Climates on Leadership Development

Organizational context is crucial in influencing leadership effectiveness (Bakker & Schaufeliu, 2008; Bolman & Deal, 2008; Cameron, Dutton & Quinn, 2003; Verbos, Gerard, Forshey, Harding & Miller, 2007). Indifference to or ignorance of organizational contexts hinders leaders and members from developing their leadership abilities (Cameron et al., 2003). Indifference and ignorance also impacted basic follower effectiveness and loyalty to leaders and their initiatives (Avolio & Luthans, 2006; Cameron et al., 2003; Riggio et al., 2008).

Poor leadership development and ineffectiveness is especially characteristic of leaders and organizations that are intolerant of mistakes and distrusting of their followers (Cameron et al.. 2003; Nahavandi, 2000; Shamir et al., 2007), in contrast to the attitude of organizations and leaders that embrace Positive Organizational Scholarship's

strengths-based approach and the notion of Multiple Realities (Buckingham & Clifton, 2001; Cameron et al., 2003; Schutz, 1962). Such organizations and leaders encourage intentional risk-taking, using the results to multiply organizational resources and effectiveness beyond conventional uses (Calloway et al., 2010; Riggio et al., 2008).

Organizations that let leaders "make mistakes, learn and develop new skills are training leaders" (Nahavandi, 2000, p. 12), the kind that are required to successfully lead in a contemporary climate of constant change, uncertainty, increased competition and dwindling resources (Bennis, 2007). Recognizing the influence of organizational dynamics on leadership development substantiates the postulates of Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS), its notion of "positive organizing and organizational tragedy" for example, (Cameron et al., 2003, p. 66; Yammarino, Dionne, Schriesheim, & Dansereau, 2008), which enables organizations to exploit the lesson learned rather than lament the loss incurred through an unfortunate event or costly outcome as a result of leader innovation or follower deviation from organizational norms.

The way organizations are structured determined their responses and approaches to leadership development (Bolman & Deal, 2008). POS was chosen in part because its ideals align with those of intentional leadership philosophically and practically. Thus the researcher believed that employing this theoretical lens along with Schutz's (1962) Multiple Realities provided the best opportunity to determine the effect of intentionality on leadership development.

In this regard, Amey (2005) offers a particularly perceptive definition of leadership, one that embodies intentionality, belief in a strengths-based approach and Multiple Realities, saying,

> We need to redefine the nature of leadership…we need to evolve from a power based model into an enabling model. We need to evolve from control and management into empowerment, and we need to move from…a linear, "we do this and that…bulwark kind of model into a mobile where you have an evolving set of constantly changing relationships where you understand and view it in its entirety. We need to move more effectively from power-based relationships into reciprocal relationships (p. 698).

Unfortunately, however, "poor management and a lack of leadership are blamed for the problems facing U.S. corporations" (Nahavandi, 2000, p. 38), when in fact these same corporations assume an attitude of intolerance for mistakes (Nahavandi, 2000). Their attitude reveals that the premises of POS and the notion of Multiple Realities (Schutz, 1962) have yet to impact their perspectives and practices in promoting leadership development. Even so, both a leader's and an organization's ability to bolster their development stalls when the climate stifles behaviors that often separates these organizations from their more successful counterparts. The section below further discusses the impact of organizational dynamics on leadership development and definitions of leadership.

The Influence of Organizational Dynamics on Leadership Development

Characteristically, leadership is epitomized by complex dynamics and conflicting demands that routinely emerge from dimensions beyond a leader's control, which requires leaders to possess Protean personalities that enable them to address these challenges in their efforts to inspire followers to achieve organizational objectives. Moreover, POS scholars assert that leadership development (and effectiveness) is partly determined by how much psychological capital leaders have acquired with their followers

or that exists among organizations and their members (Avolio & Luthans, 2006; Cameron et al., 2003).

If this capital lacks, followers are apt to engage in behaviors that undermine the success of leader initiatives, creating thereby organizational climates that derail leader and follower development simultaneously. (Riggio, Chaleff, & Lipman-Blumen, 2008; Shamir et al., 2007: Szabla, 2007). These dynamics also effect definitions of leadership. Distorted, these definitions often place leaders in the precarious position of adopting leadership stances that restrict their evolution and hamper their relationships with their followers, creating toxic rather than triumphant environments accordingly (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Cameron et. al., 2003).

Based on the stances leaders take or the styles they adopt in various organizational contexts derive definitions of leadership along with implications for leadership development. Thus it is important to reiterate how organizational dynamics influence –consciously or unconsciously—a leader's style, development, effectiveness and subsequent definitions of leadership. Koestenbaum (1991), characteristically, saw a leader as someone simply with "an obligation to develop the people for whom he or she is responsible" (p. 161).

This development prospers in a climate characterized by POS and its strengths-based approach regardless of the leader's individual style or leadership stance. Attention to the influence of organizational climates and their symbiotic relationship on leader development is fundamental to understanding how leaders develop and what conditions enhance this development. This current study asserted that intentional leaders would thrive in an atmosphere wherein the ideals of POS and Multiple Realities prevailed. Thus,

the section below examines the context for discussing leadership development, followed

by a section that outlines the prospects for intentionality to effect leadership

development.

Context for Discussing Leadership Development

Among the approaches towards leadership development taken by various thinkers

and theorists are trait theory, servant leadership, contingency theory, ethical leadership,

situational leadership, transformational/charismatic leadership, authentic leadership,

transactional leadership, leader-member exchange theory, principled-centered leadership,

and a variety of others (Avolio, Walumbwa & Weber, 2009; Bush, 2008; Cameron,

Dutton & Quinn, 2003; Covey, 1990; George, 2003; Greenleaf, 2002; Ilies, Morgeson &

Nahrgang, 2005; Liedtka, 2007; Luthans & Avolio, 2009; May, Hodges, Chan & Avolio,

2003; McBride, 2001; Northouse, 2010; Ofori & Toor, 2007; Schriesheim & Dansereau,

2008; Shaw, 2005; Spears & Lawrence, 2004; Spreitzer, 2006; Verbos et al., 2007;

Yammarino et al., 2005; Yeomans, 2009).

Some of these approaches promoted the personality and character of the leader,

e.g., transformational/charismatic (Bass, 2008; Cawthon, 2002; Liedtka, 2007;

Northouse, 2010; Williams, 2008). Others highlighted the leader-follower framework

(Lord & Brown, 2003; Riggio et al., 2008; Schermerhorn, 2011; Shamir et al., 2008). Yet

each approach had as its goal the establishment of a grid that would enhance

contemporary understanding of processes that promoted leadership development and to

understand the nature of leadership as a social phenomenon.

As mentioned earlier, previous approaches to studying leadership development

often occurred in isolation, as scholars, practitioners and laypersons worked

independently of one another in order to identify the qualities that contributed to leadership development and then published their finding accordingly (Rost, 1991). Contemporary methods, in contrast, to these previous approaches involving leadership studies (Rost, 1991; Goethals & Sorenson, 2006; Bass, 2008), attempts to understand leadership development through multiple disciplines, appropriating for example the best of anthropology, sociology, philosophy, science, business, education, politics, and psychology (organizational/social).

This same approach applies contemporarily in efforts to understand the effects of intentionality on leadership development, as theorists appropriate various orientations and disciplines, business, political, social, educational, religious, ethical, philosophical (Addison, 2009; Bass, 2008; Benton, 2003; Cawthon, 2002; Calloway, Feltz & Young, 2010; Campolongo, 2009; Ciulla, 1995Hall, 2008; Lawrence & Spears, 2004; McBride, 2001; McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004; Nahavandi, 2000; Olivares, 2007; Palmer, 2009; Rosenbach & Taylor, 2001; Shaw, 2005) in order to determine where intentional leadership fits and fosters efforts to understand the dynamic process of leadership development.

The section above extended the discussion of leadership approaches mentioned previously. Yet it had has its purpose the intention of establishing a context for discussing intentionality and its effect on leadership development. Thus its similarity to a previous section is not an oversight by the researcher. On the contrary, its reinforcement is meant as an enhancement to the eventual discussion of intentional leadership. The section below discusses intentionality and its prospects for promoting leadership development.

Intentionality and its Prospects for Promoting Leadership Development

In an age of transformation intentionality can help leaders orchestrate essential changes in their organizational cultures so that members actualize more of their collective potential even as they become more adept professionally while aiding the development of their leaders and themselves (Bush, 2008; Calloway et al., 2010; Campbell, 2009; Collins, 2001; Jennings, 2010; Millar, 2011; Riggio et al., 2008; Sanaghan, 2002; Shamir et al.,, 2007). Sanaghan's (2002) assertions regarding the positive effect of intentionality on leadership development are the result of studying a cross-section of American colleges and universities to examine its impact in moderating change processes.

Based on Sanaghan's (2002) study and a review of additional literature the researcher believed that intentionality could enhance leadership development while helping leaders become more effective in leveraging organizational cultures and other intangibles and to improve employee morale without necessarily increasing financial expenditures, accelerating exponentially organizational growth and their own leadership development (Bennis, 2003; Bolman & Deal, 2008; Calloway et al., 2010; Cameron et al., 2003; Covey, 2004; Karakas, 2011; Novakowski, 2008; Olivares, 2007; Shaw, 2005). Below is a discussion of intentionality and its effect on leadership development within a strengths-based organizational context.

Intentionality and a Strengths-Based Approach to Leadership Development

In contrast to Sanaghan's (2002) study of American colleges and universities Whipple (2008), in contrast, drew her conclusions on the effect of intentionality on leadership development from her experiences as a consultant and trainer, noting its residual and enduring effect on leader's behavior. Similarly, Jacobsen (2010) based her

claims on analyses of Marcus Buckingham et al. (2001), who interviewed several hundred employees of some of America's largest companies to determine what actions they took to improve leader and employee performance and morale, most of which were based on a strengths-based approach to leadership, consistent with the emphasis and orientation of intentional leadership (Cameron et al., 2003).

An abbreviated description (and predictive approach) of the use of the Strength's Quest and the Strength's Finder models (Buckingham et al., 2001; Rath & Conchie, 2009), Jacobsen's (2010) findings aligned with the fundamentals of intentional leadership, Positive Organizational Scholarship and Multiple Realities, as leaders who used the strengths-based approach tended to conceive alternate and even novel ways to tap employee potential in the pursuit of organizational goals and their own leadership development efforts (Buckingham & Clifton, 2001; Calloway et al., 2010; Cameron et al., 2003; Covey, 2004; Schutz, 1962; Thomason, 1982).

A strengths-based approach to leadership development required a leader to adopt an intentional paradigm in order to sustain a commitment to this orientation while being necessarily flexible, purposely functioning from an interdisciplinary organizational perspective. In this regard, Bandura's (2001; 2006) psychology of human agency provided a social cognitive theory that suggested four core properties of human agency: intentionality, forethought, self-reactiveness, and self-reflectiveness, each of which contributes to leadership development and leader effectiveness. Characteristically, these elements align with the elements of intentional leadership based existing literature which highlights the elements of intentional leadership (Calloway et al., 2010; Caza & Caza, 2010; Novakowski, 2008; Shaw, 2005).

By analyzing the existing literature and symbiotic approaches to studying leadership development this study situated its findings in theoretical and methodological contexts that enhance contemporary understanding of leadership development and the ability of leaders to maximize employee efforts to accomplish organizational objectives by employing a strengths-based approach to leadership, which allowed them to do what they do best rather than spending time developing weaknesses that yield marginal gains at best (Buckingham & Clifton, 2002; Calloway et al., 2010; Cameron et al., 2003; Covey, 2004; Day, 2001).

Scholars interested in understanding the effect of intentionality on leadership development must continue to write, study, experiment, critique and create until an even greater understanding is demonstrated, duplicated and deployed in the service of organizational objectives. While much is being written there are gaps in the literature, which is the subject of the next section. Its goal is to fuse findings discussed throughout this current review and connect it with gaps that were identified and which this study strove to contribute to filling. Following a table on the next page, which summarizes the main components covered above, the succeeding section highlights the importance of mastering intentional communication and intentional goal setting as crucial components of intentional leadership and its effect on leadership development before discussing gaps in the literature.

Table 1.2: Summary of Components in Previous Section

Literature Review
Outline of intentions
Highlight the importance of leadership
Purpose Statement
Introduce concept of intentional leadership
Outline contents of subsequent sections of review
Relationship of review to proposed study; summary of each section

Main Purpose of Review
Clear statement of review's primary purpose
Highlight interdisciplinary nature of contemporary leadership studies
Characterize intentional leadership and its possible role in leadership development
Mention the role that POS can play in leadership development
Cite various disciplines that are combining to enhance modern understanding of leadership development
Cite cases where the role of intentionality has contributed positively to leadership development

Overview of Leadership Studies
Highlight the emergence of the scientific approach to understanding leadership development
Note how isolated studies of leadership development dulled our understanding of the process
Discuss leader/follower dynamic
Note importance of congruence of leader's values and its impact of development and effectiveness
Highlight the absence of an integrated understanding of leadership development

Leadership/Leadership Effectiveness
Offers definitions of leadership and leadership effectiveness
Discusses variables that effect leadership effectiveness
Highlights the various sources of a leader's power
Discusses the role of organizational climate in influencing leader effectiveness
Suggests how embracing POS can enhance leader effectiveness and change organizational climate, increasing thereby their psychological capital with their followers

Leadership Approaches and Perspectives
Cites various leadership styles: charismatic, trans-formational, authentic, etc.
Raises questions about industrial versus post-industrial leadership approaches
Discusses three areas of leadership which hinders its development
Peripheral leadership issues: 1) personality, 2) content, 3)behavioral
Introduces one scholar's appeal for 21st century leadership
Summary of the rationale behind various leadership approaches

The Importance of Intentional Goal-Setting and Communication in Moment-to-Moment
Interactions

Campbell's (2009) characterization of the effect of intentionality on leadership
development was revealing and instructive, and examined three components of
intentional leadership: 1) strategic goals/intentions, 2) daily scheduling goals/intentions,
3) moment-to-moment goals/intentions. Citing Stanislavski, the author of modern acting
techniques, Campbell (2009) defined intentionality as a "continual awareness specifically
of what one is doing in order to get what he or she wants" (p. 7).

Central to the success of goal attainment is "the necessity of self-regulation"
(Campbell, 2009, p. 7.) Campbell's (2009) approach combined intentionality with a
leader's awareness and use of self-regulation in what she termed their "moment-to-
moment leadership circumstances" (p. 8), with an emphasis on communication. By
intentionally adopting the appropriate communication stance leaders not only enhanced
their own development but their followers also. Their efforts expanded their
developmental capacity and their ability to fulfill organizational visions simultaneously.

Campbell's (2009) concern with the communicational component of intentional
leadership hooked with Hackman and Johnson's (2009) study of this facet as fundamental
to leadership development. They supported their assertion, saying, "The business of
making another person feel good in the unspectacular course of his {her} daily comings
and goings is, in my view, the very essence of leadership" (p. 61). Committed leaders
who intentionally communicated a strong belief in what they were leading others toward
took progressive steps toward success, especially when their efforts emerged from POS's
strengths-based approach and Multiple Realities, which enabled leaders and followers to

expand their perceptions and possibilities (Cameron, et al., 2003; Karakas, 2011; Sanaghan & Napier, 2002; Schutz, 1962).

Scholars may disagree with the scope of this claim and the possibilities posited by intentional leadership theorists and practitioners regarding intentionality's effect on leadership development, however, they cannot deny that communication is essential and can become more effective when accompanied by higher degrees of consciousness, competence and intentionality on the part of communicators. In this regard, contemporary leadership development requires mental habits of intentionally altering existing communication frameworks to facilitate leadership success in moment-to-moment interactions (Campbell, 2009).

Using grounded theory in her semi-structured interviews with senior level administrators, Campbell (2009) explored whether intentionality could be taught or learned, and examined what triggers leaders used to maintain intentionality as a leadership paradigm. For Campbell (2009), a leader's ability to maintain intentionality turned on the ability to convey authenticity in moment-to-moment interactions with others, even as leaders aligned these efforts with daily goals that contributed directly to fulfilling the organizational vision, which is discussed later in this study.

Critical of what they perceive as a lack of intentionality on the part of most leaders, regarding vision especially, Calloway et al. (2010) offered the following, "The power of an intentionally developed and communicated vision…is one of the most under-utilized assets in business today (p. 13). Plainly stated, "intentional leadership aligns people with strategy" (Calloway et al., 2010, p. 15). In addition to Calloway et al. (2010) claimed that there is increasing recognition that preparing and developing leaders cannot

be left to chance (Bennis, 2007; Bowers, 2010). Thus the attempt to develop leaders must become more deliberate than ever, further reason why it is important to understand the effect on intentionality on leadership development as a viable and vital alternative, which is the aim of this current study.

In characterizing intentional leaders, Novakowski (2008) provides a definition, to provide a framework for what follows. This definition aligns with the definition also operationalized by the researcher in the Introduction and helped to develop contemporary efforts to develop the kind of leaders needed for the new millennium, who Avolio, Walumbwa and Weber (2009) called "New-Genre Leaders" (p. 428).

In describing intentional leadership Novakowski (2008) said, "It is the personal, intentional, planful, deliberate, goal-oriented, or striving component of motivation, the proactive (as opposed to reactive or habitual) aspect of behavior" (p. 10). Novakowski's (2008) definition resulted from attempts to determine how intentionality affected an organization's ability to develop leaders for cross-functioning teams based on their knowledge, abilities, and skills. More importantly, it is repeated here as an effort to reinforce its features and to distinguish its approach to leadership from conventional leadership models.

Anchored by an academic study, Campbell (2009) reinforced the claims of Calloway et al. (2010), McBride (2001), Olivares (2007), for example, whose approaches also illuminated understanding of the effect of intentionality on leadership development. McBride (2001), in contrast, used a cross-case analysis in his efforts to understand intentional leadership as exercised by three experienced superintendents of school districts ranging in size from eight thousand to forty thousand students.

The research question McBride addressed was: "What leadership actions do superintendents intentionally utilize to lead effectively in the context of the school setting" (p. iv). McBride (2001; Camburn, Spillane & Sebastian, 2010) noted that superintendent success was complicated by responsibility to a variety of internal and external stakeholders, each with different priorities and perspectives on the most effective way to achieve academic objectives to satisfy its broad and often boisterous constituency.

McBride (2001) claimed that very little was known about the actions and behaviors of superintendents that were "generalizable so as to yield beneficial results in a variety of school settings" (p. 6). A central and substantial characteristic of McBride's (2001) understanding of intentionality was his distinguishing of actions from behaviors, which reflected Schutz's (1962) distinctions, which he called "empty protentions" (p. 11), which were essentially actions without aims (non-purposive behaviors).

Wissler and Ortiz (2001) eloquently described the implementation of intentional leadership as a "symphony of deliberate actions or as an art form" (McBride, 2001, p. 13). Consistent with Calloway et al. (2010), Campbell (2009) and others, they also said that intentional leaders used every opportunity and interaction to motivate others to align their tasks and commitments with overall organizational goals. Inevitably, ambiguity attended the process because of contingencies and constraints that arose, which is true of any leadership model or process and of any organization (Bolman & Deal, 2008).

Like Campbell (2009), Wissler and Ortiz (1988) also had their own criteria for intentionality and for determining when leaders were leading intentionally. For Wissler and Ortiz (1988) the two elements of intentionality are: 1) the ability to see a perceived plan or outcome as though it were already completed, 2) intentionally implement actions

and behaviors which moved the organization successfully toward a preplanned outcome (McBride, 2001, p. 13). Another key element of intentional leadership was seen in the leader's ability to adapt actions in ways that were relevant to the dynamics of the district and its various and often divisive goals, consistent with the concept of Multiple Realities, which enabled superintendents to conceive and craft alternatives accordingly.

Exploiting Schutz (1962), McBride (2001) noted that behaviors in contrast to actions often lack a clearly defined specific goal or projected goal in the future, which in effect made these behaviors "unconscious" (p. 11), in the Schutzian (1962) sense, and therefore ineffective because they were unintentional. Actions, in contrast, were always aimed toward clear and specific outcomes at some future date or state (Schutz 1962).

Conceptually, actions were types of behavior "which anticipates the future in the form of an empty protention" (McBride, 2001, p. 11), which once accomplished fills the future with the result. McBride (2001) further cited Schutz (1962), saying that "actions are conscious if they have been mapped out in the future perfect tense" (p. 11). The relation between this mapping of the future tied to intention because it enabled leaders to engage in purposive actions designed to realize their as yet "empty protentions," as though they were already realized (McBride, 2001, p. 11). The section below discusses gaps in the literature.

<div align="center">Gaps in the Literature</div>

Conspicuously absent from contemporary literature was any mention of intentional leader in Northouse's (2010) leadership handbook, also omissions by Avolio, Walumbwa and Weber's (2007) comprehensive summary of contemporary leadership models, along with no mention of it by Bass' (2008) leadership handbook or by

McCauley and Van Velsor's (2004) comprehensive account of leadership development.

A search of the phrase *intentional leadership,* however, yielded approximately 64,500

articles that covered various disciplines comprising a variety of theoretical frameworks

and methodological approaches.

However, literature directly tied to or entitled *intentional leadership* was the

primary focus of this review, which reduced the amount of literature available for review

significantly by comparison with studies done on other leadership models that simply

mentioned intentionality but did not study it in relation to its effect on leadership

development. As mentioned below, significant yields on the phrase intentional leadership

addressed religion, spirituality, peer-mentoring and church growth in admittedly very

narrow contexts (Gortner, 2009; Luckcock, 2007), for example.

Google Books and Google Scholar, in contrast, collated approximately 36,800

yields in response to the phrase *intentional leadership*. A search of WorldCat yielded 271

titles. A similar search of PsychInfo and ERIC yielded twenty-one responses, most of

which duplicated responses from Google Scholar and ProQuest. The purpose of this

paragraph (and the succeeding one) is to depict the research conducted on intentional

leadership by contemporary scholars from various fields and with various focuses that

diverge and merge interchangeably with the aims of this current study.

Of the twenty-one responses captured by PsychInfo and ERIC at least two were

unrelated to intentional leadership. In fact a search of ProQuest yielded eighteen

dissertations that included the phrase *intentional leadership* in their titles. As mentioned

above, the WorldCat search yielded 271 responses; however, many of these were

unrelated to intentional leadership and addressed issues such as intentional learning

communities, intentional counseling, or intentional peer mentoring, etc. The latter approaches were particularly true of dissertations and theses deriving from a search of ProQuest.

With regard to data collection and analyses from the various studies reviewed, primary sources used included public lectures, articles from various periodicals, extant interviews, numerous manuscript collections, and a variety of audio and video recordings. The character and contrasts of the yields suggested a need for studies such as this current one as well as others to further contemporary understanding of the effect of intentionality on leadership development with research designs and theoretical frameworks consonant with research inquiries.

The lack of literature on intentional leadership in leadership handbooks (Bass, 2008; McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004; Northhouse, 2010; Avolio, Walumbwa & Weber, 2007) is perhaps the most telling need for ongoing investigation of this emerging leadership model. Current studies notwithstanding, omission from these manuals indicated a genuine need for additional research if scholars and practitioners are to adequately understand the dimensions and dynamics associated with intentional leadership and how these enhance leadership development regardless of the methodology or theoretical frameworks employed.

This current study sought to broaden contemporary understanding of the potential of intentional leadership as a developmental device as seen through the paradigm of a successful business owner and intentional leadership practitioner, who also happens to hold an MA in Counseling. The knowledge derived from the existing literature along with the information gained from this study helped to illustrate and illuminate even the

more how intentionality could be applied practically as a model of leadership (Calloway et al., 2010; Caza & Caza, 2007; Karakas, 2011; Shaw, 2005). Below is an outline of the various approaches other researchers have used to study the effects of intentionality on leadership development. An abbreviated account appeared earlier in this study in the section on the various approaches to leadership studies.

Another conspicuous omission in the literature on intentional leadership is the absence of studies on intentionality and intentional leadership that assumed or asserted an existential orientation. This omission is especially relevant for this study based on the orientation of the primary informant, who is the basis of this current study along with the three key informants, whose orientation is also existential, philosophically speaking. There was literature, however, that addressed existential communication, which was conceptually compatible with intentional communication (Ashman & Lawler, 2008). Yet this literature was not explicitly or implicitly connected to intentional leadership. The researcher hopes that identifying this omission will inspire other researchers to fill this important gap by examining the relationship between the two. The section below discusses the character of studies on intentionality and its effect on leadership development.

Character of Studies on Intentionality and its Effect on Leadership Development

Typically speaking, most attempts to understand intentional leadership and the consequent effect of intentionality on its development occurred within the framework of traditional organizations, as opposed to strengths-based organizations, and by observing typical leadership behaviors characteristic of what could be called conventional organizations (those that are neither explicitly or implicitly learning organizations or

based on the ideals of POS, e.g.). Characteristically, several of the studies provided a conceptual structure for analyzing intentionality (McBride, 2001; Novakowski, 2008; Karakas, 2011).

Others offered accounts that were more anecdotal and exhortative and provided no specific principles or practices that necessarily illuminated understanding of how intentionality could catalyze leadership development. While this present study did not intend to produce transferable results, it did hope to identify specific principles and core concepts that would suggest how and why intentionality effected one's leadership development (Calloway et al., 2003; Caza & Caza, 2010; McBride, 2001; Shaw, 2005)

In this regard, significant titles that dealt directly with intentional leadership were related to religion, spirituality and/or church growth and focused on areas such as discipleship, for example (Gehrke, 2008; Groleau, 2009; Richards, 2000; Rollins, 1985; Smith, 2009). Of these composite yields on the phrase *intentional leadership*, various methods of inquiry were employed, (case study, causal-comparative, survey, historiography, eutopiography, narrative analysis, ethnography, including use of secondary sources, memoirs, and scholarly articles. For example, the effect of intentionality on leadership development was clearly demonstrated in Everett's (2010) examination of the Nashville Civil Rights Movement, and its subsequent impact on the national civil rights movement.

While this current study deviated methodologically from Everett's (2010) historical inquiry, its relevance and reference was offered as one indication of how intentionality provided a systematically sustainable means of producing effective leaders in the pursuit of prescribed goals, using tangible as well as intangible resources

accordingly, as is characteristic of intentional leaders (Calloway et al., 2010; Campbell et al., 2010; Shaw, 2005).

Finally of the various literatures reviewed only one assumed an explicit existential stance to leadership development (Koestenbaum, 1991). This stance aligned with the data derived from interviews with the primary informant and the three key informants, which merely viewed leadership as an extension of one's existence wherein one is responsible for making decisions, managing resources and conceiving options, objectives and opportunities to accomplish organizational goals. In the existential orientation, intentional leaders recognized the relationship between human development and leadership development and saw the two as synonymous.

Thus the data derived from this study extended and illustrated the existential stance that intentional leaders assumed in their efforts to develop their leadership abilities. These approaches to understanding the effect of intentionality on leadership development were mentioned to demonstrate the variety of designs that may be employed and the intellectual and theoretical orientations that may be assumed to study the process and to evaluate the product of leadership development. The next section provides support for the topic of this study and its relationship to previous studies.

<div align="center">Support for Topic and its Relationship to Previous Studies</div>

Support for Leadership Studies were found in numerous articles, scholarly and popular, as well as in a number of books, conferences, symposiums, conferences, retreats and workshops that were produced annually in contemporary efforts to understand its elements and the environments that promoted its development. Some approaches were highly empirical, uniquely spiritual and theoretically rigorous (Addison, 2009; Avolio &

Luthans, 2006; Bass, 1981; Bass, 1985; Bass, 2008; Cicero & Pierro, 2007; Gerhke, 2008; Glynn & Dowd, 2008; Rosenbach & Taylor, 2001).

Others were simultaneously descriptive and prescriptive (Alder, 1998; Calloway et al., 2010; Karakas, 2011; Koestenbaum, 1991; Luthans & Avolio, 2006; Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Rost, 1991; Williams, 2008), being laced with anecdotes and loaded with exhortations interchangeably. Other approaches were more intuitive and philosophical and appealed to the classical notion of leadership as examined by some of history's greatest philosophers (Cawthon, 2002), raising in route the notion of the now largely rejected Great man theory, as was the case with Cawthorn's (2002) use of Plato and his myth of the metals as a metaphor that asserted that effective leaders are born not made.

Each approach, however, had as its goal to graph a clear and compelling picture that sought to clarify ambiguities and reconcile incongruities about the nature of leadership, its development and subsequent effectiveness. What is currently known about leadership and the elements that determined its effectiveness is summarized in the table below followed by another table that depicts previous approaches to leadership development studies. The first table reflected the results of attempts to develop a general theory of leadership development (Goethals & Sorenson, 2006). The second table resulted from a review of contemporary literature on leadership development. After these tables, follows a continuation of the discussion on leadership studies and strategies, as outlined in the literature.

Table 1.3: Summary of Attempts to Develop General Theory of Leadership
Development.

Open	Effective leaders are open to communicating with organizational members
Equality	Effective leaders treat followers fairly while recognizing the difference between them.
Power	Effective leaders use power to achieve organizational goals rather than to control or coerce.
Change	Situates the role of leaders as change agents.
Agency and Context	Further develops the idea of agency and the dynamics of context as a determinant of leader action and follower response.

The above table is relevant because it provides a template for articulating

elements that suggest both leadership effectiveness and development. Luthans and Avolio

(2006), likewise, cite approximately 3000 studies, of which 201 were systematic analyses

and meta-analyses designed to measure leadership development and leadership

effectiveness. These studies examined the impact of interventions (strategies especially

designed to heighten leadership awareness and enhance leadership impact).

Many of their findings confirmed the claims of other leadership scholars which

stressed the value of various interventions, noting that these interventions must be

deliberate, strategic and intentional rather than being the results of circumstances or

confined to a particular leader's personal style if leaders were to be successful in meeting

contemporary leadership demands (Addison, 2009; Amey, 2005; Bowers, 2010; Brown

& Trevino, 2009; Goleman, 2006; Goethals & Sorenson, 2006; Miller, 2007; Riggio et

al., 2008; Shamir et al., 2007; Starratt, 2004; Zovak, 2005; Zenger & Folkman, 2009).

The table on the next page provides a summary of the main topics covered in the

preceding sections before proceeding to a summary and conclusion of the aims and

intentions of this current study.

Table 1.4: Summary of Approaches to Leadership Studies

Approaches to studying the role of intentionality in leadership development

Qualitative
Anecdotal
Metaphysical
Mythological
Case Studies
Historical
Autobiographical
Quantitative

Disciplinary Orientations

Business
Education
Anthropology
Psychology
Philosophy
Sociology
Religion
Political science

References to Intentional Leadership in Literature via Search

64,500 articles
36,800 books (Google Books)
271 titles from WorldCat
21 titles in PsychInfo
21 titles from ERIC
21 titles from ProQuest
Several titles with the *intentionality* yet unrelated to leadership development
Importance of leadership studies

Summary of Aims and Intentions of this Current Study

The aim of this study was to add to current understanding of the effect of intentionality on leadership development by conducting a single-subject case study via the theoretical lens of Positive Organizational Scholarship and the notion of Multiple Realities. This research design and attending theoretical frameworks enabled this study to contribute to the existing literature on intentional leadership, thereby enhancing contemporary understanding of leadership in general and of intentional leadership in particular. In doing so, understanding regarding the effect of intentionality on leadership development was enhanced as leaders sought to achieve organizational objectives.

Moreover, this study also sought to build on contemporary concerns with developing appropriate leadership models to meet 21st century demands (Rost, 1991). Thus its impetus is best captured by the claim of Reveta Bowers (2010) regarding the development of effective classroom teachers. Bowers asserted, "Whether or not we choose to develop leaders for our classrooms, our divisions and departments, or our administrative teams, current school heads need to be more purposeful and intentional about revealing the paths to leadership (p. 46)."

This reference regarding being intentional in developing leaders reinforced Rost's (1991), Bowers (2010), Amey et al. (2002) Amey (2005), and Avolio et al. (2009) concern with the need to be intentional about developing a new generation of leaders. Therefore below is a summary of this study with suggestions and implications for improving contemporary understanding of the effect of intentionality on leadership development. An additional table depicts some of today's major leadership models and main features taken from Northouse (2010) followed by a conclusion.

Table 1.5: Summary of Contemporary Leadership Models and their Qualities

---

Transformational

Inspirational Motivation
Idealized influence
Intellectual Stimulation
Individualized consideration

Transactional

Focus on exchanges between leaders & members.
Taps motivation of followers to inspire compliance.
Rewards are contingent upon employee performance.

Situational

Requires flexibility from leadership.
Directive and supportive dimension, based on situational evaluation.
Coaching, high-supportive-low directive style, high directive-low supportive, low-supportive-low directive

Authentic

Leaders understand their purpose.
Values-driven
Self-disciplined
Relationally transparent

Intentional

Align resources (tangible/intangible) to achieve objectives.
Existential orientation to leadership development
People-centered and purpose driven, sigh state of personal integrity
Open, flexible, self-critical reflectivity
Communicational versatility
Makes space for others to show up as great
Mentally, spiritually and emotionally healthy
High degree of presence
Sense of aliveness/enthusiasm

Conclusion

The literature on leadership development is as diverse as were the approaches to studying its development, as well as the qualities and conditions that contributed to leadership development. Historically, attempts to understand leaders and their development moved from trait theory, the great man theory, contingency theory, transformational leadership, authentic leadership to a host of others, each with its unique factors, measures, methods and claims, to the efforts of this present study's attempts to understand the effect of intentionality on leadership development. This current review and study were intended to provide a historical overview of past approaches and possible directions for future research in researcher's continuing attempts to understand the dynamic phenomena of leadership development, while suggesting that intentional leadership was a valid tool to enhance contemporary understanding of this development. The next section outlines the methods the study employed.

CHAPTER 3: METHODS

The fundamental research questions that drove this study were:

1. What happens in the intentional leadership workshops that causes or does not cause a change in the anticipated behavior of participants?

2. What effect does the intentional leadership training workshop have on participants and their organizations?

These questions were chosen because the researcher wanted to know what dynamics caused a change in informants' anticipated behavior and which subsequently impacted or did not impact their organizations after they completed the workshops, thus deepening contemporary understanding of the often ambiguous process of leadership development.

The purpose of this single-subject case study was to collect data from one primary informant via three-90-minute semi-structured interviews and one single 90-minute semi-structured interviews with three key informants and then to conduct a Deductive Analysis based on the this data that would allow the researcher to describe the dynamics of intentional leadership with the goal of suggesting how intentionality effected one's leadership development, as interpreted through the theoretical frameworks of Positive Organizational Scholarship (Cameron et al., 2003) and Schutz's (1962) Multiple Realities.

Characteristically, this study sought to import from the periphery to the center perspectives that would reveal what happens or does not happen in intentional leadership

workshops that resulted in a change (or no) change in the informants' anticipated behavior and their subsequent impact on their organizations. Seeing leadership as an existential exercise based on a review of the literature and data derived from the primary informant, this study also sought to understand the leadership development process by highlighting the lived experiences and life choices open to individuals that enabled them to recognize the constructed nature of reality and the possibilities suggested thereby in order to understand the practical effect of intentionality on leadership development, as they assumed responsibility for developing their leadership abilities.

The logic for this study was based on a review of existing literature on leadership development in general and of intentional leadership in particular. The contents of this current section includes an explanation of the research design, examination of the theoretical lens --Positive Organizational Scholarship and Multiple Realities-- and its corresponding components, characteristics of the primary informant and the three key informants complete with an explanation of why they were chosen for the study, a detailed description of the research settings.

The procedures section outlined the process used to execute each element of the study, a data analysis section that detailed how data were gathered, analyzed, including its implications, and how it was stored to ensure the confidentiality and anonymity (where appropriate) of informants. The final section of this study includes a summary and discussion of findings along with implications for practice and suggestions for future research. The section discusses the theoretical frameworks used in this study followed by a procedures section below outlines the procedures as well as sections on data collection and data analysis.

Theoretical Frameworks

Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS) is an emergent paradigm that assumes a strengths-based approach to understanding human potential and organizational capacity, as opposed to a deficit and dysfunctional approach, which emphasizes positive personal and organizational attributes that contribute to organizational and leadership success or failure accordingly (Buckingham & Clifton, 2001; Cameron et al., 2003). Characteristically, POS is concerned with "positive outcomes, processes and attributes of organizations and their members, which lead to organizational flourishing" (Cameron et al., 2003, p. 4) without, however, denying the presence of negative consequences, tendencies or dysfunctional behaviors that bar organizational success and leadership development.

POS departs from previous perspectives on leadership development and organizational life, which typically focused on the deficits and dysfunctions of these. POS in contrast seeks to highlight what is virtuous and thriving in organizations and leaders because of its strengths-based approach in recognizing the interplay of dynamics between leadership development and organizational life.

The problem with the deficit-based approach and organizational leadership in general is that it ignores organizational strengths and possibilities, highlighting pathologies instead (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2008; Bolman & Deal, 2008; Cameron et al., 2003; Schermerhorn, 2011). Philosophically, POS's strengths-based approach aligns with intentional leadership because it too seeks to highlight organizational and leadership capacities versus deficits. Thus the purpose of using POS as a theoretical framework to

understand the effect of intentionality on leadership development is to determine to what extent such an approach enhances and even accelerates leadership development.

Positive organizational scholarship defines leadership development and organizational success in terms such as, excellence, thriving, flourishing, abundance, resilience, or virtuousness (Cameron et al., 2003). In a climate where these qualities loom the likelihood of enhancing leadership development and organizational effectiveness increase significantly, resulting in "empowerment and cascading vitality" (Caza & Caza, 2008, p. 29). This potential for success multiplies in organizations that intentionally adopt a strengths-based orientation as an organizational model to enhancing leadership development. Combined with Schutz's (1962) notion of Multiple Realities (discussed below), leaders are bolstered in their efforts to develop their leadership abilities.

Multiple Realities

Multiple Realities derived from the work of Alfred Schutz (1962) and was based primarily on the premise that persons chose from a variety of possibilities in their daily existence based on their recognition or misrecognition of the created nature of the self and the social world (Pasupath, Mansour, & Burbaker, 2007). Having recognized this fact, they could then engage in purposive actions designed to alter this world or they could resort to passive behaviors to accept it instead, denying their self-efficacy and enthroning reality as an objective given, which was immune to their influence (Thomason, 1982).

Conceptually Schultz (1962) distinguished actions from behaviors or what he also called "empty protentions" (p. 11), which were essentially passive responses to an active and admittedly arbitrary environment because he claimed that everyone was busily

engaged in creating and being created by this world based on their existential stance, whether consciously or unconsciously. Failure to recognize this fact consigned them to accepting reality as unalterable, relinquishing the possibilities that existed therein because they saw themselves as incapable of effecting reality meaningfully.

Schutz's (1962) value in aiding data analysis was partly in the conceptual distinction he made between actions, intentions and behaviors (also called empty protentions), which helped the researcher heuristically and practically to perceive the components and dynamics of intentional leadership. For Schutz (1962) actions without intentions are merely behaviors, whether conscious or unconscious, that failed to affect the life-world and thus impeded efforts to understand the effect of intentionality on leadership development. Passivity toward reality retarded the ability of leaders to conceive Multiple Realities because they accepted uncritically an objective world immune to their influence.

Thomason (1982) termed this response as *reification*, which is the notion that reality exists apart from the impact of human agents whether or not they perceive their part in creating this reality. By noting leaders response to organizational challenges or their existential relationship to the world, the researcher was able to determine whether or not the three informants and the primary informant recognized the created nature of the world and embraced reification or whether they perceived the power of human agency to conceive and create suitable alternatives, embracing Multiple Realities by which they engaged in actions with the intention of altering reality accordingly, individually and organizationally.

This interpretive lens was invaluable in informing not only the data that the researcher collected but also how this data were analyzed. Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS) enabled the researcher to analyze the data based on whether or not the three key informants worked in what they considered to be a strengths-based culture wherein their job responsibilities reflected their native talents and unique gifts

Thus rather than engaging in creating alternate or Multiple Realities, these persons imputed a power to the world that it lacked without their consent and complicity. Thus a fundamental premise of this study was that intentional leaders were uniquely aware of the created nature of the social world and therefore engaged in purposive actions that had the ability to alter this world accordingly, creating new ones ultimately. Data derived from this study were collected and collated through the concept of Multiple Realities in conjunction with Positive Organizational Scholarship to better to understand the effect of intentionality on leadership development. The section below outlines the procedures used in this study.

<div align="center">Procedures</div>

A single-subject case study design was chosen because the researcher believed that it provided the best opportunity to understand the effects of intentionality on leadership development as it embedded the researcher in the research site, allowing for observation of the phenomena under study in real time context. Characteristically, "a case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident ; and in which multiple source of evidence are used" (Glatthorn & Joyner, 2005, p. 43; Yin, 2003).

Woodside (2010), in contrast, provides an obviously broader account casting case study research as "an inquiry that focuses on describing, understanding, predicting, and/or controlling the individual (i.e., process, animal, person, household, organization, group, industry, culture, or nationality. The prudence and profit of both approaches is that they allow the researcher to "achieve deep understanding in research" (p. 1) of the particular phenomena under investigation. Thus this present study strove to help researchers understand what does or does not happen in the intentional leadership workshops to effect a change in the informant's anticipated behavior individually and organizationally and the subsequent impact thereof.

This study was important in identifying how intentionality effected leadership development so that theorists, leaders and practitioners could improve their understanding of the strategies that promoted leadership development. Thus the protocol used by the researcher improved the validity of the data collected because it was especially designed to address the phenomena under study based on a prudent pruning of questions that were situated in a review of protocols used in similar studies.

The protocol was also devised partly through the researcher's own experience of having completed two separate series of workshops. One session lasted eight consecutive weeks in 2008. Another session lasted one full week, and was completed by the researcher in 2010. Both sessions were conducted at the Center for Intentional Leadership. Thus the researcher is confident that the protocol was appropriate for answering the two research questions that drove this study. Moreover the protocol was piloted among peers and reviewed by a Qualitative Researcher in UNC-Charlotte's College of Education to assess its validity and reliability. Below in the succeeding

sections is a summary of the data collection, data analysis along with an

acknowledgement of researcher bias, description of research settings and study

informants.

<div align="center">Data Collection</div>

As mentioned above, the primary means of data collection involved a protocol

developed by the researcher (and tested with peers and a qualitative researcher as

mentioned above). A review of other protocols that studied intentional leadership also

influenced the development of the researcher's protocol. The researcher was also careful

to take notes during the sessions he completed as a preliminary to informing the

development of the protocol. These notes provided a sense of continuity between the time

the researcher had completed the two workshops and when this current study began. This

approach (and protocol) was deemed appropriate for gathering data to help understand

the effect of intentionality on leadership development.

A second protocol was used to collect data on secondary informants with only

slight modifications (e.g., fewer questions than on the protocol used with the primary

informant because of his experience in teaching intentionality, as opposed to

experiencing it as a work shop informant). This protocol was also tested in the manner

mentioned as was the protocol used to collect data from the primary informant. The

rationale for this approach was that some of the data needed to understand intentionality

conceptually could only be provided by the primary informant because of his experience

in conducting workshops and his existential orientation to leadership development. Yet

both protocols enhanced the researcher's ability to execute a study that helped

contemporary researchers understand the effect of intentionality on leadership

development. Data for this study were collected via three 90-minute semi-structured interviews with the primary informant, one-time 90-minute semi-structured interviews conducted off-site with the three key informants.

The researcher believed that by conducting these interviews off site informants would be more apt to be open and honest in answering questions, enhancing thereby the quality of the research findings. In addition to these semi-structured interviews data were also collected via analysis of archival data which consisted of six articles written by the primary informant for a general audience, and yet which indirectly addressed the concept of intentionality and elements of intentional leadership. Five of these pieces appeared in the primary informant's hometown newspaper, *Charlotte Observer*. Another piece appeared in *Greater Charlotte Business Magazine*.

Typically, transcription of interviews began within forty-eight hours of each completed interview while the interview was still fresh in the researcher's mind. Peer debriefing usually occurred with the researcher's committee chair in one month intervals. Person's from the researcher's cohort were also used to refine and interpret reflections for their insight in helping the researcher to understand the effect of intentionality on leadership development based on the data collected. Both the primary and the three key informants were also allowed to review transcriptions to ensure their accuracy and to provide researcher with clarifications and additional information that informants deemed beneficial to answering the two research questions.

These methods of data collection (and subsequent analysis) supported the goals of this study because they allowed for the emergence and discovery of novel themes, obscure ideas, notions, concepts and constructs of intentional leadership that aided the

researcher's ability to provide suggestions that helped other researchers understand the effect of intentionality on leadership development. The section below discusses the methods of data analysis, data management along with researcher bias and ethical considerations.

<div align="center">Data Analysis</div>

Data collected from interviews with primary informant and three key informants were depicted on seven tables and were analyzed deductively based on the data gathered from all informants, which described the elements of intentionality and the dynamics of the workshops for their effect on leadership development. Themes derived from archival data were also depicted on a thematic analysis chart, which displayed the dominant themes derived from these data. The rationale for including the tables was to provide readers with a means of glancing at these themes and the corresponding descriptions to interpret the study's findings at a glance.

The researcher also assumed this approach in an effort to aid in the reader's understanding of the primary informant's conception of intentional leadership in consort with or in contradiction to a review of existing literature. In addition to tables and a chart, the researcher also described informant data as richly and rigorously as possible by providing examples and illustrations while drawing relevant comparisons with the literature when appropriate to further evaluate the validity of the study's findings.

Analysis of the archival data, for example, revealed themes that aligned with the postulates of Positive Organizational Scholarship, and which varied enough from data collected in interviews to be displayed in this manner in order to identify subsidiary elements that contributed to the effect of intentionality on leadership development, as the

primary informant strove to convey them to a general audience. Detailed field notes were also taken during each observation and were reviewed immediately following each session to examine them in efforts to refine the researcher's reflections.

The data gathered from the semi-structured interviews with the primary informant and the three key informants were analyzed via the lens of Positive Organizational Scholarship and Multiple Realities with the goal of identifying dominant (and determinant) themes, which were displayed, in part, on a thematic analysis table later in this study. Deductive Analysis allowed the researcher to situate data collected in a format that highlighted its most salient features, describing these as they were directly observed by the researcher and reported by the three key informants.

<div style="text-align:center">Deductive Analysis</div>

Deductive analysis, (Pope, Ziebland & Mays, 2000), in contrast, "starts from pre-set aims and objectives. The data collection tends to be more structured than would be the norm for much other qualitative research and the analytical process tends to be more explicit and more strongly informed by a priori reasoning" (p. 2). The deductive analysis approach is structured so that it allowed persons other than the researcher to assess data, conclusions, corresponding claims and suggestions for their validity in relation to a priori research questions or hypotheses (Pope et al., 2000).

According to Pope et al. (2000), "Data analysis often takes place alongside data collection to allow questions to be refined and new avenues of inquiry to develop" (p. 2). However, this present study began with two explicit questions which guided (without constraining) the researcher's efforts to understand the effect of intentionality on leadership development. From there the researcher described the dynamics and themes of

these workshops as they emerged, categorizing them accordingly and describing them vividly to clarify how intentionality effected leadership development.

Additional analysis was deduced from data provided by informants and by what derived from analysis of archival data in conjunction with observations and field notes with the goal of making sense of these. Data was then displayed on appropriate tables and a thematic analysis chart designed to highlight both dominant and emergent themes. Other elements of deductive analysis involve indexing, mapping and interpretation of data collected (Pope et al., 2000).

However, this present study confined its analysis to presenting data on tables and a thematic analysis chart with the remainder being rendered descriptively in efforts to explain the effect of intentionality on leadership development. Below is an outline of the data management strategies, characteristics of and rationale for selecting primary/secondary informants, description of research settings, researcher bias, ethical considerations and a summary and conclusion.

<div align="center">Data Management</div>

All data were stored on hard copies and computer files with duplicates kept at separate and secure locations. Audio tapes were transcribed weekly and personally by the researcher within 48 hours of interviews to ensure their accuracy. All data were kept confidential, including information derived from secondary informants. All data interview transcripts were de-identified by aliases to ensure anonymity and to protect informants confidentiality where appropriate. The succeeding sections outline the characteristics of the primary and three key informants as well as the primary and secondary research settings.

Characteristics of Primary Informant

The primary informant is a forty seven year-old married white male with two teen-aged children. He is also the founder and Chief Executive Officer at the Center for Intentional Leadership. Prior to founding this enterprise he worked as a teacher in an urban middle school within the local public school system; where he was once named teacher of the year for the entire school system before launching his own leadership development firm. However, his unstable beginnings (e.g., being raised in 8-10 different foster homes, the death of both parents during adolescence, attending 2-3 schools during an average school year, etc.) and other disruptions could have very easily derailed the course of his life.

This troubled beginning and his subsequent success was part of the reason the researcher chose him and intentionality as the subject of this study. The primary informant was also selected because his firm helps organizations change their cultures to be more consistent with the principles of Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS) and its strengths-based approach. He said that part of this task is accomplished by getting senior level leaders to participate in intentional leadership workshops prior to having leaders at other levels involved (Whitehead, 3rd Interview, 2011). In doing so, the environment encouraged innovation, organizational risk taking, self-management. It also enhanced leadership development while giving people opportunities to do what they do best (Buckingham & Clifton, 2001; Cameron et al., 2003; Shamir et al., 2007).

Otherwise the primary informant said that attempts to implement the elements of intentional leadership, POS and Multiple Realities would be marginalized except in exceptional cases. He noted that marginalization was especially true for minorities and

other persons of low social capital and symbolic power because of organizational

attitudes that impeded their ability to contribute meaningfully and to grow professionally

therein (Clarke-Hicks & Iles, 2000; Harrison & Klein, 2007; Whitehead, 3rd Interview,

2011). This existential outlook and belief in the efficacy of intentionality to effect

leadership development –individually and organizationally-- made the primary informant

a credible source of data to help the researcher understand the effects of intentionality.

Below is a description of the characteristics of the three key informants and the rationale

for their inclusion in this study.

<div align="center">Characteristics and Rationale for Selecting Three Key Informants</div>

Factors influencing the inclusion of the three key informants included the fact that

their superiors had also completed certain components of the intentional leadership

workshops. As senior leaders in their organizations, these workshops typically focused on

strategies to change their organizational cultures and climate to a strengths-based

orientation. Ideally, this participation made them more supportive of their subordinates as

they strove to implement the elements of intentionality in organizational contexts that

reflect variations of Positive Organizational Scholarship and its strengths-based approach

(Buckingham & Clifton, 2001; Cameron et al., 2003; Covey, 2004; Verbos et al. 2007).

All three informants also held leadership positions within their respective

organizations, which was another consideration for inclusion in this current study.

Moreover, each of them had also completed at least one of the half-day workshops

themselves, which were entitled Quest for Personal Leadership (QPL). The focus of these

workshops was to help informants enhance their leadership abilities. Informants were

also selected because they each had been exposed to other leadership paradigms designed

to enhance their leadership development prior to encountering intentional leadership. Yet they each agreed that the impact of these approaches paled in comparison to the changes they experienced as a result of completing the QPL workshops.

In fact all three key informants agreed that the intentional leadership workshops were effective in helping them develop their leadership potential. Although one informant (Julia) was less articulate and more ambiguous in understanding why it worked in comparison with the other two informants, she acknowledged that it did work.

Moreover the informants' ability to express elements of other leadership training in contrast to intentional leadership informed the researcher's decision to include them in this current study. Based on a review of the literature the researcher believed that the information informants related enhanced this study and provided a better understanding of the effects of intentionality on leadership development (Calloway et al., 2010; Campbell, 2009; Campolongo, 2009; Novaskowski, 2010; Kussmaul, 2005; Putnam, 2010; Shaw, 2005). Below is a description of the primary and secondary research settings.

<div align="center">Description of Primary Research Setting</div>

As mentioned previously, the Center for Intentional Leadership is located in an affluent section of a large metropolis. It sits on an acre of land amid a middle school surrounded by a predominantly white upscale neighborhood. The property contains two Victorian style houses that could very easily pass for bed and breakfast facilities because of their design, decor and architecture. The original facility (approximately 30 years old prior to being refurbished within the last five years) connects to a newer structure where most of the leadership workshops occur.

Upon entering the original facility informants encounter the aura of an era that has seemingly vanished, as the pace is intentionally slow and the décor is designed to arrest the senses rather than arouse them, though arousal is inevitable if one is sufficiently immersed in its ethos. Consisting of an upstairs and downstairs, informants get the sense that they have entered the library or reading room of a retiree or bibliophile because of the bevy of books, magazines and videos prudently placed throughout the facility, most of which address some facet of leadership, self- and organizational development. This arrangement (and ambience) amplifies the primary informant's commitment to intentionality and enhances his credibility as an intentional leader, reinforcing his selection as the primary subject of this project.

The newer facility is also more technologically advanced complete with automatic blinds, wall-mounted television screens and a viewing canvass that descends from the ceiling at the push of a button along with an in-house audio system that repeatedly played two songs that addressed the eight elements of intentional leadership during the informal part of presentations. According to the primary informant these songs (as well as the Center's design and décor) were intentionally chosen because they embodied what he considered characteristic of intentional leadership, e.g., self-efficacy, optimism, courage, vision, etc. (Whitehead, 3rd Interview, 2012). The two songs that played interchangeably were "That's just the way it is" by Bruce Hornsby and the Road Rangers and "Turn the page" by Bob Seeger.

Adjacent to the large training room was also a dining area that was designed to promote intimacy among informants. In this regard, meals were also intentional, as informants were exhorted not to eat lunch with the same group of persons with whom

they had breakfast depending upon the length of the session, some of which last an entire day, weekend and or week. The primary informant said that this prescription made informants aware not only of the need to be intentional about transcending their comfort zones or familiar ways of behaving, but also to demonstrate how readily they defaulted to these behaviors unless checked or challenged accordingly (Whitehead debriefing, phone conversation, 9/6/11).

Both buildings at the Center were arranged so as to allow for intimate moments of sharing among informants. For example, just next to the older main building was a gazebo fitted for no more than two or three persons to gather and banter about whatever was on their minds. A few feet away were a series of plants, a path, a chair and a park bench where informants could perch to reflect on a particular section of the workshop for its implications on their leadership development.

The overall atmosphere outside emitted the atmosphere of being at a secluded retreat rather than being set in the center of a bustling community because of the brush of trees and the hush of silence that often overhung, as reflection and contemplation commanded the day between the strategic breaks informants took, which allowed for periods of further reflection and intimate conversation with other informants.

Analysis of the research setting influenced the study by illustrating the value of environment as a subsidiary source of data to help understand the phenomena under investigation to see if there was a relationship or rationale between the two in order to understand the effect of intentionality on leadership development. In order to assess the relationship and rationale, during a break the researcher asked the primary informant

about the Center's design and décor to determine their relevance in contributing to intentionality positively effecting the leadership development of informants.

Consistent with the characteristics of case studies, this vivid description of the research site was provided to give readers a sense of how the primary informant conceptualized leadership existentially, and thus strove to represent it not only in formal presentations but also in the facilities where most of the workshops occurred. Of course, one could just as easily say that the above description was more incidental than intentional and was thus irrelevant to the goals of this study.

However, based on the conversation mentioned above the primary informant told the researcher that he wanted the Center to reflect intentionality in its décor and design, and thus constructed a facility he believed accomplished this purpose, displaying congruency between the formal elements of intentional leadership and his existential orientation towards life in general as reflected by Center's tangible and intangible elements. Below is a description of the secondary research setting.

<div align="center">Description of Secondary Research Setting</div>

Due to circumstances beyond the researcher's control the first two observations occurred off-site at a large, prominent Presbyterian church in a huge multi-purpose room that had been configured to accommodate the approximately 200 attendees. Roughly 20 tables were arranged in banquet style to accommodate 8-10 persons comfortably with each table spread approximately two to three feet apart. (The final observation occurred onsite at the Center for Intentional Leadership as originally intended).

Prior to entering the room where the formal presentation and observation occurred was a huge foyer stocked with refreshments (water, bagels, croissants, fruit, etc.) and

support staff to greet attendees as they arrived. The researcher arrived at the site

approximately thirty-minutes prior to the formal presentation in order to get a feel for and

a framework in which to observe the dynamics of the workshop as they unfolded (e.g.

formal/informal communication, interaction and disposition of primary informant, etc.).

Approximately fifteen minutes was spent walking through the facilities, which were open

for view, prior to scrutinizing the room wherein the formal presentation occurred.

The researcher's pattern of arriving approximately 30 minutes before workshop

began allowed for interaction with the primary informant about the nature of the

presentation, his expectations and its goals –explicit and implicit. Below is a discussion

of researcher bias followed by ethical considerations followed by a summary and

conclusion.

<div align="center">Researcher Bias</div>

The researcher strove to remain objective by triangulating data via member

checks, peer debriefing with committee chair, reviewing field notes and transcripts to

ensure that they reflected the information informants provided rather than what

researcher projected. Each informant also reviewed transcriptions to edit or amend them

accordingly to ensure that they reflected their actual comments. Triangulating data in this

manner in conjunction with reviewing archival data acted as safeguards against

researcher bias tainting the integrity of the study's findings.

Reviewing data derived from literature also helped to minimize researcher bias by

raising the question of how bias can distort research findings. Thus the researcher is

confident that these protocols protected the integrity of the process and product, as the

project strove to understand what happened or did not happen in the intentional

leadership workshops to influence changes in informants anticipated behaviors, and how they behaved within their organizations after completing these workshops. The following section discusses ethical considerations followed by a summary of the study's purpose and procedure.

Ethical Considerations

Fidelity to the research design ensured that the appropriate safeguards maintained the integrity of the research project procedurally and in its final product. In this regard, no concerns arose during the length of this project that threatened to compromise its integrity or the informants participation. Thus the researcher is confident that the study held stringently to the guidelines for conducting a qualitative study in particular and conducting research in general with human subjects to ensure that their ethical rights were priority and were thus protected accordingly. Below is a summary of the study's purpose and procedure.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of intentionality on leadership development via a single-subject case study using the theoretical frameworks of Positive Organizational Scholarship (Avolio & Luthans, 2009; Cameron et al., 2003) and Schutz's (1962) notion of Multiple Realities. The goals were to determine what happened or did not happen in the intentional leadership workshops that caused or did not cause a change in the anticipated behavior of three primary informants by conducting interviews with one primary informant and three key informants, three passive observations and analysis of archival data with one primary.

Archival data consisted of six articles written by the primary informant, five of which appeared in his city's major newspaper and another that originally appeared in *Greater Charlotte Business Magazine*, and which was extracted from a blog on the Center for Intentional Leadership's website. Findings were analyzed via Deductive Analysis which described the data gathered from all informants, including analysis of archival data and observations. Data from archival analysis was displayed categorically on a thematic analysis chart.

Data from observations were described based on deductions from findings as they were interpreted through POS (Cameron et al., 2003) and Schutz's (1962) Multiple Realities. Additional tables depict relevant components of this study were used to demonstrate the symbiotic nature of the elements of intentional leadership. The researcher is confident that this approach and study added to contemporary understanding of the effect of intentionality on leadership development. Following a conclusion the next chapter analyzes the study's findings on the eight elements of intentional leadership.

<div align="center">Conclusion</div>

The preceding chapters outlined the two research questions which prompted this single-subject case study regarding the effect of intentionality on leadership development. These questions sought to understand what happened or did not happen in the intentional leadership workshops that influenced or did not influence anticipated behavioral changes in informants, and how these changes effected or did not affect their respective organizations. In route it operationalized a definition of intentional leadership while addressing existing gaps in the literature review portion along with the potential for intentionality to be an effective tool of leadership development.

Attempts to answer the two research questions were supported by analysis of archival data written by primary informant, a comprehensive review of leadership literature, some of which examined historical approaches to leadership studies and others that emphasized specific leadership models, which sought to determine how leaders developed and how to tell when they were being effective. Characteristically, the review provided support for this current study and a context for discussing intentionality, its characteristics, the importance of communication to leadership development, for example, including appropriately what scholars already knew and needed to know about leadership in general and intentional leadership specifically.

The review then surveyed studies specifically related to intentionality conducted by researchers to provide a framework for this current study, displaying salient characteristics on tables and a thematic analysis chart which presented dominant themes derived from analysis of archival data. Additional sections discussed the influence of organizational dynamics and their corresponding responses to leadership behaviors. These responses were situated in the theoretical postulates of Positive Organizational Scholarship's strengths-based approach (Cameron et al., 2003) and Schutz's (1962) notion of Multiple Realities.

The study also asserted that organizational dynamics often determined definitions of leadership, particularly when leaders deviated from organizational traditions. There was also a discussion of research procedures, including data collection, the rationale behind protocol used, data analysis (deductive), data management, ethical considerations, researcher bias, characteristics of both the primary informant (especially his existential orientation toward leadership development) and the three key informants and the criteria

for their inclusion in this study. Additional sections outlined the characteristics of the

research site an as well as the primary informant's account of its design, décor and

relationship to intentional leadership. The section ended with a summary of the study's

aim and purpose. The next chapter analyses the findings from this current study

CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this single-subject case study was driven by efforts to answer two

fundamental research questions, namely,

1. What happened in the intentional leadership workshops that caused or did not
   cause a change in the anticipated behavior of informants?

2. What effect did the intentional leadership training workshops have on informants
   and their organizations?

Via three semi-structured 90-minute interviews with a primary informant and one

90-minute interview with three key informants in conjunction with three passive

observations, and analysis of primary informant's archival data, the researcher identified

eight essential elements that characterized intentionality and their on effect leadership

development.

A few of these eight elements will be analyzed briefly in the following section

below before a detailed analysis occurs later in this chapter. Characteristically, these

elements were symbiotic and distinguished intentional leadership from other leadership

models because, according to the primary informant, intentional leadership was not a

leadership model but rather a developmental approach to life which affected its

leadership dimensions.

Other essential findings derived from this study were the characteristics of

intentional leaders, the importance of mastering intentional communication and

intentional goal–setting, the influence of organizational dynamics, climate, vision, the

primary informant's existential orientation and the role of positive disintegration in contributing to intentionality's effect on leadership development. The researcher also learned that these factors informed the primary informant's presentations and gave workshops a character which resembled group therapy.

The dynamics that emerged from this approach created an atmosphere of openness, vulnerability, trust and self-awareness wherein the three key informants became conscious of and committed to changing behaviors and attitudes that had previously hindered their leadership development. Because the primary informant addressed what he called the *beingness* of each informant they were able to identify, name and conceive strategic alternatives to change these behaviors accordingly.

All three key informants said that their commitment to developing themselves had not only resulted in noticeable changes in their leadership development but that it had also helped to change their attitude towards leadership in general. Janice (founder of a local non-profit) was especially impacted in this regard, saying, that before encountering intentional leadership she would have associated leadership with a position versus an approach to life. Julia likewise said that since completing the workshops she now understood that we "all are leaders in some way."

During the course of this study the researcher also learned of the symbiotic relationship between intentional leadership and POS's strengths-based approach to leadership development, including how this perspective allowed for the emergence of qualities such as openness, fluidity, vulnerability and creativity, which enabled informants to acknowledge the *beingness* of their persons, and not just the responsibilities associated with their positions.

Recognition of this *beingness* through what the primary informant implied was an existential counseling approach inspired informants to recreate themselves based on their recognition of the created nature of the self and social reality. Central to this self-recreation was the role of declarations, the willingness of informants to assert publicly what they intended to become existentially because of their perception of the role of narratives in self and leadership development. The role and theme of declaration appeared prominently in the archival data and will be analyzed later in this study.

Observing the workshop dynamics and the subsequent exchanges clarified the researcher's understanding of the effect of intentionality on leadership development. The selection below provides a deductive analytical overview of the characteristics of intentional leaders weaving accordingly several of its eight elements, illustrating them in action based on informants' accounts from interview, observational and archival data.

Intentional Leaders: An Overview

Key distinctions of intentional leaders as identified in this study were their commitment to being conscientious, self-reflective, self-regulative, aware of and dedicated to aligning every organizational resource to achieve organizational objectives while maximizing interpersonal interactions to strengthen their connections with followers, increasing thereby their credibility and leadership development. According to the primary informant intentional leaders were not content until organizational resources were converted into assets, which effected organizational outcomes and enhanced employee well-being. Moreover, his conception of credibility connected with a primary element of intentional leadership --personal integrity.

The primary informant said that personal integrity meant that intentional leaders "honored their word as themselves." (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011). He furthered added that "they were who they said they were and they did what they said they would do" (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011). He also said that personal integrity made intentional leaders deliberate about reducing the gap that existed between where their organizations where and where they wanted to be and strove to create mechanisms to mediate goal attainment. They also maintained the same attitude regarding their leadership development based on the comments of the three key informants. Here they expressed the importance of vision and its influence on leadership development.

Inspired by a compelling vision aligned with the organization's resources, the three key informants along with the primary informant said that intentional leaders reduced this gap by controlling conventional stimulus/response mechanisms by being more conscious and conscientious in how they approached others and appropriated organizational resources in their daily leadership activities.

In being conscious and conscientious of their behaviors, the primary informant implied that intentional leaders were more likely to create what he later called an "intentional culture" (Whitehead, 3rd Interview, 2011), where people were self-led and self -managed because of being motivated from within to achieve organizational goals and to develop themselves professionally. He used this phrase as a substitute for a strengths-based culture because of his work in helping senior executives undertake the task of changing their cultures accordingly by being more intentional in how they led.

In this regard, Julia (project manager with fortune 500 company), referenced Stephen Covey's *Seven Habits of Highly Effective People* (1989), and asserted that

intentional leaders began with the end in mind, letting this perspective guide how they behaved as well as what projects they accepted and rejected based on the relationship between these projects and their personal missions whenever the two conflicted. The primary informant affirmed Julia's perspective with another element of intentional leadership, which said that intentional leaders were purpose-driven rather than ego driven, which will be discussed in detail later.

The primary informant also implied that intentional leaders allowed a purpose-driven orientation to leadership development and organizational life rather than an excessive and egocentric concern with contingencies to control their actions and responses. Thus, he said that intentional leaders readily acknowledged their weaknesses and the role of organizational contingencies as factors that influenced leadership development.

They did not, however, let these diminish the effect of intentionality on their leadership development or weaken their commitment to becoming intentional leaders because they devised mechanisms that enabled them to sustain themselves when contingencies threatened to erode their commitment, e.g., self-reflection, self-regulation, peer feedback, etc. (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011).

The primary informant said that these leaders commitment to being intentional despite contingencies compounded their impact and conveyed authenticity to their followers, increasing their development and effectiveness simultaneously. In making this claim he gave an example that he later used as an example of communicational versatility also. "I can" he asserted, "curse you out if I need to, then turn around and tell you that you are the nicest person in the world" (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011).

The primary informant based this assertion on the claim that because of their self-knowledge and conscientiousness intentional leaders were better than others at reading situations and people. He prefaced this assertion by saying that intentional leaders ability to say whatever was needed was based on their ongoing self-inquiry, which led to presence, another element of intentional leadership to be discussed later. He ended his explanation of the effect of intentionality on leadership development by implying that if leaders were able to earn the requisite trust by getting their minds off of themselves and onto others they would not only accelerate their development but they would also increase their leadership effectiveness. The section below analyzes the purpose, value and characterizations of intentional leadership.

Purpose, Value and Characterizations of Intentional Leadership

The primary informant also said that one of the skills of intentional leaders was their ability to put the right people on the right jobs, aligning them with their strengths rather than trying to develop their weaknesses. His claim connected with the third element of intentional leadership. This element was based on the notion that intentional leaders made space for others to show up as great, and that they were deliberate about using every opportunity to call forth that greatness.

How this looked was based on the need of the person or the opportunity at hand, as well as the ability of the leader to recognize these opportunities and employ intentionality appropriately. Jessica (mid-level manager with national food retailer) said that for her creating space for others to show up as great meant taking the time to understand (and affirm) the other person's perspective whether or not she shared it. Tied to this element was the idea of empathy, which she later credited her encounter with

intentionality with helping her develop in dealing with her mother's reluctance to take her medications as prescribed.

In Jessica's example is seen the symbiotic nature of the eight elements of intentional leadership. For example, Jessica had to be present, alert to and aware of her mother's reasons for not taking her medications as prescribed. She then had to determine how to affirm her mother's feelings without offending her and yet change her mind simultaneously by using the appropriate communicational stance. This stance had to transcend what she called her former frustration with her mother's attitude. Jessica described this frustration in what could be perceived as an egocentric approach because her frustration related to what she wanted her mother to do rather than to the benefit her mother would receive by following her doctor's orders.

However, Jessica said that when she shifted her focus from her frustration with her mother's resistance to focusing specifically on the greater purpose of her mother's health (purpose-driven versus ego-driven), she found a way to become more collaborative and collegial, which resulted in her mother conforming to her doctor's orders and taking her medication as prescribed.

In this regard, Jessica said that intentionality determined the critical choices that leaders made and thereby served as a means of enhancing both human and leadership relationships, echoing the primary informant's existential approach to leadership and life. Conceptually, Jessica implied that she used Multiple Realities to pose scenarios that served as incentives to gain her mother's compliance. Scholars of existential communication called this approach "multiple truths" (Ashman & Lawler, 2008, p. 256).

Jessica's attitude revealed the strategic posture that the primary informant asserted earlier was characteristic of intentional leaders because of the conscientiousness which characterized their approach in dealing with persons and problems, which he later implied was different from seeing persons as problems (Whitehead, 3rd Interview, 2011). Thus Jessica was able to use her newly acquired approach to leadership to leverage her relationship with her mother to achieve ends that were mutually beneficial and personally developmental.

Though outside the bounds of business leadership and development, Jessica's approach was profitable and affected, as it were, the bottom line of increasing the quality of her mother's health. More important, her approach paralleled findings from the archival data (*Charlotte Observer*, 2008: *New ideals for 21st century leadership*), particularly the theme that intentional leaders used non-polarizing discourse in their efforts to achieve mutually beneficial objectives.

Later, during her interview with the researcher, in speaking on the element of communicational versatility, Jessica stated that she could not have adopted that collegial and collaborative approach had she not been exposed to the intentional leadership workshops. In this regard, Jessica's success in getting her mother to take her medications as prescribed also demonstrated an ability to manage what could be called soft or intangible resources for which she was not officially responsible but for which she assumed responsibility, which was consistent with and characteristic of intentional leaders because they were purpose-driven versus ego driven, according to the primary informant.

This purpose-driven approach held for and applied to Julia (project manager), who said that she had assumed responsibility for a problem that had arisen while her boss was out of the country. In describing her attitude toward the problem, Julia said that "no one else seemed to see it or if they did see it they weren't doing anything about it." So she said that she just stepped in and started trying to resolve it without being directed by superiors or even being responsible for doing so. Until she related this account to the researcher Julia said that she had not made the connection between her action and her exposure to intentional leadership. However, she now saw that her experiences in the workshop had played a part in her willingness to get involved and to resolve a problem that was being overlooked by her coworkers and their bosses.

Julia's actions also illustrated the difference between her former leadership training experiences (along with that of the other two key informants), which they each said highlighted the technical and tactical side of leadership development as opposed to the personal and people-centered approach. In this instance, however, Julia also said that her response was driven partly because the problem meant that other employees were being negatively affected by organizational inattentiveness. Her attitude reinforced the primary informant's claim that intentional leadership was more of a leadership approach than it was a leadership model. It also illustrated his claim that intentional leaders were not only present and conscientious but that they were also willing to do something about what they were conscious of and present to.

Julia credited the other part of her willingness to assume responsibility for the problem with the allusion that said, essentially, 'That's just how I am.' Her statement, though interpretively broad bridged the existential nature of intentional leadership

because it highlighted the *beingness* of the person and her presence to this *beingness*, which gave her the opportunity to act or annul her inclinations and impulses accordingly based partly on her sense of autonomy and growing self-efficacy.

Subtly yet significantly still, by implication she credited the increase of both to her encounter to intentional leadership. Moreover, in saying 'That's just how I am' Julia also connoted the evolutionary nature of leadership and human development, which made leaders perceptive and responsive because of their belief in their self-efficacy, which was enhanced by deliberate acts wherein they expressed their autonomy without being told when or how to act.

These themes of self-awareness, self-regulation, self-efficacy and a corresponding sense of autonomy were confirmed by analysis of archival data wherein readers were challenged by the primary informant to take responsibility for changing both the climate and course of their communities by getting engaged based on their passion and not position (formally) as leaders. In this regard, the primary informant was especially committed to challenging and encouraging readers to believe that they could make a difference despite their social status or what he later called lack of "positional power" (Whitehead, 3rd Interview, 2011).

Thematically, analysis of archival data contained all eight elements of intentional leadership, which will be discussed later in this study. The same held true for the primary informant's approach during the observations. In fact the theme of the first observation was entitled "The power of possibility." During which, he challenged the over 200 attendees to envision a new and renewed organizational reality wherein member talents were aligned with organizational and individual aspirations. Yet he said that the

prerequisite for realizing these visions depended upon their willingness to assume responsibility for the problems and opportunities to which they were present, though they weren't formally responsible for.

According to the primary participant presence required intentional leaders to engage in the kind of critical reflectivity that enabled them to become conscious of how others experienced them as well as how they experienced others. Sequentially, they could thus perceive the challenges or opportunities that existed in their midst and then decide if and how they would attempt to resolve these (Whitehead, *Charlotte Observer*, 2008: *How to make a difference*). Presence, in this instance, superseded strategy, according to him.

In being appropriately present the primary informant said that intentional leaders could then recognize that their previous ways of being and behaving was due in part to their inattentiveness or perhaps their sense of powerlessness, which in turn diminished the quality of their leadership development and effectiveness with others. Yet he related the release of power and the ability to empower with becoming present to and aware of possibilities. In this instance what mattered was a leader's willingness to embrace self-critical reflectivity in ways that challenged assumptions that hindered their leadership development.

With the proper awareness and corresponding sense of self efficacy, however, he said that intentional leaders could then make declarations about what they were willing to commit to in order to change the current reality to a more beneficial one. In this regard, the researcher learned that intentional communication was as much intrapersonal as it was interpersonal. The importance of mastering intentional communication through self-reflection and self-regulation is discussed below.

Mastering Intentional Communication through Self-reflection and Self-Regulation

Having mastered intentional communication through self-reflection and self-regulation, intentional leaders could then adopt a trans-situational approach in their efforts to use intentionality to effect their leadership development, inspiring, challenging and helping others to design new options and opportunities for themselves simultaneously.

Campbell (2009) clearly believed in the efficacy of intentionality to effect leadership development and specifically highlighted the communicational component with concerns such as: To what extent does the leader use intentionality…in the leadership setting at any of the three levels: Strategic Planning Level, Daily Planning Level, or Moment-to-Moment Level?

1. Does the leader shift intention when called for, depending upon the reaction or response of the follower?

2. What specifically causes the shift in intention ("objective" or "action") when a leader is communicating with a follower? Are they aware of the "actions" they pursue toward intentionality?

3. How did they develop these skills for any level? Did they learn by experience or were they taught?

These questions enhanced this current study because they provided a basis for deducing the effect of intentionality on leadership development by recognizing the influence of intentional communication grounded in a design that was relevant to the goals of this current study in relation to the two research questions outlined in the Chapter I. More important, the above questions provided a context for deducing the validity of the informants' data that asserted intentional leaders assumed whatever

communicational posture was appropriate to promote leadership development within the organization and for themselves.

Characteristically, however, Campbell's (2009) questions and subsequent analyses were not a leadership model but rather modes of inquiry that contributed to contemporary understanding of the effect of intentionality as a leadership model on leadership development, especially the communicational component. The section below discusses the influence of vision on leadership development within intentional cultures.

The Influence of Vision on Leadership Development within Intentional Cultures

Intentional leaders combined a sense of what was necessary with what was possible (Rosenbach & Taylor, 2001, p. 2001). The primary informant used this claim to describe how America's architects inspired thirteen struggling American colonies to believe that they could fight and defeat the British Empire in an archival piece entitled, *What local goals would you declare* (*Charlotte Observer,* 2008) to inspire employees to extraordinary performance, thereby enhancing their leadership development.

The primary informant asserted that intentional leaders inspired others' commitment to superior performance by getting them to recognize the inherent alternatives that existed even in the direst and darkest conditions. Connected to colonial leaders ability to catalyze colonists was the aforementioned power of declarations, which suggested that they perceived the created and constructed nature of the self, reality and the social world. In doing so the primary informant said that they rejected the given for the desirable and signed their names to it, as indicated by the Declaration of Independence, which was the pivot of the archival piece, *What local goals would you declare (Charlotte Observer* 2008*).*

In similar fashion, the primary informant challenged readers to mirror the same boldness regarding changes that they believed needed to be made in their local communities and said, "Can we be as bold as our forefathers were about our country? Can we envision a future and fully commit ourselves to bringing that vision into existence? What would it take for you to sign your name to a declaration of the city's future?" Conceptually, the dominant theme of this piece embellished Schutz's (1962) distinction of behaviors from actions, the former were what he called "empty protentions" (p. 11), which was mentioned earlier but is reiterated here to reinforce the difference between purposive actions and passive behaviors.

These behaviors were empty because they were not aimed toward or committed to changing social reality. Actions in contrast, were diametrically opposed because they had the goal of using one's self-efficacy and autonomy to act on that part of the world that the actor had committed to changing to align with his or her unique vision. In this regard, the primary informant's questions were also meant to mobilize citizens into action and away from apathy by believing in their capacities.

The researcher learned, confirmed perhaps, that leaders who embraced Multiple Realities were more apt to inspire follower loyalty and create a sense of individual and organizational enthusiasm by their words and their deeds. In doing so, he said that they also moved closer toward creating an intentional or what POS called a strengths-based culture. The three key informants added that such cultures were open to new ways of doing things and leading people if they were present to how people experienced its leadership in conjunction with the dialectics and dynamics of organizational life.

The primary informant also added that cultures who adopted this paradigm were more likely to be cultures where people worked with minimal supervision because of the vision they had and which the character of the organization encouraged and supported them to pursue (Whitehead, 3rd Interview, 2011). Here the notion of intentional leadership being an approach reiterated, as it were, itself and also reinforced the primary informant's existential orientation to leadership development and is analyzed below.

Intentional Leadership: An Approach versus a Model of Leadership Development

The primary informant cast intentional leadership as an approach because of his admittedly existential orientation, which highlighted what he called the *beingness* of a person, which he said was fluid and not fixed and therefore amenable to change. In contrast, he said that a leadership model tended to show up as "the answer, a closed, and all-inclusive system" (Whitehead, 2nd Interview, 2011), being less responsive to existing realities as was intentional leadership.

The primary informant further framed intentional leadership as a journey of self-exploration or as an experiment he was conducting on himself, with human nature, and which included the leadership dimension of life. He and the three key informants all agreed that viewing intentional leadership as an approach was empowering because it gave them room to create conceptions of themselves as leaders that leveraged their strengths and identified limiting beliefs. Each informant asserted that the sense of being empowered was true if they worked in a strengths-based environment, such as described by Positive Organizational Scholarship.

In this climate they said that they were empowered to pursue possibilities that they might not have even recognized prior to encountering intentional leadership. In this

regard, each informant said that intentional leadership differed from their previous

leadership development experience because it focused more on the personal (existential)

than on the technical or tactical side of leadership development, which resulted in a

fundamental shift in their perceptions of themselves and their leadership abilities.

Embedded in their claims and the archival data were the eight elements of intentionality,

as explained by the primary informant, and as witnessed by the researcher during the

observations. Before analyzing these elements the section below discusses the existential

orientation of the primary informant and its effect on leadership development.

Intentionality: An Existential Approach to Leadership Development

Central to the primary informant's conception of the self as being fluid and

created is the role of declarations in fostering leadership development; that is, in what he

called the willingness of leaders to declare new realities in their absence and despite

resistance from others or from themselves initially. He added that for declarations to

prosper leaders must be hyper-committed to achieve (and sustain) these new realities

through deliberate periods of self-examination.

Otherwise intentionality failed to produce its promise or to deliver on its

existential premise that individuals were responsible for who they were and for what they

became personally and professionally. The recognition of one's personal power and the

created nature of reality provided the context for personal growth and leadership

development and represented the basis of what he earlier called a person's *beingness*

(Hoeller, 1993).

According to the primary informant this *beinginess* was buttressed by a leader's

willingness to "look within to question one's self about who one is, how one came to be

this and who does one want to be" based on one's ability to change him or herself since identities were` constructed by the stories persons told themselves about themselves, or what was told to them by others (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011; Whitehead, 3rd Interview, 2011).

The willingness to look within acted as an antidote to what could be called an anti-self, one whose development was confounded by forces and deference to realities that a commitment to intentionality would alter. He countered this claim, however, by saying that reality would prevail provided persons and leaders failed to recognize the role of declarations and narratives in constructing the self and its expressions.

The primary informant added that looking within provided a platform for self-recreation since he believed that persons ultimately became who they declared themselves to be if they adjusted their actions accordingly. He said that doing so required them to adopt new intentions to create new realities that accentuated (and accelerated routinely) their self-growth and leadership development (Whitehead, 3rd Interview, 2011).

Throughout this study the primary informant reiterated and exemplified an existentialist approach, and continually asserted that the self was something not so much that was given but rather was something that was fashioned through the various experiences leaders under-went in the process of developing their potential whether in supportive or subversive environments (Whitehead, 3rd Interview, 2011).

Moreover, he repeated the notion that the ability to re-create the self was based on a leader's ability to recognize the constructed nature of the social world and the self, which allowed them to experience greater autonomy and increased self-efficacy in developing their leadership abilities (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011). The primary

informant's claims coincided with Multiple Realties, which rejected reification or the objective givenness of the world and the self.

By viewing intentionality as a leadership approach rather than as a leadership model the primary informant said that he saw himself as "constantly, constantly inventing it, you know, creating it the more I develop" (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011), which married and magnified his existential orientation to life with the notion of a fluid self that was under ongoing construction via experiences, responses, circumstances and narratives that either supported or supplanted success based on personal proclamations and whether or not the appropriate actions supported these –individually and environmentally.

Another fact that the researcher learned during the course of this study was that the primary informant's conception of intentional leadership differed from characterizations found in contemporary literature because of its profoundly existential perspective, which was more often implied than stated yet stressed nonetheless, as he sought to gain a deeper understanding of himself, which inevitably effected his leadership development. In fact his approach was more characteristic of existential leadership instead with its stress on persons, what they were feeling, how they were affected by the often facile yet fragile interplay of external forces and their own internal phenomenology (Olivares et al., 2007).

The primary participant said that his existential orientation (and continual progress) in changing his life from what it was previously to where it is currently inspired him to continue experimenting with and creating intentional leadership as he conceived it. More important, he said that his previous experiences also prepared him to teach it to organizations and individuals to help them enhance their leadership development. The

primary informant summarized his approach and perspective on intentionality by saying

that intentional leadership was an "ongoing inquiry and analysis of myself and my

relationship with people," (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011). This orientation to

leadership development allowed him to modify his practice and uncover approaches that

were more effective than others in accentuating others efforts to enhance their leadership

development.

Central to others' ability to benefit from intentional leadership was their ability to

be self-aware combined with a corresponding sense of self-knowledge. He said that the

combination of these two factors were prerequisites for facilitating personal and

professional development. Sustained he implied that self-knowledge eventually revealed

and increased a leader's self-efficacy and enabled them to act on their aspirations in ways

that altered their leadership development and effectiveness, even when the environment

impeded their pursuits. Yet the primary informant along with the three key informants

agreed that it was still possible to practice intentionality in what the primary informant

later called "a tough culture" (Whitehead, 3rd Interview, 2011).

In this regard, he said that symbiotic yet often imperceptible organizational

dynamics enhanced or impeded leadership development accordingly. Characteristically,

the ability of other leaders and members to be intentional was retarded if senior leaders

were unaware of the role they played in producing these dynamics.

Of necessity, he asserted that intentional leaders who found themselves in such

cultures were said to have an even stronger internal locus of control in order to undertake

what the primary informant called the hard work of self-reflection and self-assertion to

overcome the resistance characteristic of the climate (Whitehead, 3rd Interview, 2011).

Even then, however, the primary informant said that this attitude did not guarantee the success of leaders' projects though it contributed to their leadership development. Here he implied a crucial yet critical distinction between leadership development and leadership success, initially especially. But he did say that the friction these leaders encountered inevitably strengthened their leadership abilities (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011). What mattered ultimately was the leader's self-perception and sense of self-efficacy, not the organizational resistance or the sense of inertia that sought to discourage the practice of intentionality.

Instead the primary informant along with the three key informants said that success at effecting change hinged on the person's commitment to being a different and a more effective leader than they had been previously. Hence the need to ask themselves what he called some very basic questions such as, "Who am I; what do I believe; what do I stand for; and, what am I committed to" (Fivush & Haden, 2003; Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011).

The primary informant believed that if leaders embraced the answers they received and the solutions they followed as a result of their self-interrogation they would experience what Dabrowski and Piechowski (1977) called an inner psychic transformation consonant with who they wanted to become. All they had to do was be willing to take the corresponding risks or engage in what Cameron et al. (2003) deemed as "positive deviance" (p. 132), to enhance their leadership development despite the organizational climate.

First, though, leaders had to begin the necessary process of self-interrogation in order to be rightly intentional rather than reactionary. The researcher deduced this

statement based on data derived from archival analysis and observations. The section

below discusses the factors that facilitated this self-interrogation and which were

fundamental to sustaining the existential approach that allowed the primary informant to

lead his clients to experience what he called "breakthroughs" in their leadership

development (Whitehead, 2nd Interview, 2011).

Creating the Self as an Intentional Leader through Positive Disintegration

The primary informant's constant claim concerning the created nature of the self

and the often subtle but powerful influence of organizational dynamics embellished his

reiteration that so much of leadership was tied to the *beingness* of persons and their

willingness to engage in an "ongoing inquiry or personal journey, and self-consciousness

into their own development" (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011). His own inquiry made him

aware of the fact that his clients were experiencing what he termed as "some pretty

extraordinary results in their business and in their personal lives" (Whitehead, 1st

Interview, 2011) as a result of having attended the Quest for Personal Leadership (QPL)

workshops.

In order to understand what provoked these changes the primary informant said

that he would stop and ask himself, "What is it that I'm doing or is going on that is

causing them to have these results in contrast to the results they may have experienced

(or not experienced) during other leadership training programs."

The primary informant said that the answers that he derived became the data that

added to the "body of knowledge" (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011), which in turn

influenced how he approached future training QPL sessions, altering in route the

character of the workshops to incorporate the new information as he and the other

informants engaged in what he called an existential process of self-discovery and self-development.

With the understanding derived from his ongoing self-analysis the primary informant then said that the resulting process freed persons to choose who they wanted to become provided they endured what Dabrowski and Piechowski (1977) called "positive disintegration" (p. 9), which was preceded by what they further called an "existential moratorium" (p. 11), wherein persons experienced an often dramatic and emotional transition from one existential state to another.

Two of the three key informants acknowledged that they had that kind of experience that Dabrowski and Piechowski (1977) labeled as positive disintegration during the intentional leadership workshops, though they didn't use the language of existentialism or the phrase *positive disintegration* specifically. Jessica (mid-level manager at a regional corporation), for example, said that amid one of the QPL sessions she suddenly realized that she didn't have to go through life expecting the worst to occur at every moment because she had previously experienced an extended period of what she called "good luck."

Jessica said that without her QPL experience she might not have made this discovery and challenged herself to change accordingly, albeit gradually. By implication, she noted that her newfound optimism also improved the quality and course of her interactions with coworkers, which also accentuated her development and their perception of her effectiveness as a leader. Another key informant, Julia (project manager for a fortune 500 company), was less impressed and impacted by the intentional leadership workshops as were her two counterparts; although she admitted that it was

probably because she was more accustomed to leadership development forums that were more structured and that stated initially what attendees could expect to get from the experience.

This approach contradicted both the format and content of how the primary informant facilitated the Quest for Personal Leadership (QPL) sessions. As mentioned before, these sessions resembled group therapy more so than leadership development workshops. However, the researcher learned that the primary informant's approach was supported in part by his formal education, as he held an M.A. in Counseling from an area university.

Even so, according to Julia the workshops still provided her with several factors to consider, consciously more so at least than she would have had she not experienced the atmosphere and approach adopted by the primary informant as he facilitated the workshops. Later in the interview with the researcher, however, Julia began to make connections in what she associated with her leadership development and her presence at the QPL sessions that she had not made previously. In fact it wasn't until the end of the interview that she recognized how the workshops did more than affect her personal life, as she had previously restricted its influence, to recognize how it had influenced her professional and leadership development as well.

Julia further implied that she experienced emotions and saw conceptions of herself (and leadership) that had previously escaped her notice and which had hampered her development in certain areas, communications for example, which was where she currently worked in her capacity as a project manager. Overall, Julia said that her encounter with intentional leadership produced a sense of power and empowerment that

the other two informants agreed that they had sustained after the workshops ended because they continued to practice the self-reflection that prompted their initial self-awareness and self-knowledge, which were key components of the QPL sessions. The section below discusses the increased autonomy and self-efficacy experienced by the key informants before analyzing the eight elements of intentional leadership.

The Role of Intentionality in Increasing Leader Self-Efficacy and Autonomy

Central to the three key informants' newfound self-awareness was an increased sense of autonomy and self-efficacy that enabled them to recognize they could choose their response in any given situation despite external pressures because of their ability to recognize the created nature of the self and the world. They said that this existential space provided the perspective they needed to be creative and constructive as a result, rejecting in route reifications. The primary informant portrayed this recognition and corresponding resolution of the key informants in deciding on their response as "a free choice, a complete existential choice" (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011).

The ability to make this choice required informants' to pause and reflect on the environment, the consequences, the audience and their intentions for choosing to respond accordingly based on how they conceived themselves existentially. Each informant said that recognizing the space between stimulus and response gave them the opportunity to invent, as it were, their responses rather than to react, as they admitted that they would have done previously. Their claims confirmed the findings that asserted the need for leaders to manage their moment-to-moment micro-level communication with peers in ways that enabled each to achieve mutually beneficial objectives.

Otherwise rather than being intentional in choosing their responses the three key informants said that they probably would have reverted to their normal way of being, or what the primary informant labeled "the default self" (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011), which connoted subtle acceptance of the self as given rather than created based upon its misrecognition of its role in co-creating itself and its environment. In failing to make this recognition the key informants would have embraced reification by passively accepting what is known psychologically as *the personality*, i.e., a fixed set of traits genetically endowed rather than envisioning and actualizing new communicational or behavioral realities that enhanced their leadership development.

Yet through the self-reflective, regulative existential orientation characteristic of the intentional leadership workshops the primary informant reiterated that all three key informants recognized their role in creating themselves as an opportunity to change their self-conceptions, which inevitably effected how they led and were ultimately perceived by others. These new perceptions beneficially affected the character of their organizations and their leadership development.

The relationship between leadership development and the effect of intentionality on leadership development was most clearly seen in Positive Organizational Scholarship's strengths-based approach to organizational life and the dynamics that attend because of their inextricable ties. POS's approach aligns with intentional leadership's orientation and thus provided the optimal framework for helping the researcher to understand how intentionality effected leadership development, especially in divining the often subtle yet insuperable boundaries of organizational dynamics.

In this regard, Erikson (Knowles, 1986; Schlein, 1987) provided insight into the nature of this symbiotic relationship, saying,, "…All men, at any given moment, live through stages of life in which their changing needs and developing capacities must be reintegrated with their institutions" (p. 508). If this were true, then perhaps the primary informant's existential orientation to leadership development via intentional leadership can help leaders to better understand the effect of intentionality on leadership development by ensuring that they gave proper attention to this developmental time and the processes that promoted and characterized it. In doing so, leaders and members alike would be more likely to experience Erikson's (Knowles, 1986) assertion that reintegration into the life of institutions was a necessary condition for leadership development and effectiveness (Murphy, 1958). The section below analyses the effects of intentionality in a strengths-based culture or what the primary informant called an intentional culture.

<div align="center">Leadership Development in a Strengths-Based Culture</div>

Characteristically, leadership development was accentuated when persons worked in organizations that adopted a strengths-based approach toward leadership development, assigning employees to tasks compatible with their talents while encouraging and tolerating actions that contradicted organizational traditions. POS scholars cast this organizational approach as transcendent behavior and positive deviance regardless of whether the outcome was positive.

The fact that organizations (and their leaders) encouraged risk-taking or assigned duties based on members' talents had the effect of inspiring others to be more intentional and innovative in their approach to leadership and in their interactions with others. The

primary informant said that such a culture communicated another element of intentionality (to be discussed later), namely, that everyone and everything mattered. Insignificance in this regard was a disregard for things and people that, rightly perceived, had power to improve organizational performance and enhance leadership development simultaneously.

What mattered was not whether the outcome of specific actions was positive but rather whether a leader's and an organization's resilience increased. According to POS postulates and the primary informant's implications this attitude required leaders and organizations to adopt a learning approach to leadership development. In this regard, each of the three key informants stated that they worked in strengths-based organizations and were therefore able to implement what they learned in the QPL sessions authentically in efforts to enhance their leadership development. How this implementation looked or what it meant practically depended upon the informant's perspective.

Julia, for instance, agreed that intentionality resonated with her, especially its emphasis on being purpose-driven versus ego-driven, for example, and thus credited it with helping her to reinvent herself within the context of the organization that had recently bought out her former employer. Unlike her previous employer, Julia characterized the environment created by the new owners as "strengths-based."

Because of this climate she implied that she was more willing to take risks, assume responsibility and to recognize problems and opportunities interchangeably, acting on these accordingly without fear of retribution if her actions failed to produce the intended results Based on interviews with the primary informant and the three key informants the researcher became convinced that organizational dynamics played an

often dubious role in enhancing or impeding leadership development if leaders or organizations lacked the required courage, resilience, optimism, autonomy and sense of self-efficacy that was implicit in the concept of leadership in general, and characteristic of intentional leadership especially (Whitehead, 3rd Interview, 2011). These characteristics also described what the informants said they experienced emerging within themselves after completing the intentional leadership workshops as they resumed their respective leadership responsibilities

Jessica, for example, credited the communicational versatility component of intentional leadership with not only making her more effective as a mid-level manager with a national food chain. She also credited it with changing peer, subordinate and her superiors' perceptions of her and her overall leadership development. In doing so, Jessica said that coworkers commented that she was "easier to work with and talk to than she had been before." Jessica herself said that she experienced herself differently also, noticing that she had become more effective in the last few years since being introduced to intentional leadership than she had been the previous ten years with her employer.

The consequences of Jessica's application of communicational versatility resulted in increased credibility with coworkers and collegiality among them, as she accrued crucial psychological capital in ways that she implied she had lacked before because of her previous communicational style and coworker's self-perceptions of her.

Janice and Julia also agreed that becoming more intentional in their moment-to-moment communications significantly altered their leadership practice and development, empowering coworkers in ways that they hadn't done before because they were more conscious of ensuring that coworkers experienced them as positive and supportive. Much

of what Julia related was implied; whereas Jessica's claims were explicit and often animated as he related her accruing successes.

The three key informants' expanding consciousness gave them opportunities to conceive different options and alternatives on how they actualized their leadership abilities. In doing so, they each said that they not only felt more empowered but they also felt freer to empower others also, which they stressed that they had become intentional about doing even in casual encounters with coworkers. All three key informants credited this approach with enabling them to envision new processes and paths to achieve professional and organizational goals. They said that their expanding consciousness also made them more relational and inclusive with coworkers.

Thus each informant said that they began to pursue knowledge and solicit (and receive) support from persons who they might not have otherwise sought had they not become intentional in their leadership development and made what the primary informant previously called a free existential choice regarding the character and course of its trajectory. Elements of these outcomes were acknowledged by all three key informants, though each was at a different stage of incorporating intentionality as a normal part of their leadership paradigm.

However, as mentioned earlier, a strengths-based environment was not a prerequisite for conceiving Multiple Realities or for practicing intentional leadership. In this regard, Janice said that intentional leadership had more to do with individuals than it did with environments, as did the other two key informants. Following the Conclusion below is a more thorough analysis of the eight elements than the abbreviated analysis that occurred earlier.

As mentioned in the Introduction this analysis included and combined archival and observational data concurrently. Procedurally, the preceding analysis of certain eight elements of intentional leadership was intended to provide readers with a preview of all the informants' perspectives before beginning an extensive description of these elements as they were enacted and integrated in their leadership practices. In integrating and enacting these elements accordingly, often unconsciously in some cases, the three key informants contributed to contemporary understanding of the effect of intentionality on leadership development. The section below provides a summary and conclusion of the above sections.

Section Summary and Conclusion

The preceding sections described by way of illustration and example not only what made intentional leadership intentional, but more importantly what made it work. This latter attempt can be framed accordingly. Part of what made intentionality effective in leadership development was its emphasis on the leader as a person and not exclusively as a leader, thus limiting fields of inquiry to those domains associated solely with leadership. The primary informant characterized this emphasis as expanding the conception of leadership to include the *beingness* of a person. This *beingness* encompassed leadership dimensions as persons identified their capacities, pursued their inclinations and created structures to achieve and sustain actions and attitudes that enhanced their leadership development.

Another factor that made intentionality work connected to the first factor and was expressed as seeing the self as fluid rather than as stagnant and thus capable of becoming other than it was based on a conscientious response to perceiving the created nature of its

self and of its environment. Fluidity, categorically, thematically, and practically enabled

leaders to identify and overcome limiting beliefs and inadequate methods to create

methods and mechanisms that enhanced their leadership development. Fundamental to

the notions of *beingness* and fluidity was the existential orientation assumed by the

primary informant as he sought to make leaders conscious of options and alternatives that

existed within and around them by the use of declarations based on who they were

currently in contrast to who they wanted to be in the future.

Central to the key informant's ability to realize these alternatives, which also

made intentionality effective, was the willingness of leaders to declare new realities

because they recognized its created nature. Thus they were then able to make what the

primary informant called a free existential choice to reject these realities for ones

consonant with their desires.

The prerequisite for drafting new declarations depended upon a leader's

willingness to look within and examine his or her own phenomenology and adjust

accordingly. This inquiry and subsequent adjustment connected to another factor that

made intentionality work. Stated explicitly, this factor was the primary informant's

insistence on seeing intentional leadership as an approach rather than as a model.

The perspective of approach connoted openness, fluidity, flexibility and

amenability and reflected the *beingness* of persons, which the primary informant

punctuated during his initial interview with the researcher. Model, in contrast, connoted

closeness and tended to show up as *the answer*, being characterized as an all-inclusive

system that limited self-exploration, self-innovation and self-regulation, according to

him. Together, these factors made the eight elements of intentional leadership possible

(and profitable) because they were practical extensions of efforts that emerged from an existential orientation to leadership development.

Awareness of these elements and experiencing the QPL sessions gave leaders opportunities to re-create themselves while developing their leadership abilities simultaneously and declaring new narratives accordingly (Orth, Robins & Trzeniewski, 2010). The findings cited thus far derived from interviews, observations and analysis of archival data. The section below introduces the eight elements of intentionality along with analysis of these. It also highlights analysis of archival data and observations in an effort to further understand the effect of intentionality on leadership development.

Introduction: The Eight Elements of Intentional Leadership

The eight elements of intentional leadership listed at the end of this immediate section resulted from the primary informant's last fifteen years of practicing intentionality and teaching it to organizations and individuals in an ongoing effort to identify what factors fostered leadership development. These elements aligned with much of what was found in the literature on intentional leadership, although no literature was found that cited these elements specifically.

Analysis of their nature occurred deductively as the researcher sought to thematize, categorize and describe these as vividly as possible based on collected data. Other accounts and qualities of these elements were displayed on a thematic analysis chart (e.g., archival data) and relevant tables designed to notate nuances that were deduced but not described narratively. In other instances tables acted as quick-glance summaries to provide other researchers an opportunity to determine if the findings of this current study aligned with the goals of impending studies. Listed below are the eight

elements followed by analysis of each. Before beginning the analysis, however, is a section that summarizes the goals of the observations along with researcher deductions followed by analysis of the observations. Characteristically intentional leaders:

> Have presence and a high degree of self-awareness.
> Believe that everyone and everything matters.
> Honor their word as themselves (personal integrity).
> Are purpose-driven versus ego-driven.
> Create space for others to show up as great.
> Demonstrate enthusiasm, spiritedness and aliveness.
> Maintain superior physical, mental, spiritual and emotional health.
> Are conscientious and creative communicators.

Summary of Observational Goals

The goal of the three observations as outlined in the Methods section was to focus on the primary informant as he facilitated intentional leadership workshops which were designed to increase the leadership development of the three key informants. While no formal observational instrument was used, three fundamental features guided this phase of the researcher's data collection and consisted of surveying the primary informant's *interaction*, *communication* and *disposition* as he delivered his presentations. Each of these elements is described below, and is also depicted later on a table.

Communication, characteristically, included verbal and nonverbal components, explicit as well as implicit actions and inclinations that either enforced or enfeebled the primary informant's efforts to enhance informant's leadership development. Disposition, in contrast, denoted the primary informant's ability to change attitudes and behavioral approaches based on informants' response while remaining true to his existential core, as conveyed to the researcher during the interview phase of the study. Particular attention was also paid by the researcher to whether or not he remained or at least appeared to remain authentic while necessarily accommodating the various personalities,

expectations, and demands associated with gaining commitments to and respect for the potential of intentionality to positively effect informant's leadership development.

Interaction also echoed communicational components but the emphasis here was on the primary participant's behavior with and attitude towards informants prior to beginning his formal presentation. Thus the researcher was careful to record the nature of these interactions, observing for example, him as talked with informants, noting the tone and tenor of exchanges as well as the physical posture and patented gestures that emerged during the informal portion of the program.

The researcher's concern here was with how the primary informant used this preliminary segment to support the principles of intentional leadership. For example, notations were made on whether or not he touched informants (communicational versatility/enthusiasm/sense of aliveness), or whether he nodded affirmatively as they talked (being present/making space for them to show up as great), the distance at which he stood as they talked (affirming their inherent worth/significance/personal integrity), as well as his willingness to become more engaged (openness/vulnerability/purpose-driven versus ego-driven), as they talked were also documented and deconstructed during debriefing sessions to understand the logic of his actions and their overall impact on his presentation. The section below deductively analyzes the observations and seeks to categorize and describe their most salient features to help contemporary researchers and practitioners understand the effect of intentionality on leadership development.

Analyses of Observations

The primary informant was active and animated during all three observations. The first two of which occurred offsite while the final one occurred onsite at the Center for

Intentional Leadership. In fact his disposition was consistent despite the unique dynamics that existed among the two groups observed by the researcher during the three observations, which occurred approximately forty-five days apart. This consistency included his dress, as his attire was business casual, reminiscent of a mid-level employee of IBM during all three sessions.

During the day long session in which two of the three observations occurred the primary informant wore a neatly-pressed button down light blue shirt and a pair of creased khakis accompanied by brown penny loafers accentuated by a pleasant countenance, which he used to arm some informants and to disarm others. The arming element empowered them during their casual encounters and occasionally intense interactions. During the latter, he listened intently as they talked excitedly, nodding appropriately and nudging them authentically to give details. The primary informant also gave informants time to gather themselves during those inevitable awkward moments that often characterize events when others aren't sure what to expect.

Characteristically, however, the primary informant's core was consistent yet his approach was open and fluid as he accommodated himself to the person with whom he talked. In most cases, he seldom talked. He usually did so just enough to get informants talking instead. In doing so, the researcher observed the practice of presence, the first element of intentional leadership, among others as outlined in the preceding paragraph.

Thus amid the noise of constantly arriving attendees and last-minute details executed by his support staff, the primary informant was attentive to and supportive of each of the various groups and individuals among whom he migrated. In most instances throughout the informal sessions of each observation the researcher stood discretely

(roughly five-seven feet) from wherever the informant mingled so as to observe more closely the character of his encounters with informants as they talked among themselves and with him.

The informal session of the first observation lasted approximately 30-45 minutes. During which, the primary informant intentionally greeted as many of the roughly two-hundred attendees as possible. Sometimes this greeting assumed the guise of a simple handshake or shoulder stroke followed by a smile. Other times he talked with them at length based on their needs before judiciously exiting the conversation to join another.

Characteristically, the primary informant was as aware of attendees as he was of himself yet without being uncomfortably self-conscious or hurried, as if he had a quota to meet. On the contrary, his approach had the effect of creating a sense of intimacy considering the brevity of most exchanges. What mattered was not their length but his level of engagement, which he later mentioned to the researcher in passing.

Thus it was apparent that the primary informant left each person feeling a greater degree of warmth, worth and acceptance from their exchange, which was related to the second element of intentional leadership, which asserted that intentional leaders deliberately made space for others to show up as great. His behavior also echoed the element that asserted that everyone and everything mattered. They also sought ways to call forth this greatness from them. The primary informant's way of doing this during the formal and informal portions of the day-long session of the first and second observations was to get them talking, to encourage their prospects and projects, which they hoped would enhance their leadership development while contributing to organizational success simultaneously.

Thus, the primary informant's custom of taking the tone of the conversation rather than giving it demonstrated the third element of intentional leadership –communicational versatility or perhaps an extension of presence. More subtle during the forty-five minute informal session, this element was clearly evident during the formal presentation in both observations, as he used a variety of approaches, postures and vernaculars (including light profanity) to pepper points he deemed important. After which, he often offered a half-smile and a full apology that ended with the addendum "but you get my point" (Whitehead, 2nd Observation, 2011). The attendees typically laughed and nodded supportively, showing no offense or affectation at what could have easily been perceived as an indiscretion.

Characteristically, the primary informant's use of profanity was not profane, conventionally speaking. Rather, it had the effect of lightening the load his point carried, not only disarming attendees but empowering them also because of his casual as opposed to careless demeanor. By the middle of the second session he had reduced the size of the room and created an atmosphere wherein informants felt safe enough to express their vulnerabilities, hopes, fears, successes and disgruntlements, all in the presence of their organization's senior leadership team.

During the latter part of the second observation it was obvious to the researcher that everyone in the room felt that they mattered equally whether they offered a complaint or rendered praise to the organization and its leadership team. This sense that they mattered could have been easily dismissed based on their job titles, duties or tenure with the organization, which they usually mentioned before responding to the primary informant's solicitation for input. Yet his approach had the effect of reducing the distance

(emotionally speaking) that tended to exist when people meet initially, especially in formal settings, even though they are from the same organization.

However, no noticeable change in the atmosphere or behavior was observed by the researcher when persons with low status jobs spoke (e.g., changes in posture or pitch when others spoke in response, etc.). In fact the primary informant often followed up their comment with a commendation, sometimes highlighting its value. Other times he thanked them for their willingness to share themselves accordingly.

In behaving so, he expressed the fourth element of intentional leadership that was captured by the simple statement: "Everything and everyone matters equally" (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011). This doesn't mean that obvious distinctions in rank or tenure didn't influence listeners differently or subconsciously. But these differences didn't result in diminishing the person visibly, as the other informants generally faced whoever was talking, often nodding affirmatively or listening authentically, mirroring unconsciously perhaps the primary informant's approach.

In fact he would often walk over to an informant's table and stand a few feet from them as if to further validate their comment to commend its credibility even if for no other reason than that the person thought it important enough to share. Overall, the primary informant's demeanor was collegial and consoling, encouraging and revealing in suggesting the effects of intentionality on leadership development. His behavior also confirmed his claim of the symbiotic nature of the eight elements of intentional leadership, which will be discussed in detail after the sections below that provides a brief analysis of the final observation. After this analysis appears a chart depicting the dominant themes deduced and described accordingly from analysis of archival data.

Analysis of Third Observation

The third and final observation occurred at approximately 10 a.m. on beautiful

Wednesday on site at the Center for Intentional Leadership. As with the previous two

observations, the researcher arrived early (approximately 30 minutes) to observe

preparatory efforts to see if or whether they differed from what had been observed off-

site during the two previous observations. Ostensibly there were no noticeable differences

in how the primary informant prepared, technically or personally, for example. Upon

arrival, he greeted the day's attendee's with the same collegiality as he had done forty-

five days earlier at the day long workshop which occurred offsite rather than at the

Center.

However, there was a noticeable degree of comfort and confidence with the

technological aspects of the primary informant's presentation, as he was working with his

own equipment at his own facility, as opposed to working off-site with someone else's

equipment. Thus he spent less time in preparing for this portion of the presentation and

more time interacting with the attendees as well as his with support staff to ensure that

every detail and detour had been considered. This attention to detail described the

primary informant's manner during all three observations, as well as during his three

interviews with the researcher.

Thus considerations that could have very easily been viewed as unimportant, how

the sun shone through one set of blinds onto a corner table, for example, during the

beginning of the formal presentation, was adjusted without anyone having to alert his

staff or himself. The researcher spoke with the primary informant for approximately ten

minutes upon arrival prior to the arrival of the workshop attendees. This conversation

consisted of an abbreviated comparison of his approach to leading the day's group versus the approach he had taken during the first and second observations forty-five days earlier.

Essentially, the primary informant said that the only difference he expected would be based on the dynamics that emerged as he mingled with the participants upon their arrival for whatever cues he perceived and/or acquired during their meeting, and whatever else might happen to emerge during the actual workshop once it started. Otherwise he said that he was confident and consistent characteristically, repeating his former approach of greeting and grabbing attendees as they began to fill the much smaller room (compared to the large multi-purpose room where the two previous observations had occurred).

The room at the Center was roughly one-third the size of the previous location. However, it was more than adequate to accommodate the approximately 35-40 attendees present. Moreover, the room itself was state-of-the-art complete with projectors and screens built into the roof. The same was true of the sound system with its inconspicuous speakers discretely sprinkled around the room and the wall-mounted controls that masqueraded as light switches. Across the room from where the primary informant stood was a set of pane-glassed doors that led to a large upper deck that overlooked the freshly cut lawn.

The arrangement of the room consisted of seven mid-size round tables spaced one-two feet apart and were each draped with white linen cloths characteristic of what might be found in a casual dining restaurant or eatery. Each table accommodated five people comfortably and seven intimately. The size of the room combined with the arrangement of the tables made it easy for the primary informant to amble as needed

between tables as the occasion commanded. When the noon-day sun ascended, it was immediately shaded by the flick of one of the wall-mounted switches that controlled a series of slots from which descended blinds that reached just to the edge of the shiny hardwood floors.

Meanwhile the researcher sat near the double-paned doors in the back of the room at a table with the primary informant's personal assistant. During the presentation they made occasional contact as if to communicate some change or adjustment to be made amid the presentation. For example, during one point when the primary informant was making a point about rejecting the current reality in exchange for a new reality he looked at her and she immediately moved toward the wall-mounted switches to play a song that had been played forty-five days earlier in the previous observations (Bruce Hornsby's "That's just the way it is"), which accentuated his point and pulled the attendees attention away from the restrictions of their current reality to imagine new realities based on working in a strengths-based culture that embraced the concepts of Positive Organizational Scholarship and Multiple Realities.

The chart on the following page depicts the three dominant elements that emerged from the observation, which were the focus of the data collection efforts and were deduced (and described) based on close scrutiny of the primary informant's behavior and the attendee's reactions in conjunction with the two primary research questions. Analysis of these data suggested helped the researcher to understand the effect of intentionality on leadership development. Following the chart below begins the analysis of archival data.

Chart 1.1: Observational Data Collection Chart

Disposition	*Dominant Behaviors*	*Dominant Behaviors*	*Dominant Behaviors*
Describes the primary participant's overall attitude as he interacted with workshop attendees.	Pleasant, cordial, authentic, reassuring and affirmative demeanor,	Respectful, sensitive, responsive, curious, self-effacing yet self-projecting via presence	Inquisitive, emotionally flexible, genuinely focused on attendees needs versus his expectations
Communication	*Dominant Behaviors*	*Dominant Behaviors*	*Dominant Behaviors*
Describes verbal/ nonverbal, explicit/implicit elements of primary participant's efforts.	Followed the tone of the conversation rather than set it. Nodded agreeably and prodded gently to extend points.	Consistently made physical contact with attendees, stroking shoulders, clasping palms, back-patting.	Open posture; stood close when talking, exhibited gestures that invited elaboration of key details.
Interaction	*Dominant Behaviors*	*Dominant Behaviors*	*Dominant Behaviors*
Summarizes the actions, responses and overall character of primary participant's encounter with attendees.	Obviously comfortable, appropriately consoling and encouraging.	Exuded confidence, concern, passion and compassion. Proactive in being interactive with attendees who appeared to be reserved.	Temperate, deliberate in greeting as many attendees as possible. Always greeted each person with a hearty, healthy smile void of posing or posturing.

Analysis of Archival Data

The primary informant composed five columns for his city's major morning newspaper –*The Charlotte Observer*. (A table appears at the end of this section which outlines the column titles as well as the dominant themes that emerged from each). These columns usually appeared on the editorial or Viewpoint page, addressed a variety of issues and were written for an audience who were mostly unfamiliar with intentional leadership –its aims as well as its elements. The sixth article, *New ideals for a 21st century leader,* originally appeared in *Greater Charlotte Business Magazine*, but was extracted from the Center for Intentional Leadership's blog.

Topically, each of the six documents addressed ideas that centered on the importance of personal and community responsibility, goal-setting, critical self-reflectivity, teamwork, shared agreements, the importance of having a vision, a primary purpose, the necessity of commitment, the notion of Multiple Realities, how to make a difference, and the ability of simple promises to produce big changes. Thematically, each piece pushed the benefits of intentionality without, however, naming the eight elements of intentional leadership explicitly. Yet elements of each were evident in each of the six pieces, which will be analyzed in this present section.

After scrutinizing articles for emerging and obscure themes findings were compared with interview transcripts to see if these same themes were repeated in both data sets. Following this process, reflection occurred on the observational experiences. Here the researcher also drew on conversations with the primary informant as a means of triangulating the data along with peer debriefing and a review of field notes and intentional leadership literature to better understand the effect of intentionality on

leadership development. After identifying the dominant themes (four altogether) the researcher represented these on a thematic analysis table, which appears later in this study. Characteristically each archival piece conveyed, conceptually at least, elements of POS and multiple realities.

For example, in the article, *What local goals would you declare* (Whitehead, *Charlotte Observer*, 2008), the primary informant referenced the actions of America's architects, saying, "Can we be as bold as our forefathers were about our country? Can we envision a future and fully commit ourselves to bringing that vision into existence? What would it take for you to sign your name to a declaration of the city's future?" Situated between these questions was an acknowledgement of the challenges associated with defying the status quo or what the primary informant often called the default self, systems and supporting beliefs that sustain these and stifle change.

In this regard, the primary informant admitted that leaders did not always have the evidence that their visions could come true. However, he then added that visionary leaders challenged us to think beyond what we believe was possible, another postulate of POS (Cameron et al. 2003) and Schutz's (1962) Multiple Realities, provided others aligned with them by rejecting reification and recognizing the created nature of the world. The primary informant further added that strategies and tactics flowed much easier from a clear and compelling vision, making realization easier even amid friction and resistance. He ended this section with the assertion, "How we do it is much clearer once the where we are headed is agreed upon," suggesting the possibility that specific goals must be set and pursued accordingly.

The primary informant said that after America's Founders declared the new reality, an implicit need for and intention to focus on colonial strengths followed in order to mount the kind of resistance that created what we know today as democratic liberty. He also said that they sealed their commitment by signing their names to the revolutionary document –essentially pledging their promise to the premise of freedom from tyranny, validating these goals accordingly. This account was presented above and is repeated her to reinforce the primary informant's emphasis on the consciousness and the ability of intentionality to be what could be called a paradigm shifter if it is practiced deliberately and integrated appropriately with the eight elements that characterize intentional leaders. Before beginning chapter five, below is a thematic analysis chart that captures the dominant themes revealed via analysis of archival data, which were analyzed succinctly here because of the chart.

Table 1.6 : Dominant Themes from Analysis of Archival Data

Article: *What local goals would you declare? (Charlotte Observer, A Section; 6/24/2008)*

Themes
Authentic sense of autonomy and the responsibility to make an existential choice that has real impact.
Sacrificial,
Visionary.
Courageous
Confrontational.

Features
They truly believe that they are responsible for their decisions and corresponding consequences.
They are vested in and add value to their communities.
They embrace adversity as an inevitable part of the process.

Quote: "Can we be as bold about our city as our forefathers were about our country?"
"An equitable & high quality education system."
Access to affordable quality healthcare."
 Environmental integrity."
"Safe spaces for all citizens."
Trust among races & classes
Article: *Opportunity from chaos (Charlotte Observer, Viewpoint Section; 10/28/2008)*

Themes
Creating constructive dialogue that envisions new possibilities.
Actively involved in creating solutions.
Realistic yet optimistic outlook.
Strong sense of self-esteem & self-efficacy.

Features
Legitimate belief in their ability to conceive and create new realities.
Faith in democratic processes.
Perceptive about imminent changes.
Accept destruction as part of the creative process.

Quote: "Every act of creation is first an act of destruction."
"I'd like to propose that we spend some time on what's possible from all the turmoil."
"Is it possible that we are on the verge of creating a new type of community where ALL people matter?"
"We have a choice of the outcomes we experience."

Article: *Big Changes: How to make a difference (Charlotte Observer, Viewpoint Section: 8/26 2008)*

Themes
Authentic actions, when sustained, can produce exponential change.
Paradigm Shifts that result in: A) Separateness to similarity and B) Adversarial to partnership
Apathy to possibility

Features
Reality is malleable if we are intentional about changing its nature and the existing culture.
Willingness to abandon artificial boundaries.
Being curious enough to suspend our assumptions.

Quote: "I suggest that we could gain considerable momentum and get even more people engaged in making a difference if we shifted points of view."

An adversarial view assumes, "I am right & you are wrong."
Partnership is created when new catch ourselves "being right."
"The shift to possibility is generated by curiosity, compassion & creativity."
Article: *Simple promises, big changes. (Charlotte Observer, Opinion Section 7/22/ 2008)*

Themes
Little actions add up
Requires sincere community engagement
Public declaration to commit to making a difference
Private obedience to public promises

Features
The willingness to conceive and commit to something greater than one's self.
Commonsense approach to conventional problems.
Identifies and creates personal approaches to contributing to micro-level problem-solving.
External conditions don't determine their actions/attitude

Quote: "What if we all consider five personal promises that could make a lasting impact on our city's future?"
"What if we kept our promises simple & doable?"
"What if we all took our own 'Take Five Pledge?'"
"What if we lived these five simple promises every day?"
"A simple action like turning off the water every morning as we brush our teeth can make a difference."
Article: *What's your primary purpose? (Greater Charlotte Biz Magazine, 11/29/2010)*

Themes
Internal locus of control
Self-reflective & self-critical
Strong commitment to goals.
Self- and professional clarity
Intentionally committed to staying on task

Features
Distinguish between services provided & benefits that result.
Driven by mission vs. money
Strong sense of professional satisfaction.
Hyper-focused/self-correcting.

Quote: "We all have a sense of our true purpose; as leaders, we can easily be pulled away from this and get distracted by "running the business."
"The primary purpose of a business is not to make money."

The primary purpose is to bring value to your clients & customers."
"People can miss this simple concept because they get fearful when business begins to drop off."
"Being of service to others leads to business development."
Article: *New ideals for a 21ˢᵗ century leader (Charlotte Observer, Viewpoint Section 9/26/2008)*

Themes
Non-polarizing discourse
Defies old conventions of "us vs. them."
Transparency
Authenticity
Ego-transcendence
Self-aware & responsible

Features
Has extra-ordinary skill of listening & discernment.
Able to embrace data from many sources.
Able to bring people to shared purpose & aligned action.
Views/values diversity
Honors word
Versatile

Quote: "I am assuming that you are as concerned as I am about our country."
"What if elections focused on the people leading the leaders rather than the other way around?"
"It's our job as citizens to identify a new kind of political leader and lead them to the future we desire."
"New leaders mean what they say & say what they mean."
"Can discern between being reactive rather than responsive."
"Is self-aware & takes responsibility for personal biases."

Section Summary and Conclusion

Clearly intentionality effected the leadership development of the three key informants. The section below begins with an Introduction followed by analysis of the eight elements of intentional leadership in order to enhance contemporary understanding of its effects on leadership development.

Introduction: Analysis of Eight Elements of Intentional Leadership

The effect of intentionality on leadership development as explained by the primary informant and the three key informants were revealing and instructive, ultimately suggesting that the true emphasis of leadership development should be on human development through recognition of an evolutionary process. This process was characterized by a heightened degree of self- and social awareness rather than on the tasks, techniques or positionality associated with leadership as a function of someone responsible for helping others to achieve organizational and individual objectives.

Supported by the articulation of eight elements outlined by the primary informant, leadership and its subsequent development was a result of conscientious efforts and a devout belief in one's ability to meaningfully impact one's environment on micro and macro levels together regardless of one's place in an organization's hierarchy. What mattered beyond positionality was one's perspective and one's commitment to and understanding of how to apply (symbiotically) the elements of intentional leadership in ways that brought out the best in others by focusing on their strengths as opposed to highlighting their weaknesses.

Fundamental to the ability of intentionality to effect one's leadership development was its ability to make leaders aware of their current practices and proclivities by

adopting an existential orientation, which required leaders to look within themselves, seeing leadership through a developmental lens that encompassed their entire lives rather than just its leadership dimensions. After this initial and ongoing period of introspection alternatives could then be suggested and tested such as were characterized by the eight elements of intentional leadership, which are analyzed below.

1.They have presence and a high degree or self-awareness

2.Everything and everyone matters

The above postulates rest on the recognition that leaders and followers share a complex bond that required each to recognize the role of the other in fulfilling individual and organizational goals. For intentional leaders, however, the symbiotic nature of organizational relationship required them to achieve (and sustain) a degree of presence and awareness that communicated a deep and developing regard for the challenges that each faced –within and outside the organization—and to show commensurate commitment to be attentive to how each could help eliminate unnecessary barriers accordingly.

Leaders who exhibited the above attitudes transcended the often adversarial and insincere interactions that characterized most encounters with leaders and their followers, as well as with leaders and their peers, according to the primary informant and the three key informants. However, this claim collected more than it conveyed because such interactions may be characteristic but they aren't inherent in non-intentional cultures that lack a strengths-based approach to leadership development.

On the contrary, what determined a leader's presence and impact was as much a function of the leader's actions as it was a follower's fidelity to his or her own commitment to self-development. In this regard, presence helped but it didn't herald,

inherently at least, transformative results. Neither did it always hasten leadership

development. Unless presence included an awareness of what was going on with others,

then being attentive and aware were merely necessary but insufficient conditions to

conduce leadership development and the relational features that all informants agreed

were essential to leadership development. Yet presence properly practiced enabled truly

intentional leaders to ask the kinds of questions to gain essential insight which enhanced

their leadership efforts.

Presence allowed intentional leaders to probe for problems that impeded follower

responsiveness to leadership efforts, avoiding thereby organizational apathy. When

extended thusly presence contributed significantly to leadership development and

effectiveness. Jessica's account of how presence allowed her to become more conscious

of how she communicated, for example, contributed to her being seen as more supportive

and understanding by her coworkers. So much so, she said that she had an older coworker

enter her office one day and share her marital frustrations with her.

Prior to encountering intentional leadership, Jessica said that she probably would not

have cared or committed herself to listening and giving authentic advice and support to

alleviate her coworker's stress by seeking to understand its dynamics. She further stated

that she was seldom present except to those things that related directly to her job.

Therefore when traveling, for example, she said that she seldom talked to her seat-mate

on the plane.

On the contrary, she buried herself in a book instead or reviewed work-related

literature rather than take the opportunity to connect with the person with whom she

would be flying for the new few hours. Jessica attributed this change in her behavior

directly to her commitment to being intentionally present to others and herself personally

and professionally because of the awareness and space for change she became aware of

as a result of her encounter with intentionality.

Presence thus can be translated into or seen in the second element of intentional

leadership, namely, its claim that everyone and everything mattered, and that there were

no insignificant organizational moments or members. While one could question a

leader's ability to achieve, let alone sustain such a heightened state in valuing and

validating of others, the ability to do so was clearly fundamental to intentionality having

as positive impact on a leader's development.

Principally, however, one of the key informants said that leaders could believe that

everyone and everything mattered yet still fail to demonstrate this belief if they lacked the

ability to communicate it in the language and logic of organizational relationships. She

said that the ability to do so required emotional intelligence and not simply a principled

belief that everyone and everything mattered equally. The primary participant, in

contrast, implied that presence and communicational versatility were sufficient supports

to convey this sentiment.

Janice countered this claim that everyone and everything mattered equally by saying

that it was truer in theory than it was in practice because leaders needed to prioritize

organizational and leadership resources, which meant that some things and some people

would not matter as much as leaders claimed that they did. However, she agreed that

holding this principle enabled intentional leaders to be more creative and responsive in

communicating this belief practically. She also said that she strove to practice presence

with the belief that everyone and everything mattered equally by adopting a more

democratic approach when conducting staff meetings at the organization she leads, for example.

Janice added that she also used casual encounters to communicate that she was present and that everyone and everything mattered equally by asking employees if there was anything they were working on that she could help them with, whether help assumed the form of providing intangible or material resources, or if it required her direct involvement. As a result, Janice said that she was now more focused on empowering others, which had the reciprocal effect of empowering herself also, thus accentuating her leadership development and effectiveness.

When combined with the belief that all things and persons mattered equally presence permeated leader-member encounters and changed their character. It also created opportunities to engage in meaningful interactions wherein leaders were authentically engaged with employees, saying and giving thoughtful responses that validated their words and their personhood. Rightly appropriated, this approach inspired employees to overcome obstacles, altering their outlook on organizational/personal issues and enabled them to exit the exchange with the sense that the leader not only cared but more importantly that they mattered as persons and not just as employees.

Another significant consequence of such exchanges increased the amount of credibility that leaders had with employees and with others in the organization, as they sustained presence and its awareness as a leadership practice. An additional consequence of leaders who functioned from this frame gave employees a greater sense of the value of their present contributions as well as their potential ones to the organizational mission by their willingness to conceive and support realities that they might otherwise have rejected

because of harboring negative feelings toward leaders, which indicated that these leaders had little psychological capital with these employees Walumbwa, Peterson, Avolio & Hartnell, 2010).

In this regard, Positive Organizational Scholarship and its strengths-based approach minimized individual and organizational resistance, especially when leaders incorporated follower-centric assumptions that viewed people as capable of exercising self-regulation, self-goal setting and other qualities that contributed to a leader's willingness to trust followers' abilities. In this climate presence combined with the belief that everything and everyone mattered gave intentional leaders the perspective to perceive the existence of intangible organizational resources, assigning them accordingly to members whose strengths complemented these and thus converted these resources into assets instead, thereby enhancing organizational success and leadership development. Before proceeding to the next two elements of intentional leadership the section below analyses the relationship between intentional leader's believe in their follower's capacities.

<center>Intentional Belief in Follower Capacity</center>

Leaders with an authoritarian, Hegelian conception of persons, which treated them as objects of domination or as unworthy of trust and thus in need of constant and controlling supervision (Baird & Kaufmann, 2007; Northouse, 2010) hindered their own development and that of their followers also. The primary informant agreed that the practice of intentionality was harder in what he called a "challenging environment" (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011) but added that it was still possible to transcend this environment if one was sufficiently committed to practicing intentional leadership. He also said that the ability to practice intentionality successfully increased if leaders were

sufficiently present and committed to the belief that everyone and everything mattered equally.

In fact the primary informant said that a "tough culture gave leaders the opportunity to transcend resistance" (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011). Conversely, he added, that intentionality became easier "if it's a real positive and supportive environment (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011). The primary informant ended his claims by asserting that the mark of effective intentional leaders was their ability to deal with resistance in ways that enhanced the effect of intentionality on their leadership development rather than letting it discourage their pursuit and practice.

The characteristics of intentionality and its admittedly existential approach privileged perspectives that highlighted listening, empathy, healing, persuasion, awareness, foresight, commitment to the growth of people, and community-building, attitudes and behaviors that were all observed by the researcher during the observations and interviews with the primary informant. Similar notions were kneaded in the archival data also and substantiated the claims of the primary informant as well as those of the three key informants.

In this regard, the primary informant reiterated an earlier claim to which he had merely alluded regarding his notion that intentional leaders were noted for their communicational versatility, saying that communicationally intentional leadership had a "bit of an edge to it" (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011). He also said that the impetus of this edge was to say what was going to serve the greater good of the person. To this end, he added that intentional leaders were more committed to being effective than they were to being nice (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011). The primary informant then hinted that it

was difficult to know when to use what communicational approach without being appropriately present to the person or the situation at hand and reading it rightly.

Another way he said that intentional leaders practiced presence and showed that everyone mattered was by requesting feedback from followers, which required hierarchies to be flattened, or else leaders would be flattered for fear of retaliation for giving critical feedback. If, however, the proper level of trust prevailed, then the primary informant said that feedback was beneficial to effecting leadership development even if it was initially perceived as negative.

By being sincere in requesting feedback from coworkers intentional leaders enhanced their credibility and awareness of organizational resources because they valued and validated follower feedback by practicing attentive listening. It also demonstrated the leader's belief that followers mattered as much as did organizational leaders. Sustained, attentive listening compounded the power of presence, according to the primary informant.

Attentive listening also demonstrated that intentional leaders were present because they provided the appropriate cues that coaxed persons to share pertinent information that enhanced leadership effectiveness, which was the basis of the belief that intentional leaders were highly self-aware and committed to treating everyone and everything as if they mattered equally even if only principally.

These two elements of intentional leadership were obvious during all three observations, as the primary informant deliberately related to each person as personally as the person permitted, whether he smiled and nodded agreeably as they talked or was intentional about touching them in ways that affirmed their words, their person and their

presence. In displaying these behaviors the primary informant extended his influence and enhanced his own leadership development simultaneously, as witnessed by the level of engagement exhibited by workshop attendee's throughout the day-long sessions. Below is an analysis of the third and fourth elements of intentional leadership and their effect on leadership development.

3.Personal Integrity

4.They're Purpose-Driven versus Ego-Driven

The primary informant summarized being purpose-driven versus ego-driven by saying, "Intentional leaders honor their word as themselves. They have incredible consistency with their words and behavior" (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011). He said that this consistency undergirded personal integrity in any leadership paradigm and not just with intentional leaders (ethical leadership, e.g.). However, he emphasized that intentional leaders were especially deliberate in resisting short-term gains by connecting their actions with what he had earlier called doing what would serve the "greater purpose of their lives" (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011).

He also implied that being purpose-driven was crucial to increasing leader credibility, which inevitably enhanced their leadership development and effectiveness. Another consequence of the personal integrity that characterized intentional leaders was the confidence that it inspired in followers, and which suffused throughout the culture compounding its strengths. In this regard, the primary informant tended to substitute the phrase *strengths-based culture* with what he called an *intentional culture* instead because he said that leaders had to be deliberate in resisting ethical compromises and to believe

that followers possessed a comparable degree of intentionality to act autonomously and with integrity.

Ostensibly his claims may seem idealistic. However, the primary informant said that his experiences had taught him that it was possible to create strengths-based intentional cultures. He further implied that these cultures were not ideal but optimal instead in creating conditions that enhanced the development of leaders and followers together. He also added that the belief in the ability of followers to act autonomously and with personal integrity is the cornerstone of an intentional culture (strengths-based), which gave followers the latitude to develop themselves within the context of the organizational mission, deviating when necessary if the culture were truly strengths-based. Characteristically, the primary informant said that intentional leaders saw integrity as essential to supporting their responsibility to followers needs to experience greater degrees of autonomy and self-development, which was only possible in an atmosphere of trust.

Without the primary informant's experience in helping organizations and individuals successfully alter their frameworks from conventional climates to empowering ones instead it would be easy to dismiss him as idealistic. Yet based on the data gathered from the three key informants and analysis of the archival data it was evident that the primary informant's approach to leadership development was rooted in an authentic commitment to personal integrity, and in a desire to serve something greater than himself. In fact, during the initial interview he told the researcher that his sole reason for getting into leadership development related to his desire to and belief that he could make a difference.

The primary informant added that he thought that he could best do this by training senior executives at both profit and nonprofit organizations, who in turn could influence the larger community (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011). Moreover, personal integrity as practiced by intentional leaders included yet eclipsed their own gain to include the greater goals of the organization's mission, according to the primary informant.

Such persons saw themselves as stewards and their responsibilities as stewardships which had been committed to their trust because they were deemed trustworthy, either on principle or through experience. Thus it made sense, according to the primary informant for intentional leaders to behave with personal integrity and to treat others with the same also. He asserted the same sentiment in reiterating the claim that everyone mattered equally.

Here the primary informant recounted an experience he had during a visit with client who was interested in moving his organization to a strengths-based culture. While touring the facilities he said that he was introduced to most of the employees, even if only briefly. However, he said that he noticed that although his client had two receptionists, he was only introduced to one. In punctuating his point regarding the receptionist he was not introduced to, he said, "The fact that she was black wasn't lost on me."

Though he said he didn't mention it then, he pondered it in relation to what the senior executive had told them about the company, its values and its respect for employees. Conjecturing, he said that "this woman clearly didn't matter as equally as did the other receptionist who just so happened to be white." (Whitehead, 3rd Interview, 2011). In contrast to this attitude, the primary informant said that intentional cultures and intentional leaders tended to adopt an attitude toward integrity and being purpose driven

in ways that promoted organizational renewal. He said that this attitude also prevented

them from reneging on their commitment to use intentionality as a positive approach to

leadership development. His words seemed to imply that the receptionist who he never

meet would have been introduced with the same degree of deliberateness as were the

organization's other employees if they truly believed that everyone mattered equally.

He further suggested that the approach of intentional leaders was rooted in

principles but was not constrained by them. Instead he said that the elements of

intentional leadership gave leaders and members the necessary framework in which to

make decisions and devise strategies for individual development and organizational

success, developing and validating them accordingly.

What was conspicuously absent in the primary informant's conception of integrity,

explicitly at least, was the conventional connotation of it as behaviors that denoted right

and wrong. Yet this notion was clearly embedded in the idea of congruency. Thus his

claim that intentional leaders honor their words as themselves was synonymous with

personal integrity and affirmed the symbiotic nature of all the elements. This theme and

claim also appeared in an archival piece that depicted new ideals for a 21st century leader,

as was mentioned earlier. Characteristically, he said that these in keeping with intentional

leaders, these leaders mean what they say and say what they mean, in public and in

private (Whitehead, *Charlotte Observer*, 2008).

The ability to achieve and sustain congruency through a commitment to being who

they say they were connoted not only authenticity but also became the basis of integrity

and/or ethical leadership by intentional leaders. In this regard, ethics was simply an

expression and extension of their commitment to lead with integrity for purposes greater than their own personal pursuits, according to the primary informant.

The three key informants, especially Jessica, also said that integrity was crucial to leadership in general but to intentional leadership in particular because of the character of its workshops. Here the previous characterization of these workshops' resemblance to group therapy required informants to be vulnerable. Yet they were vulnerable only to the degree that they felt safe emotionally, which was critical to intentionality positively effecting informants' leadership development. Undoubtedly, the primary informant's education in counseling contributed to his ability to create an atmosphere wherein informants felt comfortable enough to share personal information that they perhaps wouldn't have shared in other leadership development forums.

Personal integrity, in this regard, as conceived by the primary informant and the key informants began at a basic, existential level that sought to help others understand who they were and who they wanted to become. Only after they had begun this necessary introspection could the larger and more practical issues of what behaviors contributed to and connoted this new leadership self be answered beyond conventional definitions of personal integrity as the difference between right and wrong. To the extent that intentional leaders were guided and supported by commitments to self-transcendent purposes did they exhibit and sustain the kind of integrity that inspired confidence and credibility with their followers and the larger organization.

Moreover, the primary informant implied that maintaining a high degree of integrity accentuated a leader's overall personal power because others sensed that such leaders viewed life through multiple lenses and were as concerned with their own

development as they were with the development of others. Properly aligned with themselves and rightly related to others, personal integrity and being purpose-driven allowed intentional leaders to move from being leaders to mentors or personal coaches, popularly speaking, coaxing others to achieve personal greatness. In being so, intentional leaders leveraged two additional elements of intentional listed below.

5. They Create Space for Others to Show up as Great

6. They Demonstrate Enthusiasm and Aliveness

In the language of POS intentional leaders broadened and built off of their personal integrity and purpose-driven orientation to create opportunities for others to develop and demonstrate their excellence, or as the primary informant asserted, they created space for others to show up as great. Among the ways intentional leaders accomplished this was by highlighting and heralding others achievements, the roles they played in contributing to successful projects while noting their overall commitment to the success of the organization even when their roles were minor. What mattered was not their role but the presence of mind and committed manner in which intentional leaders used these opportunities to increase follower loyalty while enhancing their own credibility and development simultaneously.

In an intentional culture, one that was characteristic of yet which eclipsed the qualities consonant with a follower-centric culture, leadership was a result of perception not position and the belief in leaders' ability to positively impact organizational efforts through their agency. In doing so, they created additional space for others to show up as great because of the attitude that characterized this culture and their leadership approach. A strengths-based culture denoted by the ideals of POS didn't necessarily mean that

hierarchies were flattened but it did suggest that relationships and communication were sufficiently fluid so that members mobilized themselves to act in ways that served organizational development as well as their own without compromising either.

Acting intentionally and with integrity the actions of intentional leaders exemplified courage, positive deviance, and resilience as they sought to transcend limits and transform lives simultaneously, demonstrating uncommon efficacy and occasionally achieving extraordinary results, according to the primary informant and the three key informants. On these points, however, the three key informants generally related results to personal goals and professional development, as opposed to macro-level and exponential contributions that characterized the primary informant's responses.

Perhaps that was because other than Janice, who is also the founder and leader of her organization, positionality played more of a role than the primary informant acknowledged and which the other two informants (one a project manager for a global conglomerate and the other a mid-level manager at a national food chain) recognized and thus related their accounts accordingly. However, analysis of archival data confirmed his claim that difference-making was accessible to everyone in an article, *How to make a difference*: *Simple Promises, big changes* (See Table 1.6).

Consonant with the consequences of effecting change is the sense of excitement and enthusiasm it releases in persons and the organizations that employ them. Thus, by being alert to and aware of the infectious and influential nature of enthusiasm, intentional leaders were deliberate about sharing organizational successes –micro and macro—to help create a greater sense of aliveness and enthusiasm. According to the primary informant, intentional leaders demonstrate this aliveness and enthusiasm on principle.

Characteristically, however, he said that "They don't have to be the rah-rah types"

(Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011).

On the contrary, he said that the *rah-rah type* was perhaps more typical of

transformational or charismatic leadership than it was of intentional leadership. However,

by their commitment to being authentic, enthusiastic, transparent and present intentional

leaders inspired employees and members to adopt a transformative approach to

organizational possibilities. In making this point and illustrating this claim the primary

informant used the Civil Rights Movements and its various leaders as examples of

intentionality and its effect on leadership development (Whitehead, 3rd Interview, 2011).

The primary informant also added that the presence of a "critical mass"

(Whitehead, 3rd Interview, 2011) was an important catalyst in compounding the efforts of

Civil Rights leaders to engage Blacks and other racial-ethnic groups to adopt an

existential orientation to leadership and to become vested in and vigilant towards creating

a new reality that would allow Blacks to show up as great, racially speaking.

He also said that part of the power that sustained this push was the sense of

enthusiasm with which its leaders employed civil disobedience to achieve extraordinary

results, which ultimately enabled them to re-construct reality because of a basic

understanding of its created nature. In this regard, the primary informant said that

communicational versatility was fundamental to the creation of new realities and critical

to be present and committed to creating space for others to show up as great.

For the primary informant creating space for others to show up as great carried the

connotations of a mandate. It also echoed the existential orientation that is optional for

some leaders but was essential to informing his actions and the actions of the three key

informants who also saw enthusiasm as a crucial component of intentional leadership. Depicting the symbiotic relationship of these elements, the primary informant implied that when people are allowed to express their greatness their attitude became infectious.

Thus in instances when the researcher felt as though the primary informant were repeating himself needlessly, he was actually illustrating how each element of intentional leadership overlapped and under-girded the other and gave intentionality the ability to positively effect leadership development. Thus he said that intentional leaders created this crucial space by "treating people as if they are great and then calling forth that greatness out of them" (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011). Once people felt that the environment was conducive for and encouraged the pursuit of personal greatness, then a sense of aliveness and enthusiasm followed accordingly.

In this regard, a sense of aliveness as conceived by the primary informant was based on intentional leaders having an internal locus of control, which limited the influence of external events, especially when these were negative or threatened the success of their intentions. According to him, this internal compass allowed intentional leaders to reinterpret events, conceive alternatives and redirect their energies toward things that they could control rather than rehearsing disappointments, whether organizationally or individually. Characteristically, he said that intentional leaders maintained a greater degree of enthusiasm than was possible if they allowed circumstances to determine their response to leadership challenges.

Of course intentional leaders were not immune to life's challenges but they were more deliberate in deciding how they used their energies and were conscious of what they gave their attention to, especially if they had appropriated the other elements

symbiotically. As an example, the primary informant said that it would be difficult for most leaders to focus if they were having problems with the IRS or with their marriages or children. In these instances he said that they could recall their primary purpose or in other instances they could re-inspire themselves by visiting with other members in the organization to hear of their successes, being rejuvenated and re-focused accordingly.

To this end, the primary informant said that intentional leaders sustained intentionality by creating mechanisms that moved them through the inevitable inertia which individuals and organizations were subject. Thus they were able to limit the tenure and tempests of these downturns by activating a series of mechanisms that moved them from inertia to action and from action to enthusiasm and aliveness, creating in route what POS called "upward spirals" (Cameron et al., 2003, p. 163), which routinely influenced their organizations.

These mechanisms resemble what Stephen Covey (1989) called "sharpening the saw" (p. 287-289) connotatively at least. Characteristically sharpening the saw connected with the seventh of the eight elements of intentional leadership. They include taking time to renew one's self and soul physically, mentally, emotionally and spiritually so that one can function at optimal capacity, such as is required of leaders in general but of intentional leaders especially, according to the primary informant and the three key informants.

Jessica, for example, recounted how prior to intentional leadership she was prone to foreboding, always expecting the worse, especially after a period of good fortune or favorable results, whether personally or professionally. Yet she credited her encounter with intentionality with helping her to recognize and gradually change this attitude,

seeing it as a mental lapse, and indicative of a need to revise her assessments and renew herself accordingly.

Since then, she said that she no longer expected bad things to happen but rather accepted that they will in their own time without her fixating or focusing on them. Jessica's attitude denoted themes drawn from the archival data and observations that echoed courage, optimism, resilience, and adopting an attitude toward tragedy that resulted in individual and organizational learning. Here she said that she applied the latter approach after her father died of a heart attack, and sought to learn from the experience, which enabled her to celebrate his life rather than lament her loss.

Related to the need for renewal and periods of introspection, Pete Hall (2008) proclaimed that "The most important thing we can pass on to a new principal is self-reflection. It's the least-practiced thing we do" (p.449). While Hall's (2008) comments were connected to intentional mentoring of principals specifically, they echo generally the primary informant's emphasis on intentional leadership being preceded (and sustained) by an ongoing self-inquiry that enabled leaders to manage and monitor themselves in their efforts to sustain intentionality.

When combined with verbal feedback from others, and environmental feedback (based on the success or failure of organizational projects), the primary informant said that intentional leaders are then in a better position to conceive and catalyze new realities to enhance their leadership development and their ability to achieve organizational goals. These adjustments also had the residual impact of improving their enthusiasm and sense of aliveness as they approached organizational members revitalized by their reflections and encouraged by the possibilities that emerged as a result.

Both the primary informant and the three key informants said that the experience of intentional leadership enabled leaders to be more enthusiastic and increased their sense of aliveness because something about it made them feel more power and "empowered," which Jessica said "directly leads to self-improvement, which of course," she added, "leads to better leadership." Related to the release of power and the corresponding sense of empowerment is an awareness of the "filters" (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011) that governed one's life and leadership, and which also determined in part one's attitude and approach to leadership and behaviors that enhanced or hinder one's development.

According to Janice, awareness of these filters gave intentional leaders the option of altering their approach by removing them or modifying them accordingly, thus increasing their leadership development and effectiveness because of the renewed energy they exhibited in the pursuit of organizational goals. Having become aware of these filters (ways of seeing the self and the world) and being committed to making ongoing adjustments, intentional leaders were then able to employ the final two elements of intentionality to positively affect their leadership development. These two elements are analyzed below. Afterwards follows a summary and discussion, including among other things implications for practice and recommendations for future research.

7.They're Healthy Physically, Mentally and Spiritually

The health of intentional leaders is triadic and encompasses the physical, mental and spiritual domains because of the demands they constantly faced from external and internal organizational stakeholders. The primary informant made this claim during his initial interview with the researcher and said that it was critical in intentional leader's efforts to sustain intentionality.

Without good health or what the he called, "an optimal state of health," which he further described as being "really, really healthy, not much weight, good relationships, etc." (Whitehead, 1st & 3rd Interviews, 2011), he said that it would be difficult to become or to remain an intentional leader. In this regard, the primary informant said that he often scheduled workouts in the middle of his day or between appointments in an effort to enhance his ability to practice intentionality, which he described as "hard work" (Whitehead, 2nd Interview, 2011).

The primary informant says that this hard work multiplied unless a leader possessed a "superior state of well-being" (Whitehead, 2nd Interview, 2011), which he connected to being "grounded in a high integrity state in all three dimensions of one's health" (Whitehead 1st, Interview, 2011). Central to the achievement and maintenance of his conception of a superior state of well-being was the ability of intentional leaders to prioritize their lives and not just their leadership responsibilities. Thus other mechanisms mentioned by the primary informant that enabled intentional leaders to attain this state were self-reflection, peer-superior feedback, exercise, healthy personal/professional relationships in and outside of organizational life.

Conventionally defined as balance, he said that these ballasts not only bolstered the practice of intentionality but its appeal also because others experienced intentional leaders as different from how they were formerly after having experienced Dabrowski and Piechowski's (1977) positive disintegration, and the resulting inner psychic transformation necessary to and characteristic of intentional leaders, which his workshops facilitated. Dabrowski and Piechowski's (1977) concept of positive disintegration as described below:

During these periods leaders routinely experience what Dabrowski and Piechowski (1977) call "positive disintegration (p. 15)," which allows them to reorient themselves and incorporate beneficially data derived from lived experiences to undergo a "inner psychic transformation" (p. 26). The result of this transformation is reflected in their relationship with themselves and their constituents as they reconceive ways to achieve organizational goals.

Continuous characterization by the researcher of the workshop's resemblance to group therapy substantiated and illustrated the primary informant's existential approach to leadership development. Less technical and more personal, informants were invited (a word he used regularly) to go on a journey or what he called a quest for personal leadership (QPL). The prerequisites of this journey were a willingness to be vulnerable and confidence in the primary informant's competence to help informants navigate and negotiate the emotions that often emerged (positive disintegration) because of taking what he called a deep look within while in the presence of others.

Unfortunately, however, not every informant was willing to make this commitment no matter how safe the atmosphere or salient the approach. Julia, for example, admitted that what she called the "unstructured nature" of the workshops made it difficult for her to grasp how the primary informant's approach could enhance her leadership development. In fact during the interview (approximately one year after completing the week-long workshop) she said that she still had trouble "wrapping my mind around it."

Julia's inability to grasp the relationship between leadership development and the primary informant's presentation prevented her from having the kind of breakthroughs (or breakdowns) that characterized several sessions. In these instances, the primary informant said that intentional leaders simply met informants where they were and gently lead them to where they wanted to be, often indirectly by soliciting their feedback based

on the vulnerability displayed by the other informants. Accomplished or at least begun, informants found themselves experiencing emotional releases and mental renewal because of being able to be transparent in what Janice called "a non-judgmental atmosphere where they are no expectations."

Less, however, was said by the primary informant about how an intentional leader would achieve optimal spiritual health. Implicitly, he related its attainment to being grounded in a high integrity state and making decisions that reflected one's values, vision, and views of reality. He had more to say, however, about the physical component of intentional leadership, noting that an intentional leader's diet also contributed to leadership development.

In fact, during all three observations he provided healthy snacks (nuts, grains, fiber and fruits) for informants. Lunches also consisted of a tasty yet well-balanced serving of low carbohydrates and high protein foods, all of which he said increased a leader's energy reserves, enhancing thereby their ability to be sustain intentionality by employing the appropriate combination of intentional elements in efforts to help others maximize their development.

Before discussing the eight element of intentional leadership, the primary informant stressed the importance of physical health by saying that leaders who were obviously overweight or unhealthy simply could not work at the Center because they would inevitably be hindered in their ability to sustain the rigors of intentional leadership. Below is a discussion of the final element of intentional leadership –communicational versatility.

8.Intentional Leaders are Versatile Communicators

Communicational versatility was demonstrated by an intentional leader's attentiveness to the person or the process which connected them, according to the primary informant and the three key informants (by inference). Practically, communicational versatility enabled intentional leaders to adopt whatever stance they deemed necessary to enhance the informant's progress even if what was communicated was negative.

What mattered, according to the primary informant, was the leader's ability and flexibility in reading the situation rightly and adopting the appropriate communicational posture. Formally stated, he said that, "Intentional leaders assume whatever communicational stance is appropriate to convey their message based on knowledge of the person with whom they are dealing" (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011). Central to intentional leaders' ability to read persons and situations rightly related back to the symbiotic and fluid nature of the other seven elements. Without the proper presence, for example, intentional leaders risked assuming communicational stances that alienated rather than accentuated their relationship with others, thus hindering their leadership development.

If, moreover, they failed to create space for others to show up as great, they risked saying something that might be perceived as belittling or patronizing rather than empowering and ennobling Yet the primary informant said that it was possible to create a sense of connectedness with others in a relatively brief period of time that made them open to the stance that an intentional deemed as necessary to help leaders achieve their leadership goals.

For example, he used the meet and greet time during each observation to quickly accumulate the psychological capital that later enabled him to be protean in his communicational postures because he had gained their trust by being open and transparent during his brief interactions with informants. In the language of POS, the primary informant deliberately related to others, seeing this relatedness as essential to helping them make the kinds of changes they envisioned for themselves and their organizations. In doing so, he connected leaders with member and members with leaders in ways that transcended traditional organizational and relational hierarchies, especially in his moment-to-moment communication during the informal and formal portions of his presentation (Cameron et al., 2003; Campbell, 2009).

The primary informant's ability to master these moment-to-moment interactions fused dangling organizational parts and persons (based on the discussions that occurred during his formal presentation). In doing so, he created new organizational contexts in which leaders and members found themselves with more resources and resourcefulness for the pursuit of organizational and individual goals (Calloway et al., 2010; Campbell, 2009). In this regard, renowned leadership scholar Warren Bennis (2007) asserted that the future success of leaders would require them to be adaptive generally as well as communicatively, especially when others initially resist leadership messages.

In making his case Bennis (2007) said, "I believe adaptive capacity or resilience is the single most important quality in a leader, or in anyone else for that matter who hopes to lead a healthy, meaningful life" (p. 4). Implicit in Bennis' (2007) statement is the primary informant's existential orientation to leadership and life. Bennis' (2007) statement implied that no leader could be effective over the long-haul unless he or she

was able to adapt to the demands of leadership, society, its institutions, peculiar circumstances and their own self-constructed identities. This sentiment synthesized the claims of both the primary informant and the three key informants regarding the need for intentional leaders to be versatile communicators. More important, Bennis' (2007) claims confirmed the value intentional leadership and helped to illuminate its effect on leadership development.

Central to the ability to practice communicational versatility id the ability to create the kind of atmosphere that inspires transparency on the part of informants. In fact Janice (founder of local non-profit) said that the second facilitator was unsuccessful at sustaining the atmosphere that had been previously created by the primary informant, though she said that he exhibited the qualities of intentional leadership.

Yet something about his manner and demeanor failed to elicit the corresponding comfort and level of trusts that the she said she experienced during the primary informant's presentation. In this regard, communicational versatility transcends speaking with an edge, for example, or reading the situation or the person rightly then responding appropriately. None of this matters if the informants don't feel emotionally safe with the person charged with the responsibility of helping them to develop their leadership abilities. The section below discusses the relationship between, philosophy, education and leadership development.

The Relationship between Philosophy, Education and Leadership Development

The above definition and the concept of intentionality derived, philosophically at least, from phenomenology, which emphasized *consciousness* or what Husserl (1983) called "mental representations" (p. 1) as a prerequisite for intentionality. Fundamental to

Husserl's (1983) conception of the relationship between consciousness and intentionality were notions of directedness, conditions of satisfaction and mental content (www.stanfordwncloypedia.com). Employing Husserl's concept enables leaders to distinguish purposive actions from passive contemplations, both of which are denoted by a leader's degree of awareness and corresponding commitment in acting on what they are aware of.

Characteristically, Husserl's (1983) conception of consciousness was peculiar because it perceived the created or constructed nature of the world (Schultz, 1962; Thomason, 1982), and the ability of consciousness to engage it critically and to modify it practically. For Husserl (1983) this meant that thought and experience were directed toward objects that had the quality of existing independently of the perceiving self, connoting possibilities to be realized based on one's perception and commitment to realization (Schutz, 1962).

In this regard, intentional leaders were said to be more conscious than were other leaders in perceiving opportunities and leveraging organizational resources to achieve organizational goals (Calloway et al., 2010; Campbell, 2009; Shaw, 2005). They were more likely to see possibilities where other leaders saw limitations. In doing so, they were are able to construct structures and strategies that supported their pursuits.

The relationship between philosophy and education is fused in in this study in ways that allowed the researcher to employ philosophical notions to perceive nuances of intentionality and intentional leadership for its effect on leadership development. Ostensibly the relationship between the two may seem incompatible or incoherent even. However, scrutiny rejects this discrepancy because without Husserl's concept of

consciousness and its connection to intentionality this current study could not have generated the findings that it did; nor would it have had the language to describe these findings accordingly, albeit philosophically, in several places.

Yet the researcher was convinced of the compatibility of philosophy with education as means to not only helping scholars and practitioners understand the basis of intentionality but also its ability to broker a deeper understanding of the character of intentionality and the elements of intentional leadership. Education in this regard provided the researcher with a rationale for incorporating studies specifically focused on developing educational leaders, whether in the classroom or at principal and superintendent levels to broaden (and deepen) contemporary understanding on its applicability as a leadership development approach, examples of each were cited in this current study.

Additional studies that incorporate this approach might prove even more profitable in producing an even greater understanding of leadership development in general and of intentional leadership in particular. The conclusion below summarizes the goals of this study and the possibilities of intentional leadership to beneficially effect leadership development.

Conclusion

Intentional leadership is an emerging approach to leadership that incorporates an existential approach to leadership development. Specifically, its eight elements are symbiotic in nature and provide leaders with a fluid structure through which they can move and manage the often ambiguous demands of leadership, especially in today's challenging environment. Rightly appropriated, these elements can not only positively

impact leadership development but also effectiveness as well. One of the challenges to be encountered by researchers wishing to adopt an existential approach as characterized by the primary informant is the necessary skills or experience in counseling or assuming s therapeutic approach to leadership development.

Without the essential counseling skills or therapeutic experiences the researcher believes that it is unlikely that other practitioners will be able to constructively manage the myriad of emotions that were characteristic of the sessions observed by the researcher. More importantly, it is highly unlikely that such a person will be able to create the atmosphere of vulnerability, trust, and non-judgment that are important components of informant's willingness to practice the kind of introspection that leads to an inner psychic transformation.

Thus adopting an existential approach is a necessary condition for practicing intentional leadership as conceived by the primary informant. But it is not a sufficient condition, as other factors are needed for the successful facilitation of workshops to create the dynamics that lead to leadership development on the part of informants. Recognizing the *beingness* of the person and the created nature of the self and social world are essential yet preliminary components to the overall practice of intentional leadership, which validates even more the primary informant's claim that is more of an approach to leadership that it is a model.

This approach is rooted in the primary informant's own *beingness* and background as a counselor, as evidence by how he facilitated the workshops and was able to addre3ss each person as if he or she was the only one in the room at the time . Such a skill is not something that can be practice or deployed by anyone even if such a person is

profoundly existential in orientation. The table below outlines the eight elements of

intentional leadership and their characteristics followed by a summary and discussion.

Table 1.7: Eight characteristics of intentional leadership.

Quality	Feature
They have presence and a high degree of self-awareness.	Presence determines when and how intentional leaders greet and engage others.
Everything and everyone matters.	Intentional leaders see "significance" as ineffective if it marginalizes others.
Personal integrity	Intentional leaders use integrity to increase their psychological capital with others.
They're purpose driven versus ego-driven.	Intentional leaders practice transcendent behaviors that inspire excellence.
They create space for others to show up as great.	Intentional leaders see in others what they don't see in themselves.
They demonstrate enthusiasm and aliveness.	Intentional leaders' commitment to their mission creates enthusiasm in others.
They're healthy physically, mentally and spiritually.	Intentional leaders recognize and honor the symbiotic nature of the self.
They're versatile communicators.	Intentional leaders are perceptive and reflective in their micro interactions with others.

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

This final chapter provides an overview of the results derived from this current study by restating the research problem, the research methodology and theoretical frameworks used to interpret findings, including a discussion of findings, research goals, relationship of this study to other studies, implications for practice along with suggestions for future research.

Introduction

The eight elements of intentional leadership offered by the primary informant provided the researcher with a grid to guide collection and analysis of data derived from the various sources, as outlined in Chapter III, and as restated later in this final chapter. These elements also helped to inform how data were displayed, including investigation and examination of what themes emerged, what omissions were masked or escaped the informants notice based on interviews with each informant.

These elements were also instrumental in helping to determine what conclusions were deduced regarding the effect of intentionality on leadership development. Central to the success of this study was the researcher's fidelity to employing approaches designed specifically to answer the two research questions regarding what happened or did not happen in the intentional leadership workshops to effect anticipated change in informants behavior, and how these behavioral changes effected or failed to effect their organizations accordingly.

Thus exceptional emphasis was placed on noting the primary informant's actions, attitude, habits, behaviors and beliefs as he facilitated these workshops. This same approach prevailed

during the three interviews conducted with him; likewise during debriefing sessions and follow-up calls to clarify ambiguities and researcher uncertainty on informant feedback. Data were analyzed deductively and categorized thematically on tables and charts.

In contrast to the other components of deductive analysis, the researcher chose not to include mapping and indexing for example, and limited data analysis to themes which could be rendered primarily through describing the dynamics that gave readers insight into what occurred in the workshops and to illuminate what factors fostered informants leadership development.

Procedurally, however, the choice to use these eight elements as a guide did not hinder the researcher from focusing or foraging for other factors that had the potential to illuminate more clearly how the dynamics of the intentional leadership workshops enhanced informants leadership development while causing change in their organizational (and personal) behaviors also.

On the contrary, using these elements provided the study with conceptual purviews to characterize and to categorize behaviors, responses and other data to assess their validity. Crucial also to the data collection and interpretive process was the use of positive organizational scholarship and multiple realities given the symbiotic relationship between leadership development and organizational dynamics.

These theoretical frameworks also helped to direct the researcher in deriving, arranging and interpreting data for its implications and applications to further scholarly and practitioner understanding of how these elements worked in concert with other themes such as openness, seeing intentional leadership as an approach versus a model, the fluidity or *beingness* of the self, and its ability to recognize the created nature of the self and reality, as was mentioned in chapter four.

The researcher deemed this scheme as sufficient since the goal of the study was not to produce transferable results but rather to understand the peculiar characteristics of the intentional leadership workshops as they unfolded during the data collection process and through Deductive Analysis. In this regard, the research design also determined how the researcher approached the research process as well as analysis of its product.

Statement of the Problem

In order to better understand the dynamics that contributed to leadership development this current study employed a single-subject case study in order to understand the effect of intentionality on leadership development. The fundamental research questions that drove this study were: 1) What happened or did not happen in intentional leadership workshops that caused or did not cause a change in anticipated leadership behavior? 2) What effect did the intentional leadership workshop training have on participants and their organizations?

Review of Methodology

As a single-subject case study the primary means of exploring the two research questions occurred via three 90-minute interviews and observations with the founder of the Center for Intentional Leadership, who was the primary informant. Of these observations two occurred off-site and the final one occurred onsite at the Center. One-time 90-minute interviews were also conducted off-site with three key informants who had completed at least one of the generally half-day intentional leadership workshop sessions along with the senior leaders of their respective organizations

Typically, these leaders completed the segment of intentional leadership that focused on changing an organization's cultured to a strengths-based one, characteristic of positive organizational scholarship. Archival data written by the primary informant were also analyzed.

This data consisted of a total of six articles, five of which were written for his city's large metropolitan newspaper and a final piece that was originally composed for *Greater Charlotte Business Magazine*, each of which addressed some element of intentional leadership designed for a general audience.

Debriefings usually occurred after each interview and observation, and again via member checks after the data had been compiled and analyzed to ensure accurate transmission of what had been captured by the researcher. Below is a discussion of the primary informant's existential orientation and its implications for understanding the effect of intentionality on leadership development. This orientation characterized his perspective and approach to leadership development and its implications for leadership development.

Leadership: An Existential Orientation and Implications for Leadership Development

The effect of intentionality on leadership development is clear throughout this study based on the explicit statements and implicit assumptions conveyed to the researcher by the primary informant, as well as based on date derived from observations and analysis of archival data. Still, the results of this study suggested that properly understood and employed leaders who embraced this paradigm could expect to experience significant and sustainable increases in their leadership development and leadership effectiveness. Central to this effectiveness is the willingness first of all to see leadership as an extension and/or expression of an existential approach to life in general and not leadership in particular, as expressed by the key informant.

Adopting this existential orientation requires that leaders being willing to model his manner and begin their leadership efforts by "taking a look within first" (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011). However, it would be difficult for someone without a background in counseling or who is proficient in the therapeutic approach to replicate the results of the primary

informant even if such a person does embrace an existential orientation to leadership development.

The dynamics that emerge in the intentional leadership workshops are such that it takes someone with the requisite skills to help leaders negotiate the array of emotions that erupt as a re3sult of practicing critical reflectivity guided by the primary informant. Characteristically, these eruptions resemble Dabrowksi and Piechowski's (1977) positive disintegration. Even so, Olivares et al. (2007) also sought to understand leadership existentially in their existential phenomenological approach, an account of which is rendered below:

> At the core of existential thought is the question, "What is it to exist, or to be human?" The phenomenological theme inextricably tied to the existential theme is, "What is the nature of subjective experience?" Phenomenology is guided by the basic principle of intentionality, that is, experiences are directed toward things in the world: Humans live (exist) in relation to a world, other persons, and objects; that is, as humans we exist and are constructed by our relations with others. These basic existential-phenomenological questions can be extended to leadership development by asking, "What is leadership, and what is the nature of leadership experiences?" Hence, phenomenology can provide a framework of rational inquiry for accessing the phenomenon of leadership development. Phenomenology, by its very nature, seems to be a logical approach for helping us to better understand the essence of leadership development experiences.

The success and saliency of this look within, to seek to understand what it means to be human is predicated upon a leader's willingness to perceive his or her degree of relatedness with others. That is, those who would be intentional leaders must first acknowledge and recognize that despite their leadership label or position they Are having what the key informant "fairly common human experiences" (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011). The willingness of leaders` to look within, however, is only one component of intentionality being able to positively effect leadership development. The other component depends upon the skills of the facilitator, as was mentioned above.

In this regard, the crux of intentional leadership and its directional dynamics were based on what the primary informant called the *beingness* of the person" (Whitehead, 1st Interview, 2011). Moreover, he said that he results of acknowledging this *beingness* combined with taking a look within produced a self-knowledge that might otherwise have escaped leaders notice and thus negatively impacted their leadership development because they were oblivious to themselves and how others experience them in their leadership efforts in concert with organizational dynamics.

However, this self-knowledge is often perilous and precarious because leaders experience emotions and express reactions that are` often untouched in leadership development forums that are more technical and tactical in approach. Thus it is crucial that attempts to replicate the primary informant's existential orientation be combined with the skills characteristic of a counselor, especially during the often emotionally-charged experiences informants experience through rigorous self-reflection.

During periods and through practices of self-reflection the primary informant said that intentional leaders were able to identify attitudes, actions, inhibitions and other elements of their personality that precluded and prevented them from maximizing their leadership impact (Maslow, 1982; Olivares et al., 2007). They were also able to recognize the similarities that connected them to others existentially rather than separating them positionally because of their place in the organizational hierarchy or their indifference to organizational influences and common human experiences. He said, for example, that intentional leaders could adopt several stances when interacting with subordinates that would accentuate their mutual development and attainment of organizational goals; or they could behave in ways that impeded these.

For them to do so though they would have to reject the Hegelian helix (Baird & Kaufman, 2007) of the Master-Bondsman relationship wherein one person is only able to recognize him or herself at the expense of diminishing the *beingness* of others. Such an attitude is characteristic of authoritarian leadership (Northouse, 2010) where the roles and rules were clearly defined and rarely transgressed because the emphasis was on honoring the hierarchy versus actualizing the potentials and possibilities possessed by organizational members. Inattention to this human side of leadership obscures a leader's ability to recognize that "the deeper transformation required for productivity is an act of will: the free decision to be an adult a mature human being in the conflicting loyalties of the matrix organization" (Koestenbaum, 1991, p. 5).

Needless to say such a culture rejected the principles of Positive Organizational Scholarship and its strengths-based approach. In recognizing the *beingness* of others in relationship to themselves, however, the primary informant said that intentional leaders sought to empower rather than imprison or constrain others. They sought rather to help them activate and actualize their mutual leadership development and human potential because leaders recognize the existence of a common human condition rather than centering themselves exclusively in leadership dimensions.

In the Hegelian (Baird, 1982) notion of Master-Bondsman relations followers themselves do not act for themselves as independent autonomous agents capable of creating and catalyzing authentic actions (Riggio et al., 2008; Shamir et al., 2007). They existed instead for the leader or Master's benefit and were therefore highly subservient and characteristically submissive rather than appropriately empowered or participatory at levels that leveraged their potential or desire to contribute to organizational goals and experience professional (and personal) development simultaneously.

In contrast these constraints, the existential orientation of intentional leadership and its eight elements required leaders to assume what could be characterized as an I-Thou (Buber, 1970; Priest, 2001) relationship with organizational members, especially subordinates if they were to avoid engaging in behaviors that limited their agency, autonomy and personal integrity.

In this regard, the researcher determined that regard for the *beingness* of persons was the pivot and prerequisite for understanding the effect of intentionality on leadership development. In failing to recognize common quality leaders were more apt insult their subordinates and fail to recognize their innate need for respect and dignity, thus affecting their actual performance and inner attitude toward leaders and their organizations (Koestenbaum, 1991; Olivares et al., 2007).

Failure to honor the *beingness* of a person through a process of self-reflection and awareness also revealed a lack of leadership intelligence "with its emphasis on full disclosure, freedom, autonomy, encounter and respect for the existential crisis" (Koestenbaum, 1991, p. 75; Schwandt, 2005). Echoing the key informant's existential orientation, Koestenbaum (1991) stressed, stretched perhaps, the value of this component as a catalyst for maximizing leadership potential by embracing its unique and inevitable human dimension.

Leaders who were ignorant of or indifferent to themselves as individuals were also apt to be seen as authoritarian and disingenuous by others (George, 2003; Northouse, 2010). These leaders were also more likely to view employees as instruments to be used rather than viewing them as persons to be led, reducing them instead to the level of thinghood in the Hegelian sense (Baird & Kaufmann, 2007; Buber, 1970).

This attitude contradicted the eight elements of intentional leadership, positive organizational scholarship, multiple realities, and discouraged others from engaging in the kind of behaviors that advanced organizational interests and leadership development simultaneously.

On the contrary, leaders that betrayed the postulates of the intentional paradigm did not, for example, believe in the capacity of followers to engage in self-leadership, which was defined as the "process through which influence themselves to achieve the self-direction and self-motivation needed to perform" (Shamir et al., 2007).

Consonant with the preceding claim, Koestanbaum (1991) said that to speak of the human core of leadership required leaders to transcend an emphasis on techniques. Yet without the necessary self-knowledge and awareness of what made them tick were hampered in their ability to touch this core and to apply the elements of intentional leadership symbiotically and effectively, thereby enhancing their leadership development and the leadership development of others.

One obstacle to developing this kind of awareness was the social conditioning that all leaders were subject to. Unless leaders questioned these messages, beginning with trying to understand how they influenced and informed their self-concept it was unlikely that they would disassociate themselves accordingly and began to create themselves authentically, according to the primary.

In this regard, the primary informant reaffirmed the need to approach leadership existentially with a necessary and ongoing process of self-reflection leading to self-knowledge as central to sustaining a heightened degree of intentionality. Otherwise he said that external messages and mediums would prevail and prevent the emergence and molding of a new self-capable of adapting to the demands of leadership. Describing the dilemma faced by leaders, he said,

> The problem is is that sometimes people don't know who that is. Um, they've confused the, um, the messages they've received growing up and the conclusions that they've drawn about themselves having grown up the way that they did…they confuse that with themselves. They've been conditioned by life, by people, by authority figures…to conclude this is how I am…and in fact that's not who people are, and so what I've been

> able to do is to help people intentionally go through a process of self-awareness, self-examination, self-exploration so that at the end of that process, "Okay, I get it. I now know who I am, and I know what I'm committed to, what I believe in and it's my choice to do this, not someone else's (Whitehead 1st Interview 2011).

Failure to question the influence of social conditioning led to forms of determinism wherein people saw their behaviors as fixed, final and overly influential in shaping their leadership behaviors. These leaders were also less likely to be open to an approach such as intentional leadership or any other medium that deviated from what they had become accustomed to or had come to identify as synonymous with themselves, uncritically ignoring the existential orientation to leadership development. These leaders were also more apt to recognize their freedom to un-choose behaviors in the same fashion that they had chosen them, albeit unconsciously.

Addison (2009) provided an apt rendering of the attitude characteristic of this malignant attitude, which Thomason (1982) termed *reification,* and which inevitably prevented leaders from recognizing the created nature of reality as well as leaders part in creating it. Regarding leaders' role Addison (2009) wrote, "Social reality exists, so to speak, twice, in things and minds, in fields and in habitus, outside and inside social agents. And when habitus encounters a social world of which it is the product, it is like a 'fish in water,' it does not feel the weight of the water and it takes the world about itself for granted" (p. 332). Hence, the value of the existential and constructivist approach to understanding leadership development.

Embedded in an existential orientation of choosing and un-choosing who one is, how one is and who one became conveyed a leader's sense of self-efficacy. Unless this efficacy was adequate, leaders were more apt to feel constrained by environment, temperament and a host of other conditions that limited their ability to be reflective and their courage to challenge behaviors that hindered their leadership development because they did not believe they could change it.

This attitude also prevented the experience of positive disintegration (Dabrowski & Piechowski 1977), which was mentioned earlier in this study and is discussed again briefly below.

The Role of Positive Disintegration in Developing Intentional Leaders

Positive disintegration occurs when a person reaches a critical intersection of who he or she has been versus facing the opportunity to become some other (often better) than this previous self-conception. Disintegration occurs when they discard the old identity with its limited and limiting components and began the arduous and emotional process of reinventing and reinvigorating themselves and the organizations on which they work depending upon their perceived power and personal commitment.

Defined formally, positive disintegration "means a period of restructuring of the underlying organization of affective and cognitive functions. It is called disintegration because the lower level of functioning must break down before it is replaced by a new organization of a higher level" (Dabrowksi & Piechowski, 1977, p. 15). In this regard, positive implies a move from a lower state or stasis to higher one wherein persons are able to actualize more of their human potential in the leadership dimension as well as in the various other dimensions of their lives. This doesn't mean that the process itself is positive but rather the outcome of the process. In fact the process is often characterized by anxiety, uncertainty, ambiguity, ambivalence and a range of other negative emotions. Yet these are essential to the construction of a new self and organization.

As stated earlier, this process typically happened to everyone and is a simple function of being human. Yet intentional leaders tended to be deliberate during this process for it to produce the kind of results that enhanced their development as leaders and as persons, paralleling the existential orientation expressed by the primary informant. In this regard, intentional leaders saw

the dynamics of disintegration as opportunities to further explore their *beingness* and change it accordingly, adopting in route a holistic approach to understanding themselves and the phenomenon of leadership development. The section below discusses the characteristics of the intentional leadership workshops and their implications for leadership practice.

Characteristics of Intentional Leadership Workshops and their Implications for Leadership Development

Characteristically, each of the three intentional leadership workshops observed by the researcher resembled group therapy more so than leadership development workshops, as everyone bore their souls and revealed themselves in an atmosphere of acceptance, confidentiality and mutual vulnerability. The key informant's background in counseling as well as his own constant self-inquiry, which routinely led to voluntary self-disclosure while facilitating the workshops, had the effect of disarming informants and encouraging critical reflectivity.

In fact two of the three key informants said that they were relieved to be in an atmosphere where they could say and admit things that often went unaddressed or were considered taboo in other leadership development forums. These characteristics amplified the primary informant's existential orientation and illustrated his claim that intentional leader was a leadership approach and not leadership model.

According to the primary informant, viewing intentional leadership as an approach connoted openness, an ability to recognize the fluid and created nature of the self and social reality (Addison, 2009; Schultz, 1962; Thomason, 1982). Thus he said that intentional leaders were more apt to engage reality (and themselves) to achieve significant and sustainable changes in their organizations and in their leadership lives.

Deliberately constructivist and creative, intentional leaders rejected reification and what the primary informant alluded to as the temporary sovereignty of circumstances. Instead he said that intentional leaders leveraged individual and organizational resources until they became assets instead, aiding in the creation and construction of a new reality, which better served individual and organizational needs while enhancing their leadership development and effectiveness.

Because they were constructivist in their approach to life and leadership, intentional leaders demonstrated the courage to create a new reality in the heart (and heat) of the old reality, according to the primary informant. He used leaders from the Civil Rights Movement as examples of an intentional approach to leadership, which resulted in the creation of new realities based on their willingness to declare these realities in their absence. In route, he noted that these leaders also inspired others to reject prevailing realities for possible ones instead that provide more opportunity and equity for African-Americans. The primary informant said that their efforts succeeded because they created an intentional framework for change (Diehl, 2010).

His example is exemplary in conveying the possibilities that intentional leaders made others aware of and also committed them to through their own existential orientation to life and leadership, complete with painful periods of positive disintegration, which eventually re-made them and the world in which they lived. However, his example failed to acknowledge that most organizations didn't normally have such extreme conditions as would compel their degree of support or sacrifice by most of its members. This is true even in what he had earlier called a *tough culture*. In this regard, there was not only formidable friction that the Civil Rights leaders had to fight but also periods of inertia that had to be overcome for leaders and members to be revitalized if the realities they envisioned were to manifest.

Moreover, not all leaders are able to effect comparable results or to sustain successful pursuit of multiple realities without adequate support from peers, superiors and subordinates. Unless these leaders inspire others to see (and pursue) their visions exist in a vacuum. In these instances, conditions are neither optimal nor ideal for their attainment. Yet this conjecture doesn't discredit the potential for intentionality effect leadership development. In fact findings from this study suggest the opposite though they aren't generalizable. Even so, intentionality as understood by data derived from this study added to contemporary of its ability to positively effect leadership development. The section below discusses the relationship between this current study and other studies.

<div align="center">Relationship of Current Study to Other Studies</div>

This current study is consistent with other efforts to understand the effect of intentionality as found in the literature (Adams, 2006; Calloway et al., 2010; Campbell, 2009; Campolongo, 2009; Cashman, 2008; Gortner, 2009; Groleau, 2000; Hall, 2008; Jennings, 2010; Larrier, 2007; McBride, 2001; Novakowski, 2008; Olivares, 2007; Putnam, 2010; Shaw, 2005). Even those studies that do not focus on intentionality as a leadership construct by omission suggest that room exists for the emergence of other approaches to conceiving leadership studies and the development of leaders to serve the various contemporary organizations.

The fact that Northouse (2010), for example, omits intentional leadership in his relatively recent and admittedly comprehensive leadership volume validates the need to increase our knowledge of intentionality and explore in greater depth and theoretical and conceptual diversity its eight elements in relation to what scholars already know about how leaders develop and what conditions are optimal, if not ideal in enhancing this development.

In this regard, this current study sought not only to add to the literature but also had the unintended consequence of revealing the dearth of studies on intentional leadership as an object of research scholars and practitioners. However, interest is growing as evidenced by the number of dissertations that address the concept of intentionality and its potential to promote the development of leaders. The data derived from this single-subject case study also offers research theorists the opportunity to examine intentionality within existing leadership paradigms to identify parallels as well as departures, conceptually and practically speaking that will lend even more credence to this and future studies based on an intentional approach to leadership development. The succeeding section outlines the implications of this current study.

<div align="center">Implications of Current Study</div>

Given the challenging and changing nature of society, its organizations and the members that comprise these, it is important to deepen our understanding and broaden our awareness of those dynamics and devices that contribute to as well as detract from leadership effectiveness. Thus this current study sought to survey the potential of intentionality to have a positive and perhaps permanent impact on the development of leaders while providing a context that is coterminous with contemporary needs and desires, especially as technology continues to change human nature, social structures and their corresponding structures it is crucial to develop leadership constructs that answer contemporary demands.

These demands are compounded by the changing nature of organizations and the advent of globalization and its flattening of hierarchies because of a need to respond in real time to real demands that present themselves with an immediacy that demands agility (and ingenuity) by organizational leaders. Intentionality and the eight elements that comprise its construct has the potential to be a bona fide and beneficial basis for building and buttressing a new approach to

leadership, one that is existential in orientation and application, acknowledging leadership as an extension of the human dimension reduced to a set of tasks that are assigned to individuals who exemplify the qualities that fit them for leadership.

With this perspective the principles of intentional leadership can then be applied, symbiotically ideally, to optimize their results and to maximize leadership development. As a single-subject case study, however, the implications of practice are defined by this research Yet findings from this study suggest that as more insight is gained and an assortment of assessments are made intentionality contains legitimate promise as an effective means of helping leaders leverage their leadership potential, particularly when supported the principles of POS, Multiple Realities and a strengths-based approach to leadership.

Combined with a strengths-based orientation and an existential approach to leadership development intentional leadership holds great promise for contributing to contemporary understanding of leadership development. Its tendency to use multiple realities because of recognizing the created nature of the self and the world enables intentional leaders to envision possibilities and to see opportunities that other leaders are apt to overlook or under-rate as valid and valuable in contributing to the achievement of leadership development and organizational goals.

Leaders and organizations who wish to accelerate and accentuate their growth and development can employ any of the eight elements individually or to maximize their impact, symbiotically, to achieve the kind of breakthroughs that were reported by the three key informants interviewed for this current study. More important, this study provides both scholars and practitioners with another paradigm that can aid them in constructing programs and

processes that practically impact how leaders lead and how leadership and leadership development is conceptualized. The section below provides suggestions for future research.

Suggestions for Future Research

Future researchers should focus their efforts on understanding more deeply the existential orientation of intentional leadership and the concept of intentionality. Special emphasis should be given to the eight elements as articulated by the primary informant to better understand the nature and value of their impact beyond the limited applicability of the findings because of the research design.

Individually and collectively these elements are worthy of exploration because they suggest that a counseling oriented approach to leadership that deals with the person, as opposed to developing leaders exclusively may by default have the effect of increasing a leader's overall effectiveness in this dimension of his or her life. Intentionality and its effect on positively impacting one's leadership development would also benefit from quantitative studies that are capable of measuring in greater detail the degree of changes in one's leadership approach and subsequent development.

Quantitative studies for example, can also help provide intentional leaders with valid and reliable measures that go beyond the routinely stated sense of empowerment that all three informants expressed repeatedly. Perhaps quadrants can be devised from these elements in ways that would submit to being measured and monitored in a method that is equally existential and thus prevent intentionality and its eight elements from being reduced to anecdotal accounts rather than appropriately rigorous efforts to under-gird the findings from qualitative studies with concomitant confirming quantitative data.

In this regard, longitudinal studies can be especially fruitful in determining the sustainability of intentionality and its eight elements, especially since its approach deviates significantly, at least according to the three key informants, from other leadership models and training with which they were familiar. Passionately and prudently pursued, scholars and practitioners who embrace these suggestions or who devise their own based on the findings of this current study can add significantly to contemporary literature and understanding of the effect of intentionality on one's leadership development.

Future research should focus on conducting a wide array of research designs and theoretical postulates that will enable researchers to create instruments to measure the effect of intentionality on leadership development similar to the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire -- ALQ (Northouse, 2010) or the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire MLQ (Fleenor, 2004). Such instruments would reinforce the theoretical underpinnings of intentional leadership and contemporary understanding on its effect on leadership development, improving its practice consequentially.

Another instructive direction that future research might take is in examining the relationship between existential leadership and intentional leadership to enhance contemporary understanding of both. Equally important, a more fully developed understanding of the effect of intentionality on leadership development will help leaders meet the demands associated with 21st century leadership. The succeeding section ends with a conclusion that seeks to synthesize the overall findings and value of this present study.

Conclusion

Guided by an internal locus of control and a high sense of self-esteem and self-efficacy, intentional leaders employ courage, authentic belief in their autonomy to influence the world, their organizations and themselves. They are optimistic yet realistic in their appraisals of organizational problems and liberal in their belief in human potential because of their existential orientation to leadership, recognizing its constructed nature and people's capacity for growth and expansion.

Therefore intentional leaders see leadership as a process that prospers by staying true to their primary purpose while striving to create an environment that highlights employee strengths in an atmosphere that encourages (and even rewards) risk-taking, seeing its results as opportunities to learn rather than as warnings to suppress individual and organizational leadership potential, accumulating important psychological capital in route.

These themes prevailed in the archival data and the interviews with both the primary and three key informants. One important, their ability to employ the eight elements of intentionally symbiotically while maintaining an existential orientation contributed to the gains they experienced in their leadership development. However, as reiterated above the researcher believes that these gains will be difficult to replicate unless the facilitators of intentional leadership workshops have some kind of counseling background or familiarity with and skill in employing the therapeutic approach.

Otherwise such person will not be able to create the ethos and the corresponding dynamics that make intentionality a viable and potentially viable tool of leadership development to meet the increased demand for capable and competent leaders to lead the diverse and dynamic organizations in a hyper-globalized world.

REFERENCES

Adams, M. (2006). Towards an existential phenomenological model of life span human development, *Journal for the Society of Existential Analysis*, 17(2), p. 261-280.

Addison, B. (2009). A feel for the game – a Bourdieuean analysis of principal leadership: A study of Queensland secondary schools, *Journal of Education Administration and History*, 41(4), 327-341.

Alasuutari, P., Bickman, L, Brannen, J. (2008). The sage handbook of social science research methods, CA: Sage Publications.

Alder, H. (1998). Think like a leader, WI: Magna Publishing.

Amey, M.J., Vanderlinden, K.F., Brown, D.F. (2002). Perspectives on Community College Leadership: Twenty years in the making, *Community College Journal of Research and Practice,* 26(7/8), 573-589.

Amey, M.J. (2005). Leadership as learning: Conceptualizing the process*, Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29(9/10), p. 689-704.

Ashman, I., Lawler, J. (2008). Existential communication and leadership, 4(3) p. 253 269.

Avolio, B.J, Walumbwa, F.O., Weber, T.J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions, Annual Review of Psychology, p. 421-449.

Avolio, B.J., Luthans, F. (2006). The high impact leader, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Baird, F.E., Kaufman, W. (2007). From Plato to Derrida*,* Fifth Edition, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bakker, A.B., Schaufeli, W.B. (2008). Positive organizational behavior: Engaged employees in flourishing organizations, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, p. 147-154.

Bass, B.M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B.M. **(**2008) The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B.M. (1981). Stogdill's handbook of leadership (Revised & Expanded Edition)*,* NT: Free Press.

Bennis, W. (2007). The challenges of leadership in the modern world, *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 2-5.

Bennis, W. (2003). On becoming a leader, NY: Basic Books.

Benton, D.A. (2003). Secrets of a CEO coach: Your guide to thinking like a leader and acting Like a CEO, OH: McGraw-Hill.

Bolman, L.G., Deal, T.E. (2008). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bowers, R. (2010). Developing future leaders, *Independent School*, 70(1), P. 42-46.

Brown, L., Martinez, M., Daniel, D. (2002). Community college leadership preparation: Needs, perceptions, and recommendations, *Community College Review*, 30(1), p. 45-73.

Brown, M.E., Trevino, L.K. (2009). Leader-follower values congruence: Are socialized charismatic leaders better able to achieve it? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 478 490.

Buber, M. (1970). I and thou, Kaufman, Walter, Translator: NY: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Buckingham, M., Clifton, D.O. (2001). Now discover your strengths, NY: Free Press.

Burns, J.M. (1978). Leadership, NY: Harper & Row Publishers.

Bush, T. (2008). Developing Educational Leaders –Don't leave it to chance. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership,* 36(3) 307–309, p.5-10.

Buttner, E.H., Lowe, K.B., Billings-Harris, L. (2007). Impact of leader racial attitude on ratings of causes and solutions for an employee color shortage, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 73: 129-144.

Buttner, E.H., Lowe, K.B., & Billings-Harris, L. (2006). The influence of organizational diversity orientation and leader attitude on diversity activities, *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 18(3), p. 356-371.

Callahan, C. (2009). Resonance, Dissonance and Leadership, *The Army Medical Department Journal*, October-December.

Calloway, J., C., Feltz, & Young. K. (2010). Never by chance: Aligning people and strategy through intentional leadership, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Camburn, E.M., Spillane, J. P., Sebastian, J. (2010). Assessing the utility of a daily long for measuring principal leadership practice, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(5), p. 707-737.

Cameron, K.S., Dutton, J.E., Quinn, R.E. (2003). Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline, CA: Brett-Koehler.

Campbell, D. (2009). The awareness and practice of intentional leadership, University of Southern California, (*Unpublished dissertation*).

Campolongo, E,D. (2009). Intentional Peer-mentoring programs in Christian schools: An exploratory study, *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 18: 69-83.

Cashman, K. (2008). Leadership from the inside out: Becoming a leader for life, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Cawthon, D. (2002). Philosophical foundations of leadership, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Caza, B.B., Caza, A. (2008). Positive organizational scholarship: A critical theory perspective, *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 17(1), p. 21-33.

Cicero, L., Pierro, A. (2007). Charismatic leadership and organizational outcomes: The mediating role of employees' work-group identification, *International Union of Psychological Sciences*, 42(5), 297-306.

Ciulla, J.B. (1995). Leadership ethics: Mapping the territory, *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 5(1), p. 5-28.

Clarke-Hicks, D., Iles, P. (2000). Climate for diversity and its effects on career and organizational attitudes and perceptions, *Personnel Review*, 29(3), p. 324-345.

Collins, J. (2001). Good to great: Why some companies make the leap and others don't, NY: HarperBusiness.

Cooper, C.D., Scandura, T.A., Schriesheim, C.A. (2005). Looking forward but learning from our past: Potential challenges to developing authentic leadership theory and authentic leaders, *The Leadership. Quarterly*, 475 (19).

Covey, S. (1991). Principle-centered leadership, NY: Summit Books.

Covey, S.R. (1989). The 7 habits of highly effective people: Powerful lessons in personal change, NY: The Free Press.

Covey, S. (2004). The eighth habit: From effectiveness to greatness, NY: Free Press.

Dabrowski, K., Piechowski, M.M. (1977). Theory of levels of emotional development: Volume I, Multilevelness and positive disintegration, NY: Dabor Science Publications.

Day, D.V. (2001). Leadership development: A review in context, *Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 581-613.

Desjardins, J. (2008). An introduction to business ethics, 3rd Edition, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Diehl, F.A. (2010). Eutopiagraphies: Narratives of preferred-future selves with implications for developmental coaching, (*Unpublished dissertation*).

Dyer, Wayne, (2004). The power of intention, CA: Hay House Publishing.

Everett, B.L. (2010). The Nashville Civil Rights Movement: A study of the phenomenon of intentional leadership development and its consequences for local movements and the national civil rights movement, Georgia State University, (*Unpublished dissertation*).

Ezzy, D. (2002). Qualitative analysis: Practice and innovation, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Fivush, R., Haden, C.A. (2003). Autobiographical memory and the construction of a narrative self: Developmental and cultural perspectives, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Fleenor, J. (2010). Review of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, Third Edition, NE: *Buros Institute of Mental Measurement*.

Forman, R., Jones, J., Miller, B., (2007). The leadership baton: An intentional strategy for developing leaders in your church, MI: Zondervan Publishing.

Gehrke, S.J. (2008). Leadership through meaning-making: An empirical exploration of spirituality and leadership in college students, *Research in Brief*, 49(4), 35-359.

George, B. (2003). Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value, NJ: Jossey-Bass.

Glatthorn, A.A., Joyner, R.L. (2005). Writing the winning thesis or dissertation: A step-by-step guide, CA: Corwin.

Glynn, M., & Dowd, T. J. (2008). Charisma (Un)Bound. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 44(1), 71-93.

Goethals, G.R., Sorenson, G.L.J. (2006). The quest for a general theory of leadership, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Goleman, D. (2006). Emotional Intelligence: Tenth anniversary edition: Why it can matter more than IQ, NY: Bantam Books.

Gortner, D. (2009). Looking at leadership beyond our own horizon, *Anglican Theological Review*, 91(1), 119-142.

Groleau, D. (2009). Will intentional biblical leadership development result in a church body that has an increasing pool of trained and willing individuals available for needed leadership positions, Grace Theological Seminary, (*Unpublished dissertation*).

Servant leadership: Greenleaf, R. (2002). A journey into the nature and legitimate power of greatness, 25th anniversary edition, NJ: Paulist Press.

Hackman, M.Z., Johnson, C.E. (2009). Leadership: A communication perspective, fifth edition, IL: Waveland Press.

Hall, P. (2008). Building bridges: strengthening the principal induction process through intentional mentoring, *Phi Delta Kappa*, 89(6), p. 449-452.

Hannum, Martineau, and Reinelt, (2006). The handbook of leadership development evaluation, NJ: Jossey-Bass.

Harrison, D.A., Klein, K.J. (2007). What's the difference: Diversity constructs as separation, variety or disparity in organizations, *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4), p. 1199-1228.

Hoeller, K. (1993). *Review of existential psychology and psychiatry*, 21-22, 1988-1991 NJ: Humanities Press International, Inc.

Husserl, E. (1983). Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy, First Book. Trans. F. Kersten. Kluwer.

Hoover, J., Valenti, A. (2005) Unleashing leadership: Aligning what people do best with what organizations need most. Origins. www.amazon.com.

Ilies, R., Morgeson, F. P., & Nahrgang, J. D. (2005). Authentic leadership and eudaemonic well-being: Understanding leader-follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 373-394.

Jacobsen, T.L. (2010). Showing our strength, *Library Journal*, September, 28-31.

Jennings, D.A. (2010), Intentional Leaders: Follow four guidelines, *Executive Excellence*, p. 5.

Jue, A., Amato, P., Bodam, G., & Boyle, M. (2007). Leadership Moments: Turning points that changed lives and organizations, CA: Trafford Publishing.

Karakas, F. (2011). Positive Management Education: Creating creative minds, passionate hearts and kindred spirits, *Journal of Education Management*, 35(2), p. 198-226.

Knowles, R.T. (1986). Human development and human possibility: Erikson in the Light of Heidegger, MD: University Press of America.

Kostenbaum, P. (1991). Leadership: The inner side of greatness, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kussmaul, D.L. (2005). The Leaders of the Future, *School Administrator*, 62(1), p. 44.

Langseth, M., Plater,W., & Dillon, S. (2004). Public work and the academy: An academic administrator's guide to civic engagement and service-learning, CA: Anker Publishing.

Larrier, R. (2007). Development of an intentional leadership model for a mediation service with a plan for implementation and evaluation, Nova Southeastern University, (*Unpublished dissertation*).

Liedtka, J. (2008). Strategy making and the search for authenticity, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 80(12), 237-248.

Lord, R.G., Brown, D.J. (2003). Leadership processes and follower self-identity, UK: Psychology Press

Luckcock, T. (2007). Personal growth and spirituality in leadership development: A Critical analysis of the construction of self in LPSH. *Educational Management Administration Leadership*, *35*(4), 535-554.

Luthans, F., Avolio, B.J. (2009). The "point" of positive organizational behavior, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, p. 291-307.

Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, p. 695-706.

Marshall, C., Rossman, G.B. (2006). Designing Qualitative Research, CA: Sage Publications.

Maslow, A. (1970). Motivation and personality. New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishers.

Maslow, A. (1982). Toward a theory of being, 2nd Ed, NY: Van Norstrand Rheinhold Publishing Company.

McBride, R. A. (2001). The School Superintendent: A study of intentional leadership, (*Unpublished doctoral dissertation*), Washington State University: WA.

McCauley, C.D., Van Velsor, E. (2004). The Center for creative leadership handbook of leadership development, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mellon, L. (2011). Inside the leader's mind: Five ways to think like a leader, NJ: Financial Times Press.

Millar, C., Poole, E. (2011) Ethical leadership: global challenges and perspectives, NY: Palgrave-McMillan.

Miller, M. (2007). Transformational Leadership and mutuality, *Transformation*, 24(3), 180-192.

Mitra, A.M., Hsieh, Y., and Buswick, T. (2010). Learning how to look: Developing leadership through intentional observation, *Journal of Business Strategy*, 31(4), 77 84.

Murphy, G. (1958). Human potentialities, NY: Basic Books.

Nahavandi, A. (2000). The art and science of leadership, 2nd edition, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Nemanich, L.A., Vera, D. (2008). Transformational Leadership and ambidexterity in the context of an acquisition, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20: 19-33.

Northouse, P.G. (2010). Leadership: Theory and practice, Fifth edition, CA: Sage Publications.

Novakowski 2008, Intentional Leadership: Using knowledge, skills, abilities and the conative dimensions to select cross-functional teams, MN: Capella University Press.

Olivares, O.J. (2007). The formulation of a leadership development praxis: Linking intentions to outcomes, *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 29(6) 530-543.

Olivares, O.J., Peterson, G., Hess, K.P. (2007) An existential phenomenological framework for understanding leadership development experiences, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 28 (1), p.76 – 91.

Orth, U., Robins, R.W., Trzeniewski, K. H. (2010). Self-esteem development from young adulthood to old age: A cohort-sequential longitudinal study, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(4), p. 645-658.

Ottenritter, N. (2006). Competencies for community college leaders, *Community College Journal*, 76(4), p. 15-18.

Palmer, D.E. (2009). Business leadership: Three levels of ethical analysis, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(3), p. 525-536.

Parry, K.W., Proctor-Thompson, S.B. (2002). Perceived integrity of transformational leaders in organisational settings, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 35: 75-96.

Pasupathi, M., Mansour, E., & Brubaker, J.R. (2007). Developing a life story: Constructing relations between self and experience in autobiographical narratives, *Human Development*, 50, p. 85-110.

Pounder, J. S. (2008). Transformational Leadership: Practicing what we preach in the classroom, *Journal of Education for Business*, 2(5), 2-6.

Putnam, S.M. (2010). Leadership for effective change: Creating intentionality using staff development, *National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal*, p. 21-28.

Rath, T., Conchie, B. (2009). Strengths-based leadership, Washington: Gallup Press.

Richards, R. (2000). Intentional leadership: an interactive workshop for kingdom leaders, FL: Charisma Press.

Riggio, R.E., Chaleff, I., Lipman-Blumen, J. (2008). The art of followership: How great follower create great leaders and organizations, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rollins, C.H. (1985). Training lay leaders to educate one another in local congregations: Empowering people to empower themselves through intentional ministry, IL: Charisma Press.

Rosenbach, W.E., Taylor, R.L. (2001). Contemporary issues in leadership, Fifth edition, CO: Westview Press.

Rost, J.C. (1991). Leadership for the twenty-first century, CT: Praeger.

Salkind, N. (Ed.) (2006). Encyclopedia of human development, CA: Sage Publications.

Sanaghan, P., Napier, R. (2002). Intentional design and the process of change: Strategies for successful change, Washington, DC: Follett Educational Group.

Sartre, J.P. (2001) Priest, S., Ed., Jean-Paul Sartre: Basic Writings, NY: Routledge.

Schermerhorn, J.R. (2011). Organizational behavior, NJ: Wiley Press.

Schlein, S.P. (1987). A Way of Looking at things: Collected Papers from 1930-1980. W.W. Norton & Company, New York: NY.

Schutz, A. (1962). Collected papers, Volume I: The problem of social reality, MA: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Schwandt, D.R. (2005), When managers become philosophers: integrating learning with sensemaking, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 4 No.2, pp.176-92.

Senge, P. (2006). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization, NY: Crown Business Publishing.

Smith, M.R. (2009). Assessing the spiritual formation of Christian leadership through the intentional practice of spiritual disciplines, Southeastern Baptist Seminary, *Unpublished dissertation*).

Shamir, B., S., Pillai, R., Bligh, M.C., and Uhl-Bien, Mary. (2007). Follower-Centered Perspectives on Leadership, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Shaw, K. (2005). The intentional leader, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Spears, L.C., Lawrence, M. (2004). Practicing servant-leadership: succeeding through trust, bravery and forgiveness, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Spreitzer, G (2006). Leading to grow and growing to lead: Leadership lessons from positive organizational studies, *Organizational Dynamics*, 35(4), 305-315.

Starratt, R.J. (2004). Ethical leadership, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Szbala, D.B. (2007). A multidimensional view of resistance to organizational change: Exploring cognitive, emotional and intentional responses to planned change across perceived change leadership strategies, *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 18(4), 525-558.

Thomason, B. (1982). Making sense of reification: Alfred Schutz and constructionist theory, NJ: Humanities Press.

Toor, S., & Ofori, G. (2008). Taking leadership research into future: A review of empirical studies and new directions for research. *Engineering Construction & Architectural Management* 15(4), 352 371.

Trafton, R.S., & Marentette, D.S. (2010). Leadership practices that unless the best from your people and your business, CA: New Brain for Business Institute.

Verbos, A.K., Gerard, J.A., Forshey, P.R., Harding, C.S., & Miller, J.S. (2007). The Positive ethical organization: Enacting a living code of ethics and ethical organizational identity, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17(17), 17-33.

Walumbwa, F.O., Peterson, S.J., Avolio, B.J. and Hartnell, C.A. (2010). An investigation of the relationships among leader and follower psychological capital, service climate, and job performance, *Personnel Psychology*, 63: 937-963.

Weiner, A.S., Ronch, J.L. (2003). Culture change in long term care; NY: Routledge.

Wendorf-Heldt, K.K. (2009). Emotional Intelligence: The link to school leadership practices that improve achievement, WI: Cardinal Stricht University.

Whipple, K. (2008). Accentuate the positive and play to your strengths, *The Interpreter*, November-December, 14-15.

Whitehead, M. (2008, October 28). Opportunity from chaos. Charlotte Observer. Origins. http://www.charlotteobserver.com/2008/10/28/v-print/28209/opportunity-from-chaos.html.

Whitehead, M. (2008, September 23). New ideals for a 21st century leader. Charlotte Observer, Origins. http://www.charlotteobserver.com/2008/09/23/v-print/20880/new-ideals-for-a-21st-century-leader.html.

Whitehead, M. (2008, August 26). How to make a difference. Charlotte Observer Origins. http://www.charlotteobserver.com/2008/08/26/v-print/150952/how-to make-a difference.html.

Whitehead, M. (2008, July 22). Simple promises, big changes. Charlotte Observer. Origins. http://www.charlotteobserver.com/2008/07/22/v-print/87464/simple-   promises-big-changes.html.

Whitehead, M. (2008). What's your primary purpose. Origins. http://www.centerforintentionalleadership.com/2010/11/whats-your-primary-purpose-/

Whitehead, M. (2008, June 24). What local goals would you declare. Charlotte Observer, Origins.http://www.charlotteobserver.com/2008/06/24/v-print/56060/what-local-goals would-you-declare.html.

Williams, G.H. (2008). Perspectives on Leadership, VA: Federal Publications.

Wissler, D. (2004). Decentralization of decision-making in Riverside Unified School District: An historical analysis (leadership, intentional model, University of California, (*Unpublished dissertation*).

Woodside, A.G. (2010). Case study research: Theory, methods, practice, UK: Emerald Press.

Yammarino, F.J., Dionne, S.D., Schriesheim, C.A., & Dansereau, F. (2008). Authentic leadership and positive organizational behavior: A meso, multi-level perspective,   *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(6), 693-707.

Yeomans, T. (2009). Building the system and leadership capacity for change: The experience of a small district superintendent, University of Washington, (*Unpublished dissertation*).

Yin, R.K. (2003). Case study research: Design and methods, CA: Sage Publications.

Zenger, J., Folkman, J. (2009). The Extraordinary Leader: Turning good managers into great leaders, McGraw-Hill, OH.

Zovak, K.S. (2006). Intentional leadership multiplication: Key factors of leaders who successfully reproduce leaders, CA: Fuller Theological Seminary, (*Unpublished dissertation*).

http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0999/is_7227_320/ai_59110536/pg_2/?tag=conte t;col1

APPENDIX A: PRIMARY INFORMANT PROTOCOL

Tell me how you came to be involved in leadership studies and leadership development?

What other leadership models were you familiar with prior to your involvement with intentional leadership?

Can you give me an example of one of these models and its major characteristics?

How do these characteristics differ from those qualities that are characteristic of other leadership models with which you are familiar?

How did your experience with these models influence your conception of leadership?

How do you define leadership? What about leadership effectiveness?

Why out of all the possible leadership models did you gravitate towards intentional leadership?

 How did you develop your understanding of intentionality and its possible impact on leadership development? Did you read books or attend a workshop or something?

How do you define "intentionality?"

What is an intentional leader? Can you give me some qualities and features of what he or she looks like?

.What separates intentional leaders from other leadership styles and models?

What do intentional leaders do that other leaders don't?

Specifically, what do you see as the role of intentionality in leadership development? What makes it work?

How or perhaps what about intentionality enables it to positively impact a leader's development?

Can you give me one or two examples of public figures who you consider intentional leaders, outlining their unique features?

Can you give me an example of one or two public figures who you consider to be non- intentional leaders and explain why you see them so?

 How do you teach someone to be intentional? Can you?

Can you describe the role that intentionality has played in your leadership development over the years?

How would someone measure the degree to which they leading intentionally? Do you have a scale or criteria?

How does someone maintain the kind of intentionality that would characterize them as intentional leaders?

What role does the organizational climate play in developing intentional leaders?

What do you think of when you hear the phrase "multiple realities?" How does it apply to leadership development?

How would you describe your leadership style prior to being introduced to intentionality?

APPENDIX B: THREE KEY INFORMANTS PROTOCOL

What other kinds of leadership models are you familiar with?

What training have you had in these models or leadership training in general, excluding intentional leadership

What was the experience like in comparison to your experience with the intentional leadership workshop?

Can you give me an example of one of these models and its major characteristics?

How do these characteristics differ from those qualities that are characteristic of other leadership models with which you are familiar?

How do you define leadership?

What about leadership effectiveness?

How did your experience with these models influence your conception of leadership?

How do you define "intentionality?"

What is an intentional leader? Can you give me some qualities and features of what he or she looks like?

What do intentional leaders do that other leaders don't?

Specifically, what do you see as the role of intentionality in leadership development? What makes it work?

What has been the role of intentionality in influencing your leadership development?

Why do you think this is?

What about the concept of intentionality differs from some of your other leadership development training?

How does someone maintain the kind of intentionality that would characterize them as intentional leaders?

How would someone measure the degree to which they leading intentionally? Do you have a scale or criteria or benchmark?

Describe your leadership style prior to being introduced to intentionality?   What was different about it then versus now?