

# Walden University

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Brigit Olsen

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,  
and that any and all revisions required by  
the review committee have been made.

## Review Committee

Dr. Thomas Diamond, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty

Dr. James Carroll, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty

Dr. Peter Manzi, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty

Dr. Richard Thomlinson, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer

David Clinefelter, Ph.D.

Walden University  
2011

Abstract

Transformational Leadership Behaviors Among Future Search Leaders

by

Brigit C. Olsen

M.B.A., North Park University, 2003

B.A., North Park University, 2001

Dissertation Proposal Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Psychology

Walden University

August, 2011

## Abstract

Future Search, a model founded by Weisbord and Janoff, has experienced incredible success in the realm of organizational and social change. Prior researchers have indicated that organizational and social change from Future Search is lasting and impactful across industries, governments, and cultures. However, there is an important gap in the literature regarding the behaviors of leaders who successfully implement this model. To help address this gap, this study constituted an exploration of differences in transformational leadership behaviors of leaders of Future Search efforts compared to leaders who have not implemented Future Search. The study used a quasi-experimental design, using Bass and Avolio's Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire to identify critical transformational leadership behaviors. Fifty four Future Search leaders were compared to a group of 82 leaders who did not implement a Future Search program. Independent sample *t*tests and correlation analyses found that Future Search leaders display more transformational leadership behaviors. This study also included an investigation of relationships between transformational leadership and goal accomplishment, where the findings did not indicate a significant correlation. An additional qualitative anecdotal component, (using critical incident interview techniques) added meaning to the results and supported these findings. These results have implications for using the Future Search model to accomplish community or organizational vision and goals by applying transformational leadership. The findings make a distinct contribution to the existing literature and contribute to positive social change by understanding potential causes for Future Search's impressive ability to improve worldwide health through health care and education initiatives.

Transformational Leadership Behaviors Among Future Search Leaders

by

Brigit C. Olsen

M.B.A., North Park University, 2003

B.A., North Park University, 2001

Dissertation Proposal Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Psychology

Walden University

August, 2011

## Dedication

This project is dedicated to the loving memory of Margit Helander, who lived her life to support and encourage others. I am one of the many people changed by her inspirational faith in God. I also dedicate this work to my best friend and amazing husband, Ryan Olsen, and to the best mother in the world, my loving father and three supportive sisters, and to the friends who helped me in so many ways.

## Acknowledgement

I would like to acknowledge the work of my committee, Dr. Thomas Diamond as Chair, and Drs. Peter Manzi and James Carroll. I am in deep appreciation of the Future Search Network and the work they all do to change the world. I am inspired by the legacy of Marv Weisbord and Sandra Janoff and I am grateful for their support over the years. Thank you to Mindgarden.com for the rights to use the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and to all of those who participated. I would also like to acknowledge those who will study and help advance the Future Search model in the future. This is truly worthwhile and we can change the world through methods like this, that value democracy and put people first.

## Table of Contents

List of Tables.....	iv
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Background of the Problem .....	2
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Research Questions.....	5
Purpose of the Study .....	7
Theoretical Framework.....	7
Definition of Key Terms.....	9
Assumptions.....	10
Limitations, Scope, and Delimitations.....	10
Significance of the Study and Relationship to Social Change.....	12
Summary of Chapter 1 .....	15
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature.....	17
Introduction.....	17
Research Strategy.....	19
Review of Literature .....	19
Relevance and Justification of the Study: Methodology Rationale.....	23
Review of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.....	25
Transformational Leadership Theoretical Background .....	29
Leadership Literature in Future Search Settings.....	33

Future Search Theoretical Background .....	39
Conference Design and Components .....	44
Genealogy and Historical Timeline of Future Search.....	46
Comparable Search Conference Models.....	49
Stakeholder Participation and Self Performing Teams .....	52
Summary .....	56
Chapter 3: Research Method.....	57
Introduction.....	57
Research Design and Methods.....	58
Population and Sample and Participants of the Study .....	61
Procedures .....	64
Instrumentation .....	68
Reliability.....	69
Validity .....	70
Computer Software .....	71
Follow Up Interviews .....	71
Ethical Protection of Participants.....	76
Summary .....	77
Chapter 4: Results .....	78
Introduction.....	78
Sample Demographics .....	81
Descriptive Statistics of Variables of Interest.....	84
Research Questions .....	85

Anecdotal Component .....	89
Summary .....	92
Chapter 5: Discussion .....	93
Introduction.....	93
Summary of Findings.....	93
Implications for Practice .....	96
Limitations .....	99
Future Recommendations .....	100
Conclusion .....	102
References.....	103
Appendix A: Future Search Leaders.....	1167
Appendix B: Leaders Who Have Not Used Future Search.....	125
Appendix C: Consent Forms.....	127
Appendix D: E-mails for Groups 1 and 2 .....	132
Appendix E: Demographic Questions .....	134
Appendix F: Permission for Instrument.....	135
Appendix G: Follow up Interview Questions .....	137
Ciriculum Vitae.....	138

## List of Tables

Table 1: Schedule of Survey Administration.....	68
Table 2: Schedule of Survey Administration, 2010.....	82
Table 3: Sample Demographic Characteristics.....	84
Table 4: Future Search Leaders: Productivity and Success.....	85
Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for MLQ Subscales and Total Score.....	86
Table 6: Independent Samples t Test Results.....	88
Table 7: Correlation Matrix for MLQ Subscales and Success Rate.....	90

## Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

### **Introduction**

Future Search is a model of leadership development that uses many popular processes that have been developed for changing whole systems in the 1990s (White, 2000). These processes are all based on involving the widest representation of the whole organization in the same place at the same time, based on the assumption that all types of stakeholders are necessary to improve the whole system. This is called “all in the room” or “whole system in the room” approach. White also explained that these groups share four main functions: (a) encourage and support a systems perspective, (b) allow cross-organizational boundaries, (c) recognize that ordinary people can be engaged in different issues (not being dependent on experts), and (d) include multiple perspectives and unique mixes of people. The Future Search model differs from other similar models of conferences, as it represents a more fixed design, and discourages variations (Manning & Binzagr, 1996). The Future Search conference has been used in a wide variety of situations in the public, private, and independent sectors. The meetings are strategically designed dialogues where key stakeholders participate together and action plans are formed for the future (Cornish, 1993).

The clear gap in the research is the lack of understanding among scholars and leaders of the specific behaviors in which leaders who drive the success of Future Search possess. Success was measured in terms of an organization’s accomplishment toward their own goals, as measured by actions plans which are developed. A goal of this study is to understand the behaviors of the leaders who are willing to step aside and allow their organization to run as a democracy. The intent was to research these leaders on the basis

of transformational leadership. It is imperative to understand what behaviors are shared among those who allow other stakeholders to participate and gladly get on board of where the organization wants to go as a whole. Some researchers have said that Future Search methodology is an excellent tool to help people learn that they can cope with a mass of complex and confusing data, making sense of it by trusting the intuitive part of the brain (Nixon, 1998a). Learning about the leaders who find ways to deal with the task of organizational change is a clear contribution to the existing research. This research is useful to organizations when determining if their current leadership is well suited to lead a Future Search event. This study will add to scholars' understandings of not only the Future Search methodology, but its relationship to transformational leadership and social change implications.

### **Background of the Problem**

Future Search has been widely successful in the United States, Canada, Australia, and Scandinavia and it continues to spread around the world. More research is still needed to understand the true results and leadership behaviors that lead to the most successful Future Search programs. Because of the diverse range of stakeholders who participate in this whole system process, the typical result is not only dramatic and lasting change, but the organization can continue to learn and grow beyond their initial goals (Wilkinson & Pedler, 1996).

Scholars have suggested that managers originating from different levels of the organization serve in different leadership roles. However, the whole system program must encourage participation regardless of formal lines of authority and power to make a large group change initiative program more successful (Thomas, McDonnell, &

McCulloch, 2005). Similarly, in a related case study of Ikea, the revolutionary Swedish furniture maker, a leader with little formal power prior to the Future Search event ended up acting as the primary leader of the change effort. Weisbord (2004) wrote of the leaders in this case describing the top level management being involved, joining the dialogue, but refraining from dictating how the change would be made.

Vansina (1999) outlined eight shared behaviors that successful leaders display as a part of large group systems in changing environments. They must have an open systems framework and holistic approach, understanding the different environments. Second, all efforts are directed toward the common purpose. Third, they manage the whole organization. Fourth, they play a role in shaping the company's identity. Fifth, they understand that they are a part of the system within which they operate. Sixth, they take simple steps to build upon organizational foundations. Seventh, they exude personal leadership. Eighth, they are successful at delegating and work well through people. More research is needed to see if the characteristics of transformational leadership match those of Future Search leadership.

Future Search has proven to be an effective tool with a wide variety of applications for accomplishing significant and lasting social change. However, leaders need to either already possess or attempt to develop the ability to examine closely and accurately their personal conditions for success. More specific and applicable research needs to be done for the leaders who are considering Future Search to ensure that they can be successful with this program. During the initial phases of planning for a Future Search event, more solid information needs to be available for the consultants to ensure that the leadership is ready and capable of this program. If it is established that successful

Future Search leaders are transformational leaders, this could serve to help organizations identify if Future Search is the best program choice to meet their needs. Prior to implementation of the Future Search methodology, a fit analysis of transformational leadership could be done to assess the feasibility of a conference.

Search conferences have received considerable attention and research since the 1970s, and review of this research indicates that these programs achieve considerable success when conditions are right. Future Search is a strong possibility for those searching for a model to help achieve genuine change in their communities and organizations. More research is needed to determine the potential for Future Search to be successful among a larger scope of leaders.

### **Statement of the Problem**

A growing number of researchers consistently suggest that transformational leadership is at the center of scholars' understanding of organizational change and effectiveness (Bass & Avolio, 1994). However, transformational leadership in organizations that follow the Future Search model has not been studied. It needs to be determined if there is a relationship between successful organizations that achieve success with Future Search conferences and transformational leadership behaviors. The findings of this study greatly contribute to researchers' understanding of a successful model of organizational and social change, in addition to the relationships between the model and transformational leadership.

## Research Questions

The following two research questions and their corresponding hypotheses guided this research:

### Research Question One

1. Will leaders who choose to implement Future Search methodology achieve higher scores for transformational leadership as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire than leaders who have not implemented Future Search methodology?

#### Hypothesis One

Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ): Leaders who have implemented a Future Search conference in their organization do not display more transformational leadership behaviors than leaders who have not implemented Future Search methodology (holding similar leadership positions) as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_1$ ): Leaders who have implemented a Future Search conference in their organization do display more transformational leadership behaviors than leaders who have not implemented Future Search methodology (holding similar leadership positions) as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

The null hypothesis will be rejected if the statistical results show that the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire test scores are significantly ( $p=.0038$ ) higher for group one (Future Search leaders) than for group two (Leaders who have not implemented a Future Search).

Hypothesis one will be tested by using independent sample *t*tests with a significance level of  $p=.0038$ . The significance level would typically be set at  $p=.05$ . This value is generally the standard on tests such as these. However, in this research it is

more appropriate to raise the threshold for significance to  $p=.0038$  to sustain data being exposed to multiple tests. This allows for the primary significance level to remain somewhat conservative regardless of the multiple comparisons being performed on the same data set. The Bonferroni correction was used to make this adjustment, where  $.05/13$   $t$ tests  $=.0038$ . The alpha level is set at a conservative enough level to address the data set being exposed to multiple tests, but also liberal enough to capture the potential trends that could emerge. These trends are imperative to understand the data, but also to make suggestions for future research.

I predicted that Future Search leaders would score highest on the subscales of Intellectual Stimulation and Inspirational Motivation on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. The complete theoretical background for this prediction is presented in chapter two.

### **Research Question Two**

2. Will more successful Future Search leaders (as measured by organizational action plans) share a common set of leadership behaviors by achieving higher scores on the same subscales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire?

#### **Hypothesis Two**

Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ): Transformational leadership (measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) does not positively correlate with Future Search success (measured by the percentage of action plan goal completion).

Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_1$ ): Transformational leadership (measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) positively correlates with Future Search success (measured by the percentage of action plan goal completion).

The null hypothesis will be rejected if the statistical results show that the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire test scores are significantly correlated with the completion of Future Search action plan goals.

Hypothesis two will be tested using a correlation analysis to test for significance among the variables, where the alpha level will be set at .05.

To augment the interpretation of quantitative results, an additional qualitative component was conducted in the form of follow-up interviews. I employed the critical incident technique to collect this data. The purpose of this procedure is to incorporate anecdotal evidence, including interviews and a post hoc analysis for added meaning and enhanced interpretation of the quantitative results. The addition of this component offered a balanced perspective to the findings of this research. All procedures are outlined in chapter 3.

### **Purpose of the Study**

In this study, I sought to explore the role of transformational leadership in Future Search methodology. More specifically, this study compared transformational leadership in leaders of Future Search efforts versus leaders who have not implemented Future Search, and also study relationships between transformational leadership and goal accomplishment in Future Search efforts. The methods for this investigation are provided in chapter 3.

### **Theoretical Framework**

I investigated an effective model of change by evaluating the relationship between the successful action plan accomplishments and transformational leadership. According to Schaubroeck, Lam, and Cha (2007), groups and teams are an underlying principle of

effective transformational leadership style as effective leaders have been shown to encourage teamwork. Specifically, a transformational leader type is effective in a variety of settings, including the day to day leadership of the organization. They also set a strong example during events and other team building exercises. Similarly, effective Future Search leaders work alongside of the other members as a team. This presents a natural theoretical link between Future Search methodology and transformational leadership.

Transformational leaders display four critical behaviors which present a rationale for comparing them to successful leaders who have implemented Future Search. First, transformational leaders successfully communicate a high level of belief and confidence in the group's ability to achieve ambitious goals, which can have a contagious effect on an organization and the individual confidence level of participants. Secondly, they model the desired behaviors for premium performance. Third, they show concern for people as individuals which promotes a belief among participants that the leader will be there for them. Finally, cooperation is encouraged as transformational leaders have the ability to build a sense of community. They have the unique skills to convey to members that they should not be derailed by conflicts that can be destructive to overall performance. It is also important that leaders encourage subordinates that it is safe to speak up, encouraging democratic principles. This safe environment helps to validate subordinates' ideas (Detert & Burris, 2007). Transformational leadership has been associated with superior team performance, further reinforcing the purpose of this study and the connection to Future Search outcomes. However, research still needs to be done to fully understand when and in what specific settings transformational leadership is more effective (Schaubroeck, Lam, & Cha, 2007).

In this study, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire was used to measure transformational leadership characteristics. This questionnaire was developed by Bass and Avolio in 1985. The current form (Bass & Avolio, 2000) consists of 45 questions which measure seven transformational leadership factors.

### **Definition of Key Terms**

In recent years of study, much literature has been produced on the following topics offering conflicting views and definitions of the following terms. For the purposes of this study, the terms below are defined based on the way they are used for this study and used interchangeably throughout.

*Conditions for success.* As originated from the Asch Assumptions in the 1940s, social psychologist Solomon Asch outlined conditions for open dialogue. He asserted when people experienced themselves living in the same world as one another, with the same needs and abiding by the same laws, they would be more willing to accept each other and therefore be capable of planning together more effectively (Wiesbord, 1987).

*Leadership.* An integrative force sufficient to launch and sustain a successful development process (VanDeusen, 1996). Leadership for the purposes of this research is considered to be the sponsor, those who hold positions of authority in the organization and who have chosen to implement the Future Search.

*The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.* The most widely used instrument for measuring the characteristics of a transformational leader (Bass & Avolio, 2000).

*Stakeholders.* This term includes anyone belonging to a category of people who have a direct or indirect stake in the future of the organization (Casolara, Haynes, & Mcheeters, 1999).

*Transformational leadership.* This is defined as a certain style of leadership that includes the ability to affect deep change within an organization. Transformational leadership is “the process of influencing major changes in the attitudes and assumptions of organization members and building commitment for the organization's mission or objective” (Yukl, 1989, p. 204).

*Vertical slice.* This term refers to when looking at the organizational chart, a vertical slice represents participants from every level of the organization (Weisbord, 2004).

*Whole system in the room (vertical slice).* Components of each part of the whole system of an organization is represented by someone who is in attendance at the conference (Nixon, 1998a).

### **Assumptions**

Several assumptions were made for the purposes of this study. First, transformational leadership is associated with driving positive organizational change. Second, the success of Future Search conferences can be determined and measured based on the organization's progress on their action plan. This is a valid means of measurement to decipher whether an organization can be classified as successful. And third, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire is an acceptable measure of transformational leadership behaviors across organizations.

### **Limitations, Scope, and Delimitations**

The larger population consists of both leaders who have chosen the Future Search Methodology, and those who have not for comparison purposes. The final sample of

Future Search leaders and leaders who have not chosen Future Search was drawn from the larger population of people holding leadership positions.

A possible limitation of this study is a reliance on the data as gathered with questionnaire based measures. The chosen sample may present limitations of generalizability to the general populations of leaders, which could restrict this research from having more meaningful and contextual connections. Efforts were made to include a variety of types of leaders for the purpose of providing an empirical generalization to the larger population, as is the goal of quantitative approaches.

Measures of leader behaviors are potentially limited by reliance on self-reporting, rather than directly observable behaviors. Also, correlational research studies possess inherent limitations because they can only provide the level and direction of relationships between the variables, which means that causality could not be inferred or determined. Survey research carries additional limitations such as halo effects of stereotypes and attributions biases (Hetland & Sandal, 2003). In a study by Hinkin and Tracey (1999), the authors evaluated the fit of the four-factor confirmatory model. They used the variance covariance matrix as input and a maximum likelihood solution. The overall chi-square was statistically significant ( $\chi^2 = 532.28$ ;  $df = 224$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). They reported the goodness of fit index was 0.76, the comparative fit index was 0.86, the normed fit index was 0.78, the non-normed fit index was 0.84, and the root mean square residual for the predicted minus observed correlation matrices was 0.09. This is not within the range of conventionally accepted values, so they asserted that the four-factor model was not supported. The overall meaning, according to Hinkin and Tracey, suggests that Bass and his colleagues have developed a good theory of transformational leadership, but there still

is no strong measure to truly and accurately assess it. The proposed factor structure of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire has not always received empirical support because of the possibility of the dimensions being too broadly defined.

Although many studies have demonstrated support for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and its predictive validity, it is criticized because it does not incorporate key theoretical elements of transformational leadership adequately. This suggests that some of the items are attributional in nature instead of assessing specific leadership behaviors, as the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire intends. The authors also suggest that the possibility of these limitations of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire may make it difficult to draw any firm conclusions (Hinkin & Tracey, 1999).

The use of survey designs poses a difficult challenge to achieve higher levels of discriminant validity given the typical problems associated with any survey measure such as general impression and halo errors (Bass, Avolio, & Jung, 2003). One possible limitation is that this research may not include a distinct and accurate picture of the various transformational leadership components.

### **Significance of the Study and Relationship to Social Change**

This study will add to an existing body of literature that describes the success of Future Search. In an age of trendy, instant fixes for leaders and managers, organizations are searching for a genuine and stable alternative. Not enough is known of the leaders' experience prior, during and after the Future Search conference. In an interview with Future Search co-founder Marvin Weisbord, Goodstein (1981) learned that Weisbord believes in organizations and their importance to society. Weisbord goes on to say that organizations are socially valuable human forms and working together in an organization

is an honorable and essential activity for people. The Future Search organization calls its members to constantly participate in researching the success of the method. One of their overarching research goals is to create knowledge about social change that does not now exist (Weisbord & Janoff, 2008).

Future Search conferences have a proven and well documented track record of success worldwide. Weisbord and Janoff (2000) cite many examples of their successes that are direct results of the Future Search method. In Milwaukee, WI in 1994, Future Search was used to implement action plans that led to a reduction in infant deaths from 13.1 to 10.2 per 1000 births in the following three years. In 1992, Inuit people of the Arctic region successfully negotiated a new homeland with the Canadian government; they gained an area seven times the size of Texas for their 22,000 residents. During 1997 in Tuolumne County, CA, bitter divisiveness between the timber industry and environmental interest groups was eased. This led to a grant from the US Forest Service to continue this unique collaboration. In Hopkinton, MA the school budget was increased by 12% and the town subsequently managed to sustain a major population boom in 1992, in part because of the success of the Future Search conference. In 1998, the Robert Wood Johnson National Urban Health Initiative selected Kansas City as an example of real systems change and sustainability after 5 strong years of progress and Future Search conferences.

Future Search has also been associated with rebuilding nations around the world. In Bangladesh, the Future Search program was met with doubt about its application to a fast growing Moslem nation with a minimal tradition of participation. The success here led to more Future Search programs by UNICEF on Early Childhood Development,

Child Labor, Reducing Maternal Mortality, Stopping the Spread of HIV/AIDS and Safe Water, Sanitation and Hygienic Behaviors. This has helped Future Search spread across South Asia, and the Mideast, including Pakistan, Nepal, Thailand, Sri Lanka and Iran (Weisbord & Janoff, 2000).

Future Search has begun to influence the legal community as law firms have recognized the potential of this conference to help transition from endless debating and litigation to action. The American Bar Association's Law Practice Management used a Future Search conference in 2001 to align their strategic goals (Richard & Richard, 2001). Similarly, the academic community can also find themselves in the rut of endless debate and in need of a process for action. Cornell University entrusted the Future Search program to help them counter one of their fundamental challenges in higher education. The Future Search paved the way for much needed collaboration among departments and led to a \$6.6 million grant for research at Cornell (Warzynski, 2004).

In the political realm, Future Search conferences have been credited for many examples of positive progress. In 1992, a Massachusetts Future Search conference led to a manufacturing bill passing with a \$1 million budget and eventually becoming one of the Governor's 12 action items.

This study adds to the existing literature focusing on the leader's behaviors and attitudes. The potential exists to redefine scholars' idea of leadership, based on the shared ideas of the common ground of the entire represented group. Implications for followers to recognize responsible leadership will also help effect positive social change (Lynham & Chermack, 2006). The results of this study may also provide insight towards developing

leaders to think extrinsically about their skills instead of honing their intrinsic dynamics as is the common assumption of leaders today.

Great care has been taken to keep the Future Search focus on action. Just as Future Search discourages deep conflict resolution as a part of the process, leaders are also encouraged to refrain from dwelling on personal failings and inner conflicts. The past and present both hold significant value in Future Search. However, this is only true to the extent that they are necessary for stakeholders to find common ground. This parallel can help leaders remember that they are a part of the whole and the common purpose is larger than one person. Steering clear of personal distractions and staying focused on action is an imperative leader behavior. All leaders of organizations, including for-profit corporations, non-profits, governments, educational systems alike, can benefit from what is learned from this study by tailoring their leadership styles and perceptions to accomplish greater change. To change an organization, leaders need to be change-centered people, which is the epitome of transformational leadership (Lievens, VanGeit & Coetsier, 1997). Because Future Search has been proven to have a socially profound effect on communities and organizations alike, being committed to social change means scholars must investigate this potential link further. Transformational leadership is also important to the study of large scale social change because it has been found to be consistent across age levels and unaffected by gender (Barbuto, Fritz, & Matkin, 2007).

### **Summary of Chapter 1**

Clear evidence of the success of Future Search establishes a need for more research in this area in general. This study will examine successful leaders of Future

Search conferences to investigate any relationship or correlations between them and transformational leadership. The possibility of linking leadership behaviors with successful Future Search conferences has the potential to change scholars' perception of the type of leader that is not just seen as effective in one area, or successful in one organization, but has the ability to allow democracy and stakeholders to participate. Responsible leaders who see themselves as only a piece of the whole need to be the type of leaders that scholars research to find ways for others to emulate positive leadership behaviors. This dissertation is organized as follows: the first chapter introduced the research and the justification, purpose, and the problem with research questions to be investigated. The second chapter will include a review of the theoretical and empirical literature pertaining to transformational leadership and Future Search success. This is done by outlining the research and basis of transformational leadership, then successful Future Search conferences and literature pertaining to both. Chapter 3 includes a description of the research methods that were selected for conducting the study and the justification for using this method.

## Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

### **Introduction**

This study helps to fill a gap in the current research by aiming to understand the behaviors that make Future Search leaders successful. Recent studies that have been done on Future Search conferences and similar models based on whole systems principles have focused on the effectiveness of stakeholder participation and little focus has been on the leaders themselves. Specifically, the question of what type of leader chooses to implement the Future Search design has not yet been investigated empirically. Not only is the further study of Future Search important to social and organizational change, but the study of transformational leadership is critical to understanding Future Search leadership. Thus, an area of opportunity and growth potential is presented within the research to establish links between positive leader behavior and style, and the emergence of other leaders within the Future Search process. This is essential for understanding an internationally influential model of change and the leaders who drive it.

This chapter supports the following two research questions by first exploring the past and current studies to provide the appropriate framework and context: (a) Will leaders who choose to implement Future Search methodology achieve higher scores for transformational leadership as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire than leaders who have not implemented Future Search methodology? A review of all items pertaining to this question is provided in chapter 2, including Future Search process, transformational leadership and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. (b) Will more successful Future Search leaders (as measured by organizational action plans) share a common set of leadership behaviors by achieving higher scores on the same

subscales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire? This chapter also supports this research question by reviewing similar studies that measure success related to leadership behaviors.

Initially, a review of the strategies as used to research these topics provides assistance in locating articles for future reference. The literature review also presents highlights in the research that outline the most important milestones that have contributed to researchers' understanding of this and other closely related topics. The framework of Future Search theory is investigated in depth, however very little research is available on Future Search leaders and their behavior. Transformational leadership theory and studies are presented in depth, covering the characteristics including Idealized Influence: Attributes, Idealized Influence: Behaviors, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individualized Consideration, Contingent Reward, and Contingent Theory approaches to leadership.

This provides a better understanding of what successful transformational leadership within the Future Search method can mean for an organization. This review will also shed light on how the Future Search methodology was derived and outlined the history of theories and principles that have contributed to its framework. Fundamental theories are built upon with current literature. Future implications and opportunities for further research are presented. Demand is explored for more understanding of what conditions and behaviors have the greatest chance of succeeding with Future Search. Finally, a review of the leadership literature offers an explanation for why more scholarly research is needed in this area.

### **Research Strategy**

The research presented in this literature review was gathered by using several sources of information. PsychArticles, PsychInfo, Academic Search Premier, SocIndex, Communication & Mass Media Complete, Business Source Elite, ERIC, Health Source: Nursing/Academic Edition, Newspaper Source, Business source complete, ATLA Religion Database with ATLASerials, Education Research Complete, and Project muse with full text were accessed using a combination of general search terms such as: Future Search, search conferences, large group interventions, transformational leadership, leadership in organizational change, and Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. From articles found by these preliminary search methods, a pattern of common additional resources were located within the references of the articles. The Walden University library was utilized to help find these additional sources.

### **Review of Literature**

A review of the past leadership literature revealed a focus on effective interpersonal relationships, whereas newer leadership theories of the 1980s and 1990s emphasize transformational leadership and advocated shared meanings, values and goals. This paradigm shift is from the psychologically based theories that were overly focused on the role of the individual leader to the new set of theories based on whole systems science and complexity theory. Leaders in the new paradigm are seen as catalysts in a complex environment, but they are only part of the whole system (Hill & Stephens, 2005; Morrell, & Hartley, 2006). Future Search is a unique tool similar in nature to the trend analysis and the Delphi method which includes a wide range of sources of information and perspectives. In contrast, Future Search offers an alternative to just compiling

information, as the stakeholders actually develop an action plan (O'Connor, 2007). This is what helps ensure people throughout the organization will participate in moving toward the solution together. According to Future Search co-founders Weisbord and Janoff (2005), systems thinking means to have the intellectual understanding that everything is connected, and the health of the whole system depends on the parts.

Although scholars may not understand completely what makes perfect leadership in every situation, the best efforts are made when leaders can judge the extent to which certain behaviors contribute to or block progress. Leaders must also be able to learn new skills when needed to match the needs of the organization (Weisbord, 1978). It is important to some managers that they hear ideas and concerns from the stakeholders, as the potential exists that they may have ideas that scholars have not thought of (Stein, 1996). Bass and Avolio argued that the transformational style of leadership is not set in stone and that the same individual may vary his or her leadership style at different times or in different situations (Hinkin & Tracey, 1999).

Transformational leadership has been linked to a variety of positive organizational outcomes. The range of which includes employee commitment to the organization, lower job stress, higher job satisfaction, and satisfaction with their leader (Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997). There have been many studies finding positive relationships between transformational leadership and follower performance (Sosik, Avolio, & Kahai, 1997). Transformational leaders have also been linked to performance beyond ordinary expectations, expressing a sense of mission, learning, and innovation (Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997; Hater & Bass, 1988). The growing amount of leadership research is accompanied by an apparent acceptance of the distinction between

transactional and transformational leadership with a stronger emphasis on transformational.

Bass and Avolio (1992) characterized the factors which represent the basic components of transformational leadership as the four “I”’s. These four categories are Idealized Influence, Individualized Consideration, Intellectually Stimulating, and Inspirational Motivation. Idealized Influence means that leaders are able to obtain extra effort from followers by gaining respect and trust. Individualized Consideration refers to diagnosing the needs and capabilities of subordinates as individuals and helping them to grow and accept more responsibility. Individualized Consideration involves paying attention to some of the developmental needs of their followers which can take the form of coaching or support. Intellectual Stimulation is referred to as the leader helping followers to move toward creativity and innovation. Followers are encouraged to look at problems in new and creative ways. This encourages innovation and fosters participation. Inspirational Motivation has also been identified as a critical ability of a transformational leader. Inspirational Motivation refers to the transformational leader’s ability to give pep talks and increase optimism and enthusiasm within their followers.

In this study, it was predicted that Future Search leaders will correlate significantly with Intellectual Stimulation and Inspirational Motivation. Specifically, the Inspirational Motivation component of transformational leadership calls for followers to imagine future desired states and are encouraged to imagine this for themselves, which is essentially what the Future Search conference spends the third day agenda on, covered later in this chapter in more detail. The transformational leadership principles mimic the principles of the Future Search design. In theory, leaders should then score highly in

these areas. This research tested this prediction and investigated this potential relationship.

Transformational leaders are known to display four critical behaviors. First, leaders successfully communicate a high level of belief and confidence in the group's ability to achieve ambitious goals, which can have a contagious effect on an organization and the individual confidence level of participants. Secondly, they effectively model the desired behaviors for premium performance. Third, they show concern for people as individuals which promotes a belief among participants that the leader is there for them. Finally, cooperation is encouraged as transformational leaders have the ability to build a sense of community. They have the unique skills to convey to members that they should not be derailed by conflicts that can be destructive to overall performance.

Transformational leadership has been associated with superior team performance; however, research still needs to be done to fully understand this style (Schaubroeck, Lam, & Cha, 2007). It is also important that leaders encourage subordinates that it is safe to speak up and that their ideas are valid (Detert & Burris, 2007).

Turner, Barling, Epitropaki, Butcher and Milner (2002), hypothesized that leaders with higher moral reasoning would be perceived by their subordinates as displaying transformational leadership behaviors. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire was used by their subordinates and the hypothesis was supported by the following findings: The analysis of covariance revealed a significant main effect for moral reasoning groups,  $F(2, 104) = 3.74, p < .05$ , as a result of scores of transformational leadership. Analysis of covariance found that managers scoring in the highest group of the moral-reasoning distribution exhibited more transformational leadership behaviors than leaders who

scored in the lowest group. These findings show initial empirical evidence in favor of the argument of higher moral development being related to a greater use of transformational leadership behaviors. This also showed that the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire is an effective resource to measure transformational leadership within avenues of social change and organizations.

According to Bass (1999), the task for the transformational leader is to align the interests of the organization and its members. Since 1978, when Burns published his seminal work outlining his theories of transformational and transactional leadership, much research has been done in this area. The theory of transformational leadership was chosen to evaluate Future Search leadership because of an established link between this well researched theory and the stakeholder participation principle, which is the cornerstone of Future Search. For example, transformational leaders have the ability to help individual members of the organization trust their leadership and believe in the values of the organization. This is rare in the current organizational climate of skepticism and cynicism. Characteristics of transformational leadership include the ability to move followers outside of the realm of their own self interests and into the interests of the organization as a whole. This is referred to as Idealized Influence, as discussed above. Leaders gain more trust by taking care of followers' careers and growth needs (Bass, 1999).

#### **Relevance and Justification of the Study: Methodology Rationale**

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire was chosen for its strong validity across cultures and different types of organizations. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire is a multirater instrument, and a variety of studies have shown this tool to

be effective in a wide range of settings. For example, it has been applied to studies in savings banks, community action agencies, offshore oil platforms, the United States Army, Chinese state-run industry, and the Israel Defense Force infantry (Hoffman, 2002). This instrument and the Future Search model share this broad range of applications. This relationship is pertinent to the advancement of social change, as the Future Search model has also shown to be effective in a wide range of diverse settings.

To evaluate the success of a Future Search leader, it was also necessary to establish a means by which to compare their accomplishments. This study used an action plan completed approach. This chosen measure of goal achievement is similar to many organizational behavior studies. For example, Howell and Avolio (1993) and Xirasagar, Samuels, and Stoskopf (2005) used percentage achievement of the business unit's targeted goals to represent leader effectiveness.

The action plan completed measure is one of the few measurable links among a very diverse population of Future Search leaders. All members of this population, regardless of industry country, have action plans as a direct result of their conference. Other measures of comparisons such as sales or employee satisfaction are not consistent among this diverse population and would not be adequate measures to address the research questions of this study. Each action plan represents the individual goals of each organization effectively, likely choosing areas that need growth and development given the unique organizational situations. There is a precedence set in literature that makes this a valid and justified means of measuring their accomplishments.

In a study by Howell and Avolio (1993), the authors found that transformational leadership measures significantly and positively predicted business performance. A

sample of 78 managers represented the top four tiers of in a large Canadian financial institution. Results of this study showed one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Bartlett's M test revealed that between unit variance was highly significant. Also, intraunit variance was homogeneous, thereby supporting the ratings by each focal leader's unit. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .93. As a result, charisma, Intellectual Stimulation and Individualized Consideration were positive intercorrelated. Also, these measures were also positively correlated with unit performance. This study helps justify the use of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire in conjunction with the action plan completed approach. Walton (2008) also asserted that action planning can enable methodological rigor, theory, testing, and good inquiry. This can be demonstrated by the researcher's effectiveness in establishing criteria.

### **Review of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire**

The application of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire has been demonstrated by the findings of many years of study. The following studies outline the wide range of situations and settings, in addition to the populations that this measure is equipped to study. A study by Gardner and Cleavenger (1998) investigated the extent to which basic impression management strategies were associated with transformational leadership as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Of the unbiased coefficient alpha estimates for each scale of this measure, most exceeded .70 with several in the .80 and .90 range. This indicated sufficient levels of internal consistency. Also the results showed multivariate  $F$  ratios of  $F(364, 548) = 1.41, p < .001$  were significant. Overall it was found that impression management strategies are indeed associated with transformational leadership.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire-5X is a well established standard instrument for assessing a range of transformational and transactional leadership behaviors. Another instrument to study transformational leadership was evaluated against the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for comparison and best fit for the research questions. For example, the Transformational Leadership Inventory (TLI) was developed by Podsakoff and colleagues (Mary, 2005). For the purpose of assessing the convergent validity, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire-5X and the TLI were administered to subordinates to evaluate the leadership styles of their supervisors. The transformational scales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire-5X were shown to have both high and significant convergent validity to the transformational leadership scales of the TLI ( $.22 < r < .79$ ). This study helped to lend even further credibility to the validity of the chosen measure (Mary, 2005).

Many studies have revealed that the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire is an effective measure to study leader effectiveness and outcomes. Hogg et al. (2005) investigated different aspects of leadership including leader satisfaction, leader effectiveness, and motivation to exert extra effort. The authors researched means and standard deviations for the demographic and background measures of age, gender, amount of contact with the leader, position in the organization and organizational tenure. They further investigated the two predictors of leadership style and group salience and the intercorrelation of these measures (Pearson's  $r$ , two-tailed test). Focusing on the predictor and outcome measures showed that they are all significantly ( $p < .001$ ) intercorrelated, with the exception of the two predictor variables of leadership style and group salience. Also, the three leadership outcome measures were not only significantly

intercorrelated ( $p < .001$ ) but also highly intercorrelated ( $r > .68$ ). Assuming leadership style would be the moderator, the effect of group salience on leader effectiveness was significant for a depersonalized leadership style (1 SD below the mean;  $\beta = .37$ ),  $t(423) = 7.15$ ,  $p = .000$ , but was weaker for a personalized leadership style (1 SD above the mean;  $\beta = .25$ ),  $t(423) = 4.81$ ,  $p = .000$ . When the leader adopted a depersonalized style (1 SD below the mean), the leader was considered more effective in high than low-salience groups; where the leader adopted a personalized style (1 SD above the mean), this preference was significantly weaker. Recent studies such as this have proven that the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire is effective in measuring transformational leadership behaviors and successful organizational outcomes.

Bogler (2001) used the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire to examine 745 teachers in an Israeli school to measure their job satisfaction. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire was translated into Hebrew, reinforcing its applicability across cultures. The results showed the coefficient alphas ranged from  $\alpha = .54$  to  $\alpha = .93$ . The study further indicates that the coefficient alpha was .94 regarding teacher satisfaction overall. Teacher satisfaction was significantly correlated with teachers' occupation perception ( $r = .65$ ,  $p < .0001$ ) and transformational leadership ( $r = .56$ ,  $p < .0001$ ).

A study in Hong Kong investigated 281 students, using a version of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire translated into Chinese. The author hypothesized that transformational leadership correlated positively and significantly with outcomes. This is yet another example of a precedence set in the literature of linking the transformational behaviors, as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire with specific outcomes. In this case it was classroom outcomes, as applicable to this

study. Spearman's rho correlations of each of the transformational dimensions ranged from .29 to .47 significance level with each of the leadership outcomes. The authors report a .01 significance level overall for the study as extra effort was .89, effectiveness was .94 and satisfaction was .97 (Pounder, 2008).

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire was also used to examine the relationship between transformational leadership and perceived transformational leadership in a study by Felfe and Schyns (2004). A pattern was found for leader specific outcomes, and different patterns emerged for organizational outcomes including commitment, overall satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, stress, and absenteeism. The results showed that no significant correlations emerged for perceived transformational leadership and age or tenure. The correlations between self-rated transformational leadership and age were all significant (ranging from  $r = .17$  for age and Inspirational Motivation to  $r = .23$  for age and Idealized Influence: Attributed). Also, some correlations between self-rated transformational leadership and tenure were significant (ranging from  $r = .15$  for tenure and Intellectual Stimulation to  $r = .25$  for age and Inspirational Motivation). This is another argument for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire being an effective tool to examine organizational outcomes.

In 2005, Barbuto conducted a study investigating 186 leaders and their subordinates using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Leaders instrumental motivation shared a negative relationship with the Individualized Consideration ( $r = -.16$ ;  $p < .05$ ). It was found, however, that motivation was an antecedent to transformational leadership overall. Leaders self concept internal motivation significantly correlated with their self reported transformational behaviors ( $r = .32$ ,  $p < .01$ ) Inspirational Motivation ( $r$

= .27,  $p < .01$ ), Individualized Consideration ( $r = .23$ ,  $p < .01$ ), and Intellectual Stimulation ( $r = .27$ ,  $p < .01$ ). In addition, goal internalization significantly correlated with leaders' self-reported Intellectual Stimulation. ( $r = .15$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

### **Transformational Leadership Theoretical Background**

House and Ram (1997) found that transformational leadership was found to be positively related to leader effectiveness and subordinate satisfaction in a variety of countries including China, the United States, Netherlands, Singapore, England, and Japan. Xirasagar, Samuels and Stoskopf (2005) hypothesized that transformational leadership would be more positively associated with executive directors rating of effectiveness, satisfaction with the leader, subordinate extra effort, and goal achievement than transactional or laissez-faire leadership behaviors. The mean leadership scores were 2.95 for transformational leadership, 2.50 for transactional leadership, 1.31 for laissez-faire, 2.79 for rated effectiveness, 2.80 for satisfaction with the leader, and 2.52 for subordinate extra effort. All leadership scores showed either normal or close to normal distribution. This study used goal achievement as a means to compare the sample as well. The mean degree of goal achievement was 91.5 percent (range= 0-193 percent). considered very high were goal achievement scores were those falling between 91-100 percent, high was 71-90, moderate was 51-70 percent, and low scores were 0-50 percent. In the top three of the four above classifications from very high, high and moderate scored higher in transformational Leadership scores (1.65 to 1.05 an higher) and transactional leadership scores (1.41 to 0.77). The low score of 0-50 percent of goal achievement was associated with laissez-faire and (although not significant) was not associated with transactional or transformational leadership behaviors. The results of this

study did find a significant association between transformation leadership and effectiveness in achieving organizational wide goals, and the authors argue that transformational leadership can contribute to accomplishing these goals.

To change an organization, the more people involved and the faster a leader can help them understand how the system works and how to take responsibility for making it better, the faster the change can happen (Baldwin, 1995). Corporate leaders will often encounter significant resistance to change efforts when they attempt to redirect their organization (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006). Understanding that these employee relation issues are central to the failure of many leader-initiated programs and ideas is one of the reason why choosing a participative method would appeal to leaders. Future Search has been named as one of the tools a successful leader will know how to implement, among multiple other approaches. The same technique will not work every time, and leaders need to be able to adapt to changing needs. When determining a vision and action plan, it is imperative that leaders have the ability to use methods other than just the typical strategic process (Collins, Lowe, & Arnett, 2000). Large group interventions represent a strong and promising approach to whole-system change, although more research needs to be done to assess the gaps between theory and practice.

Organizational change scholars and practitioners appreciate this approach, but many researchers maintain that the underlying theory has not been well established or adequately tested (Garcia, 2007). Additionally, compounding the problem is the idea that much of the existing theory is grounded in systems theory, which is difficult to test empirically.

Similarly, little empirical evidence exists to confirm or explore if leadership behaviors really do play an important role in an organization's ability to change. This further makes the case the research that could potentially provide empirical links is timely. Vansina (1999) suggested eight shared behaviors that successful leaders display as a part of large group systems in changing environments. First, they must possess an open systems framework and holistic approach and understand the different environments. Second, all efforts are directed toward the common purpose. Third, they manage the whole organization. Fourth, they play a role in shaping the company's identity. Fifth, they understand that they are a part of the system within which they operate. Sixth, they take simple steps to build upon organizational foundations. Seventh, they exude personal leadership. Eighth, they are successful at delegating and work well through people.

It may prove easier to understand the behavior of effective leaders than to truly measure their effectiveness within an organization. For example, it was found that although the performance stimulating factors were difficult to identify, the transformational leadership style was effective (Waldman, Ramirez, & House, 2001). One central theme is that charisma is an element of transformational leadership, and transformational leadership is grounded in the idea that they must create meaningful work (Purvanova, Bono, & Dzieweczynski, 2006). Weisbord (1987) would certainly subscribe to the idea of creating meaningful work, as the Future Search model is based on the notion that people will support what they help to create. This supports the argument of how Future Search and transformational leadership theories are truly related.

The current leadership research places an emphasis on a leader's ability to adapt in a changing and unstable environment (Massod, Dani, Burns, & Backhouse, 2006). This is not a new idea in the literature, as this has been a long understood quality of effective leadership. Trist's research and contributions to the type of leadership that is necessary to cope with changing environments is monumental. To survive in hectic conditions, they need to develop greater flexibility and alliances with others (Pasmore & Khales, 1993). Strong ability to adapt to a changing climate can be key to organizational survival. Therefore, leaders who have somehow learned to adapt to change as one of their key behaviors must be studied thoroughly to give future leaders the chance to emulate their behavior and replicate their results.

Organizations today are characterized by flexibility and adaptability. One of the major trends in the last few decades within the subject of leadership is that of the post-bureaucratic organization that makes decisions with more input from stakeholders (Jermier & Kerr, 1997). Organizations of the future will depend more on democratic principles and the need to involve stakeholders from all levels to accomplish large scale change. The life cycle of an organization might include restructuring to accommodate a certain process, and then soon after change the structure to support a different process. The need to adapt to changing reconfigurations has led and will continue to emphasize the need for flexibility (Galagan, 1992). Today's organizations are also characterized by less secrets and more sharing of information and training. Productivity reports can be found posted in plain sight for people at multiple levels to see, and many more people are trained to see them. Further research on participatory democratic orientated organizations has also proved to be worth looking into. Research suggests that sensitivity to local

concerns and expanding the decision making to all groups of stakeholders will ultimately produce a more implementable action plan (Lee, 2005).

### **Leadership Literature in Future Search Settings**

Little empirical work has been done in the areas of Future Search and leadership. Studies of Future Search conferences have been qualitative in nature, which further makes the case for this quantitative design. Most prevalent within the current Future Search literature is the case study approach. Most research done on Future Search has been qualitative case studies and action research. Action research is an intervention including collecting data systematically based on a research question. This type of research tends to focus on organizational change (Trullen, & Bartunek, 2007).

A Future Search conference can maximize its potential to achieve the desired results when a strong core group accepts the overall responsibility for networking with participants before, during, and after the event. They spread any pertinent news of progress, provide helpful resources and coordinate any additional activities. Despite these important people, it is up to the leaders to fulfill the following criteria: Credibility, so that participants and others will place their trust in the process. Capability, which is having the resources to get essential follow-up tasks accomplished. Stability, so membership does not vary from one month to the next and so that participants perceive the process with a sense of consistency. Commitment, so members have both the will and the motivation for their task. And finally, adaptability is important to be able to keep participants aligned with the overall vision emerging from the conference, while being open to new ideas and actions that will inevitably enrich this vision of a large scale event (VanDeusen, 1996). VanDeusen also adds that the behavior of the leadership is a critical

component of a successful Future Search event. Leadership can provide a strong center to other factors linked to successful outcomes such as scope, participation, structure, results and strong conference management.

It is necessary to differentiate between the roles of the leaders within a Future Search and the conference managers. The leadership for the purposes of this research is considered to be the sponsor, those who hold formal positions of authority in the organization and who have chosen to implement the Future Search. The conference managers are generally not a part of the organization, they are outside resources that have experience in the facilitation of a Future Search. They come as consultants to guide the process. Strong conference management is essential, and these individuals must be trained and experienced in the implementation of the Future Search model. The Future Search methodology can be simple, but the implementation is not always easy. Effective management requires significant skills in facilitation, time management and problem solving. They play the role of manager and take care of the logistics and design of the conference. While their role is critical to the conference, facilitators were not eligible for this particular study. This was based on their limited time spent with the organization, and the lack actual implementation of the goals on the action plan. To qualify for this study, the Future Search leaders were a part of the organization holding the conference.

There is often a single catalyst, either an internal participant or external person who initiated the Future Search method and introduces the program to the others. This person would be the program's earliest advocate (VanDeusen, 1996). The sponsor of the event is often an organization willing and able to plan and implement the conference and desiring to subscribe to the Future Search methodology to reach their goals of large scale

change. The sponsoring organization must have the means to effectively hold a Future Search conference. The organization must have a stake in the conference and enough resources to conduct the conference itself. They must also possess clout and follow through ability. Being prepared for a Future Search means the organization understands the Future Search approach and has done the necessary homework to implement the methodology (VanDeusen). Effective leadership behaviors and tasks differ for before, during and after the search. Before the event the leader must adequately assess the appropriateness of a search conference as the chosen method. The Future Search model should only be applied when conditions are right (Weisbord & Janoff, 2000). In fact, this is a principle shared by most search conference models (Emery & Devane, 1999). Since the Future Search founders place a strong emphasis on the conditions for success, the steering committee and the work that is put into the initial planning stages are essential.

One of the limitations of the Future Search model that ties into the conditions for success is that successful leadership must be in place in order to move forward. This is another critical factor supporting the argument that this study is both timely and relevant. The key decision makers must be a part of the process, because they cannot be convinced at the end. If the leadership is skeptical, or if the leadership has weaknesses, Future Search is not designed to make up for this. Top management or community leaders must be involved and have a genuine and deep desire for the Future Search event to succeed (Weisbord & Janoff, 2000).

The leaders must also make the announcement to the participants in a way that encourages involvement and demonstrates the importance and potential of the conference. Most importantly, leadership must agree that the results of the Future Search

should be viewed as a binding contract with the stakeholders. They must understand the detriment of using their authority to overturn any decisions or plans that the system will make. Leadership must morph into multiple roles depending upon the stage of the conference. This involves going from the leader of all the stakeholders, to recognizing that they are just one of the stakeholders with equal voice during this process. Before the event, the earliest influence is exerted by the planning and steering committee and sponsor of the conference. Leadership at this point could set the critical tone for the conference (Ruona, Lynham & Chermack, 2003).

Leadership during the conference is a critical factor as well. During the Future Search event, the conference managers take over the leadership in the form of taking responsibility for sustaining the flow of the conference. They do this with assistance from other organizers offering logistical help and information support. At this point, the leadership tasks include coordinating the independent activities of multiple work groups, maintaining the sense of common purpose and motivation, and serving as a central point for information exchange. Leadership at this stage is modeling the desirable behaviors during the conference and those needed to sustain momentum of the initiative after the conclusion of the conference. During the event, leadership must understand the critical nature of not exerting their positional authority to dominate discussions and decisions. Although they must be careful to encourage teamwork by not exerting their power, they must concurrently recognize that they are a stakeholder as well and have much information and useful experience to offer. They may possess critical pieces to the puzzle and must participate accordingly, while understanding the delicate balance between not stifling themselves or others.

After the conference the role of leadership is the most important. When the event is over, the leadership role can either revert back to the original sponsor or advocate for the conference or planning committee, or it can be transferred or assigned to a newly created person or team. They must demonstrate their commitment and be prepared to lead in a new paradigm of strategic planning and learning (Emery & Devane, 1999). They will play an important role in holding committees or planning groups accountable to their action plans and tasks. They must also act in a supporting role to make sure they have the resources and especially time to devote to their action items from the conference. They must act as overseers and supervisors to encourage consistent progress. After the event, the role of the conference manager essentially ceases as the organization is now ready to act for themselves according to their plans. By stark contrast, this is where the leadership within the organization is most critical, showing by example that they are committed long term to their role in the action plans.

Understanding that groups and teams are an underlying principle of Future Search, leadership style and the specific situations are important determinants for effective group behavior. Leadership behaviors as they pertain to power are another applicable concept and research suggests that both the leaders and followers react to situations based on perceptions. Behavior in groups is a function of our own motivations, frames of mind and readiness (Cravens & Worchel, 1977). Groups must then be prepped by finding common ground and be ready and able to move forward on action planning.

Therefore, effective Future Search leaders will do the hard work alongside of the other members, as if power and position do not count for the time being. Effective leaders have been shown to encourage this type of teamwork. Specifically, a transformational

leader type is effective in a variety of settings, including the day to day leadership of the organization. They also set an example during events such as Future Searches and other team building exercises. Transformational leaders encourage others to engage in this type of analysis to better their own understanding (Schaubroeck, Lam, & Cha, 2007).

Hammond, Petersen and Thomsen (2000) hypothesized that students in the journalism program would feel more commitment to their school program over time through assimilation. The leadership chose to implement a Future Search at the beginning of the semester with the goal of having the students coalesce behind a common vision and identify with their program. The range of scores for the first group of students spread from 62 to 112, with  $\bar{X} = 93$  and  $SD = 11$ . The survey of this first group showed three students at the beginning of the semester had low levels of identity and commitment, 19 had moderate levels and 17 had high levels. Most students had moderate to high levels of commitment before the program, with a few extremes on the high or low end. For the second group of students, the survey scores went from 56 to 135, with  $\bar{x} = 88$  and  $SD = 19$ , which was almost twice that of the first group. This study found that the second survey showed 15 people finished the semester with low commitment and identity, 18 showed moderate levels, and six showed high levels of commitment. The polarity that occurred from survey one to survey two was significant. A chi-square ( $\chi^2 = 13.22$ ) showed a significant shift of scores that occurred from the first group ( $p < .001$ ,  $df = 2$ ). As a result of these general shifts, a Future Search was used to help a new process emerge for this department. This study and the leadership of the program recommend to similar programs a whole systems approach that allows for all stakeholders to contribute.

### **Future Search Theoretical Background**

In general, a search conference can be defined as a participative event with the overall goal to enable a large group of stakeholders to collectively create a plan that its members will implement (Emery & Purser, 1996). Depending on the design and specific method used, a search conference can have 25-100 people participating, although the Future Search method prefers around 80 people. Two to three days are spent collaborating and engaging in activities with the end goal of action planning. Action plans are then agreed upon and follow up mechanisms are put in place. Search conferences are known for allowing people the chance to learn a different way of working and to achieve a wider perception of their environment. They also share their ideals and resources to make progress toward their goals. It is these action plans as developed with the stakeholder involvement that first display the agreement and initial accomplishments and agreements of the group, but also provide a criteria for success in the future.

The four main principles of Future Search are as follows: First, getting the whole system in the room is critical. The stakeholders must represent a vertical slice and have the authority, resources, information, expertise, and need for change. The whole system in the room principle has influenced meetings all over the world (Weisbord & Janoff, 2007).

The second main principle is that the conference must explore the whole before seeking to fix any individual part. The future and common ground must be the priority during the conference. The third main principle is that conflicts are only information to be shared, and must not be allowed to take away and distract the group from focusing on

the future and what is shared in common. And finally, self management in groups and personal responsibility for action must be present (Weisbord, 1992).

Future Search was founded based on principles of teamwork. Self managing teams are critical to an effective democratic process. Trist's seminal research based on self directed work groups guided the inception of the search conference, and subsequently, the Future Search conference (Pasmore & Khalsa, 1993). Successful self managing teams do not require an intricate knowledge of sociotechnical thinking or esoteric methods to produce great results (Weisbord, 1985). The process rests on the simplicity of this principle. Weisbord (1992) explains that Future Search conferences are strongly rooted in theory, crediting Lewin, Emery, Trist and more. Weisbord himself has a history of reverence toward those theorists who came before him. He writes with fierce respect and appreciation for Lewin, Taylor, Trist, and others (Janoski, 1989). Hence, Weisbord and Janoff named their organization "Future Search" to honor the pioneers as they saw it. "Future" acknowledges the work of Ronald Lipitt and Eva Schinlder-Rainman. "Search" recognizes the seminal research of Fred Emery and Eric Trist (Weisbord, 1992). Weisbord has been criticized for the assertion that he focuses too much on history, re-writing areas of research that are unimportant. Nonetheless, he continues to keep the legend of these theorists integral to the Future Search alive. Weisbord's writings build energy toward Future Search conferences and positive change in organizations and communities (Flowers, 1997). His thoughts go beyond teaching others to effectively implement a Future Search meeting and into the reality of a useful tool for leaders and managers (Cornish, 1993).

Future Search conferences have a proven track record of success worldwide.

Weisbord and Janoff (2000) cited many examples of their successes as a direct result of the Future Search method. In Milwaukee, WI, in 1994, Future Search was used to implement action plans that led to a reduction in infant deaths from 13.1 to 10.2 per 1000 births in the following three years. In areas of the highest infant death rates, the decline was from 14.6 to 12.7. In 1992, Inuit people of the Arctic region successfully negotiated a new homeland with the Canadian government; they gained an area 7 times the size of Texas for their 22,000 residents. In 1997, Tuolumne County, CA, bitter divisiveness between the timber industry and environmental interest groups was eased. This led to a \$5,000 grant from the US Forest Service to continue this unique collaboration. In 1992, Hopkinton, MA, the school budget was increased by 12% and the town managed to sustain a major population boom. The town was also able to preserve the rural character of their town and partner with businesses who donated \$350,000 worth of computers, technology, and teacher training resources for the school system to support the growth.

In 1998, the Robert Wood Johnson National Urban Health Initiative selected Kansas City as an example of real systems change and sustainability after 5 strong years of progress and Future Search conferences. Their goals included youth empowerment, services integration, regional collaboration, etc. In a study by O'Connor, (2001) it was found that students had a better understanding and sense of motivation in their courses by participating in a Future Search conference run by their professor. Average scores per item ranged from 3.3 (having a better sense of my place in the world) to a high of 4.6 (I have a better understanding of the class) on a 5 point scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree).

Future Search has also been associated with building nations around the world. In Bangladesh, the Future Search program was met with doubt about its application to a fast growing, Moslem nation with a minimal tradition of participation. Plans were formed to combat diseases, educate every villager on the use of re-hydration salts for young children. The success here led to more Future Search programs by UNICEF on early Childhood Development, Child Labor, Reducing Maternal Mortality, Stopping the Spread of HIV/AIDS and Safe Water, Sanitation and Hygienic Behaviors. This has helped Future Searches on these issues to further spread across South Asia, and the Mideast, including Pakistan, Nepal, Thailand, Sri Lanka and Iran (Weisbord & Janoff, 2000).

Future Search has begun to infiltrate the legal community as law firms have recognized the potential of this conference to help transition from endless debating to action. The American Bar Association's Law Practice Management used a Future Search conference in 2001 to align their strategic goals (Richard & Richard, 2001). During the due diligence phase of a potential merger, law firms are also using Future Search conferences to find common ground between firms to identify if a merger will be successful. Similarly, the academic community can also find themselves in the rut of endless debate and in need of a process for action. Cornell University entrusted the Future Search program to help them counter one of their fundamental challenges in higher education. It became clear within the Department of Population Medicine that their strong culture of individualism was hindering common understanding. The Future Search paved the way for much needed collaboration among departments and led to a \$6.6 million grant for research at Cornell (Warzynski, 2004). In 1996, Tompkins

Cortland Community College used a Future Search to accomplish their goal of becoming a financially stable, affordable and accessible institution. Within one year over \$900,000 in gifts and pledges was raised. They also completed a master campus plan, involving \$8.6 million in renovation projects (Casolera, Haynes, & McPheeters, 1999).

In San Diego, Future Search was used to combat high rates of recidivism among formerly incarcerated women. In 1996, the recidivism rate was 45% among women, and could be as much as 80% among those with multiple prior arrests. Of the 38 women who participated in the Future Search conference, only one returned to jail (Parsons & Warner-Robbins, 2002).

In the political realm, Future Search conferences have been credited for many examples of positive progress. In 1992, a Massachusetts Future Search conference led to a manufacturing bill passing with a \$1 million budget and eventually becoming one of the Governor's 12 action items. Although Future Search was credited with this progress, more research is needed to substantiate these changes in empirically based studies, further emphasizing the demand for studies such as this.

This study adds to the existing literature focusing on the leader's behaviors and attitudes. The potential exists to redefine scholars' idea of leadership, based on the shared ideas of the common ground of the entire represented group. Implications for followers to recognize responsible leadership will also help effect positive social change (Lynham & Chermack, 2006). The results of this study provide insight towards developing leaders to think extrinsically about their skills instead of honing their intrinsic dynamics as is the common assumption of leaders today.

A specialty chemical manufacturer became more efficient in just one year following their Future Search conference. Productivity was improved from 12% to 50%, warehouse utilization improved by 23%, and on time delivery was increased from 86% to 95% for their customers. They also dramatically improved safety and completed their training initiatives, and thus became competitive in the global marketplace as a result of a Future Search conference (Lent, Van Patten, & Phair, 1994).

### **Conference Design and Components**

A typical Future Search agenda would have the following plan: The first day would be an afternoon session covering a focus on the past and the present and identifying external trends. The second day would start in the morning and continue the exercise on external trends, then move into a focus on the present and “owning our actions” component. The afternoon session would then cover ideal future scenarios and identify common ground. Day three would conclude the conference with reaffirming the common ground, then action planning (Weisbord & Janoff, 2000). The goal in the overall conference design is to go beyond the simple task of selecting from a menu of participatory exercises, but instead design into the meetings conditions that make it more probable that good dialogue, creative future scenarios, and mutual action will actually occur (Weisbord, 1992). Although many techniques are used, such as mind mapping, time lines, discussions of prouds and sorries, and dramas, it is imperative for Future Search that techniques are always secondary to principles.

Under a typical workshop design, the activities on day one emphasize people getting involved and showing that each individual has valuable information to offer. Community is rapidly built by this interaction, as participants share markers, and wall

space to write on as they talk about their past. Also during day one, external trends that are effecting the present are discovered. During day two, present trends are discussed again and the group is lead through exercises that help them own their actions. Participants are then ready to identify their ideal futures together and this builds toward finding common ground. On day three the common ground that the stakeholders share is confirmed and action plans are made. Short and long range plans are agreed upon that the participants believe will help them achieve their ideal futures (Weisbord & Janoff, 2000).

Although there are many techniques that could be used to support these principles, Weisbord and Janoff have found many time tested exercises that serve to both support their principles and accomplish their objectives. Their organization holds training seminars and they have published many manuals and guides to help train others to implement their successful strategies. They have also established a network that allows for people who have used their methodology to act as a support system and help spread their success. Through this network, more seasoned Future Search users can offer their guidance to help train others and act as a mentor. Newer Future Search leaders can obtain advice, information and other resources from this network. Weisbord and Janoff encourage others to use their conference design and discourage variations, but they understand that sometimes people will deviate and experiment with their own techniques.

During the follow up stage, over and above committed actions, seeds can be planted during the conference that form the basis for personal connections made at the conference. This can serve to lay the groundwork for the future commitment to a participant's action plan and what they have committed to. These personal connections can help keep people invested in the process long after the event ends, but where true

change takes hold, and this is where the power of the process is, achieving the desired future (Baldwin, 1995).

### **Genealogy and Historical Timeline of Future Search**

In the 1920s, Gestalt psychologists began to explore a framework that would provide a theory for large group change methods and particularly the Future Search model. The Gestalt psychology framework involves the notion that the individual figure cannot be analyzed separate from its environment. Figure is used to describe any aspects of perception or experience that are currently in the foreground of attention, while ground refers to everything else around it in the environment. Ground serves to add meaning to the figure by its relationship. Figures can also emerge from ground as a source. Any changes in either the figure or the ground by themselves, or within the relationship between them results in a changed gestalt, and as therefore altered the meaning. This would lead others to examine the whole system rather than just the individual parts. It also resembles theories of Gestalt psychology pertaining to cognitive balance (Stensaasen, 1994).

Social psychologist Kurt Lewin then contributed his theories. He introduced his “force field analysis,” furthering the holistic idea of open systems in the 1940s (Wiesbord, 1987). Lewin’s values consisted of a spirit of inquiry, cooperation, and democratic principles and he encouraged research of human behavior to examine the surroundings and environment. Lewin offered the idea of democratic leadership, while requiring more effort and skill, produced better results than autocratic leadership of groups (Rehm, Cebula, Ryan, & Large, 2002).

Also in the 1940s, another social psychologist named Solomon Asch presented his theories which outlined conditions for open dialogue. He asserted when people experienced themselves living in the same world as one another, with the same needs and abiding by the same laws, they would be more willing to accept each other and therefore be capable of planning together more effectively (Weisbord, 1987).

Simultaneously, as the Gestalt psychologists led Kurt Lewin and Solomon Asch to discover their conclusions, object relations analysts would add a separate set of research to enhance the current understanding of the times. From this, Wilfred Bion's influential studies on group dynamics would also make a contribution to the research.

The initial idea of including all persons to help discover solutions to organizational problems surfaces in the UK in the 1950s (Stensaasen, 1994). Between the 1950s and the 1960s, Fred Emery and Eric Trist brought both of these schools of thought together and created an approach using all the prior applicable research from the first half of the century. While at the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, they developed the theoretical framework for a few days of open conferencing. They ran the first search conference, as we know it in 1960, at Barford in Warwickshire, UK. This original conference ran over a week long. Emery and Trist realized how involved and overloaded participants become and cut the design down. Emery developed an "Open Systems Theory" which could be the most important principle underpinning the understanding of the search conference. This theory outlines the world as an open system, made up on many systems and environment all requiring a relationship with its environment (Rehm, Cebula, Ryan, & Large, 2002). Trist and Emery were able to present a new way of using groups. They began to build a holistic method that considers an organization as one

system. They attempted to relate the part processes to the whole (Emery & Trist, 1965). Open systems theory is critical to the search conference design because they share the idea that the system and the environment must operate together to shape and help to determine the future of both. Systems are not capable of evolving independently; they must co-evolve with the environments they are a part of. In a search conference, participants will operate within the laws of open-systems and use these laws to plan for their future (Emery & Devane, 1999; Mix, 2006).

The initial search conferences were aimed at meeting needs for fresh ways of planning that take into consideration the dilemma of people having declining knowledge about how to react to rapid changes. Instead of using experts or committees, the emphasis was on the whole organization to identify solutions and reach unanimity about the value basis for the change and the ideal way to participate in the change and learn from it. Also significant is the orientation toward the future, offering possibilities for all to search for new directions in which to lead the organization in changing and unpredictable times (Emery & Emery, 1978).

Trist and Emery's simple goal was to assemble as many people as possible from the organization combining individual and group work. It was this research that provided the tasks surrounding self managing teams, based on the past, present, and future of the organization. Trist and Emery represented a new way of using groups with a holistic view of organizations as systems (Stensaasen, 1994). The organization can also be related to society as a whole (Emery & Trist, 1965). It is this principle that relates their research to common traits of psychological field theory of Lewin.

The works contributed by Emery and Trist remains to be the critical and foundational literature regarding search conferences. Beginning in the 1960s, the world began to respond and build upon their theories. In the 1970s emerging research began to suggest that management could achieve astonishing results by involving front line assembly workers into engineering and overall productivity decisions. Not only were great ideas coming forth, but the motivation to make them work by the ones who helped decide on them were proving theories of participatory and self managed work teams. For example, in one industrial setting, a manager and foreman on an assembly line involved a group of workers in his problem. He explained to them that they simply had a problem of needing a component made with less labor hours. What was currently taking 138 hours to make, the engineers said needed to be done in 100 hours, just to merely break even. Radical changes were made as a result of empowering this group of people, and they were successful in reducing the labor hours to 86, then 65, then 57, and eventually down to 32 hours (Weisbord, 1971). What the engineers and foreman thought theoretically impossible, was done by involving the right people and giving them the responsibility for it.

Search conferences now are run in many different formats, and have taken many different sets of methodologies and techniques. It remains paramount to the Future Search model that principles always come before techniques. Conditions must always be met to move progress to the next stage.

### **Comparable Search Conference Models**

Bunker and Alban (1997) discuss the most popular forms of search conferences in their book, *Large Group Interventions*. The authors compare the Future Search model to

other models such as The Search Conference, Real time Strategic Change, and ICA Strategic Planning Process. The key to successful large group interventions is managing the transitions between the small group dynamics and the larger group as a whole. Small group work can yield more efficiency where more people have an opportunity to share their expertise, but the ultimate decisions and action planning are made on the large group level. Future Search places more of an emphasis on the small groups than the other models. For example, the search conference and Future Search share many of the same methodologies; however the search conference does most of its work in the large group setting. A Future Search conference will transition more often between small group exercises and large group discussions. Future Search relies heavily upon the principles of self directed work groups.

Whole-scale change (real-time strategic change) is a planning process that attempts to bring an entire organization from thinking about why to understanding how in three days. During these sessions, a lot of attention is paid to making the case for change. In other words, participants address the why of their critical issue. Kathie Dannemiller is one of the developers of this approach, and says that a critical part of these sessions is helping create a shift and transition from the why to the how. People must dig in, roll up their shirt sleeves, and get ready for action and moving forward. The process is complex, and it is not uncommon for the sessions to include 500 people. It takes strong logistical work (Maurer, 2003). The ICA strategic planning process appeals to a broader range. It can include anywhere from 50 to 200 participants, and does not have a set design, as Future Search does. The planning committee and the consultants must decide on the specific design and techniques to be used. The search conference design focuses on a set

format and for more than 35-40 participants, a multi-search conference format is used (Bunker & Alban, 1997).

Other alternatives to Future Search methodologies may require that organizations be agile and responsive in their ability to adapt to pressures. They must be flexible in meeting needs for excellence and accountability alike. To accomplish this, a wide variety of expertise is necessary. The power of Future Search is being able to harness, capture and funnel this range of knowledge. Unlike other conferences, Future Search is not a finite occurrence, but is the start of long term partnerships alliances for change. They are a dynamic and innovative alternative to traditional planning processes. In times when less and less resources are available, involving stakeholders is becoming more and more common. Future Search conferences can create community in ways that other conferences cannot accomplish, and need to be studied further for their unique results (Casolara, Haynes, & Mcheeters, 1999). Other research has suggested that Future Search and other methods can be used in tandem to increase effectiveness, such as the open space method (Lent, McCormick, & Pearce, 2005). Open space is less structured and thus, more flexible than the Future Search conference design. (Calton & Payne, 2003)

Future Search also has the potential to be used with a virtual planning team. Being geographically dispersed may not be a hindrance in the future (Dewey & Carter, 2003). Future Search is a unique tool such as trend analysis and the Delphi method which includes a wide range of sources of information and perspectives. In contrast, Future Search offers an alternative to just compiling information, as the stakeholders actually develop an action plan (O'Connor, 2007). This is what helps ensure people throughout the organization will participate in moving toward the solution together.

A study by Weber (2005), within a time frame of 3 years, examined 923 large group interventions in Germany, and offered a picture of the most and least used methods. Open space is the application with the highest use (39.1%) holding its position over 3 years, and mixed designs are the second highest use and were increasing in frequency (23.1%) over the 3 year timeframe. Future Search conference's market position is the third most commonly used (14.5%), and real-time strategic change (11.8%) is the fourth highest used.

Overall, there are many benefits of choosing a Future Search event over other comparable events. Future Search can be considered high yield and low risk. It has been proven to achieve significant input from a variety of stakeholders about what they want and more importantly what they will be able to support in the action planning stage. It can affect change quickly because people can commit themselves to the specific action plan tasks. The specific Future Search process overall can prepare participants to become significant and active social leaders in this changing world (Baldwin, 1995; Bushe & Kassam, 2005).

### **Stakeholder Participation and Self Performing Teams**

It has been suggested by Bass (2000) that the future of leadership requires more research and support of democratic methods. Stakeholder involvement and self management are strong areas of growth within the current leadership literature. White (2000) outlines the change literature and suggests a common theme that effective models for change need to focus on on-going interaction. White adds that this process would require a participative approach. Emery and Trist (1965) advocate for a process that involves the widest set of stakeholders. Voices representing all aspects of the whole

system should be included. Prior to search conferences, Trist and Emery's research indicated that they were beginning to understand the power of stakeholder participation. They outlined a social, democratic process where an organization learns together and from each other. As a result of their research, understanding was increased regarding involving stakeholders. The effectiveness is increased by greater variety of perspectives and ownership of participants (Pasmore & Khalsa, 1993).

Stakeholder participation is an imperative element of systems thinking and change. One theory by Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995), which they have named the "Theory of Organizational Knowledge," lays out the local knowledge of individuals that can be harnessed for organization-wide benefit. This theory has been shown to be reproducible by Pedler (2002). Pedler's case study proved that a local democracy, along with neighborhood facilitators experienced positive change by incorporating the knowledge of the community and coupling it with the leadership of the change initiative and the wider political system. Stakeholder participation models, such as Future Search are on the rise in Germany and in the UK, particularly in local governance (Oels, 2000).

Certain assumptions need to be made about not only these participating stakeholders, but also about people in general. First, it must be assumed that people are purposeful creatures with the capacity to understand and pursue desirable outcomes for themselves. It must also be believed that when a task is meaningful to a person, they will accept responsibility and work for it. Finally, it must also be understood that people can function successfully in the ideal seeking mode when the appropriate conditions are met (Emery & Purser, 1996). Therefore, if this framework for understanding human relations is not present, the appropriate conditions for success do not exist. Future Search leaders

must comprehend the magnitude of change possible to implement a search conference within their organization. If a leader does not naturally subscribe to these assumptions about people, they would not attempt to choose this methodology to achieve their organizational goals. Stakeholder participation has been shown to be a key construct within the organizational system improvement literature. To complement the design of efficacious development processes, work design practices that encourage the participation of key stakeholders and empowerment of employees need to be established (Ravichandran & Rai, 2000). Choosing stakeholders is an important process. Some educational and community groups have learned the value of including students as stakeholders. Students and young people can have a dramatic impact on the group's perspective, as they are often capable of articulate, thoughtful, and meaningful contributions (Baldwin, 1995).

Research on self performing work teams is also a foundational principle for Future Search. During the Future Search conference, work groups are formed and operate without assigned leadership. Their work in these groups form the basis for the major accomplishments and outcomes. Here, participants form personal relationships with stakeholders who they may have thought had different or conflicting interests, but ultimately find common ground together. This process among stakeholders serves to inspire those who have the power to find solutions and commit to action. Weisbord (1985) conveys a keen understanding of consensus building. To him, consensus means giving each person an equal chance to influence the outcome. Effective teams have interdependence, leadership, joint decision, and equal influence.

The research of Bion (1961) helped solidify scholars' understanding of group dynamics. He coined the term "mode" to describe a group's approach as they come together. He argued that groups meld together quickly and take on their own characteristics. A group becomes an individual entity with dynamics and behaviors of their own. Search conferences depend upon self managing groups to be in this work mode, functioning beyond just the abilities of the individual in the group. When groups work together they are responsible for their work and are committed to their common goals. If the conditions are right, meaning a democratic structure has allowed all participants to become involved and responsible for the outcome, then work mode has been achieved and the group will accomplish more together than would be possible as individuals (Emery & Purser, 1996).

New research on self directed work teams indicates that they are achieving the stated goals of management and their organizations overall (Walumba, Avolio, Garnder & Wernsing, 2008). Over 800 executives were interviewed and reported that 27 percent of their organizations were currently using self directed work teams, and of these 47 percent were working toward making almost half of their workforces operate within these teams. This is in response to their findings of higher productivity and improved morale which has lead to reduced labor costs. The research on self directed work teams ultimately show that this design can be a very effective way to work, however they are still new to many work settings. Only 23 percent of industrial setting companies who employ the use of work teams had been using them for more than three years (Galagan, 1992).

### **Summary**

Chapter two presented a review of the literature available on both transformational leadership and Future Search. This chapter described in detail the gap in the current research and highlights the need for an empirical study of this nature. To understand the success of the Future Search methodology for both organizational and social change, more research in this area is necessary, relevant and timely. Objectives and background for the research questions was presented. Chapter 3 delves into the specifics of the research method, design, and implications associated with this study. Chapters 4 and 5 will then outline the results and implication of the study.

## Chapter 3: Research Method

### **Introduction**

In this study, I explored the role of transformational leadership in Future Search methodology. More specifically, I compared transformational leadership in leaders of Future Search efforts versus leaders who have not implemented Future Search, and also studied relationships between transformational leadership and goal accomplishment in Future Search efforts.

This research was designed with the intention of uncovering any patterns or correlations between Future Search leaders and leaders who have not chosen to implement Future Search. This information is valuable to potential leaders of Future Search and Future Search facilitators trying to determine whether conditions are right for implementing this conference to achieve organizational or social change initiatives. Because of the strong track record of the Future Search methodology in accomplishing social change, this study outlines a contribution to the efforts and mission of Walden University and is timely and relevant to the fields of social and organizational change. The previous chapters have described the case for the importance of this research to add to the existing literature and to the field as a whole. This chapter includes a presentation of the research methodology and design, followed by a description of the sample, population, participants, procedures and compliance with ethical guidelines. This chapter then covers the chosen instrumentation and measures, followed by a discussion of the validity and reliability of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. The software that was utilized in conducting this investigation is also discussed. The remainder of this

chapter is used to focus on the data gathering procedures employed in this study. The research method and procedures used for the anecdotal component are discussed. The critical incident technique is explained and a justification are presented as to why this is the best possible fit to add value to the exploration of the research questions and the anecdotal, post hoc analysis.

### **Research Design and Methods**

This research study is a quasi-experimental quantitative design, which employed survey methodology to measure characteristics of a static group. A quantitative research design was constructed for the data collection of this study. Then, an anecdotal interview component was conducted and added meaning to the interpretation of the results. Participants were surveyed to study leadership behaviors among successful Future Search leaders. A self-rater assessment (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) was used with leaders who took part in a Future Search event and a sample of comparable leaders who did not take part in a Future Search event. The objectives of this study drove the research design toward a self-administered questionnaire. This questionnaire was sent by electronic mail to the participants. This method has many benefits and also presents some challenges. Based on an exploratory examination of many possible methods, the survey research method was found to be the most appropriate option given both the nature of the objectives and resources available.

The following two research questions and their corresponding hypotheses guided this research:

### **Research Question One**

1. Will leaders who choose to implement Future Search methodology achieve higher scores for transformational leadership as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire than leaders who have not implemented Future Search methodology?

#### **Hypothesis One**

Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ): Leaders who have implemented a Future Search conference in their organization do not display more transformational leadership behaviors than leaders who have not implemented Future Search methodology (holding similar leadership positions) as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_1$ ): Leaders who have implemented a Future Search conference in their organization do display more transformational leadership behaviors than leaders who have not implemented Future Search methodology (holding similar leadership positions) as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

The null hypothesis will be rejected if the statistical results show that the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire test scores are significantly ( $p=.0038$ ) higher for group one (Future Search leaders) than for group two (leaders who have not implemented Future Search).

Hypothesis one was tested by using independent sample *t*tests with a significance level of  $p=.0038$ . The significance level would typically be set at  $p=.05$ . This value is generally the standard on tests such as these. However, for this research it is more appropriate to raise the threshold for significance to  $p=.0038$  to sustain data being exposed to multiple tests. This allows for the primary significance level to remain somewhat conservative regardless of the multiple comparisons being performed on the

same data set. The Bonferroni correction was used to make this adjustment, where  $.05/13$   $t$ tests = .0038. The alpha level is set at a conservative enough level to address the data set being exposed to multiple tests, but also liberal enough to capture the potential trends that could emerge. These trends are imperative to understand the data, but also to make suggestions for future research.

I predicted that Future Search leaders would score highest on the subscales of Intellectual Stimulation and Inspirational Motivation on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. The complete theoretical background for this prediction was presented in chapter two.

### **Research Question Two**

2. Will more successful Future Search leaders (as measured by organizational action plans) share a common set of leadership behaviors by achieving higher scores on the same subscales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire?

#### Hypothesis Two

Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ): Transformational leadership (measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) does not positively correlate with Future Search success (measured by the percentage of action plan goal completion).

Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_1$ ): Transformational leadership (measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) positively correlates with Future Search success (measured by the percentage of action plan goal completion).

The null hypothesis will be rejected if the statistical results show that the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire test scores are significantly correlated with the completion of Future Search action plan goals.

Hypothesis two was tested using a correlation analysis to test for significance among the variables, where the alpha level was set at .05.

Follow-up interviews were conducted to augment interpretation of quantitative results using the critical incident technique. This procedure included an anecdotal interview and a post hoc analysis for added meaning and enhanced interpretation of the quantitative results. Participants were also asked to forward any documented action plans and recorded progress. While the quantitative approach remains the primary method of this study, the additional post hoc anecdotal component also was used to explore additional, meaningful information. The critical incident technique was used in combination with suggestions offered by Creswell (2009). This adds meaning and applicability of the results as the findings were integrated, however, this component serves only an informal exploratory purpose. The interviews were not used for hypothesis testing, but simply to gain insight into processes underlying Future Search leadership. This included approaches to leadership and individual perceptions of the organizational leaders who have brought about significant change to their organization and society. The study explored the behaviors which the leaders possess that have brought success to the organization and improved the climate and culture in conjunction with the Future Search conference.

### **Population and Sample and Participants of the Study**

As defined by the hypotheses, the population included Future Search leaders and leaders who held leadership positions at the time of the Future Search conference within their own organization. To compare the two groups (the population described above is group one, along with group two which consists of leaders who have not implemented a

Future Search for comparison group data) across all subscales with .80 power to detect a medium effect size, the sample size was computed as 179. However, because I have access to a sample size of up to 200 participants, the ideal sample size was increased to 200 for added value. To compare Future Search leaders to other comparison group data, the initial goal was to divide the sample size in half, where 100 (50%) are Future Search leaders referred to as group one. The other 100 (50%) consisted of leaders who hold comparable leadership positions in their organization, considered group two. Although the actual number of leaders who have participated in a Future Search event is unknown, it is estimated that the whole population under investigation is in the thousands and well above internationally. I, however, had access to a list of over 400 published sponsors by the founder of the Future Search organization. See Appendix A for the list of organizations who were contacted to participate in this study, in an effort to recruit the Future Search leaders needed for the sample. See Appendix B for the list of leaders who have not implemented a Future Search who were contacted to participate for group 2, the comparison group. Many more organizations were contacted than could be used in the study. I took all qualifying candidates from each group to conduct the research.

For the Future Search leader portion of the sample, organizations that have used the Future Search methodology were chosen to participate in this study, as identified by the Future Search organization itself, on their website ([www.futuresearch.net](http://www.futuresearch.net)). Successful leaders were measured by the degree of accomplishment of their own action plans. Each organization has quantifiable results, where documentation exists to show their improvement since their Future Search conference. This documentation is in the form of an action plan created during the Future Search conference. Participants were asked to

forward their actions plans and any follow up documents that may exist for the purpose of a post hoc analysis. A successful organization is operationally defined as reporting positive, specific and measurable outcomes as a result of Future Search. Initial classification of successful is defined as organizations who are higher achievers on their action plans. This was determined by the leaders' self report on their own progress directly after completing the survey instrument. This group answered these additional questions as a part of the online survey. This information was used to determine their success for comparison purposes and further analysis. This method of self reporting is a common approach of measuring progress or a condition in the social and behavioral sciences. The complete justification and theoretical background of this approach was presented in chapter two. Pounder (2008) and Barbuto (2005) both designed studies around the idea of self reporting on specific outcomes and their relationships to transformational leadership, as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Howell and Avolio (1993) and Xirasagar, Samuels and Stoskopf (2005) used percentage achievement of the business unit's targeted goals to represent leader effectiveness. This research follows this established precedent of using a leaders self reporting on outcomes and progress as the primary measure of success.

For the purpose of adding further meaning and rigor to this self report measure, a more objective post hoc assessment was completed to augment the results of the self report. As stated above, additional documentation of action plans were collected as requested in Appendix C. Upon analysis of these action plans, the researcher's own expert rating was applied based on their completion rating. A score of 1, 2, or 3 was assigned based on the success of their action plans. These scores were compared to their

self report rating. This post hoc analysis created a component with more objectivity to help assess the validity of the leaders more subjective self reports on Future Search action plan success.

### **Procedures**

The following procedures were employed to study the independent variable, which is Future Search leadership, and the dependent variable, transformational leadership. The specific measure to translate the independent variable was to divide the sample in two groups. Participants either belonged to the Future Search leadership group 1, or the comparison group 2, which consisted of leaders who have not implemented a Future Search. To measure the dependent variable, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire was used. This instrument has 12 subscales by which to measure leadership behaviors. I followed the outlined procedures as a guide to recruit participant support, inform participants, collect and analyze data, and verify findings. Prior to administration of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, all organizations and identified participants received an e-mail asking for their participation and a brief explanation of the study (Appendix D). Once participation was agreed upon they followed the link to the online survey, including the consent form (Appendix C).

The process was precisely explained in the e-mail outlining the research efforts. Group one received the e-mail communication as listed in Appendix D, with the link to participate in the online survey including the following two additional questions: (a) Would you be willing to participate in a brief follow up phone interview? If the participants answer yes, they were prompted to provide a time and contact phone number to arrange for the data collection. (b) How many items were on your action plan as a

result of the Future Search event? How many of these items were completed? They were also asked to forward their action plans and any other documentation of their progress. See Appendix C for this correspondence.

Basic demographic information was added to the online survey tool for all participants. This included questions regarding gender, age, education level, ethnicity and position level. The questions were asked of all participants in both groups. See Appendix E for wording of questions and responses for all participants. The purpose of adding these questions is to make comparisons between two groups, meaning the Future Search leaders and the non-Future Search leaders. To further analyze these groups, *t*tests were employed to determine if there are any significant differences between the groups on responses to the questions.

The comparison group (group two) received an e-mail as outlined in Appendix D with the link to the survey which has only the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire instrument. Participants were not offered a choice of response methods and all questionnaires were electronically returned. Collection of data procedures included the use of a service for online research. The company chosen was SurveyMonkey.com, located in Portland, Oregon USA. The author/owner is Ryan Finley, from whom a professional subscription for use was purchased accordingly. The data was gathered using self-administered questionnaires, using the following procedures:

- 1.) The introductory e-mail (Appendix D) was sent to initially recruit participants in both groups. I recruited participants for the groups separately, including a

different link to the study, depending on which group they belong in. The e-mail to all participants included:

- a. The purpose of the study.
  - b. A request for their participation.
  - c. A link to the online survey, starting with the consent form. Two separate online surveys were created to ensure that groups 1 and 2 could have separate web links to access the survey.
- 2.) The participants electronically signed the consent form when they follow the link to the survey and agreed to take part in the study. The survey was then automatically available to the participant.
- 3.) Future Search leaders that meet the requirements were coded as group 1. Leaders who had not implemented a Future Search who fit the requirements were coded as group 2.
- 4.) I then followed up to schedule the anecdotal interview with those participants who volunteered to take part in this additional component. Participants were contacted for the purpose of scheduling these interviews, starting with the first 5 respondents for the pilot study. When the pilot study was completed, the remainder of the interviews were conducted. A second consent form for the interviews was e-mailed, and was electronically signed and returned by each participant prior to the interview. See Appendix C for the variations of consent forms the participants signed, depending on their status as either pilot study or the follow up interview group.

The total time expected to gather the data was three weeks for the quantitative component. See Table 1 for a schedule of survey administration. Participants were given one week to respond with their interest in taking part and to return their electronically signed consent form. Once the link to the survey has been sent to the participants, two weeks were given for them to complete the survey online. After one week, however, all participants who had not yet completed their survey received a notice to remind them of the deadline and ask that they participate. The importance of the cut off date was reinforced to the participants. This served the purpose of emphasizing the importance of their participation in the study, and asks for them to submit their responses as soon as possible.

Table 1

*Schedule of Survey Administration*

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
Week 1	<u>Survey Opened</u>				
	Initial E-mail sent				
Week 2					
				Reminders E-mails sent	
Week 3				Cut off date	<u>Survey Ended</u>
Week 4	Follow up phone interviews arranged and data gathered.				<u>Phone interview cut off date.</u>
(Anecdotal component, post hoc interviews)					

### **Instrumentation**

The primary measuring instrument is the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5x-Short. Permission to use this instrument was granted in accordance with the guidelines set forth by the publishers found on their website, [www.mindgarden.com](http://www.mindgarden.com). See Appendix F for official permission documentation. Likert-type scale characterizes the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, where 0 = not at all, 1 = once in a while, 2 = sometimes, 3 = fairly often, and 4 = frequently/if not always for each of the 45 total questions. It is a closed-ended questionnaire format (Likert) where participants answer closed-ended questions from a fixed set of alternative responses, selecting the most fitting answer. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire profile is a vital instrument in transformational leadership development and provides researchers with a relatively unbiased assessment of leadership behaviors (Lievens, Van Geit & Coetsier, 1997). The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire has been the chosen instrumentation in well over 500 doctoral dissertations since 1995 because of its strong reliability and strong construct validity (Bass & Avolio, 2000). This instrument was also chosen for the current study because of its known conceptual and empirical links (Avolio, Yammarino & Bass, 1991).

The purpose of this study is to identify transformational behaviors of leaders who have helped lead their organization through a successful Future Search conference. The purpose is also to identify if, as a result, they have achieved positive social or organizational change after the event. A successful leader is identified as a person in a leadership position at the time of the Future Search, who experiences significant results from the Future Search program. Organizations are considered more successful based on

the degree of accomplishments made toward their action plans. The design is a quasi-experimental test of leadership behaviors among Future Search leaders.

### **Reliability**

A high degree of reliability has been found regarding the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Additionally, the revised 45-item version of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X), which was used for this study benefits from many researchers findings (Bass, Avolio & Jung, 2003). Many results provide evidence for the interrater agreement for this instrument. The test-retest reliabilities of this measure's leadership scales were generally high and significant (Rowold, 2005). The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire was conceptually developed and empirically validated to reflect the complementary dimensions of transformational and transactional leadership with subscales to further differentiate both transformational and transactional leader behavior. Reliability estimates for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire include internal consistency measures (Cronbach's Alpha) and test-retest. Given the fact that the nine leadership scales consist of only four indicators, the internal consistencies can be categorized as very good. Avolio, Bass, and Jung (1995) reported alpha reliability for each scale based on exploratory factor analysis of a sample of 2,154 respondents. They reported reliabilities for leadership subscales ranged from .74 to .94 and exceed the standard cut-off criteria of .70. There is a high degree of consistency in estimates of reliability, including a broad base of evidence for the six-factor model underlying the Multifactor Leadership survey (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). This measure has also been tested across nine samples for construct validity and reliability. Reliability for the total items for each leadership factor ranged from .74 to .94 reported using coefficient alpha.

Descriptive statistics and reliabilities for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X reveal scale scores which are based on ratings by others evaluating their leader from the initial set of nine samples ( $n = 2,154$ ) reported in the 1995 Technical Report. All of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire scales' reliabilities were generally high. They exceeded the standard cut-offs for internal consistency recommended in the literature.

### **Validity**

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire was chosen for its strong validity across culture and different types of organizations. It is a multi-rater instrument, and a variety of studies have shown it to be effective in a variety of settings. For example, it has been applied to studies in savings banks, community action agencies, offshore oil platforms, the United States Army, Chinese state-run industry, and the Israel Defense Force infantry (Hoffman, 2002). Gardner and Cleavenger (1998) reported that the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire is the most extensively used and very best validated leadership measure in the literature today.

According to the manual regarding the validity of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, the transformational leadership scale had a .30 validity coefficient with unit performance under standard operating conditions in one study. However, it was also found that the validity coefficient rose to .60 for transformational leadership. This predicted the unit's maximum versus typical performance level in a particularly challenging assessment context (Bernard & Avolio, 1995, 2000, 2004). Exploring the external validity of this instrument, numerous studies report that transformational leaders were found to generate higher commitment in their followers. Construct validation of this measure was developed in response to many justified and substantive criticisms of the

instrument. The criticisms consistently addressed the high correlations among the transformational scales.

The original 80-item survey was based on initial validation results using a nine-factor model, which produced satisfactory fit indices as reported in a previous version of the published Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Technical Report in 1995. As the replication set of the sample consisted of 1,706 cases ( $n = 1,498$  after list-wise deletion), the results showed that among this sample set, the six-factor model produced a better general fit on all of the indices. Although there was some minor shrinkage reported in the level of fit for the six-factor model on several fit indices, the sixfactor solution did produce the best fit over all the alternative models based on results of the chi-square difference tests (Bernard & Avolio, 1995, 2000, 2004).

### **Computer Software**

SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) Version 10.0 Incorporated Chicago, IL and Microsoft Excel, Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, Washington software was used to enter, manage, analyze, and present the findings of this research. This software program was utilized because of the benefits offered, including functions and features, and flexibility of design.

### **Follow Up Interviews**

The focus of the follow up interviews was centered on how leaders define their roles, how they build relationships, and how they initiate change. The content included questions for the leader to self report on their leadership style, specific questions are provided in Appendix G. The purpose of this procedure is to identify the relationship between particular leadership behaviors and effectiveness before, during, and after a

Future Search setting to illuminate theories about leadership and their application for others. A narrower objective is to identify specific behaviors which may influence leadership behaviors in organizational settings by analyzing leaders' anecdotal accounts. The interviews were conducted via telephone after the leader has completed the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, using the Critical Incident Interview technique and the Creswell approach, both explained and justified in this chapter. The Critical Incident Technique was chosen for a variety of important reasons, with the primary need of an approach that lends itself to a wide array of possible outcomes being met. Interviews with various leaders were transcribed to reflect thoughts, memories, and perspectives on the leadership behaviors before, during and after the Future Search meeting. Using the interview findings along with anecdotal accounts from leaders enabled the triangulation of the results in the study. It should also be noted that participants for this study were chosen based on the demographic data provided when the initial Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire survey was taken. Efforts were made to select a diverse range of participants that vary in age, gender, ethnicity and organization rank.

The critical incident approach is a systematic interview procedure for recording behavior that has been observed to lead to a successful or not successful event. This technique can be modified to an approach that takes an individualized look at each leader for the purpose of a better and more meaningful comparison (Couch, 1965). A critical incident interview can be sufficiently complete to make inferences and predictions regarding the person's performance. A Future Search leader goes through a multi stage process during the Future Search process and thus, is a great match for this technique. This technique can capture a holistic viewpoint in addition to the leader's individual

perceptions and interpretations. The critical incident approach was developed by Flanagan (1954) with a psychological orientation toward finding an effective method for anecdotal data. It was developed for use in studying occupational groups. It is an epistemological process in which qualitative and descriptive data is gathered regarding real-life accounts (Stitt-Gohdes, Lambrecht, & Redmann, 2000).

This procedure is relevant to this study because it meets the criterion for decisive, significant events that reveal information about the successes and failures of the leader. This procedure has been described as both reliable and valid, as methodological checks of this technique give a positive impression (Andersson & Nilsson, 1964).

The critical incident technique is not only effective for efficient data collection, but also to get at the deeper levels of the leadership processes. One advantage is that it does not require long term engagement to each participating leader. The data can also be collected in a short time, and is centered on the precise theme of study, keeping the amount of information both manageable and applicable. The technique can be viewed as a collaborative inquiry between the researcher and participants, aiming to produce meaning from the events (Angelides, 2001).

The interview component was designed as an inductive data analysis, where the need to build patterns exist. Categories and themes from the bottom up, this inductive process helped to work back and forth between the database and the themes until an established set of themes emerges. The more open ended the questions, the more effective the researcher can be in listening for patterns. The researcher is better focused on learning the meaning that the participants hold about future search, not the meaning from researcher or literature review.

This approach is also a good fit for this study because it gives the participants the opportunity to share the themes as they emerge. This is a more interactive process and relates well to research on future search, as it places a strong value on stakeholder participation. Giving the participants the opportunity to exude their own thoughts helps solidify any meaning that is drawn. Involving stakeholders in the dialogue of research, makes them active participants in the inquiry (Creswell, Shope, Plano Clark, & Green, 2006). This adds to the value of a holistic understanding.

Creswell (2009) outlined an interview protocol for qualitative interviews for asking questions and recording answers. The general format includes a starter or ice breaker question, then 4-5 central questions. Central questions should be kept general, so as not to limit the inquiry. Then 4-5 more probe or subquestions. These are questions that the researcher can ask if needed, identified ahead of time for consistency. The probe questions must always be pre-tested for clarity, understanding and appropriateness. Creswell suggests including all questions, there should be no more than 12. A final thank you and acknowledgement should be offered to the participant.

The central questions should start with “what is it like for you” or “how was your experience” instead of using words such as “why.” Then, exploratory verbs such as influence, impact, relate, etc. can be used to formulate the question. The result is an open ended question that does not reference the literature or theory in question. The broadest of questions are the key to exploring the complex set of factors that surround the central phenomenon. The associated subquestions should act as follow up questions, but still remain broad. For example, a follow up question could be “who can I follow up with to learn more?”

Using a qualitative component allowed the researcher to simultaneously generalize results and gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon of interest. (Hanson, Plano Clark, Petska, Creswell, & Creswell, 2005) This aids in the confirmation of the quantitative data's findings, and enhances the credibility of the overall interpretation of the data.

Further, a pilot study was implemented to ensure the interview instrument met the needs of this study and adds the appropriate anecdotal value and perspective. I conducted this pilot test with 5 participants. These participants completed a separate pilot study consent form (Appendix C). The purpose of this procedure was to refine this interview form based on feedback and findings. Attention must be paid to ensure that questions would be proper and would avoid an ambiguous or leading nature. This is an important step to implement before proceeding to interview the remainder of the sample.

Consistency among the ratings does not diminish reliability since all interpretation of findings was done by the sole researcher. Where multiple researchers are used, the threat to reliability is increased because of inconsistency. One threat to the reliability of the study is the potential for interviewer bias. A bias could occur if the interviewer either signals to the interviewee that certain answers are correct or incorrect, as many people often desire to provide only answers that are correct and gain the approval of others. If the interviewee desires to be accepted and therefore, answers questions in a way that places their social acceptance above the truthful and accurate nature of the answers, the risk exists for social desirability bias (Mitchell & Jolley, 2004). This bias risk was reduced by using telephone interviews, which diminishes social cues. Open ended questions exist so participants are free to respond in their own words and allow the

researcher more investigation into what their beliefs and opinions behind the answers are to control for uniformed ratings. These telephone interviews are characterized by synchronous communication in time and place. Social cues of the interview can give the interviewer pertinent information to the study that cannot be derived by other types of interviews (Opdenakker, 2006).

A structured interview is most popular in psychological research because the format ensures that all respondents are asked the same set of questions in a standard order (Mitchell & Jolley, 2004). This also helps to further reduce interviewer bias. A semi-structured interview may also offer more results to be analyzed differently for future researchers exploring this topic. Findings were verified in collaboration with the committee established to guide this research. The anecdotal research component contributed to the rigor of the study when verifying the findings. Verification of findings is considered to be the process of checking and confirming to be certain of the findings presented, referring specifically to the mechanisms used during the research process that contributes to the overall rigor of the study (Morse, Barrett, Mayan, Olson, & Spiers, 2002). This was a very important step to ensure that any potential errors have been identified and corrected to protect the analysis.

### **Ethical Protection of Participants**

The participants in this study were adult participants who have volunteered by their own choice to help with this study. There is no known chance of harm associated with participating in this study. The participants took the survey in private, in electronic format from their own computer and could cease their participation at any time during the process. They also completed a consent form and their confidentiality was also protected.

The informed consent form included a brief background and information on the study. It also included procedures for participation, a description of confidentiality, the voluntary nature of the study, and ethical concerns. A copy of the informed consent is provided in Appendix C. A separate consent form was required for the interview component, which is also included in Appendix C. All data collected from the surveys is stored securely on the researcher's personal computer. Only the researcher and those selected to assist in validating results have access to the data. Any data that could potentially be used to identify the participants will be destroyed after 5 years of retention. Collection of data occurred during the months of May through November of 2010. All data gathered from participants was collected with explicit permission from the participants and I operated in full compliance with Institutional Review Board (IRB #04-20-10-0290491) guidelines of Walden University.

### **Summary**

This chapter outlined the methodology and justification for the chosen design. The sample, population, and participants were described along with compliance issues for their protection and ethical guidelines. The research instrumentation (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) was discussed in detail and issues pertaining to reliability, validity, and scoring were presented. The interview procedure and anecdotal component were also described. Lastly, the computer software used and data gathering procedures that were implemented were described. In the following two chapters, the results of this study are presented for the purpose of bringing meaningful relationships to light and offer suggestions for future research.

## Chapter 4: Results

### **Introduction**

The purpose of this study was to explore transformational behaviors of leaders who have helped lead their organization through a successful Future Search conference. The purpose is also to identify if, as a result, they have achieved positive social or organizational change after the event. A successful leader is identified as a person in a leadership position at the time of the Future Search, who experiences significant results from the Future Search program. Organizations are considered more successful based on the degree of accomplishments made toward their action plans. The design was a quasi-experimental test of leadership behaviors among Future Search leaders. This chapter outlines the participants of this study and presents the results of the statistical analysis. Findings from the anecdotal component are provided to augment the statistical results. This chapter also explains the findings and significance of the results.

Group 1 data collection efforts included contacting a total of 974 valid e-mail addresses. For the Future Search leader portion of the sample, organizations that have used the Future Search methodology were chosen to participate in this study, as identified by the Future Search organization itself, on their website ([www.futuresearch.net](http://www.futuresearch.net)). This information was used to find e-mail addresses for leaders who experienced a Future Search, as well as additional searches of documented action plans and organizations' specific websites. Due to the early low response rate, the period of time needed to collect surveys was extended. Originally planned for 4 weeks, data collection was allowed to continue for 6 ½ months to recruit as many participants as possible. Upon evaluation of the survey answers, it was determined that many of these participants did not complete

enough of the survey. An 80% rule was applied to the survey results, meaning that only participants who answered 80% or more of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire items would be counted. As recommended in the literature for handling data, the first step was to carefully evaluate to determine any patterns (Montiel, 2006). The conclusion was that the missing items were a result of a group of participants not completing the survey. Langkamp, Lehman, and Lemeshow (2010) suggest missing data must be addressed in a thoughtful and appropriate manner. If not, the sample may be biased, and the conclusions drawn may not be valid for the larger population. In their study they implemented four models, one with 10% missing data, 20%, 30% and 40%. The authors submit that the exact cut point may be different for different datasets. The amount of allowed missing data was increased from this recommendation of 10% to 20% as the instructions for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire direct participants to leave an answer blank if it does not apply to them, therefore, a non response is still a response. The authors recommended that researchers use caution when analyzing survey data if a large percentage of values are missing suggest a 10% cutoff percentage. Given the design of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, all surveys could have been used, as the manual states (Bernard & Avolio, 2004). The chosen 20% missing (or 80% complete) was chosen as a conservative approach to avoid sampling bias.

Of the 974 participants, 114 signed the consent form and began the survey. Of these 114 responses, 54 were at least 80% complete and 60 surveys were discarded as a result of falling below the 80% threshold. The response rate for group 1 was 5.5%. Since the desired sample size was not reached for Group 1, the conclusions that can be drawn are limited. The low response rate was a result of participants simply not completing

enough of the survey items, compounded by the instructions that direct participants to leave an answer blank if the question is not applicable to them. Chapter 5 explains more about the conclusions and meaning of the results. Undeliverable e-mails addresses were not counted, as there was not an opportunity for a human to participant in the event an e-mail address was returned. The total of undeliverable e-mails that were returned was 401.

Group 2 data collection efforts included e-mailing a total of 350 valid e-mails. Of these, 96 signed the consent form and began the survey. It was again determined to use only surveys who answered 80% or more of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Of these 96 responses, 82 were at least 80% complete. The response rate for group 2 was 23%.

The survey was designed on Surveymonkey.com, as discussed in chapter 3. One of the options included limiting responses to only one computer, this option was chosen to be sure that one person could not submit more than one survey. It was not likely that the participants would be completing the survey from public computers, such as a library or computer lab, so this option was appropriate and provided further security for the online collection.

The total time spent on data collections was 6 ½ months. Participants were continuously recruited, in phases, until the cut off date. Participants were sent e-mail reminders, which were simply the same introductory e-mail, sent again with an additional line that reminded them to participate. This reminder served the purpose of emphasizing the importance of their participation in the study and asked for them to submit their responses as soon as possible. The survey was closed when the cut off date was reached. Participants who attempted to access the online link after this date received a message

that read “This survey is now closed, thank you for your willingness to participate.” The data was exported from the online data collection site (www.surveymonkey.com) to Microsoft Excel first, then input into SPSS for analysis.

Table 2

*Schedule of Survey Administration, 2010*

May	June	July	August	September	October	November
<u>Web Survey Opens</u>						
Initial E-mail sent to groups 1 and 2						
Reminders E-mails sent to groups 1 and 2						
Anecdotal component, post hoc interviews begin, Follow up phone interviews arranged and data gathered.						
						Cut off date, <u>Survey Closed</u>
						<u>Phone interviews cut off date.</u>

### Sample Demographics

Participants were 136 individuals who hold a leadership position in their organization, 55 (40.4%) of whom were male and 81 (59.6%) of whom were female. More than one third ( $n = 48$ , 35.3%) were between the ages of 51 and 60, with 15 (11.0%) between the ages of 20 and 30, 29 (21.3%) between the ages of 31 and 40, 24 (17.6%) between the ages of 41 and 50, and 20 (14.7%) in the 60 and above age category. Most ( $n=119$ , 87.5%) participants were Caucasian; 6 (4.4%) were African American, 4 (2.9%) were Hispanic, 1 (0.7%) was Asian/Pacific Islander, 5 (3.7%) were Native American and 1 (0.7%) participant described their race as other. More than half of the

participants reported to have either a masters ( $n=55$ , 40.4%) or doctoral degree ( $n=31$ , 22.8%) as their highest degree earned, and 8 (5.9%) have earned a medical doctor or juris doctor degree. Thirty four (25%) had obtained a four year college degree (BA/BS) and 3 (2.2%) had obtained a two year college degree and 5 (3.7%) had obtained some college education. More than half of the participants reported to be a director level or higher in their organization, with 39 (26.5%) in the director category, 18 (13.2%) in the executive or dean category, and 20 (14.7%) in the chief executive office category. Twenty three (16.9%) reported to be in middle management, 17 (12.5%) were in the first level management category and 12 (8.8%) were in the entry level category.

Table 3

*Sample Demographic Characteristics*


---

Demographic	<i>n</i> (%)
<hr/>	
Gender	
Male	55 (40.4%)
Female	81 (59.6%)
Age	
20-30	15 (11.0%)
31-40	29 (21.3%)
41-50	24 (17.6%)
51-60	48 (35.3%)
60+	20 (14.7%)
Race	
White	119 (87.5%)
African American	6 (4.4%)
Hispanic	4 (2.9%)
Asian / Pacific Islander	1 (0.7%)
Native American	5 (3.7%)
Other	1 (0.7%)
Education	
Some college	5 (3.7%)
Associate's degree	3 (2.2%)
Bachelor's degree	34 (25.0%)
Master's degree	55 (40.4%)
Doctoral degree	31 (22.8%)
Professional degree (MD / JD)	8 (5.9%)
Position level	
Entry-level	12 (9.5%)
First level manager	17 (13.5%)
Middle manager	23 (18.3%)
Director	36 (28.6%)
Executive / Dean	18 (14.3%)
Chief executive officer	20 (15.9%)

---

Of the 136 participants, 54 (39.7%) participants were Future Search leaders and 82 (60.3%) were non Future Search leaders. Participants reported identifying an average of 7.10 ( $SD = 7.57$ ) items on their action plans and completing an average of 2.70 ( $SD = 2.94$ ), for an average success rate of 51.9% ( $SD = 46.9\%$ ).

Table 4

*Future Search Leaders: Productivity and Success*

Variable	$M (SD) / n (%)$
Group	
Future Search	54 (39.7%)
Non-Future Search	82 (60.3%)
*Items Identified	7.10 (7.57)
*Items Completed	2.70 (2.94)
*Success Rate	51.9% (46.9%)

\* denotes Future Search participants only.

### Descriptive Statistics of Variables of Interest

The first step of the analysis was to calculate Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire scores for each participant. Table 5 presents the descriptive statistics of the variables of interest, that is, the subscales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

Table 5

*Descriptive Statistics for MLQ Subscales and Total Score (N = 136)*

MLQ Subscale	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Idealized Influence: Attributed	1.00	5.00	4.07	0.54
Idealized Influence: Behavior	1.00	5.00	4.17	0.67
Inspirational Motivation	1.00	5.00	4.19	0.65
Intellectual Stimulation	1.00	5.00	4.09	0.60
Individual Consideration	1.00	5.00	4.32	0.56
Contingent Reward	1.00	5.00	4.09	0.64
Management by Exception: Active	1.00	4.25	2.50	0.72
Management by Exception: Passive	1.00	3.75	1.97	0.60
Laissez-faire Leadership	1.00	3.50	1.62	0.56
Extra Effort	1.00	5.00	4.00	0.68
Effectiveness	1.00	5.00	4.22	0.58
Satisfaction	1.00	5.00	4.27	0.65
MLQ Total Score	1.00	4.27	3.59	0.38

### Research Questions

Research Question One asked: Will leaders who choose to implement Future Search methodology achieve higher scores for transformational leadership as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire than leaders who have not implemented Future Search methodology? Hypothesis One stated: Leaders who have implemented a Future Search conference in their organization do display more transformational leadership behaviors than leaders who have not implemented Future Search methodology (holding similar leadership positions) as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

A series of independent samples *t* tests were conducted to compare Future Search leaders to non-Future Search leaders across the subscales and total score of the

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire subscales that specifically assess transformational leadership are Idealized Attributes, Idealized Behaviors, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration. Chapters two and three outlined predictions for this research, specifically that Future Search leaders would score highest on Intellectual Stimulation and Inspirational Motivation subscales. Future Search leaders did not score significantly higher on both of these subscales than their non Future Search counterparts, but this prediction was supported on the subscale of Intellectual Stimulation. On the two subscales of Intellectual Stimulation and Idealized Influence: Behavior, the Future Search leaders scored significantly higher. These subscales are both indicative of transformational leadership on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was supported. Table 6 shows the means and standard deviations for each individual subscale.

Table 6

*Independent Samples t Test Results Comparing Future Search and Non-Future Search Leaders on MLQ Subscales and Total Score*

Subscale	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Idealized Influence: Attributed</i>				
Future Search	4.11	0.52	0.70	.48
Non-Future Search	4.04	0.55		
<i>Idealized Influence: Behavior</i>				
Future Search	4.42	0.60	3.77	<.001*
Non-Future Search	4.00	0.66		
<i>Inspirational Motivation</i>				
Future Search	4.37	0.65	2.61	.01
Non-Future Search	4.07	0.63		
<i>Intellectual Stimulation</i>				
Future Search	4.28	0.59	3.13	.002*
Non-Future Search	3.96	0.58		
<i>Individual Consideration</i>				
Future Search	4.44	0.48	2.14	.03
Non-Future Search	4.23	0.60		
<i>Contingent Reward</i>				
Future Search	4.23	0.56	2.14	.04
Non-Future Search	3.99	0.68		
<i>Management by Exception: Active</i>				
Future Search	2.31	0.67	-2.56	.01
Non-Future Search	2.63	0.73		
<i>Management by Exception: Passive</i>				
Future Search	1.99	0.57	0.19	.85
Non-Future Search	1.97	0.62		
<i>Laissez-faire Leadership</i>				
Future Search	1.68	0.55	1.00	.32
Non-Future Search	1.58	0.56		

Table 6 (cont)

*Independent Samples t Test Results Comparing Future Search and Non-Future Search Leaders on MLQ Subscales and Total Score*

Subscale	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Extra Effort</i>				
Future Search	4.08	0.64	1.01	.31
Non-Future Search	3.96	0.70		
<i>Effectiveness</i>				
Future Search	4.30	0.59	1.24	.22
Non-Future Search	4.17	0.57		
<i>Satisfaction</i>				
Future Search	4.33	0.67	0.95	.34
Non-Future Search	4.23	0.63		
<i>MLQ Total Score</i>				
Future Search	3.67	0.34	2.24	.03
Non-Future Search	3.53	0.39		

\* denotes significant *t* value ( $p < .00038$ ).

Research Question Two asked: Will more successful Future Search leaders (as measured by organizational action plans) share a common set of leadership behaviors by achieving higher scores on the same subscales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire? Hypothesis Two stated: Transformational leadership (measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) positively correlates with Future Search success (measured by the percentage of action plan goal completion). Pearson product moment correlations were run to examine the relationship between Future Search conference success rates and Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire subscales for Future Search leaders only. Results revealed no significant relationship between any of the Multifactor

Leadership Questionnaire subscales and success rates. In other words, the hypothesis was not confirmed. (See Table 7)

Table 7

*Correlation Matrix for MLQ Subscales and Success Rate: Future Search Leaders Only (N = 40)*

	IIA	IIB	IM	IS	IC	CR	MEA	MEP	LL	EE	E	S	TOT
Success rate	-.04	.05	.13	.11	.14	-.01	-.07	.07	.15	-.09	-.11	-.04	.05

*Note.* IIA = Idealized Influence: Attributed; IIB = Idealized Influence: Behavior; IM = Inspirational Motivation; IS = Intellectual Stimulation; IC = Individual Consideration; CR = Contingent Reward; MEA = Management by Exception: Active; MEP = Management by Exception: Passive; LL = Laissez-faire Leadership; EE = Extra Effort; E = Effectiveness; S = Satisfaction; TOT = MLQ Total Score.

\* denotes significant  $r$  ( $p < .05$ ).

### **Anecdotal Component**

While the quantitative approach remains the primary aim of this study, the additional post hoc anecdotal component also was used to explore additional, meaningful information. The critical incident technique was used in combination with suggestions offered by Creswell (2009). This added meaning and applicability of the results as the findings were integrated. However, this component served only an informal exploratory purpose. The interviews were not used for hypothesis testing. The purpose of this procedure was to illuminate theories about leadership. A narrower objective was to identify behaviors which may influence leadership in organizational settings by analyzing anecdotal accounts from Future Search leaders. A pilot study was conducted with 5 Future Search leaders as participants to test the interview questions in Appendix G. No modifications to the interview questions were made as a result of the pilot study. I

concluded that the questions were effective in providing the desired anecdotal data. The actual sample included an additional 5 Future Search leaders. The pilot study findings were consistent with the results of the rest of the interview questions collected. All respondents answered all questions without any observed hesitation or reservation. I asked all questions of all participants and transcribed and analyzed the results. In addition to the interviews, a second post hoc assessment was completed to augment the results of the study. As explained in Chapter 3, participants were asked for additional documentation of action plans. Upon analysis of these action plans, the researcher's own expert rating was applied based on their completion rating. A score of 1, 2, or 3 was assigned based on the success of their action plans. Two participant action plans were analyzed for this procedure and both assigned a rating of 3. This was based on the success of their accomplishments toward their action items, as well as success of the 3 day conference event, as determined by the documents. These scores were compared to their self report rating and provided reinforcement and added validity of their scores on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

Upon analysis of the follow up interviews, multiple themes emerged that support the findings of the quantitative results. Regarding research question one, the results of the interviews confirmed that Future Search leaders display transformational leadership behaviors. All interviewees report being a participatory leader, describing themselves as innovative, collaborative and interested in developing shared interests and building community. This further confirms the results of Future Search leaders scoring higher in transformational leadership. These findings and their implications are discussed further in Chapter 5. Regarding research question two, the results of the interviews also confirmed

the results previously reported in the statistical findings. While participants all reported the conference itself to be a success, when specifically asked about the action planning portion of the conference, the responses ranged from problematic, conflicted and a result of miscommunication, to the other end of the spectrum, such as dramatically smooth, exciting, and impressive. This falls in line with the quantitative results with no significant correlation found among success on the action plans in relationship to the subscales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. More discussion of the limitations of this success measure as well as the individual anecdotal examples that help explain this question is presented further in Chapter 5. In addition to supporting the results of the hypothesis tests of this study, the interviews also added important information about Future Search and the difficulty of measuring success across a sample of organizations whose people and objectives are so diverse. For example, one respondent reported, “it took a huge amount of time, effort, ups and downs and at least 10 years until the work started to come together and bear fruit. Future Search is not just one conference lasting 3 days, it requires a kind of commitment to the principles that has to be sustained over many years.” While success with the action planning portion of the conference ranged from rocky to successful, all respondents reported that this marked a major milestone for positive change. One clear trend that emerged from the interviews was the meaningful experience of having key stakeholders in the same room for the very first time. While success on action plans is the ultimate goal, many other positive results were attributed to the conference. For example, other forms of success included better relationships with community members, a collective vision shared with the community and an increase in employee empowerment, ownership and teamwork. Each leader also reported personal

growth in leadership and development, especially in key areas of transformational leadership.

### **Summary**

This chapter presented the results of the hypothesis and exploratory analyses along with a summary of these analyses. Hypothesis One was supported, as Future Search leaders scored higher on two subscales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire that determines transformational leadership, Idealized Influence, Behavior and Intellectual Stimulation. Hypothesis 2 was not supported, as the subscales' scores were not related to success of the action plans as measured in this study by the approach used at this time. Correlations could not be found to confirm that the items completed on an action plan were significantly related to transformational leadership. Results from the anecdotal interviews were presented to augment the hypothesis results and add meaning that will be further discussed in the next chapter.

The following chapter will summarize the study and present conclusions about the findings. Chapter 5 will also discuss the social change implications of these findings, the limitations of this study, and future recommendations for continued research in this area.

## Chapter 5: Discussion

### **Introduction**

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the nature of transformational leadership among Future Search leaders. This chapter includes a summary and interpretation of the results of these analyses, and discusses implications of those findings for social change and practice. It also presents the limitations of the current study and recommendations for future research.

### **Summary of Findings**

The first research question of this study asked: Will leaders who choose to implement Future Search methodology achieve higher scores for transformational leadership as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire than leaders who have not implemented Future Search methodology? Results indicated that Future Search leaders scored higher than their non Future Search counterparts on two of the subscales that indicate transformational leadership. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was supported as discussed in chapter 4. In chapter 1, predictions were made that Future Search leaders would score higher on the subscales of Intellectual Stimulation and Inspirational Motivation on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. One of these predictions was confirmed by the results. Future Search leaders scored significantly higher on two different subscales, one of them being the predicted Intellectual Stimulation subscale, and the other was Idealized Influence: Behavior. Both of these subscales indicate transformational leadership, but represent different aspects. These two scales are especially appropriate for leaders of Future Search conferences. Intellectual Stimulation is associated with a leader who fosters creativity and innovation. Idealized Influence

means that leaders are able to obtain extra effort from followers by gaining respect and trust (Bass & Avolio, 1992). According to Bass (1999), the task for the transformational leader is to align the interests of the organization and its members. Specifically speaking about Idealized Influence, transformational leaders showcase the ability to move followers outside of the realm of their own self interests and into the interests of the organization as a whole. Leaders gain more trust by taking care of followers' careers and growth needs (Bass, 1999). This reinforces the strong relationships that transformational and Future Search leaders alike must be capable of developing. All interviews reinforced the leaders' ability to command extra effort from the participants. One interviewee reported, "...groups have been very dedicated and a real success." People view transformational leaders in an idealized way, which allow them to identify more closely with the mission. This was previously known throughout the leadership literature as "charisma" (Bernard & Avolio, 2004). These leaders wield much power and influence and could be the link between the success of Future Search and transformational leadership, which this study suggests and more research of this nature could confirm.

Bernard and Avolio, (2004) discuss the behavioral side of the Idealized Influence category, where leaders talk openly about values and beliefs, emphasize a strong sense of purpose, encourage others to consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions and consistently emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission. The theory of transformational leadership was chosen to evaluate Future Search leadership because of an established link between this well researched theory and the stakeholder participation principle, which is the cornerstone of Future Search. The anecdotal accounts confirmed that leaders thought of themselves as participatory and collaborative and

supported the statistical results. This finding also reinforces the lack of understanding that researchers have of the specific behaviors in which leaders who drive the success of Future Search possess. This study helps relate transformational leadership outcomes back to Future Search. In chapter 2, I stated that scholars need to redefine ideas of leadership, based on the shared ideas of the common ground of the entire represented group. Weisbord (1992) states self management in groups and personal responsibility for action must be present (Weisbord, 1992) for Future Search success. This is very closely aligned with the participatory model of Future Search, where self managed teams are responsible for action. Implications for followers to recognize responsible leadership also helps effect positive social change (Lynham & Chermack, 2006).

The second research question of this study asked: Will more successful Future Search leaders (as measured by organizational action plans) share a common set of leadership behaviors by achieving higher scores on the same subscales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire? Results revealed no significant relationship between any of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire subscales and success rates. In other words, the hypothesis was not confirmed. Participants reported identifying an average of 7.10 ( $SD = 7.57$ ) items on their action plans and completing an average of 2.70 ( $SD = 2.94$ ), for an average success rate of 51.9% ( $SD = 46.9\%$ ). Similarly to the first research question, the follow up interviews also confirmed the results of the statistical findings. The action planning portion of the conference varied greatly and comments about the success of this process were inconsistent. This inconsistency not only occurred across groups, but within them as well. One interviewee reported, "Not all groups from the conference survived, but others have been very dedicated...one even received a significant Department of

Labor grant for their work with youth.” Success in organizations that are as varied as the followers of Future Search is difficult to quantify among groups. Because of this, success could potentially be measured in future studies with a multifaceted approach that considers success among the multiple groups.

While participants all reported the conference itself to be a success, when specifically asked about the action planning portion of the conference, the responses ranged from “problematic,” “conflicted” and “a result of miscommunication,” to the other end of the spectrum, such as “dramatically smooth,” “exciting,” and “impressive.” This falls in line with the quantitative results with no significant correlation found among success on the action plans in relationship to the subscales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

For these reasons, transformational leadership should theoretically help Future Search in goal accomplishment. If it could be further explored and confirmed, Future Search could be made even more successful by harnessing the many tools available to assess and train leaders according to the theory of transformational leadership. For example, measuring potential leaders with the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire multi-rater version and utilizing the associated developmental tools, discussed further in this chapter. This could then be related to the success of goal accomplishment. Future studies might better assess this issue by more precisely separating out the impact of the transformational leadership style versus other factors that impact goal accomplishment.

### **Implications for Practice**

Several major conclusions can be drawn from this study. While the success of Future Search has been widely documented, the available research is qualitative in nature

and primarily follows the case study approach. This tells the story of the individual organizations well and makes the case for more research in this area, however, this study is the first of its kind to quantitatively measure leadership behaviors among Future Search leaders.

The Bonferroni approach used in this study, while appropriate for the significant testing, could almost be too conservative for this new, and therefore exploratory research. There is some debate about using Bonferroni or any alpha correction in exploratory studies of new research areas, which Future Search might be considered. According to Vialatte and Cichocki (2008), corrections for multiple comparisons, such as Bonferroni adjustments in statistical testing, have given rise to controversies within the scientific community. This is because of their negative impact on statistical power. The Bonferroni procedure offers the benefit of controlling the risk of rejecting one or more true null hypotheses, but allows the risk of failing to reject false null hypotheses to grow with the number of tests. Silverstein (1986) argues that setting a less stringent significance level for the set of tests is shown to be less effective than increasing the sample size. Nonetheless, future researchers, possibly with greater access to the community of Future Search leaders could improve their results by increasing their sample size for greater power.

Taking this into account, it could be suggested that scholars consider this debate when looking at the results of this study. Without the Bonferroni adjustment and at an alpha level of .05, the results could be assessed differently. If allowed to consider this as a possibility, the results would suggest additional meaningful results, where further exploration could find additional statistically significant results between the subscale

results and Future Search leaders. Six subscales, including all four that indicate transformational leadership, and the total score would have been significant. While they cannot be called significant for this study, the trends are leaning this way and are worth discussion. This suggests that there are even further and more meaningful links between Future Search and transformational leadership among this data to be explored further.

This study makes a significant contribution to the research in organizational psychology by starting to apply quantitative approaches to leadership research where they have not yet been tested. The research design utilized in this study can be modified and used in practice to study this and other methods of social and organizational change.

The implications of knowing that transformational leadership plays an important role in Future Search has dramatic potential for the planning decisions, steering committees, consultants and facilitators. This can impact the potential hiring and selection of leaders for Future Search conferences, those who are recruited as a part of the steering committee and all participants involved. The potential exists to utilize the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire in conjunction with forming the steering committee and recruiting participants.

While I have concluded that Future Search leaders score higher on two subscales of transformational leadership, more specific and applicable research needs to be done for the leaders who are considering Future Search to ensure that they can be successful with this program. This study makes a contribution by bringing us one step closer, but also reveals the need for more understanding. In addition, I can conclude that when planning a Future Search event, more solid information needs to be available for the consultants and steering committees to ensure that the leadership is ready and capable of the conference.

The results of this study creates social change by improving scholars' understanding of organizational readiness for a Future Search conference. Chapter 1 stated that Future Search has proven to be an effective tool with a wide variety of applications for accomplishing significant and lasting social change. Because of the diverse range of stakeholders who participate in this whole system process, the typical result is not only dramatic and lasting change, but the organization can continue to learn and grow beyond their initial goals (Wilkinson & Pedler, 1996). A goal of this study was to understand the behaviors of the leaders who are willing to step aside and allow their organization to run as a democracy, which, especially from the anecdotal accounts, Future Search leaders specifically value their own participatory approach. Learning about the leaders who find ways to deal with the task of social and organizational change is a significant contribution to the existing body of research.

### **Limitations**

The measure of success used in this study is a crude measure, given that some of the participants attended years ago and other participants attended more recently. This makes the timetable within which I am measuring variable. It is difficult to conclude that a leader who has not yet been successful may not be after this study, as it is possible that they have not had the necessary amount of time to achieve their action plan at the time of this study. This factor should be considered, and could potentially skew relationships between success and Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire variables. In addition, I did not achieve the full sample size needed for the Future Search leader group, thus the conclusions that can be drawn may be limited because of the reduced power of the study. Another possible limitation is that the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire technically

measures the leaders self perception of leadership, however leadership is in the 'eye of the beholder' and the rating should not be discounted (Bernard & Avolio, 2004).

### **Future Recommendations**

The field of organizational psychology can benefit from additional studies of this nature. Future researchers can help determine the potential for Future Search to be successful among a larger scope of leaders. Despite this study's contribution, more research is still needed to understand the true results and leadership behaviors that lead to the most successful Future Search programs. For this study, it was appropriate for use of this research to utilize the Self Rating form of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire to measure transformational leadership. In addition to research uses, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire is also available to consultants and researchers who can implement the self ratings in addition to ratings from other associates. This version is called the Full MLQ 360 Multi-Rater Report, and can provide additional information about the perception of others. This collection of ratings can be analyzed with a comprehensive feedback report and used for organizational development (Bernard & Avolio, 2004). This could be especially useful for organizations looking to implement a Future Search conference to achieve their goals.

Examining the leadership among Future Search leaders could be part of the initial steering committee's task to explore and develop transformational leadership within an organization as a precursor to implementing the process. It could also assist in evaluating an organization for cultural fit among the leaders. This could have significant implications for resource allocation if researchers could better predict if an organization will have success with Future Search.

Future research of this nature may be able to detect a larger degree of significance among the variables by implementing a more robust design. For example, a more comprehensive definition of success with a larger sample, such as exploring organizational performance or measurable outcomes of business units may yield a meaningful study. Future researchers may also benefit from a more defined success measure.

While there are many reasons why Future Search has achieved success and multiple ways to measure the impact of this model, evaluating the goal accomplishment is a method of measuring the organization's success against what they have defined as their key priorities. Success can also take place in the form of byproducts that were not defined on their action plan, but have been well documented in the literature. These byproducts include a greater sense of community, relationship building and leadership development. The interviews suggest that these leaders are interested in their own development and the Future Search invigorated and inspired them. One interviewee stated "Future Search gave me the confidence and skills and tools and a set of principles to move my own leadership forward. Future Search was already a match and it continues to serve as an inspiration." More research is needed in this area to explore the relationship between transformational leadership and goal accomplishment; however, the foundation for this link has been established. Future studies could expand upon the anecdotal component to better capture the meaning of these results, possibly doing mixed method designs where the statistical design is more robust, as previously suggested, coupled with the qualitative component can help enhance the researchers interpretation of the results.

## **Conclusion**

This chapter summarized the results of this study and presented the findings along with the interpretation augmented by the anecdotal component. Implications for the field, limitations and future recommendations were discussed in detail. This research contributes to the field of organizational psychology and also provides us with greater tools to understand a successful model of worldwide organizational change. This study enhances the ability of the Future Search leaders around the world to continue building community, finding common ground and working together as a team toward a better future.

## References

- Avolio, B. J. & Bass, B. M. (1990). Developing transformational leadership: 1992 and beyond. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 14, 21-27.
- Avolio, B. J. & Bass, B. M. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 72, 441-462.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I., (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 441-462.
- Avolio, B. J., Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. (1991). Identifying common methods variance with data collected from a single source: An unresolved sticky issue. *Journal of Management*, 17, 571-587.
- Baldwin, M. (1995). A Future Search conference: The future of information services in K-12 schools in Washington State. *Emergency Librarian*, 22, 20-23.
- Barbuto, J. E. Jr. (2005). Motivation and transactional, charismatic and transformational leadership: A test of antecedents. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 11, 26-40.
- Barbuto Jr., J. E., Fritz, S. M., Matkin, G. S. & Marx, D. B. (2007). Effects of gender, education, and age upon leaders' use of influence tactics and full range leadership behaviors. *Sex Roles*, 56, 71-83.

- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, 8, 9-32.
- Bass, B. M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7, 18-40.
- Bernard B. M & Avolio B. J (1995, 2000, 2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden, Inc.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (Eds.) (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 207-218.
- Bion, A. (1952). Group dynamics: A review. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 33, 235-247.
- Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37, 662-683.
- Bunker, B.B. & Alban, B. T. (1997). *Large group interventions: Engaging the whole system for rapid change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bushe, G. R. & Kassam, A. F. (2005). When is appreciative inquiry transformational? A meta-case analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 41, 61-181.
- Calton, J. M., & Payne, S. L. (2003). Coping with paradox: Multistakeholder learning dialogue as a pluralist sensemaking process for addressing messy problems. *Business and Society*, 42, 7-42.

- Casolera, W. M., Haynes, C. E., & McPheeters, J. (1999). Involving the community in college planning: the Future Search conference. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 23, 193-205.
- Collins, D. B., Lowe, J. S., & Arnett C. R. (2000). High-performance leadership at the organization level. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 2, 18-46.
- Cornish, E. (1993). Future-search conferences. *Futurist*, 27, 39-41.
- Cravens, R. W. & Worchel, P. (1977). The differential effects of rewarding and coercive leaders on group members differing in locus of control. *Journal of Personality*, 45, 150-168.
- Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Research design, qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. (3rd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.
- Creswell, J. W., Shope, R., Plano Clark, V. L., & Green, D. O. (2006). How interpretive qualitative research extends mixed methods research. *Research in the Schools*, 13, 1-11.
- Den Hartog, D. N., Van Muijen, J. J., & Koopman, P. L. (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 70, 19-34.
- Detert, J. R. & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 869-884.
- Dewey, J. D. & Carter, T. J. (2003). Exploring the future of HRD: The first Future Search conference for a profession. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 5, 245-256.

- Emery, F. & Trist, E. (1965). The causal texture of organizational environments. *Human Relations, 18*, 21-32.
- Emery, F. & Emery, M. (1978). Searching for new directions in new ways, for new times in Sutherland, J.W. *Management handbook for public administrators*, 257-301. London, England: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Emery, M. & Devane, T. (1999). *The search conference: Collaborating for change*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Communications Inc.
- Emery, M. & Purser, R. (1996). *The search conference: A powerful method for planning organizational change and community action*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Felfe, J. & Schyns, B. (2004). Is similarity in leadership related to organizational outcomes? The case of transformational leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 10*, 92-102.
- Flower, J. (1997). Where can we learn about change? *Physician Executive, 23*, 34-38.
- Garcia, S. K. (2007). Developing social network propositions to explain large-group intervention theory and practice. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 9*, 341-358.
- Gardiner, W. L. & Cleavenger, D. (1998). The impression management strategies associated with transformational leadership at the world-class level: A psychohistorical assessment. *Management Communication Quarterly, 12*, 3-41.
- Goodstein, L. (1981). Interview with Marvin Weisbord: A dean of American OD. *Group and Organization Management, 6*, 135-160.
- Galagan, P. A. (1992). Beyond hierarchy: The search for high performance. *Training and Development, 20*-35.

- Hammond, S. C., Petersen, D., & Thomsen S. (2000). Print, broadcast and online convergence in the newsroom. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 55, 16-26.
- Hanson, W. E., Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, V. L., Petska, K. S., & Creswell, J. D. (2005). Mixed methods research designs in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52, 224-235.
- Hater, J. J. & Bass, B. M. (1988). Superior's evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 695-702.
- Hetland, H. & Sandal, G. M. (2003). Transformational leadership in Norway: Outcomes and personality correlates. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, 12, 147-171.
- Hinkin, T. R. & Tracey, J. B. (1999). The relevance of charisma for transformational leadership in stable organizations. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 12, 105-120.
- Hoffman, E. (2002). *Psychological testing at work*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Hogg, M. A., Martin, R., Epitropaki, O., Mankad, A., Svensson, A. & Weeden K. (2005). Effective leadership in salient groups: revisiting leader-member exchange theory from the perspective of the social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 991 - 1004.
- House, R. J., & Ram, N. A. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23, 409-473.

- Howell, J. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control and support for innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 891-902.
- Janoski, T. (1989). Productive workplaces: Organizing and managing for dignity, meaning, and community: A Review. *Contemporary Sociology, 18*, 712-713.
- Jermier, J. M & Kerr, S. (1997). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement - contextual recollections and current observations. *Leadership Quarterly, 8*, 95-102.
- Kavanagh, M. H., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2006). The impact of leadership and change management strategy on organizational culture and individual acceptance of change during a merger. *British Journal of Management, 17*, 81-103.
- Langkamp, D. L., Lehman, A. & Lemeshow, S. (2010) Techniques for handling missing data in secondary analyses of large surveys. *Academic Pediatrics, 10*, 3, 205-210.
- Lee, C. W. (2005). *How much democracy is not enough?: Comparing governance and participation in public-private partnership regimes*. Conference Papers, American Sociological Association, 2005 Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, 1-28.
- Lent, R. M., McCormick, M. T., & Pearce, D. S. (2005). Combining Future Search and open space to address special situations. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 41*, 61-69.
- Lent, R., Van Patten, J. & Phair, T. (1994). From: Handbook of large group interventions, 13-31. Bunker and Alban (Eds), San Francisco, CA: Barret Koehler.

- Lievens, F., Van Geit, P. & Coetsier, P (1997). Identification of transformational leadership qualities: An examination of potential biases. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, 6, 415-430.
- Montiel-Overall, P. (2006). Implications of Missing Data in Survey Research. *Canadian Journal of Information & Library Sciences*, 30, 241-269.
- Mauer, R. (2003). Action plan: The task of moving from why to how. *Journal for Quality & Participation*, 26, 36-37.
- Manning, M. R. & Binzagr, G. F. (1996). Methods, values, and assumptions underlying large group interventions intended to change whole systems. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 4, 268-285.
- Mary, N. L. (2005). Transformational leadership in human service organizations. *Administration in Social Work*, 29, 105-118.
- Masood, S. A., Dani, S. S., Burns, N. D., & Backhouse, C. J. (2006). Transformational leadership and organizational culture: The situational strength perspective. Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineer, Part B. *Engineering Manufacture*, 220, 941-949.
- Mitchell, M. L. & Jolley, J. M. (2004). *Research design explained*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Mix, P. J. (2006). A monumental legacy: The unique and unheralded contributions of John and Joyce Weir to the human development field. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 42, 276 - 299.
- Morrell, K. & Hartley J. (2006). A model of political leadership. *Human Relations*, 59, 483 - 504.

- Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers J. (2002). Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods I*, 2, 1-19.
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Nixon, B. (1998a). Creating the futures we desire - getting the whole system into the room: Part I. *Industrial & Commercial Training*, 30, 4-12.
- Nixon, B. (1998b). Creating the futures we desire - getting the whole system into the room: Part II. *Industrial & Commercial Training*, 30, 71-77.
- O'Connor, B. N. (2007). Innovative research strategies for business education. *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, 49, 50-55.
- O'Connor, D. (2001). The organizational behavior Future Search. *Journal of Management Education*, 25, 101-112.
- Oels, A. (2000). *Evaluating stakeholder participation in the transition to sustainable development: Methodology, case studies, policy implications*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Opdenakker, R. (2006). Advantages and disadvantages of four interview techniques in qualitative research. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 7, 1-10.
- Pashmore, W. A., & Khalsa, G. S. (1993). The contributions of Eric Trist to the social engagement of social science. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 546-569.

- Parsons, M. L., & Warner-Robbins, C. (2002). Formerly incarcerated women create healthy lives through participatory action research. *Holistic Nursing Practice, 16*, 40-49.
- Pedler, M. (2002). Accessing local knowledge: Action learning and organizational learning in Walsall. *Human Resource Development International, 5*, 523-533.
- Pounder, J. S. (2008). Full range classroom leadership: Implications for the cross-organizational and cross-cultural applicability of the transformation-transactional paradigm. *Leadership, 4*, 115-135.
- Purvanova, R. K., Bono, J. E., & Dzieweczynski, J. (2006). Transformational leadership, job characteristics, and organizational citizenship performance. *Human Performance, 19*, 1-22.
- Ravichandran, T. & Rai, A. (2000). Quality management in systems development: An organizational system perspective. *MIS Quarterly, 24*, 381-415.
- Rehm, R., Cebula, N., Ryan, F., & Large, M. (2002). Futures that work: Using search conferences to revitalize companies, communities, and organizations. Gabriola Island, Canada: New Society Publishers.
- Richard, L R., & Richard, D. L. (2001). The Future Search conference, a unique tool for finding common ground. *Of Counsel, 20*, 6-9.
- Rowold, J. (2005). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, psychometric properties of the German translation*. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden, Inc.
- Ruona, W. E., Lynham, S. A. & Chermack, T. J. (2003). Insights on emerging trends and the future of human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 5*, 272-282.

- Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. K., & Cha, S. E. (2007). Embracing transformational leadership: Team values and the impact of leader behavior on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 1020-1030.
- Silverstein, A. B. (1986). Statistical power lost and statistical power regained: The Bonferroni procedure in exploratory research. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 46*, 303-307.
- Sosik, J. L., Avolio, B. J. & Kahai, S. S. (1997). Effects of leadership style and anonymity on group potency and effectiveness in a group decision support system environment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 89-103.
- Stein, M. L. (1996). Stakeholders ponder future. *Editor & Publisher, 129*, 19-25.
- Stensaasen, S. (1994). How may we use the search conference to start implementing total quality leadership in a company? *Total Quality Management, 5*, 355-366.
- Stitt-Gohdes, W.L., Lambrecht, J.J., & Redmann, D. H. (2000). The critical-incident technique in job behavior research. *Journal of Vocational Education Research, 25*.
- Thomas, P., McDonnell, J., & McCulloch, J. (2005). Increasing capacity for innovation in bureaucratic primary care organizations: A whole system participatory action research project. *Annals of Family Medicine, 3*, 312-317.
- Trullen, J. & Bartunek, J. M. (2007). What a design approach offers to organization development. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 43*, 23-40.
- Turner, N., Barling, J., Epitropaki, O., Butcher, V., & Milner, C. (2002). Transformational leadership and moral reasoning, *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 304-311.

- VanDeusen, J. (1996). Honing an effective tool for community improvement. *Journal for Quality & Participation*, 19, 54-64.
- Vansina, L. (1999). Leadership in strategic business unit management. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 87-108.
- Vialatte, F. B & Cichocki, A. (2008) Splittest Bonferroni correction for QEEG statistical maps. *Biological Cybernetics*, 98, 295-303.
- Waldman, D. A., Ramírez, G. G., & House, R. J. (2001). Does leadership matter? CEO leadership attributes and profitability under conditions of perceived environmental uncertainty. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 134-143.
- Walton, J. S. (2008). Scanning beyond the horizon: Exploring the ontological and epistemological basis for scenario planning. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 10, 147-165.
- Walumba, F. O., Avolio, B.J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, 34, 89-126.
- Warzynski, C. C. (2004). Future Search conferences at Cornell University. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 132, 105-112.
- Wilkinson, D. & Pedler, M. (1996). Whole systems development in public service. *Journal of Management Development*, 15, 38-53.
- White, L. (2000). Changing the 'whole system' in the public sector. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 13, 162-177.

- Weber, S. M. (2005). The dangers of success: Diffusion and transition of large group interventions in German-speaking countries. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 41*, 111 - 121.
- Weisbord, M. R. (1971). Eight most important issues managers should look into. *Industrial Management, 13*, 11-15.
- Weisbord, M. R. (1978). Organizational diagnosis: A workbook of theory and practice. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Weisbord, M. R. (1985). Participative work design: A personal odyssey. *Organizational Dynamics, 13*, 5-20.
- Weisbord, M. R. (1985). Team effectiveness theory. *Training & Development Journal, 39*, 27-29
- Weisbord, M. R. (1987). Toward third-wave managing and consulting. *Organizational Dynamics, 15*, 5-24.
- Weisbord, M. R. (1992). When the wall comes down: Views of Marvin Weisbord. *Training & Development, 46*, 33-36.
- Weisbord, M. R. (2004). Productive workplaces revisited: Dignity, meaning and community in the 21st century. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Weisbord, M. R. & others (1992). *Discovering common ground*. San Francisco, CA: Barrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Weisbord, M. R. & Janoff, S. (2000). *Future Search, an action guide to finding common ground in organizations and communities*. (2nd ed.) San Francisco, CA: Barrett-Koehler Publishers.

Weisbord, M.R. & Janoff, S. (2005). Faster, shorter, cheaper may be simple; it's never easy. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 41, 70-82.

Weisbord, M.R. & Janoff, S. (2007). Get the whole system in the room. *Journal for Quality and Participation*, Fall, 4-8.

Weisbord, M.R & Janoff, S. (2008). Future Search research, the "ripple" research project. <http://www.futuresearch.net/network/research/index.cfm>.

Xirasagar, S., Samuels, M. E. & Stoskopt, C. H. (2005). Physician leadership styles and effectiveness: An empirical study. *Medical Care Research and Review*, 62, 720-740.

Yukl, G.A. (1989). *Leadership in organizations*. (2nd ed.) Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

## Appendix A: Future Search Leaders

Information Retrieved on September 14, 2008 from:  
<http://www.futuresearch.net/method/applications/sponsors.cfm>

List of Future Search Sponsors: Leaders within these organizations may have been contacted to participate:

## Business

- 3M Germany
- 3M Plant Engineering, St. Paul, MN
- Advanta Corporation, Spring House, PA
- American Fishing Tackle Manufacturers Association
- American Red Cross, Capitol Area, NJ
- Amoco Corporation
- Ashland Chemical, Triangle Park, NC
- ASKOE Steyr, Austria
- Association of American Railroads
- AT&T Alliance for Employee Growth & Development
- AT&T Card Services Center
- Atomic Energy of Canada, Medical Products Division, Canada
- Auburn Technical Assistance Center, AL
- Avery Denison, MA
- Bank of America, Commercial Support Systems Division
- Bay State Skills Corporation, Boston, MA
- Bay States Center for Applied Technology, CA
- Berrett-Koehler Publisher, San Francisco, CA
- Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Maryland
- Brain AG, Germany
- Brazilian Institute of Quality & Productivity
- Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce
- Capral Aluminium Smelter, Australia
- Chemical Manufacturers Association
- Christian Science Publishing Society
- CIGNA International, PA
- Commonwealth Edison, Chicago, IL
- Continental Cablevision, Western New England
- Core States Financial Corporation, PA
- DFS Deutsche Flugsicherung, Germany
- DG Bank, Germany
- Digital Equipment Corporation, MA
- District Four Credit Union, Canada
- Electronic Payment Services, Inc.
- Elsag Bailey Hartmann & Braun, Germany
- FAIRWAY Filamentos, Brazil

- Fannie Mae, Washington DC
- Fashion Today Magazine, Germany
- Forte Consulting, Chester, PA
- Goulds Pump, Inc., NY.
- Grace Cocoa, CT
- GTZ, Gesellschaft fuer Technische Zusammenarbeit, Germany
- GWW, Gemeinnuetzige Werk und Wohnstaetten, Germany
- Haworth, Inc., MI.
- Hoffman-LaRoche, NJ
- Inter-American Development Bank, DC
- International Printers Network, London , England
- Johnson & Johnson, Chicopee Division, New Brunswick, NJ
- Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, CA
- MNC Corporation, Singapore
- New Hampshire Travel Council
- New Leaf Distributing Co., Atlanta, GA
- New Society Publishers, Philadelphia PA
- Nissan of North America, Cleveland, OH
- Penn Ventilator Corporation, Philadelphia PA
- Quaker Oats Pet Foods Plant, Topeka KS
- Reichhold Chemical, NC
- Royal Bank of Canada, Toronto, Canada
- Royal Trust Company, UK
- Royal Trust, Global Private Banking Division, UK
- RR Donnelly, Hudson Division, NY
- Shared Medical Systems, PA
- Siemens AG, Germany
- Sony Electronics Corporation
- State Street Bank, Boston MA
- StorageTek, Golden, CO
- UNUM Insurance Company, NH
- Whole Foods Market, Austin TX
- Wholesale Bank of Westpac, Australia
- Woodlawn Corporation
- World Bank, Washington, DC
- Zurich Insurance, Australia

#### Communities

- Adams County Business Education Partnership, Adams County, PA
- America Speaks, Washington DC
- Beloit Community, Beloit WI
- Benton, Lane, Linn, and Lincoln Counties, OR
- Boston Foundation, Boston MA
- ByWard Market, Ottawa, Canada
- City of Laramie, Laramie WY

- City of Launceston, Australia
- City of Lithgow, Australia
- City of Ottawa, Canada
- City of Surrey, BC, Canada
- City of Viersen, Germany
- City of Wilmington, DE
- Columbus Chamber of Commerce, OH
- Communities for a Drug Free Colorado, Denver CO
- Community Action of Greater Middlesex County, CT
- Community Connections, MA
- Community of Black Mountain, NC
- Community of Danbury, MA
- Community of Hopkinton, MA
- Community of Kansas City, MO
- Community of Londonderry, NH
- Community of Madison, WI
- Community Partnership Agency, Woodland, CA
- Community Resource Exchange, NY
- Connecticut Coalition Against Domestic Violence, CT
- Dane County Heritage Foundation
- Dervitt Police and Town Officials, Syracuse, NY
- Gay Men's Chorus of Washington, DC
- Gettysburg Chamber of Commerce, PA
- Greater Santa Cruz Community Foundation, CA
- Maine Association of Non-Profits, ME
- Major Events Tasmania, Australia
- Mantua Community, Philadelphia, PA
- Massachusetts Department of Public Health, MA
- National Civilian Community Corps, Washington DC
- New Economics Foundation, London, UK
- Parents Educating Parents Network, Minot, ND
- Pee Dee Region of South Carolina, SC
- Pinecrest Community, CA
- Queen Emma Foundation, Oahu, HI
- Radio Nderland Training Center, Zimbabwe
- Rocky Ford Community, CO
- Roxbury Community, MA
- Sacramento Area for Total Quality, CA
- SunDaram Industries Ltd., India
- Sunnyside Community Services, CT
- Town of Dewitt, NY
- Tuolumne County, Sonora, CA
- United Jewish Communities of Harrisburg, PA
- Victorian Opera Society, Australia
- West Virginia Future Search Consortium, WV
- West Virginia Governor's Office for Community Service, WV

- Women's Resource & Development, Northern Ireland
- Yolo County Dept. of Social Services, Woodland, CA

#### Congregations

- American Ethical Union, NY
- American Jewish Conference, PA
- Association of Unity Churches, MO
- Beth Tikva Synagogue, Rockville, MD
- Bryn Athen Church, PA
- Cal Aggie Christian Association, CA
- Church of St. Martin, CA
- Davis Friends Meeting, CA
- Elwyn Institute, PA
- Episcopal Church USA, OH
- Episcopal Diocese, Danville, CT
- Episcopal Diocese, Hartford, CT
- First Unitarian Congregation of Ottawa, Canada
- Friends Yearly Meeting, PA
- Jewish Reconstructionist Federation, PA
- National Episcopal Church, OH
- Native American Baptist Churches of Arizona
- Orleans United Church, Ottawa, Canada
- Sierra Sanctuary, CA
- Sisters of Loretta Community, MO
- St. John's Episcopal Church, CA
- St. Vincent de Paul Catholic Parish, UT
- Trinity Memorial Church, Philadelphia, PA
- United Church of Christ, NY
- United Methodist Church in Absecon, NJ
- Unity Church, Kansas City, KS
- University of California, Davis, Campus Ministries, CA
- Washington Ethical Society, DC

#### Environment

- Borough of Rushmoor, Farnborough, Southern England
- Del Cabo Organic Farmers, Mexico
- Environmental Action Group, Potomac, MD
- European Union, Bangladesh
- Institute for Ecological Economics, University of Maryland, MD
- Jacobs Farm, Pescadero, CA
- London Borough of Sutton, England.
- Regional Planning Agency, Denver, CO
- Schuylkill Valley Nature Center, Philadelphia PA
- Trust for Public Lands, Springfield, MA

- Urban Land Institute, Washington, D.C.
- US Environmental Protection Agency, Washington DC
- US Forest Service Fire Research, Washington DC
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation, Washington DC
- Water Development Board, Bangladesh

#### General Education

- Bensalem School District, PA
- Block Island Public Schools, RI
- Blue Mountain Union School District, VT
- Blue Valley School District, KS
- Brockton Public Schools, MA
- Burlington School District, VT
- Carson City School District, NV
- Catlin Gabel School, Portland, OR
- Centennial School District, PA
- Chatham Public Schools, MA
- Chester-Upland School District, PA
- CHILD - Children's Integrated Learning and Development, Thailand
- Children's Literacy Initiative, PA
- Counseling & Guidance Programs in Washington State, WA
- Danvers Public Schools, MA
- Deighton-Rehobeth Regional Schools, MA
- Delaware County Intermediate Unit, PA
- Duxbury Public Schools, MA
- Encina High School, Sacramento, CA
- Family Literacy in Colorado, CO
- Glen Urquhart School, Salem, MA
- Lawrence Public Schools, NJ
- LEARN (UCLA School of Management and Local Businesses), CA
- Lower Merion Vocational Training Center, PA
- Maine State Board of Education, ME
- Montgomery County Public Schools, MD
- National Math Education Commission, Washington DC
- New Hampshire Department of Education, NH
- New York City Board of Education, NY
- North Montgomery County Technical Career Center, PA
- Novoto Unified School District, CA
- Oak Hill Elementary School, KS
- Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, WA
- Parents Educating Parents Network, Minot, ND
- Pennsylvania School-To-Work Partnership, PA
- Perkioman Valley School District, PA
- Philadelphia Housing Authority, PA
- Philadelphia School District, PA

- Randolph Public Schools, MA
- Raynham Public Schools, MA
- San Juan Unified School District, CA
- Springfield School District, MA
- Sun Prarie Area School District, WI
- Synergy School, Stockton, CA
- Toronto District Public Schools, Toronto Canada
- Toronto Waldorf School, Toronto Canada
- Totem Falls Elementary School, CA
- US National School-to-Work Program, Washington DC
- Washington State Association of Vocational Educators, WA
- Will Rogers Middle School, Sacramento, CA
- Winchester Public Schools, MA
- York County Area Vocational Technical High School, PA

#### Government

- Boulder Department of Public Works, CO
- CALTRANS - California State Transportation Systems, Ca
- Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, CO
- County Fermanagh, Northern Ireland
- Delaware State Police, DE
- Education Ministry of Jakarta, Indonesia
- European Union & Ministry of Education, Bangladesh
- Federal Judicial Center, Washington, DC
- Human Resources Development Council, Washington Dc
- Marion County Health & Human Services, OR.
- Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Bangladesh
- Ministry of Health, Population, & Highways, Sri Lanka
- Ministry of Population & Environment, Nepal
- Ministry of Population, & Welfare, Islamabad, Pakistan
- New Hampshire Lodging and Restaurant Association, NH
- Northwest Colorado Council of Governments, CO
- Office of Family Policy of the US Office of the Secretary of Defense
- Philadelphia Mayor's Commission on Literacy, PA
- Ramsey County Community Partnership, MN
- San Joaquin County Prevention Partnership, CA
- South Dakota Rural Development Council, SD
- State of Delaware Governor's Cabinet, DE
- Texas Department of Health, TX
- Union Sanitary District, Freemont, CA
- US Bankruptcy Court, CA
- US Environmental Center, Washington, DC
- US Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC
- US Federal Judicial Center, Washington, DC
- US Forest Service, Pinecrest, CA

- US Office of Personnel Mgt & HR Devel Council, Washington DC
- Western New South Wales, Australia,
- Wilmington Police Department, DE

## Healthcare

- American Cancer Society, PA
- American Society on Aging, PA
- Association of Community Health Nursing Educators, Washington DC
- Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Maryland, MD
- Canadian Diabetes Association, BC and Yukon, Canada
- Centers for Disease Control, GA
- Chandler Hall Health Services, Newtown, PA
- Collaboration for Healthy and Happy Family, Thailand
- Covina Healing Arts, CA
- Delaware County, PA
- Erie County Mental Health Association, NY
- Executive Leadership in Academic Medicine, Philadelphia PA
- Florida Atlantic University, Dept. of Nursing, FL
- Group Health Cooperative, WA
- Hyacinth AIDS Foundation, NJ
- Independent Living Center, Philadelphia, PA
- INOVA Health Systems, VA
- Kahuku Hospital, Oahu HI
- Kanton Glaur, Switzerland
- Katholische Lkiniken Marl/ Westerholt, Germany
- Latino Health Access, Orange County, CA
- LifeSpan Hospitals, Rhode Island
- Linda Creed Breast Cancer Foundation, PA
- Marion County Health and Human Services, OR
- Milwaukee Department of Health, WI
- Multnomah County Early Childhood Care & Education Committee, OR
- National Spinal Cord Injury Association, Washington Dc
- Nevada State Board of Health, NE
- New Jersey Department of Mental Health, NJ
- Passaic County Mental Health Board, NJ
- Princeton Alcohol and Drug Alliance, NJ
- Regina Saskatchewan Health District, Canada
- Saint Mary's Hospital, NJ
- San Joaquin County Prevention Partnership, CA
- Sisters of Mercy Health System, St. Louis, MO
- South Dakota Office of Adult Services & Aging, SD
- St. Joseph's Health Systems, CA
- Substance Abuse Prevention, Gloucester County, NJ
- Sunnyside Community Hospital, WA
- Visiting Nurse Association of America, Florida Division. FL

- Wyoming Medical Center Foundation, WY
- York County Area Agency on Aging, PA

#### Higher Education

- Allegheny University, School of Health Professions, PA
- Antioch Seattle Whole Systems Design, WA
- Antioch University, Master's Program, MA
- Auburn University Technical Assistance Center, AL
- Austin Community College, TX
- Boston University School of Dental Medicine, MA
- Brigham Young University, Marriot School of Business, UT
- California Institute of Integral Studies, San Francisco, CA
- California School of Professional Psychology, CA
- Franklin College Library
- George Washington University, School of Business, DC
- Gloucester County College, NJ
- Keene State College, NH
- Kendall Campus of Miami Dade Community College, Miami, FL
- Madison Area Technical College, WI
- Maine College of Art, ME
- Mission College, CA
- Rockland Community College, Suffern, NY
- TAFE - Institute of Technical and Further Education, Australia
- Temple University Center City, Philadelphia PA
- Trinity College School for Professional Studies, MA
- Truckee Meadows Community College, Reno, NV
- University of Chicago Graduate School of Business, IL
- University of Colorado, Denver CO
- University of Illinois, College of A.C.E.S, IL
- University of Maine, Farmington ME
- University of Mass, Center for International Education, MA
- University of Mass, Department of Environmental Management, MA
- University of Michigan Department of Housing, MI
- University of Minnesota Extension Service, MN
- University of Minnesota, Crockston, MN
- University of Missouri School of Education, MI
- University of North Carolina Institute of Government, NC
- Washington State Board for Community & Technical Colleges, WA
- Westfield State College, Westfield, MA
- William Patterson College, NJ
- Worcester Polytechnic Institute, MA

#### Human Services

- Action For Children, OH

- Child Day Care System in Oregon, OR
- Colorado Foundation for Families & Children, CO
- Connecticut Coalition Against Domestic Violence, CT
- Corporation for National Service, Washington DC
- Habitat For Humanity, CO
- Holly Shores Girl Scouts Council, NJ
- Independent Living Center, Philadelphia, PA
- Kansas City Consensus, Junior League, KS
- Knutson Foundation, MI
- National Civilian Community Corps, Washington Dc
- National Clearinghouse for the Defense of Women, Washington DC
- Ohio Head Start Association, OH
- Packard Foundation, Adolescent Reproductive Health in Ethiopia
- Packard Foundation, Adolescent Reproductive Health in Phillipines
- Packard Foundation, Maternal and Child Health in North Nigeria
- Pathfinder International, Bangladesh
- Penn Laurel Girl Scout Council, PA
- PLAN International, Surrey, United Kingdom
- Resources for Human Development, Inc., PA
- Trevor's Place, PA
- UN Coordinator for Bangladesh
- UN Development System in Bangladesh
- UN Family Planning Agency, NY
- UN Population Fund (UNFPA) & Planned Parenthood Association of Thailand
- UN Population Fund (UNFPA), Bangladesh
- UN Population Fund (UNFPA), Islamabad, Pakistan
- UN Population Fund (UNFPA), Manilla, Philippines,
- UN Population Fund (UNFPA), Nepal,
- UN Population Fund (UNFPA), Sri Lanka
- UNICEF, Bangladesh
- UNICEF, Child Abuse in Iran
- UNICEF, Child Labor in Indonesia
- UNICEF, Children of Southern Sudan, Operation Lifeline Sudan, Kenya
- UNICEF, Demobilization of Child Soldiers, Operation Lifeline Sudan, Kenya
- UNICEF, Maternal Mortality in Indonesia
- UNICEF, Regionalizing Education in Indonesia
- UNICEF, Street Children inIran
- Women of Vision, Seattle, WA
- Women Organized Against Rape, Philadelphia, PA

## Appendix B: Leaders Who Have Not Used Future Search

List of organizations for Sample of Leaders who have not implemented a Future Search, leaders from these organizations may have been contacted to participate:

### **Business**

- The Home Depot, Locations throughout the United States
- RHR International in Los Angeles, CA
- RHR International in Chicago, IL
- APEX Apparel, Rainbow Sports and Printing, Scottsville, KY
- Covered Bridges Land Development, Williams Bay, WI
- Midwest Airlines Corporate Headquarters, Milwaukee, WI
- Aramark, Philadelphia, PA and multiple international locations
- Lake Lawn Properties, LLC. Delavan, WI
- Marina Harbor Anchorage, Marina Del Rey, CA
- Decron Properties, Culver City, CA
- Keonig and Strey, GMAC, Chicago, IL
- Society of Industrial Organizational Psychology
- Society of Human Resource Management
- International Association of Applied Psychologists
- American Society of Training and Development

### **Communities**

- The Town of Lake Geneva Lake Geneva, WI
- The Village of Williams Bay, Williams Bay, WI
- City of Wahiawa, HI
- Childrens Hope International, Chicago, IL

### **Congregations**

- Calvary Community Church, Williams Bay, WI
- Playa del Rey Community Church, Playa del Rey, CA
- North Park Covenant Church, Chicago IL
- Anchor Covenant Church, Lake Geneva, WI

### **Environment**

- The United States Environmental Protection Agency
- The Environmental Protection Agency of Ireland
- Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality

### **General Education**

- Lake Geneva Middle School, Lake Geneva, WI
- Leilehua Middle School, Wahiawa, HI
- Williams Bay High School, Williams Bay, WI
- Badger High School, Lake Geneva, WI

- Supply Chain Educational Alliance, Beachwood, OH

### **Government**

- Department of Homeland Security
- Lake County Prison System Lake County, IL
- Lake County Department of Information and Technology, Lake County, IL
- Los Angeles Department of Urban Development, Los Angeles, CA
- Great Lakes Naval Base, Grayslake, IL
- Juvenile Defender Committee, Seattle, WA

### **Health Care**

- Aurora Health Care, Lake Geneva, WI
- Mercy Health Systems, Walworth, WI

### **Higher Education**

- Aurora University, Aurora, IL
- Aurora University, Williams Bay, WI
- The Chicago School of Professional Psychology, Chicago, IL
- The Chicago School of Professional Psychology, Online Campus
- The Chicago School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles, CA
- Carroll College, Waukesha, WI
- North Park University, Chicago, IL
- The University of South Florida, St. Petersburg
- The University of South Florida Polytechnic, Lakewood, FL
- University of Chicago, IL, Department of Sociology
- University of California, Los Angeles, Psychology Department
- University of Nevada, Reno, NV
- University of Wisconsin, Stout, Menomonie, WI
- University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire, Eau Claire, WI
- Chippewa Valley Technical College, Eau Claire, WI

### **Human Services**

- Women Employed, Chicago IL
- Habitat for Humanity, Locations throughout the United States
- Center for Working Families, Minneapolis , MN
- Project for Pride in Living, Minneapolis, MN
- Baldwin Counseling Center, Bannockburn, IL
- The Underground Youth Program, Chicago, IL

## Appendix C: Consent Forms

### Group 1 Consent Form

You have been selected to participate in a research study of leadership behaviors. You were selected as a potential participant in this study because you held a position of leadership during the time when your organization experienced a Future Search conference. I ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to participate. This study is being conducted by Brigit Olsen, a doctoral candidate at Walden University. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

**Background Information:** The purpose of this study is to gain an understanding of transformational leadership behaviors and examine their relationship to successful Future Search behaviors.

**Procedures:** If you agree to participate in this study please electronically sign this informed consent form below. The survey will take about 15 minutes.

**Confidentiality:** The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report that might be published, the researcher will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a participant. Research records will be kept in a secure file; only the researcher(s) will have access to the records.

**Voluntary Nature of the Study:** Your participation in the study is voluntary and you are free to withdraw at any time.

**Risks and Benefits of being in the Study:** There are no physical risks and no benefits to participating in the study.

**Contacts and Questions:** The researcher conducting this study is Brigit Olsen. She can be reached by e-mail at [bclm001@waldenu.edu](mailto:bclm001@waldenu.edu). The researcher's advisor is Dr. Thomas Diamond who can be reached by e-mail at [tdiamond@waldenu.edu](mailto:tdiamond@waldenu.edu). To speak privately about your rights as a participant, you may contact Walden representative, Dr. Leilani Endicott, (800) 925-3368, x 1210. Walden University's approval number for this study is 04-20-10-029049 and it expires on April 19, 2011. You may keep a copy of this consent form.

**Statement of Consent:** I have read the above information. I have asked any necessary questions and received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

\_\_\_ Yes, I consent to participate in the study.

As a leader who has participated in a past Future Search event, please answer the questions below.

*(Note: For example, If my organization made an action plan to complete the following 4 items as a result of the Future Search: Improve productivity by 10%, Cut budget by \$100,000, form a committee to reduce community violence by 20% and form a task force to involve students in extra-curricular activities, I may report 3 of 4 complete). Please report how many of your items you would consider complete.*

Documentation is appreciated, please feel free to forward action plans or any documents showing your progress toward your goals from your conference. If you have participated in multiple Future Search conferences, please choose just one to report.

1.) How many items were on your action plan as a result of the Future Search event? \_\_\_\_\_ How many of these items were completed? \_\_\_\_\_

2.) After you complete the survey, would you be willing to participate in a brief follow up phone interview? (If yes, an additional consent form will be sent)

\_\_\_ No, Thanks

\_\_\_ Yes, I would be willing

3.) If you answered yes to question 2, please answer the following questions.

Name \_\_\_\_\_ E-mail \_\_\_\_\_

Phone Number \_\_\_\_\_ Best time to call \_\_\_\_\_

## Group 2 Consent Form

You have been selected to participate in a research study of leadership behaviors. You were selected as a potential participant in this study because you hold a position of leadership in an organization. I ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to participate. This study is being conducted by Brigit Olsen, a doctoral candidate at Walden University. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

**Background Information:** The purpose of this study is to gain an understanding of transformational leadership behaviors and examine their relationship to successful Future Search behaviors.

**Procedures:** If you agree to participate in this study please electronically sign this informed consent form below. The survey will take about 15 minutes.

**Confidentiality:** The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report that might be published, the researcher will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a participant. Research records will be kept in a secure file; only the researcher(s) will have access to the records.

**Voluntary Nature of the Study:** Your participation in the study is voluntary and you are free to withdraw at any time.

**Risks and Benefits of being in the Study:** There are no physical risks and no benefits to participating in the study.

**Contacts and Questions:** The researcher conducting this study is Brigit Olsen. She can be reached by e-mail at [bclm001@waldenu.edu](mailto:bclm001@waldenu.edu). The researcher's advisor is Dr. Thomas Diamond who can be reached by e-mail at [tdiamond@waldenu.edu](mailto:tdiamond@waldenu.edu). To speak privately about your rights as a participant, you may contact Walden representative, Dr. Leilani Endicott, (800) 925-3368, x 1210. Walden University's approval number for this study is 04-20-10-029049 and it expires on April 19, 2011. You may keep a copy of this consent form.

**Statement of Consent:** I have read the above information. I have asked any necessary questions and received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

\_\_\_ Yes, I consent to participate in the study.

Future Search and Leadership Study Consent Form  
Interviews

You have been selected to participate in a research study of leadership behaviors. You were selected as a potential participant in this study because you held a position of leadership during the time when your organization experienced a Future Search conference. I ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study. This study is being conducted by Brigit Olsen, a doctoral candidate at Walden University. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

**Background Information:** The purpose of this study is to gain an understanding of transformational leadership behaviors and examine their relationship to successful Future Search behaviors.

**Procedures:** If you agree to participate in this study please electronically sign this informed consent form and return it by replying to this e-mail. When the researcher receives your agreement to participate, you will receive a follow up e-mail to schedule your phone interview. The interview will take about 20 minutes.

**Confidentiality:** The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report that might be published, the researcher will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a participant. Research records will be kept in a secure file; only the researcher(s) will have access to the records.

**Voluntary Nature of the Study:** Your participation in the study is voluntary and you are free to withdraw at any time.

**Risks and Benefits of being in the Study:** There are no physical risks and no benefits to participating in the study.

**Contacts and Questions:** The researcher conducting this study is Brigit Olsen. She can be reached by e-mail at [bclm001@waldenu.edu](mailto:bclm001@waldenu.edu). The researcher's advisor is Dr. Thomas Diamond who can be reached by e-mail at [tdiamond@waldenu.edu](mailto:tdiamond@waldenu.edu). To speak privately about your rights as a participant, you may contact Walden representative, Dr. Leilani Endicott, (800) 925-3368, x 1210. You may keep a copy of this consent form.

**Statement of Consent:** I have read the above information. I have asked any necessary questions and received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

Electronic Signature of Participant: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Future Search and Leadership Study Consent Form  
Pilot Study

You have been selected to participate in a research study of leadership behaviors. You were selected as a potential participant in this study because you held a position of leadership during the time when your organization experienced a Future Search conference. I ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study. This is a pilot research study, and is being conducted by Brigit Olsen, a doctoral candidate at Walden University. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

**Background Information:** The purpose of this study is to gain an understanding of transformational leadership behaviors and examine their relationship to successful Future Search behaviors.

**Procedures:** If you agree to participate in this study please electronically sign this informed consent form and return it by replying to this e-mail. When the researcher receives your agreement to participate, you will receive a follow up e-mail to schedule your phone interview. The interview will take about 20 minutes.

**Confidentiality:** The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report that might be published, the researcher will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a participant. Research records will be kept in a secure file; only the researcher(s) will have access to the records.

**Voluntary Nature of the Study:** Your participation in the study is voluntary and you are free to withdraw at any time.

**Risks and Benefits of being in the Study:** There are no physical risks and no benefits to participating in the study.

**Contacts and Questions:** The researcher conducting this study is Brigit Olsen. She can be reached by e-mail at [bclm001@waldenu.edu](mailto:bclm001@waldenu.edu). The researcher's advisor is Dr. Thomas Diamond who can be reached by e-mail at [tdiamond@waldenu.edu](mailto:tdiamond@waldenu.edu). To speak privately about your rights as a participant, you may contact Walden representative, Dr. Leilani Endicott, (800) 925-3368, x 1210. You may keep a copy of this consent form.

**Statement of Consent:** I have read the above information. I have asked any necessary questions and received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

Electronic Signature of Participant: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix D: E-mails for Groups 1 and 2

E-mail for Group 1

Dear Participant,

You have been selected to participate in a research study about leadership behaviors and the Future Search Conference. You are eligible to participate if you held a position of leadership during the time when your organization experienced a Future Search conference. If you qualify, please consider helping with this important research. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes and your efforts would be greatly appreciated.

Please follow this link to complete the online survey: \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you again, your willingness to participate is appreciated.

Brigit Olsen,

Walden University Doctoral Candidate

E-mail for Group 2 (Leaders who have not implemented a Future Search)

Dear Participant,

You have been selected to participate in a research study about leadership behaviors, conducted by Brigit Olsen, a doctoral candidate at Walden University. You are eligible to participate if you hold a position of leadership in your organization. Specifically, if you have held a position where you lead, educate or manage others. If you qualify, please consider helping with this important research. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes and your efforts would be greatly appreciated.

Please follow this link to complete the online survey: \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you again, your willingness to take part is greatly appreciated.

Brigit Olsen,

Walden University Doctoral Candidate

### Appendix E: Demographic Questions

The following basic demographic questions will be added to the online survey tool, as a supplement. This will include the following questions for all participants:

- 1) Are you Male or Female?
  - a. Male
  - b. Female
  
- 2) What is your age?
  - a. 20-30
  - b. 31-40
  - c. 41-50
  - d. 51-60
  - e. 61 or older
  
- 3) What is the highest level of education you have completed?
  - a. Less than high school
  - b. High school/GED
  - c. Some college
  - d. 2 year college degree (Associates)
  - e. 4 year college degree (BA/BS)
  - f. Masters
  - g. Doctoral
  - h. Professional (MD/JD)
  
- 4) What is your race? (choose as many as apply)
  - a. White
  - b. African American
  - c. Hispanic
  - d. Asian/Pacific Islander
  - e. Native American
  - f. Other
  
- 5) What is your position level?
  - a. Entry-level
  - b. First-level managers
  - c. Middle managers
  - d. Director
  - e. Executive/Dean
  - f. Chief executive officers

Appendix F: Permission for Instrument

For use by Brigit Olsen only. Received from Mind Garden, Inc. on March 22, 2008

**Permission for Brigit Olsen to reproduce 1  
copy within one year of March 22, 2008**

# **Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire**

**Third Edition  
Manual and Sampler Set**

Bruce J. Avolio and Bernard M. Bass  
University of Nebraska and SUNY Binghamton

Contributions by:  
Dr. Fred Walumbwa  
Weichun Zhu  
University of Nebraska—Lincoln  
Gallup Leadership Institute

Published by Mind Garden, Inc.  
info@mindgarden.com  
www.mindgarden.com

E-mail : Re: MGAgree: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire from Brigit Olsen (Order # ... Page 1 of 1

 Reply
  Reply All
  Forward
  Delete
 
 Move ▼ Add to ▼   

**Subject: Re: MGAgree: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire from Brigit Olsen (Order # 11931)**

Date: Thu, Apr 15, 2010 01:50 PM CDT

From: [info@mindgarden.com](mailto:info@mindgarden.com)

To: [bclem001@waldenu.edu](mailto:bclem001@waldenu.edu)

Hi Brigit,  
 Thank you for your order and for completing the online use application. Please feel free to move ahead with your survey. Be sure to send us a link for review.

Best,  
 Valorie  
 Mind Garden, Inc.

Quoting [bclem001@waldenu.edu](mailto:bclem001@waldenu.edu):

>  
 > Name: Brigit Olsen  
 > Email address: [bclem001@waldenu.edu](mailto:bclem001@waldenu.edu)  
 > Phone number: 262-949-2555  
 > Company/Institution: Student at Walden University  
 > Order/Invoice number: 11931  
 > Order Date: 4-15-10  
 >  
 > Project Title: Transformational Leadership Among Future Search Leaders  
 > Instrument Name: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire  
 >  
 > I will compensate Mind Garden, Inc. for every use of this online form.  
 >  
 > I will put the instrument copyright on every page containing  
 > question items from this instrument.  
 >  
 > I will remove this form from online at the conclusion of my data collection.  
 >  
 > I will limit access to this online form and require a login or  
 > uniquely coded url. Once the login/code is used that evaluation will  
 > be closed to use.  
 >  
 > The form will not be available to the open Web.  
 >  
 > I will include [info@mindgarden.com](mailto:info@mindgarden.com) on my list of survey respondents  
 > so that Mind Garden can verify the proper use of the instrument.  
 >  
 > Method for Restricting Access:  
 > I will be using SurveyMonkey to collect data, which is a secure site  
 > for only participants that I would recruit to access. Thank you  
 > very much for your consideration, please feel free to contact me  
 > with any questions.  
 >  
 > Electronically signed on 4-15-10 by Brigit Olsen.  
 >

<http://my.campuscruiser.com/em2PageServlet?pg=wreadmail&tg=BaseReadmail&cx=22....> 4/15/2010

Appendix G: Follow up Interview Questions  
**Interview Questions for Future Search Leaders**

\_\_\_\_ Additional consent form signed by participant

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Job Title/Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Conference: \_\_\_\_\_ Leadership Role within FS Conference: \_\_\_\_\_

How many total items were on your action plan? \_\_\_\_ How many projects and items from your action plan would you say have been completed since then? \_\_\_\_

The following questions are designed for the anecdotal component of this study and will add value and meaning to the quantitative findings. These questions will be asked of the Future Search leaders only. Core questions are defined, and the follow up probe questions will be asked if a subquestion is needed.

- 1.) How long has it been since your Future Search event?  
 (Future Search event must be more than one year in the past in order for this leader to have been chosen as a participant. This procedure is in place to ensure organizations have been given adequate time to experience and reflect on their successful results)
- 2.) In general, can you describe your leadership style?  
 Subquestion: How would your subordinates answer this question about you?
- 3.) What was your experience with action planning like?  
 Subquestion: How successful do you feel this process was for your organization?
- 4.) How would you characterize the success of the Future Search?  
 Subquestion: What role do you think you played?
- 5.) How do you think the Future Search event affected your leadership?  
 Subquestion: How would you characterize your leadership before, during, and after the conference?
- 6.) Can you describe how the Future Search conference changed you and or organization?  
 Subquestion: How would you as a leader and your organization be different if this event had not occurred?

## Curriculum Vitae

**Brigit C. Olsen**

### EDUCATION

#### **PhD, Organizational Psychology**

Walden University 2011  
 Dissertation Title: *Transformational Leadership Behaviors Among Future Search Leaders*

#### **Masters of Business Administration**

North Park University, Chicago, IL 2003

#### **BA, Business Administration and Youth Ministry**

North Park University, Chicago, IL 2001  
 Thesis: *Spiritual Abuse, a Study of Abusive Churches and Movements*

### EXPERIENCE

**2009 – Current**      **Santa Barbara Graduate Institute**      **Santa Barbara, CA**  
*Director of Student Services*

- Hold student townhalls to address needs and design strategy to increase service offerings in a unique virtual environment
- Continuously monitor enrollment trends, produce reports with recommendations to the President for reducing attrition
- Supervise staff and manage financial aid/student accounts, office of the registrar, student advising, international students, veterans affairs and career services
- Launch new services as a result of retention analysis, including student health and wellness, programs for international students and new website design
- Ensure compliance and help prepare campus for regional accreditation

**2008 – 2010**      **The Chicago School of Professional Psychology**  
**Southern CA** *Director of Student Services*

- Directed operations for 4 campuses including downtown Los Angeles, Westwood, Irvine and Santa Barbara locations. This included the effective merger of The Chicago School with 2 acquired campuses of the former California Graduate Institute, and an acquisition of Santa Barbara Graduate Institute
- Designed hosted orientations for incoming students, including high quality events at all campuses, including additional orientation and community experience for international students
- Took strategic project management approach to bring services to all 500+ students among all 3 campuses, developed flowcharts, timelines and managed resources,

including collaboration with faculty and other operational departments in Southern California and Chicago campuses

**2008 – 2009 The Chicago School of Professional Psychology Los Angeles, CA**  
**Lead Faculty, Industrial/Organizational Psychology**

- Successfully launched I/O program for new campus in Los Angeles
- Designed curriculum for new blended (Online and face to face) format needs
- Hosted community events such as Human Resource Forum and Career Strategy Workshop to successfully build community partnerships and increase brand awareness
- Designed academic assessment plan to measure the effectiveness of the I/O Program

Aurora University, George Williams Campus, Williams Bay, WI

**Adjunct Faculty** 2007-2008

- Graduate level: MBA program, Marketing Management
- Undergraduate Business program: Human Resource Management

North Park University, Chicago, IL

**Adjunct Faculty** 2007-2008

- Graduate level: MBA program, Project Management Course (Using Microsoft Project Professional Software)

Carroll College, Waukesha, WI

**Adjunct Faculty** 2007-2008

- Undergraduate Sociology program: Complex Organizations and Work-life Balance Course

The Home Depot Corporation, Lake Geneva, WI

**Human Resource Manager**

2006-2007

- Managed multiple roles including HR and training in multiple locations
- Became certified trainer within the company to hold training classes to better address the training needs of the store and other stores in the district
- Taught training classes at district level for new store leadership: Classes included Sales Training, Managing Financials, Putting Customers First, and Survival Skills for Managers
- Evaluated and addressed learning needs and objectives for all store departments
- Interpreted and analyzed sales forecast reports to plan labor hours for store location

Echo Lane LLC., Construction and land development firm, Salem, WI

**Sales/Marketing Manager**

2003-2006

- Responsible for all sales and marketing related duties
- Developed marketing strategy of effective advertising, including direct mail brochures, advertisements and open houses

- Prepared for town and county approval meetings, research and presentations
- Managed construction schedule for staff of carpenters, electricians, drywall crews and plumbers and ensured adherence to strict timeline
- Worked to communicate with customers at every stage of their home building and design process

Orren Pickell Designers and Builders, Bannockburn, IL

**Sales Manager, South Shore Club, Lake Geneva, WI**

2002-2003

- Worked with prestigious North Shore Builder to help develop 40 acre lakefront parcel on Lake Geneva
- Assisted local network of Realtors in holding open houses, prepared paperwork, and showed property
- Worked with prospects in both North Shore Chicago and Lake Geneva area markets

**COURSES TAUGHT ( \*Also Subject Matter Expert or Curriculum Designer):**

- Statistics and Lab\* Graduate Level, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology
- Professional Development\* Graduate Level, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology
- Organizational Behavior\* Graduate Level, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology, SME only
- Organizational Culture and Design (Online)\* Graduate Level, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology
- Organizational Consulting\* Graduate Level, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology, SME only
- Human Resource Management\* Undergraduate Level, Aurora University
- Complex Organizations and Work Life Balance\* Undergraduate Level, Carroll College, Sociology, SME only
- Marketing Management\* Graduate Level (MBA) Aurora University
- Project Management, Graduate Level (MBA) North Park University
- Human Resource Management, Graduate Level (MBA) North Park University
- Sales development, performance management, orientation, and various leadership classes – The Home Depot (multiple stores in Wisconsin)

**RELATED EXPERIENCE/VOLUNTEER SERVICE**

Lake Geneva, WI and Los Angeles, CA

2007-Current

**Volunteer Career Coach**

- Develop career strategies for local community, held training sessions and vocational counseling (including resume building services)
- Providing personal job coaching and individual consultations

The Underground, Chicago, IL

**Volunteer Mentor**

1999-2001

- Mentored urban middle school students in all subjects in after school program

North Park University, Chicago, IL

**Division Chair**

1999-2001

- Developed Curriculum, Wrote Training Manual and held training Seminars for University Ministry Small Group leaders
- Started Seminary/Undergraduate mentor program, recruited participants and coordinated mentoring sessions
- Provided on going training and support for leaders, designed workshops and seminars to meet their needs and contributed to their continuing development

SAGE Program, Lake Geneva, WI

**Peer Helper**

1996-1997

- Mentored middle school students with reading development needs

**PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS**

- Society of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists (SIOP) 2005- Current
- Society of Human Resource Management (SHRM) 2007- Current
- Academy of Management (AOM) 2008 - Current
- International Association of Applied Psychology (IAAP) 2008 - Current
- Previous memberships held: NAR, National Association of Realtors, WRA, Wisconsin Realtors Association, and LARA, Lakes Area Realtors Association