INTRODUCTION

Nothing is needed more in society and the workforce than leadership whether in business or higher education. It is not uncommon to emphasize that the rise or fall of a nation depends on its leadership. For those aspiring to be leaders; one must do some soul searching first before signing up for leadership (Bolman & Gallos, 2011; Greenleaf, 2002). In order to fill leadership shoes competently—whether wearing Wingtips or Prada, leaders must be called to the profession. Higher education needs to rethink its leadership characteristic implementation strategies—from rigid hierarchal infrastructures to one of shared leadership.

Spiritual leadership is an intentional open systems management strategy that addresses worker performance issues by its worker-centered shared leadership approach (Court, 2003; Greenleaf, 2002). Because there is no one leader who can make accurate and ethical decisions 100% of the time, shared management helps sustain processes within the work environment (Senge, 1990). The rapidity of change in today’s business environment makes leadership increasingly exigent and complex, placing unrealistic expectations on the outdated “heroic” leadership model (Greenleaf, 2002; Kocolowski, 2010).

WHAT IS SPIRITUAL LEADERSHIP?

Instead of trying to be a super-leader, it is critical that the perceptions of others view the leader as being authentic and committed to the work that one does and loving the people one serves (Bolman & Gallos, 2011; Carter, 1996; Greenleaf, 2002). Spiritual management and leadership strategies value people the same as capital profits (Court, 2003). They value the eminence of human existence and the authenticity of the individual—beliefs, values and way of life. Unpacking the term, “spiritual leadership” as cooperation, cooperative consensus-based democratic decision making and facilitating cooperative dialogue, appeals to our sense of wholeness in our politically-charged work environments (Court, 2003; Greenleaf, 2002). Its wholeness not just tolerates but respects the opinions of others (Kocolowski, 2010; Lee-Davies, Kakabadse, & Kakabadse, 2007).

Though the word spiritual means to enliven or the vital principle, its derivation came from the Old French word spirit which came from the Latin word spiritus, which meant soul, courage, vigor, or breath (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2015). The focus of leading from “spirit” and imparting spirit or soul
into others is the foundation for the use of the term, spiritual leadership (Bolman & Deal, 2011). It is a leadership strategy that leads authentically from one’s most prized value system (Gardner, Cogliser, Davis, & Dickens, 2013; Greenleaf, 2002). The essence of this kind of leadership values one’s relationships and collaborations with others, one’s connection to the natural world, and beyond (Capra, 1996; Wheatley, 2006). Spirituality in the context of leadership isn’t so much about religion but about genuine compassion and authentic concern for others (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Gardner, et al., 2013). Within the work environment, spiritual leadership takes shape as empowering natural inclinations in others, cooperation, cooperative consensus-based democratic decision making, and facilitating cooperative dialogue (Carter, 1996; Gardner et al., 2011; Senge, 1990).

Why “Emergence” of Spiritual Leadership?

The term emergence has several definitions, one of which is that something comes into existence or develops. Another definition of emergence, however, references what comes forth into view from obscurity (dictionary.com: emerge, 2015-12-13). It is this latter definition that is used in the chapter as the authors asserts that spirituality in leadership has existed prior to recent times, but is only now being noticed and identified as a specific leadership style. In reviewing the literature for this chapter, the pioneers in the field of spiritual leadership were chosen, such as Robert Greenleaf and E.O. Wilson, as well as contemporary leadership theorists such as Lee Bolman, Margaret Wheatley, and Peter Senge, who built contemporary frames of reference on Greenleaf’s and Wilson’s existing work.

Spiritual Leadership Model Empowers Natural Inclinations

Leadership theories offer a framework in which to guide organizations. The spiritual leadership model facilitates empowering natural inclinations in employees (Blanchard, Carols, & Randolph, 2001). One way is by being a good listener. A good leader listens; this action alone motivates and empowers others (Merriam, Caffarella, & Baumgartner, 2007). Listening is critical in order for collaboration to happen (Schein, 2013). A valuable outcome of empowering others is facilitating meaningful teamwork. In order for meaningful teamwork to flow naturally accurate information must flow naturally (Wheatley, 2006) and the leader’s belief in her staff must also flow naturally.

Leadership scholars have done research in the area of working authentically to allow empowerment to bloom (Benziger, 1996; Carter, 1996; Greenleaf, 2002). We touch and inspire others when we lead with an authenticity rooted in our best gifts (Bolman & Gallos, 2011). If workers are empowered to utilize their own innate giftedness—their strengths, this sets them in a positive stance to minister solutions to problems naturally. If employees feel supported and rewarded within that function, according to Jung (1926) and Benziger (1996), they will tend to be happy and thrive within the work environment. If for whatever reason their natural tendencies are not allowed to function, then the brain is forced to expend large amounts of unnecessary energy trying to function (falsify) in ways that are unnatural in order to please the boss. Dr. Carl Gustav Jung called this phenomenon Falsification of Type (Benziger, 1995). Jung (1926) viewed the Falsification of Type as a violation of the natural disposition of a behavioral (way of thinking, doing, knowing, and interacting) personal preference.

By building on Jung’s premise, the application of Katherine Benziger’s work offer potentially huge benefits to organizations. She focused on the common tendency of people in work, whether being assessed or not, to “falsify type” (Benziger, 1996). She noted that when people adapt their natural thinking and working styles to fit work expectations of employers, tension and stress resulted. Workers were not
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