5

Goodness of Fit

American corporate culture is of two minds about the importance of fit between leaders and organizations. The tendency is to identify the best leadership style and assume it will work anywhere—to believe that someone with "general management capabilities" can succeed in a leadership role in any organization, profession, or industry. At the same time, other concepts, often dismissed by advocates of the great leader theory, have entered the vocabulary of everyday life. Chief among these are fit and readiness. This alternate view holds that if you have the right person in the right place at the right time, your organization will hum like magic. This chapter will focus on the time and place aspects of that assertion.

We take the view that fit matters as much as skill, talent, and experience, and we go one step further to give full credence to degrees of fit. A fit that is too perfect leads to stagnation. Leaders must change in order to align with organizations, and organizations must change in order to align with the leader's strategic design or operational style. Close but imperfect fit combines the smooth functioning we associate with efficiency and effectiveness with the flexible adjustment to change we associate with creativity.

Howard Gardner (1983) has shown that people think in very different ways with multiple intelligences, including linguistic, logical/mathematical, personal, and musical. Each form is effective in different arenas, shining in solving certain problems and failing in others. Imposing or valuing one form over another is a surefire strategy for devaluing people and squandering intellectual resources. So it is with leadership. Each form has its place; organizations and societies that fail to value and utilize many forms of leadership are squandering social resources.

There are many forms of leadership, among them entrepreneurial and managerial, grassroots and corporate. Within each of these categories, there are wide variations. Some entrepreneurs, for example, are extremely detail-oriented

and controlling; others move ahead with broad strokes and expect others to pick up the pieces of their bold, often wild initiatives. There are entrepreneurs who are good managers, and managers who are entrepreneurial.

Followers also have styles. People are able and inclined to follow certain kinds of leaders and not others. Some, for example, respond to inspiring orators. These same orators make others suspicious. Some people trust soft-spoken leaders who have recognizable goals that seem within reach. People are frequently responsive to leaders who hail from their own ethnic, racial, or professional group. These leaders are chosen because people identify with them and believe they understand their needs, sharing their imagery, humor, yearning, resentments, and hopes.

Furthermore, distinctive circumstances can shape distinctive forms of leadership. For example, women historically have not been permitted positions of authority in organizations. The challenge of getting things done and of being effective without authority has been a problem overcome to a degree with very creative forms of leadership. Women have learned to exert influence through the development and use of informal networks and to manage from one-down and peripheral positions by teaching and supporting those in formal positions of power. They have learned to lead by convening and facilitating others, and by removing obstacles from the paths of those charged with leading projects and making decisions. They have learned to mobilize and demobilize their networks according to the needs of projects. In recent years, management theorists have adopted such flexible organizational approaches and pioneered many of the leadership styles that have now become mainstream. Styles of leadership, then, are often formed in the interaction between potential leaders and potential followers.

The civil rights struggles of the 1960s and 1970s gave rise to a style of democratic political organizing among African American women—denied power and position by both white people and black men—that more closely resembles church gatherings and neighborhood associations than any corporate hierarchy. Many Jewish leaders take their character from their community's belief that, as a very small and different people, their organizations must go beyond specific functions to provide a kind of government-in-exile. Grassroots leaders of all kinds must often lift the morale and inspire hope and effort in communities that are in short supply of both.

Each of these leadership types can be effective, depending on the qualities, desires, and habits of both leaders and followers, and upon the organizations and cultures that mediate the relationships between leaders and followers—in short, depending on the fit between the leader's skills, style, and values and those of the organization and the community in which the organization resides.

A Theoretical Note

The idea that individuals and the context in which they live reciprocally influence one another has become a commonplace of social science research. The power of person-context interaction is so great that it literally shapes all levels of human behavior, from biological to political. To take an example from the literature on adolescent development, individual physical characteristics elicit varying responses from both peers and adults. Those who grow and mature rapidly, for example, are treated differently than those who develop slowly. At the same time, the social context influences biology. Better nutrition and health care, for example, hasten the onset of puberty. In other words, social context literally influences biological development. Early puberty then has social consequences, such as earlier childbearing capability, which, in turn, has an impact on social and community relationships.

Social scientists point to several ways that the context, or ecology, influences individual development. They call these influences "social demands" (Lerner et al., 2002), indicating how the social context encourages certain qualities in individuals and inhibits others. To name a few of these social demands: First, there are attitudes, values, and stereotypes regarding a person's physical and behavioral attributes. More specifically and importantly, there are the attitudes and attributes of those people with whom an individual must coordinate activities—must fit in with—in order to adapt to be effective in a particular setting. Furthermore, the social and physical assets or resources, provided by a community—these could be jobs, educational opportunities, after-school programs—help focus and bring out certain qualities in individuals, letting other qualities remain dormant.

The quality of match between individual and environment determines, to a significant extent, how well the individual will do. Here's how Richard Lerner (2002, p. 542) puts it: "Those children whose characteristics match most of the settings within which they exist should receive supportive or positive feedback from the contexts and should show evidence of the most adaptive behavioral development. In turn, of course, poorly fit or mismatched children should show alternative developmental outcomes."

All individuals and systems, leaders and followers shape one another. We know parental behavior and expectations influence the character of children and the course of their lives. But parents will tell you that their lives in general and the way they bring up their children are influenced by how their children respond to their parenting—and to qualities in the children, themselves, that seem to be hardwired. In other words, parenting is shaped by children. Together, parents and children exist in recursive relationships. A parent might encourage one kind of behavior; a child responds in a particular way, to which

the parent adapts. Then the child adapts. This process continues until a pattern is reached, and for a while, one can observe repetition and sameness. Then something changes in the circumstances: The child develops new skills, enters school, or is influenced by other adults; or the parent takes a course and tries out a new way to express love or approval or a new way to practice discipline. Then there is some mutual jostling until a new pattern is reached. And so it goes through several changes due to development or circumstance. So it is with leaders and followers. This chapter extends this theory to leadership and argues that social context exerts a powerful influence on the nature and effectiveness of particular leaders.

Poor Fit

By the same token, poor fit between leaders and their social environment makes it almost impossible for them to succeed. Before describing what goodness of fit looks like, let's look at its opposite. Here, we are specifically not discussing poor leaders, but those considered excellent in one circumstance and, because the fit is poor, ineffectual in another.

The importance of fit is well known in sports. There are coaches, for example, whose teams perform brilliantly in one setting—let's say college basketball—who then fail in the professional ranks, or with another college team. Rick Pitino had spectacular success turning around basketball programs at Boston University, Providence College, the University of Kentucky, and, now, the University of Louisville, moderate success as coach of the New York Knickerbockers, a professional team, and little or no success with the Boston Celtics. Some coaches are good with young players—perhaps they are good teachers and need a degree of admiration and obedience. These coaches thrive when rapid success is not required and slow team development is sanctioned by owners and fans. They fail when they must produce quickly and when they have to work with experienced players who want more autonomy and on-court leadership themselves. And there are others who are good with the veteran players. These coaches may not like teaching or starting anew, yet thrive under pressure and rise to the need to produce quickly.

Casa Myrna Vazquez presents good illustrations of poor fit before Shiela Moore's tenure. When the organization was in transition between a collective and a more hierarchical and professionally managed organization, one leader after another departed in defeat and tellingly went on to become an effective leader in other organizations.

Joan Goldman (a pseudonym) effectively led a Jewish day school for twelve years. By her own account, she entered at just the right time for her skills and temperament. Joan followed the founding school head, a flamboyant,

entrepreneurial leader, who brought the school from conception to operational reality. Joan says she doesn't like the early stages of organizational life. Concern for the school's survival makes her anxious and unable to bring her best to the job. She's not particularly good at giving speeches, raising money, and dealing with community politics. "I'm an educator," she says. She's good at selecting and managing teachers, teaching children, talking with parents, and developing curriculum. She even likes the nitty-gritty of day-to-day administration. So it's not surprising that Joan took over a badly organized school and made it succeed with efficiency, warmth, and good humor; and it's not surprising that her organization, warmth, and pedagogical skills helped the school grow, little by little, until enrollment surpassed the school's physical capacity.

At that point, the board and its new strategic plan outlined rapid growth to accommodate enrollment, a new building, and generally expanded educational programs. Joan knew that she did not have the proper skills for this phase of the school's organizational life, and she asked for continuing education courses, coaching, and the like in order to get up to speed. The board did not accommodate her because it was mired in a factional battle between those favoring rapid growth and those who wanted to slow growth to maintain the school's current character. The battle broke when the board elected a new chair who completely supported the rapid growth. Now there was a poor fit both between Joan's skills and the organization's needs—fund raising, leading a capital campaign, managing a larger, rapidly growing institution—and between Joan's temperament and that of the board chair, who, in the daytime, was a corporate president. She was aggressive, business-oriented, autocratic, and impatient, whereas Joan prided herself on her collaborative leadership style. In sum, the very skills, values, and temperament that made Joan an excellent leader for over a decade now fit poorly with the new phase of the school's life.

Jake Collins (a pseudonym) is a brilliant, charismatic, and creative leader. Three times now, he has started schools with great success and fanfare that have received national attention for their innovative programs and exuberant spirit. As a result, he has been elected to head national organizations. Informally, he is considered a leader and is treated with great respect, almost deference—and love. He elicits this kind of response from the lay leaders who employ him, the teachers he employs, and students and parents.

At his first two schools, his disinterest and ineptitude with administration eventually disillusioned people. He was asked to move on from both. He is terrific in the beginning, during the conception and early growth stages—creating curriculum, hiring wonderful people, providing and marketing a vision, calling forth funding—and he is a poor manager who is so sure of himself that he won't rely on others. One effective way to deal with this set of qualities would be to complement him with an operations chief. A better strategy would be to hire him under a contract for only a few years and prepare for a transition

by grooming a next generation of leader. Equally instructive, Jake is a leader in national educational organizations that are loosely organized and run by others, where he is admired for his vision and creativity. Here, he is the right man for the job over a long period of time.

Finally, we would like to offer a complex illustration of mismatching from the corporate world. Sam Healey (a pseudonym) built a technology company with close to $700 million in annual revenue. In doing so, he combined entrepreneurial and managerial skills, technological savvy, grit, determination, and stamina. He is brilliant, personable, and often charismatic. The majority of people in his company loved working for him. Now, at another organization, Sam can't get many of the employees to take his lead, causing him frustration and, he confesses, "just plain confusion." He doesn't understand what's going on and confesses self-doubt.

When the venture capitalists, who dominated the company's board, hired Sam, they did so because of his ability to marry technological savvy to marketing and financial skills. The company had been profitable but small, and a little complacent. They were not growing. Sam's challenge was to transform the organization from a technology-driven to a market-driven company in order to take on aggressive growth objectives.

Originally, the company had been built around a brilliant software engineer, an MIT graduate who had invented several innovative products before graduating from college. He had collected a group of like-minded software people who happily took their lead from him. Although autocratic and irascible, he was the genuine article. His employees might grumble, but this combination of grumbling and reverence was integral to a culture that fit their image of a great technology organization. Finally, and this was important, they got to work on challenging problems and not the "ticky-tacky" problems that other firms imposed on engineers.

The transformation Sam wished to implement required engineers and managers able to meet market demands, which required them to submerge their intellectual interests in order to meet deadlines and customer specifications. The current group of managers and engineers balked at this prospect. What is more, the style of management best suited to a market orientation is collaborative and interactive—with engineers, marketing and sales, and financial people all working together to define products, determine project plans, establish objectives, and deliver results. Unlike the founding guru, master of his technical domain, the marketing leader needs to be collaborative. Even as final decisions and responsibility is his, he tries to create the best, the richest, and the most productive chemistry among constituents—customers, employees, and board members, who are clamoring for a big return on their dollar.

Where other employees had valued Sam's asking their opinions and genuinely listening, this group is disappointed in what they perceive as his

uncertainty. Where he practices a model of respect, curiosity, and broad-based decision making, they see weakness. As a result, they shut him out of their deliberations, distancing him from the technological aspects of decisions. With time, his isolation and growing ignorance have actually made him uncertain about how to approach them. A vicious cycle has set in.

Sam is in his early fifties, with three children approaching college. He put away enough from his first company to pay for college and to retire in a modest way, but he wants to reap the benefits of all his hard work and success. He wants a big financial success in his current company—"My last," he intoned—in order to retire in style. In other words, his objectives and the urgency they imply fit badly with the organization's initial, slow-moving, problem-savoring culture.

Sam cannot change personnel fast enough to change the culture and still meet product deadlines. He says there are times when he believes he doesn't fit in his own company. He does not fit, and it is doubtful that he has the time and resources—the venture capital is burning at an alarming rate—to align the whole company to its future needs.

Goodness of Fit

The concept of fit has grown familiar to some, particularly human resource personnel and search firms who are asked to identify and place executives in organizations. But fit with what? To put it simply, the character and skills of leaders must fit with the needs and culture of the organizations they serve— and, frequently, with the larger culture in which the organization lives. There are some leaders and potential leaders who take a reciprocal view. They ask: What organization will optimize my chances of success? In the following section, we tell stories that illustrate how distinctive cultures and organizational needs shape the type of leadership that emerges.

THE INFLUENCE OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

To state the obvious, knowledge, skill, experience, and credentials within the organization's core competency create credibility for leaders. Physicians, for example, generally accept physicians in leadership roles, or at least give them the benefit of the doubt upon appointment, and often object strenuously to the imposition of a businessman as the head of a hospital or clinic. In psycho-therapeutic settings, leaders must not only come with experience and credentials but probably a specific clinical orientation—psychodynamic, behavioral, whatever—in order to be welcomed. Twelve-step programs generally won't accept medically oriented leaders. Medical organizations, no matter how little success

they have had with substance abuse, will not turn to those with considerable success as leaders of 12-step programs. Community-based organizations are suspicious of professionals; professionally oriented organizations are suspicious of those whose credentials have been won through experience on the street. Street smarts count much more in the former; degrees, internships, and the like count in the latter.

In the corporate world, brash and brilliant boy-men serve as the archetype of the technology leader, soft-spoken senior gentlemen serve as bank presidents, and aggressively flamboyant women or men serve as heads in the retail clothing industry. These stereotypes contain grains of truth. Imagine, for example, Bill Gates in a retail firm or Lee Iacocca in a bank. Entrepreneurial cultures will only accept and thrive with hard-driving, risk-taking, do-it-all leaders. Large, stable, older cultures more narrowly circumscribe their leaders' activities. Those who come up from the ranks are steeped in the organization's culture and fit well. Those brought in from the outside are brought in with the culture in mind.

Shiela Moore and Casa Myrna provide clear illustrations of the importance of fit between leader and organization. At first, the counterculture social workers at Casa Myrna were openly suspicious of Moore. Her skills were those of a manager, and she came from a medical background—what they saw, in fact, as a corporate medical background. According to alternative therapists, financial and management skills bear only a distant relationship to those that help heal battered women. Furthermore, medical centers were governed by what was then disparaged as the medical model, with its tendency to see and treat people in terms of pathology, to see the doctor as expert and the patient as a passive recipient of the doctor's wisdom, and often to blame or infantilize victims of domestic violence. This hierarchical, male-dominated practice was repugnant to Casa Myrna's staff. As a result, Shiela Moore had to prove that she understood—and valued—the staff's ways of healing before they would willingly follow her lead.

Casa Myrna provides a second illustration of organizational needs determining the selection of leadership. Carmen Rivera became board chair during the strategic planning process, a process that signaled the end of the old ad hoc organizational structure and processes. She believed the organization had reached a scale that demanded substantial infrastructure improvement and more systematic management. So she guided a search process to hire such a manager. Shiela Moore fit the future of the organization.

To counteract the resistance of the old culture, Moore developed a strategy of enlisting and supporting key executives. Jossie Fossas, the financial officer, was first. Then Moore included Fossas and key program officers—representatives of the founding or grassroots culture—on a team to implement the strategic plan that they had helped construct. Inside the tent, as it were, they promoted the new culture and the need for better accountability, clarity of roles, and an

infrastructure to support rapid growth. Then, with an unexpected rapidity, the cultural assumptions shifted—"If we want to fulfill our mission, we need 'qualified' people in executive positions," they intoned in ways that surprised them even more than others. Within a year, the culture had been more or less transformed and, with it, the belief in who would fit its needs. The spate of new hires that followed—an IT director and a new clinical program director, among others—were, indeed, selected on that basis.

THE CULTURAL AND COMMUNITY CONTEXT

As we discussed in the previous chapter, there is a dynamic interaction between certain ideas about leadership that span the centuries and the particular ways that specific cultures shape those ideas. Although we described a national narrative, there are many subcultures, each with its ideas about what makes for effective leadership. Any person seeking leadership or being asked to serve within these cultures must more or less fit with those ideas. This process of fit is, in many cases, so automatic and so much an expression of character that the act of fitting oneself to cultural archetypes is effortless and unconscious. Many of the men of the Southern Leadership Conference who led the civil rights struggle, each a church leader in his own right, may fit that description. For others, like Shiela Moore, achieving the fit is, in various degrees, intentional and hard-won.

The research literature on African American women who rose up to positions of leadership during the civil rights movement of the 1960s illustrates the particularity of leadership within a distinctive culture. The title of one article says it all: "Invisible Southern Black Women Leaders in the Civil Rights Movement: The Triple Constraints of Gender, Race, and Class." The author, Bernice McNair Barnett, goes on to set the scene:

> Even while suffering the daily indignities heaped on them by their location in the structure of society, many southern Black women were much more than *followers;* many were also leaders who performed a variety of roles comparable to those of Black male leaders. Although seldom recognized as leaders, these women were often the ones who initiated protest, formulated strategies and tactics and mobilized other resources (especially money, personnel, and communication networks) necessary for successful social action. . . . (Barnett, 1993, p. 163)

These women performed their roles in the only way possible in that time and place. Several authors describe the roles taken by female organizers as emerging from both the strengths and limitations of their social conditions (Elliot, 1996; Gyant, 1996). They argue that for black and other minority women, caretaking is heightened by both the general culture's emasculation of men and their own wish to protect and promote their children and their communities. Many black women have become social activists after fighting

local, specific battles on behalf of their own children, then for children within their neighborhood. As Nancy Naples (1998, p. 114) puts it, "Latinas, Native American women, and Asian-American women have well-established traditions of community-based work designed to defend and enhance the quality of life within their communities." In effect, black women foreshadowed the late-1960s emphasis on making the social political.

Black women organized protests through networks, relationships, and cooperation, much as they organized church functions, not through hierarchical positioning. That is the positive pull of culture. On the negative side, both white and, perhaps even more so, black male culture forbade black women from assuming formal positions of authority. As a result, Patricia Parker suggests (2001) that black women continued to behave in a collaborative and informal style and to avoid competition and conflict, particularly with white and male leaders. According to Nancy Naples, multiple layers of oppression, ironically, have given black women an advantage over white women because they have a more developed sense of the need for equality. Naples says that minority women's activism has several qualities distinct from other women's activism. Many became involved because they wanted to improve their child's environment, either regarding school quality or neighborhood safety, or by improving welfare and health systems. Black and Hispanic women became activists out of their concern for improving the lives of their low-income communities where solving pressing problems in health, education, poverty, and the environment, among other issues, was a matter of survival. The added struggles against racism and poverty caused these women to get involved—and they played crucial roles in the survival of their communities.

Several authors focus on the way the oppression, itself, shaped black female leadership. Because of the discrimination they have faced, Cheryl Townsend Gilkes argues, black women are better suited than black men to fight for social causes: "The position of Black women at the bottom of both the status and income hierarchies produces an interesting paradox in their politics of liberation. They have a better and more comprehensive view of the dynamics of oppression. . . . Historically, the Black community has recognized the power of Black women's powerlessness" (Gilkes, 1988, p. 74). Black men, as ministers and politicians, were viewed with skepticism and as a source of instability, but black women were responsible for everyday life and for maintaining stability at home and in the community.

The Role of Church Leadership in the Development of Women's Leadership

The church, religion and spirituality have historically played a role in black women's leadership in a variety of ways. Women developed many

leadership and activist skills in church. Its patriarchal hierarchy has prevented women from assuming leadership positions as pastors and in other black organizations—and spurred them on to seek equality. Spirituality and faith, central to many black women's leadership styles, have given them strength to persevere.

Coordinating Activities. Historically, black women had roles as social networkers in churches and served as coordinators of church activities. Leadership skills were frequently developed in church activism. "African American women who exercised strong membership in church communities were also historically prominent in secular organizations, in which their activism was a powerful force in sustaining the movement for social change" (Barnett, 1993, p. 132).

Faith. Many of the women leaders in the civil rights era had moral and religious upbringings. "Women were motivated to participate for various reasons. One important reason was their belief and faith in God. . . . Because the church was the center for mass meetings, it provided women the opportunity to become leaders." Faith played a large role in activist Fannie Lou Hamer's leadership. She had a spiritual fervor that drew people to her. "Without her faith in God and the essential rightness of her cause, Fanny Lou Hamer could easily have been dissuaded by the adversities and defeats she suffered," Williams states in *Servants of the People: The 1960s Legacy of African-American Leadership* (Williams, 1996, p. 197).

When leading a cause, such as civil rights, the ultimate goal can seem elusive, its attainment often in doubt. Yet, the servant leader is sustained by, and draws strength from, an abiding faith—faith in God, faith in self and in others, faith in the vision and in the integrity of the cause. Fannie Lou Hamer often alluded to her trust in God and how that belief was a sustaining power in her life. She, as did Martin Luther King Jr. and many of the southern activists, came out of a religious background with a deep spirituality. Faith plays a defining role because it assures the servant leader that even in the midst of fear and confusion, amid turmoil and uncertainty, appropriate actions and responses will somehow be revealed. . . . Fannie Lou Hamer's inspiration was firmly grounded in a spiritual context and sustained by her Christian faith. Her religious beliefs were the source of her strength. Personal faith, which has historically and traditionally sustained African Americans under brutal conditions in their sojourn through slavery and even now, was a strong palliative against the pervasive poverty and racism that surrounded Hamer and could, in a less determined person, have weakened resolve (Williams, 1993, p. 144).

Servant Leaders. Williams defines Hamer as a servant leader, and weaves Robert Greenleaf's ideas of servant leadership into her description. Hamer was

committed "to serving others through a cause, a crusade, a movement, a campaign with humanitarian, not materialistic, goals," writes Williams (1996, p. 145). Hamer eschewed personal gain to achieve a greater good; she was guided by a prophetic, transforming vision, was willing to lead in the face of adversity, relied on her intuition, and was persuasive.

Participatory Democracy. Most black women leaders have embodied this leadership style; Ella Baker has been hailed as its champion. This decentralized leadership style is cited as the underlying strength of the civil rights movement. Ella Baker knew that she had a different leadership style than the black male leaders: She was a strong supporter of participatory democracy and admitted to having no ambition to be in formal leadership roles:

> As an astute and seasoned organizer, Baker believed that the most effective strat-egy for sustaining activism among local people would be to develop a decentral-ized, group-centered approach to leadership which would minimize hierarchy and involve grassroots people in the decisions affecting their lives. In describing her own approach to activism, Ella Baker once commented that "the kind of role that I tried to play was to pick up pieces or put together pieces out of which I hoped organization might come. My theory is strong people don't need strong leaders." (Crawford, 2001, p. 109)

Black women in their homes, churches, social clubs, organizations, and communities throughout the South performed valuable leadership roles during the modern civil rights movement in the United States. Although race, gender, and class constraints generally prohibited their being the recognized articulators, spokespersons, and media favorites, these women did perform a multiplicity of significant leadership roles, such as the initiation and organization of action, the formulation of tactics, and the provision of crucial resources (e.g., money, com-munication channels, and personnel) necessary to sustain the movement. Sisters in struggle, they were empowered through their activism (Barnett, 1993, p. 17).

Other Cultural Variables

Culture in organizations varies along many dimensions beyond ethnicity and race. One is whether processes are bureaucratic or entrepreneurial, and another is whether procedures are loose or tight. These are also aspects of fit. Just as an Anglo man would have a hard time leading a Latino domestic vio-lence organization, an entrepreneur would struggle trying to budge a bureau-cratic organization into rapid, risk-taking action, and a leader who by experience and temperament likes order, upon entering a loosely structured organiza-tion, might institute clear-cut rules and procedures only to provoke wide-scale resistance if not rebellion.

Two cases of leadership in nonprofit agencies supporting children, one in Massachusetts and one in North Carolina, shed light on fit within a cultural and community context. In Massachusetts, Suzin Bartley's leadership is almost perfectly attuned to her state's blend of progressive social programs and Irish-dominated politics. She is passionate about protecting children. She is a political pragmatist. She is "connected." Bartley is the granddaughter, niece, cousin, and friend of generations of Irish politicians. One might say that the Massachusetts State House is the community in which she was raised, and the community she can call on in times of need.

Suzin Bartley has helped build the Children's Trust Fund (CTF) of Massachusetts from a start-up to an extensive, statewide effort to prevent child abuse by supporting parents and strengthening families. Each of the 50 states has a CTF, but the Massachusetts version is generally considered the national standard-bearer. As an umbrella organization, it funds, evaluates, and promotes the work of over 100 agencies that serve thousands of families. CTF sponsors innovative pro-grams such as Healthy Families that brings young paraprofessionals into the homes of teenage mothers in an effort both to decrease pregnancies among young teenagers and to teach mothering skills that protect the children of these mothers. Through its Fatherhood Initiative, CTF has intensified efforts to raise public aware-ness about the important role fathers play in their children's lives. CTF also funds parenting education and support programs and the Massachusetts Family Centers.

The home visitors that Bartley hires for the Healthy Families program are based in agencies throughout the state. During their orientation, they are taught how to interview, form relationships, and support teenage mothers. But unlike most other social workers, they are also instructed to make connections with their state representatives and taught how to do so. They invite elected officials to parties, provide photo opportunities, and form relationships. In this way, they serve as political liaisons. When CTF funding has been threatened, Suzin has called not only on her powerful, high-profile board members to go to bat for her but also on her legion of home visitor "ward healers" to talk to their representatives and, in some cases, to call in their small but sometimes meaningful chips. This fit well with Massachusetts's political culture; the exist-ing structure could be used effectively in the service of young children with a high risk profile for physical abuse.

In North Carolina, Lindalyn Kakadelis is the executive director of the Children's Scholarship Fund (CSF), which provides scholarships to private schools for poor children in Charlotte. Her leadership style is as suited to the working and middle class population of Charlotte, North Carolina, as Suzin Bartley's is to Massachusetts.

Lindalyn Kakadelis is a humble woman whose husband is minister of a conservative church. Kakadelis believes in what she is doing—helping poor children "escape" the public schools and enter faith-based institutions. At

meetings, not confident in her own abilities, her style is to let others take charge. But lack of confidence in any "leadership abilities" does not stop her from working tirelessly for her beliefs. As a result, she pulls many other—also humble—people with her. They like her, feel comfortable with her, and trust her.

Dennis Williams, a former public school principal, formerly interim superintendent of schools for Charlotte-Mecklenburg County, the 18th largest school district in the country, and now executive director of a youth organization that "brings Christian faith to the schools," is "completely confident in Lindalyn." When asked in a focus group that Lindalyn had gathered if he would be interested in continued involvement with CSF, Williams said, in a slow, quiet, but unhesitating way, "I'd stay involved with anything led by Lindalyn. She knows that." This is all the more remarkable since Kakadelis is a white southern woman and Williams is an African American man. Falinda Farley, an African American mother of seven who sang for Tammy Bakker's TV ministry, "seconded the emotion."

Lindalyn Kakadelis is a leader by definition, in that people follow her lead, but that's not it exactly—they join her in a common cause. If she is the one in front, they follow. When they are in front, she follows. She serves on Dennis Williams's board, for example. Her followers don't look up to her; surely she doesn't look down on them. She has little positional power, but she's confident that if she calls, if she asks something of them, they will come through—not for her, but for the cause. This was how she had been elected to the Charlotte-Mecklenburg school board and to other leadership positions. The idea and the practice of leadership are fluid and situational, not fixed and not located in a person.

Her failures, however, may be equally instructive. When she tried to attract the rich and well educated—to contribute to CSF, for example—she failed. People would not even return her telephone calls. None of this simply rolled off her back. Instead, it hurt her feelings and reinforced her low opinion of herself.

For CSF to survive and grow, it would have to develop a sustainable funding base, which meant finding ways to reach the moneyed community. Lindalyn Kakadelis would readily let go leadership of CSF if it could thrive under someone else—she had plenty of other work, plenty of other causes, to keep her busy, she said. Dee Schwab, a member of Charlotte's moneyed community and friend of a philanthropist interested in supporting CSF, was the right person for the job, that is, to head the CSF board and eventually to hire an executive director who better fit the professional image that donors preferred. Dee had gone to the same country day schools and colleges—the University of North Carolina or Duke—and served on the same boards as those CSF was now trying to reach. Her manners were their manners. The books, movies, and vacation spots she mentioned were familiar to others of her group. She spoke with the same accent and in the same speech rhythms as they, which were clearly

distinguishable from Kakadelis and Williams. Upon agreeing to the job, Schwab rapidly began to shift the CSF image, to explore new, more professional-looking office space that would make potential donors comfortable, and to develop classy marketing materials. These are "the little things that make a difference," she said. In this next phase of CSF's organizational life, she was no doubt the right person for the job. She fit CSF as well at this stage as Kakadelis had during its grassroots beginnings.

Zeitgeist

The zeitgeist—literally, spirit of the times—is a variation on the cultural demands already discussed, but it adds the element of time. In Chapter 4, we described the current cultural narrative of leadership, ending with the observation that we may be on the verge of a paradigm shift in our cultural leadership narrative. Comparable shifting ideas characterize communities and other social sectors, prescribing and proscribing certain qualities.

In the early 1990s research on the demographics of American Jews reported that the birthrate had dropped below two per couple, which meant that the Jewish population, already small, was declining. This was compounded by what many saw as a disastrous rate of intermarriage with Christian Americans: 52 percent nationally and up to 75 percent in areas of the South, Southwest, and West, which was where Jews were migrating. Synagogue membership was also declining; even among those who remained on the membership rolls, attendance was sporadic at best; and knowledge of ritual, observance, and history was extremely low. The long-sought road to acceptance in American society—the first society to accept Jews on equal terms and with a minimum of anti-Semitism—was exacting a potentially terrible toll: assimilation so great that it seemed to threaten the survival of the Jews as a distinct people. A near panic set in. That was the zeitgeist.

In response, 12 very wealthy men gathered to see what they could do to help. They decided that they would create an organization that would fund and support new Jewish day schools. This was 1997. Their purpose was to nurture a cadre of knowledgeable, dedicated people who would at least preserve the core of the historical Jewish experience. To head their organization, they tapped Josh Elkin, a midforties rabbi, who had himself led a Jewish day school. Elkin and the organization he formed, the Partnership for Excellence in Jewish Education (PEJE), have been wildly successful, helping to start up countless new schools, to support ongoing schools, to convene and train Jewish educators throughout the country, and to gain at least some support from other Jewish organizations ordinarily wary of new, competitive initiatives in the field.

Josh Elkin is hardly a leader of Mosaic proportions, capable of leading the Jews out of Egypt. In fact, he is small of stature, gentle by nature, and happy to have others take center stage. But he is the right man at the right time. He is

smart, articulate, and passionate in his Jewish identification. He also has an odd combination of traits. On one hand, Elkin is passionate in his approach to the cause of Jewish day schools. On the other hand, he is a compromiser and a reconciler who is able to bring people together and affirm many sides of contentious situations. He can see many sides of an argument—some even accuse him of indecisiveness. But he is great in a boardroom. With his sponsors, he submerges his specific passions to their demands. Thus he continues to raise funds for PEJE. Yet he is impatient by temperament. When confronted with detailed planning efforts that threaten to go on and on, he balks. "Let's get it out the door," he'll exclaim. There's no time to waste with obsessive research and planning. By turning his back on perfectionism, he has proven an excellent entrepreneur, moving forward and forward against whatever odds exist.

In effect, Elkin is an almost perfect fit for the current crisis zeitgeist. He is rooted in Jewish traditional values, which makes him acceptable to virtually all strains of Judaism. And he is contemporary enough to try all kinds of organizational methods in order to take on the challenge of saving the Jews from continued loss of identity.

During the bull market of the 1990s, many newly wealthy individuals emerged from both the high technology and financial sectors and wondered how they might contribute to less fortunate members of their society. They were not sure how to do so but believed that the nonprofit organizations they would support should mirror their own entrepreneurial spirit. They wanted to identify and help nonprofit organizations that were lean, efficient, and innovative and that had capable leaders with big ideas that could grow rapidly and exert a major influence on American society. City Year is a well-known example of the type of nonprofit supported by these social venture leaders.

A variation on this theme is the intermediary organization, which brokers between foundations and wealthy individuals on the one hand and nonprofits on the other. These intermediaries sprung up and thrived with awesome rapidity during the 1990s. Rick Little, for example, founded the International Youth Foundation (IYF). With a stunning initial grant in the vicinity of $60 million from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, he built an organization that funneled money from both foundations and corporations into foundations in 60 nations, each a subsidiary of IYF, each dedicated to identifying and supporting nonprofit organizations and public agencies providing services to underprivileged youth. Rick Little is an idealist with considerable business savvy, a charismatic speaker and a relentless organizer, who is as much at home on the dusty streets of a Mexico City slum as in the boardrooms of the Ford, Rockefeller, and Clark Foundations and of Procter and Gamble, Coca-Cola, Lucent, and the Bank of England, all sponsors of IYF.

Peter Karoff is yet another kind of intermediary leader. He is not a young idealist. He earned his spurs as a businessman, building a successful insurance

business, and as a citizen, working for countless causes and sitting on dozens of nonprofit boards over decades. In his early fifties, Peter Karoff cast off his business to start The Philanthropic Initiative, which helps wealthy individuals "invest" in causes that suit their values and means. Even more than Rick Little, Peter Karoff had built up credibility in both worlds, neither of which exactly fit his temperament. He is, by nature, a matchmaker, and that is what the times called for.

These social venture and intermediary leaders have responded to a powerful cultural trend, providing it guidance and manpower. They have proven to be the right people in the right place at the right time; in other words, they fit the zeitgeist.

THE PULL OF THE MARKET

Like corporations, nonprofit organizations have markets. Funding and popular demand for certain services, for example, can become "hot." Some people happen to be in the right place when demand for their services escalates. And some leaders with a flexible and opportunistic bent take advantage of such market openings. We have seen both versions of such good timing in innumerable fields. For example, there were grassroots drug treatment, domestic violence and child abuse centers, and hospices that benefited tremendously when state and federal funding turned their way. There are other organizations that happened to be well positioned when state governments insisted on consolidation—they wanted to deal with fewer nonprofit organizations. Advocates, a mental health agency providing care for both formerly hospitalized mental patients and developmentally delayed adults, was well positioned when state government insisted on such consolidation—they had funds, plans, and a leader eager to take advantage of the market to spread what he believed were the tremendous skills of his agency. Many small organizations have benefited by such market turns, but, of course, they benefited over the long run only with effective leadership. For every Casa Myrna, for instance, there were many other domestic violence agencies that closed their doors within a year or two of opening.

Stages of Organizational Development: The Right Fit for Each Stage

As we have suggested throughout the book, the type of leadership organizations need changes as the organizations move through developmental stages.

For example, many startup or grassroots organizations are almost completely led by single leaders. As they grow, however, power may be shared in two ways. First, it may be shared with functional executives who complement the leader's entrepreneurial enthusiasms with a more systematic approach. A COO or a CFO may be hired for this purpose. With increasing scale, some organizations form leadership teams. Second, boards often move from a rubber-stamp to a strong governing personality and function. This shift happens frequently in response to financial and human resource problems created by entrepreneurial leaders or leadership transitions—boards will step in to govern the process and will remain powerful, monitoring and holding functional leaders accountable. Then, if powerful leaders emerge, they may win over their boards, stock them with their own choices, and essentially make their boards a rubber stamp again—until the next crisis or succession issue.

To examine the stages of organization development a little more closely and see the potential fit between leader and organization at each stage, we will focus on concrete examples taken from a study of how Jewish day schools evolve (Dym, 2003).

STAGE 1: THE BIRTH OF A VISION

Developmental Challenge 1: Clarifying the Vision

To begin, the challenge is to move from a limited idea to a clear vision, a vision that is compelling enough to move people to the next stage of planning.

As with most organizations, new schools generally begin as an idea, a vision, a yearning in the mind of an individual or small group. In one instance, a father has a fierce desire to pass on the tradition in which he was raised. In another, parents want to give their children what they lacked. In a third, parents want to extend a satisfying preschool program into the elementary school grades. In a fourth, a parent-educator wanted a more progressive, up-to-date curriculum than is available in the existing day school. In a fifth, people have read about the declining Jewish population and high intermarriage rate and, with mixtures of anxiety and excitement, set out to do their part in preserving the identity and continuity of the Jewish people.

As these "visionaries" continue to dream and to talk with others, their dream takes on increasing reality and urgency. For some, it becomes an obsession. They think about it day and night. It must be realized. They bring others into the conversation and the initial planning.

Leadership fit: At this conceptual stage, the leader must be a dreamer of sorts, able to imagine and articulate an idea and to begin drawing others to that vision. She need not be all that practical or experienced.

STAGE 2: FROM VISION TO PLAN

*Developmental Challenge 2: Developing an
Attractive Plan and Effective Leadership*

There are two crucial challenges to meet in order to move from idea to concrete plan. First, the vision must be turned into a blueprint for future action—from personal discussions to practical plans—and constructed attractively enough to draw families, teachers, administrators, and donors, as well as to keep up the spirits of the founding group. Second, effective leadership must emerge and consolidate its role.

To launch schools, founders—or leaders—have to translate their visions into concrete plans and then act on those plans. During this stage, the founders make initial decisions about who they are and what they want to accomplish, and they build their plan. Some do so in isolation, speaking mostly to themselves. Others continue to expand their knowledge and the circle of participants. The latter group is likely to conduct some kind of feasibility and demographic study to determine, first, whether there is a demand and potential funding for the school and, second, where it should be located. Some perform these activities in informal ways; others hire professional firms to conduct the studies. In some cases, one or two people do everything, following no orderly process discernible from the outside and often taking years before they are ready to launch a school.

In one city, a founder, wanting to start a Jewish community high school, talked with all pulpit rabbis, principals of current elementary schools, and leaders of Jewish communal institutions—virtually anyone who would listen—trying to build support and to develop common ground. Since her main mission was to begin the school, not to infuse it with a particular denominational flavor, her emphasis was on gaining support. Since she had financial support, the support of community leaders was uppermost on her agenda. And, with time, hiring a school head capable of bridging denominational divides was critical. His hiring also made the vision real. The first fund-raising success and the hiring of the head of the new school mark vital substages in the concretization of the school development.

Others, steeped in nonprofit and corporate cultures, follow formal planning procedures. One founding group, for instance, formed several committees—on incorporation, finance, philosophy, site selection, and curriculum—and developed sophisticated bylaws, reflecting their knowledge about how to run effective schools. They created a formal rule that only half the board could consist of parents, thus guaranteeing the perspective of those with less immediate needs from the school, and bringing influential, older community members into their orbit. In an effort to avoid the controlling ways of founders—themselves—they decided to change board presidents every two years.

Although the latter group met the challenge in the more efficient way, it is important to acknowledge that many less professional founders form service- able plans and carry their evolving organizations to the next stage. Generally, the style is entrepreneurial and informal. Roles are not differentiated. People fill in for each other. Action is often helter-skelter. Leadership either emerges and broadens in this heady mix of activities or, in the most isolated groups, simply remains in the hands of the initial visionary. Management capability and style begin to evolve through the planning process. Resources are sought without systematic plans and processes. Excitement builds, as do some anxi- eties based on beginning the real work. Now the idea seems more daunting to some—the launch is at hand—and more feasible to those who are reassured by a plan.

Leadership fit: At this initial stage, both a pure entrepreneurial and a combined entrepreneurial-managerial style work very well. Once organizations are built around either style, however, the next leader will have to fit into that style or realign the organization to fit with a new choice.

STAGE 3: LAUNCHING A NEW SCHOOL

Developmental Challenge 3: Making the School a Reality

The challenge here is to turn the plan into a reality, an operating school, in which classes are conducted, students learn, tuition is paid, other sources of funding are sought, and the preliminary rules of the road are established.

Initial money has been raised. A head of school has been hired. Incor- poration is achieved. Planning and execution take on a new, more urgent reality. The school must be financed. Faculty must be hired, supervised, and trained. Curriculum must be found, adapted, and developed. Space must be located— generally rental at this point. And families must be recruited. All of this con- tinues in a somewhat frantic manner, with the visionary leader or founding group still doing a great deal of the work.

For some, the move from planning to launch awaits a professional. With fewer controlling founders, even those with many ideas of their own, the internal construction of the schools is largely left to the professionals. This is because they firmly believe that the success of the school depends on the pros. This was true in Toronto, St. Louis, and Phoenix. In a Boston day school, a founder and school head were one and the same.

But the internal ecology of the organization is partly shaped by several dynamic processes: how much founders and heads of school differentiate roles, how much the roles and personalities complement one another, how much the founder can let go, and so forth.

If the professional, the head, has been hired, he or she takes on an increasing amount of responsibility, and orderly processes may emerge rapidly. If the school begins without a principal or with an interim principal, the founders take on operating responsibility. Even with principals in place, however, many parent volunteers are reluctant to relinquish control at this exciting moment. Control struggles may emerge and mark the next years of the school's life.

In general, though, volunteers and professionals become teams, filling in for each other, talking constantly. In the absence of established rules and systems, improvisation and creativity are the order of the day. This is both the most anxious stage—a commitment has been made—and the most exciting. When people look back to the romance of beginnings, often this is what they look back to.

Leadership fit: This stage calls for strong but flexible professional leadership. The leader must begin to put in processes, hold people accountable, and establish rules but, at the same time, must allow for considerable variation and change among teachers, students, and parents. The leader must have an ability to tolerate uncertainty—in most cases, not knowing whether student recruitment and fund raising will guarantee the school's survival. And the leader must play many roles: teaching, managing, fund raising, and recruiting. At this point the versatility and flexibility of the leader trumps management skills.

STAGE 4: CREATING A GOOD SUSTAINABLE SCHOOL

Developmental Challenge 4: Professionalizing Management and Developing Ongoing Funding Sources

The challenge is to move from a grassroots or entrepreneurial organization to a professionally managed organization that is sufficiently funded.

The majority of startups, nonprofits and corporations alike, fail within the first few years. It is easier to start than to sustain new ideas and new institutions. Now founders and professionals, together, must manage a transition from the idealistic, entrepreneurial beginnings, when everyone seems to do everything, to a stable organizational structure. In more professional organizations, roles are more defined and differentiated; people are held accountable for their performance; structures and processes (e.g., committees and information systems) are established to support teaching, recruiting, and fund-raising practices; and a supportive culture is built. Perhaps most important, management experience is building.

During this period, there is often a struggle between a visionary founder or group of parents, loath to let go control of the school they so passionately

built, and the professional staff. When the board and the founders are the same group, there is no one to mediate the conflict. When the board is independent of the visionary founder(s), the board can and often does mediate. The struggle is often resolved through either leadership transition or the development of a more formal strategic plan, with indicators of effectiveness built in. Sometimes the visionary founder is left in place and complemented by professional support. The transition may take place smoothly or with great pain, leaving wounds that resurface later.

Leadership fit: This is the time when the balance between professional and entrepreneurial leadership shifts; management skills trump versatility. For the school to grow and thrive, the leader must, first, identify personnel needs; second, either elevate and mentor or hire them; and, third, delegate responsibility to them.

STAGE 5: EARLY MATURITY

Developmental Challenge 5: Managing Growth and Establishing Sustainability

After schools are established, they often continue to grow at a rapid rate. At the beginning of this period, management and infrastructure capabilities, as well as financial resources, are limited and need to be developed at speed and with care.

At this stage, the character of the school has been established, and its staff is largely in place and expanding. Information and other infrastructure systems have been introduced and consolidated. Essentially, people know where to be and what is expected of them. This is true for both the professional staff and the board, which has, by now, established a committee structure, a tradition of governance and a clearer relationship with the school head. Generally, this is not an altogether stable period. It is a period of considerable growth, though not so much aimed toward creating something new as toward expanding what has been established. For example, more classes and grades are added, requiring more teachers and, subsequently, administrators; in some cases, middle schools have been added.

Leadership fit: At this stage, either a thoroughly professional management style has already been established or the school is floundering. The leadership style may have many variations, according to the personality of the leader, the denomination of the school, and the geographic location, among other characteristics. But, as one examines successful schools, management, not entrepreneurial or charismatic, styles prevail.

STAGE 6: MATURITY

Developmental Challenge 6: Harvesting the Field

The challenge is to get the most out of what people have built: to utilize, enjoy, and celebrate.

In this stage, the initial goals have been achieved, and people can feel proud. The school has developed a rhythm and functions in an almost automatic way. Routines reign. Relationships built over the years remain fairly steady, some supportive, some not, managed by the routine. There is the potential to become bureaucratic, even rigid. This is a time when people may look back, longingly, to the beginning, with its spirit of adventure, its close relationships, its adrenaline-filled late-night meetings. But it may also be a stable, safe place that permits individual teachers, students, and families to thrive, to experiment and learn in safe, sustaining ways.

Leadership fit: The ideal fit at this stage is a leader who feels comfortable in and supported enough by the stable organization to begin to implement long-term growth projects, such as capital campaigns to build new physical plants, and innovative plans, such as new, creative curricula. This is a reforming and community-oriented leader, not an entrepreneur or a revolutionary.

STAGE 7: STABILITY

Developmental Challenge 7:
Continuously Changing and Renewing

A new and successful organization can move along quite successfully for a number of years, relatively unchallenged either internally or in its market niche. In doing so, it can grow a little complacent, without sufficiently evaluating and renewing itself. In general, this renewal only happens when there is a challenge, from within or from without, such as the loss of students or the threat of a new school being formed.

There is a tendency for all human systems to grow conservative with time. Bureaucratic tendencies that emerge can harden. Innovation wanes, is even discouraged. Traditions become limitations: "This is how we do it here," people intone when faced with requests for change. This applies to curricula, teacher training, board procedures, marketing, and fund-raising activities alike.

But some people grow discontent with the old way and challenge it, sometimes by leaving and beginning a new school, sometimes by advocating their differences within. These challenges threaten the school. In response to the threat, the school examines itself on some or all of the dimensions that have ossified. When enough people become self-reflective in this way, a period of experiment and new growth often blossoms forth. There is a renewal. This

process of renewal is iterative. If the school lives a long enough life, it will be required to review and renew itself with some regularity, either due to external challenges or due to regular, intentional self-reflection and planning.

Leadership fit: As with the previous stage, the ideal leader is one who is comfortable within the current organization and determined to build for the future. There's a twist, though. This leader must be able to overcome inertia and resistance from traditionalists. This form of leadership must be strong and, to an extent, inner-directed, that is able to take a direction in spite of what other important people say and in spite of organized forms of opposition within boards, parent groups, and faculty. It should be no surprise that this leader is often brought in from the outside rather than one who is thoroughly part of the school culture and systems.

MOVING IN AND OUT OF FIT

Fit comes and goes. In a later chapter, we will describe the cycles of fit and misfit, or alignment and misalignment. For now, we want to illustrate the point with a brief case summary.

The day school case illustrates a sequential fit process, according to several qualities. For example, the school founders (generally a small group of parents), with their abundant time, ability, and willingness to take on operational responsibility, are often the perfect fit for the beginning an organization. Their micromanagement, however, makes it hard for new heads of schools to make their mark and establish their style. Often, initial heads are not strong enough to establish themselves. Without strength, versatility, and flexibility, they are the wrong people for the job at that stage. Then, frequently, board leadership gains understanding and grows weary of operational responsibility. "We have jobs and families," they can be heard to say. So they seek a strong and experienced professional, who, with the waning of entrepreneurial energies and fire on the part of the founding board, becomes the right person for the job. With time, this leader may grow too attached to what she has built, and needs for growth and vibrancy require a new type of leader. At every stage, the leader may be very competent, but when the goodness of fit is lost, the leader must change and grow, or a new leader must be found. In many of the best organizations, leadership development and assignment—the question of fit—is a continual concern. Fit is as critical to organizational success as the individual qualities of the leaders.

The Value of Not Quite Fitting

To conclude, we would add one caveat by way of preview. Although goodness of fit is clearly of benefit to organizations and their leaders, there is value in

not quite fitting. Without complete fit, there must be change. Leaders and organizations must adapt to one another. This can and should be a creative process, in which the leader stretches to meet strategic, operational, and cultural norms that challenge his or her assumptions and abilities, and in which the organization stretches to meet the challenges posed by the leader. Still, the underlying dynamism of fit is central to the notion of alignment.

References

Barnett, B. M. (1993). Invisible Southern black women leaders in the civil rights movement: The triple constraints of gender, race, and class. *Gender & Society, 7*(2), 162–182.

Crawford, V. (2001). African American women in the twenty-first century. In *The American Woman, 1999–2000* (pp. 107–132). New York: Norton.

Dym, B. (2003) *School development and community integration.* Unpublished research paper produced for the Partnership for Excellence in Jewish Education.

Elliot, A. (1996). Ella Baker: Free agent in the civil rights movement. *Journal of Black Studies, 26*(5), 593–603.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences.* New York: Basic Books.

Gilkes, C. T. (1988). Building in many places: Multiple commitments and ideologies in black women's community work. In A. Bookman & S. Morgan (Eds.), *Women and the politics of empowerment.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Gyant, L. (1996). Passing the torch: African American women in the civil rights movement. *Journal of Black Studies, 26*(5), 629–647.

Lerner, R., et al. (2002). Applied developmental science of positive human development. In *Handbook of psychology: Vol 6. Developmental psychology* (pp. 535–553). New York: Wiley.

Naples, N. (1998). *Grassroots warriors: Activists mothering, community work, and the war on poverty.* New York: Routledge.

Parker, P. (2001, August). African American women executives' leadership communication within dominant-culture organizations. *Management Communication Quarterly, 15*(1), 42–82.

Williams, L. E. (1996). *Servants of the people: The 1960s legacy of African-American leadership.* New York: St. Martin's Press.