

Chapter 1 : Teixeira: Why California Model Charts a Better Future Than Trump's GOP "The Democ

Democratic leadership, also known as participative leadership or shared leadership, is a type of leadership style in which members of the group take a more participative role in the decision-making process.

The Kouroukan Fouga divided the Mali Empire into ruling clans lineages that were represented at a great assembly called the Gbara. However, the charter made Mali more similar to a constitutional monarchy than a democratic republic. However, the power to call parliament remained at the pleasure of the monarch. The English Civil War " was fought between the King and an oligarchic but elected Parliament, [51] [52] during which the idea of a political party took form with groups debating rights to political representation during the Putney Debates of After the Glorious Revolution of , the Bill of Rights was enacted in which codified certain rights and liberties, and is still in effect. The Bill set out the requirement for regular elections, rules for freedom of speech in Parliament and limited the power of the monarch, ensuring that, unlike much of Europe at the time, royal absolutism would not prevail. In North America, representative government began in Jamestown, Virginia , with the election of the House of Burgesses forerunner of the Virginia General Assembly in English Puritans who migrated from established colonies in New England whose local governance was democratic and which contributed to the democratic development of the United States ; [56] although these local assemblies had some small amounts of devolved power, the ultimate authority was held by the Crown and the English Parliament. The Puritans Pilgrim Fathers , Baptists , and Quakers who founded these colonies applied the democratic organisation of their congregations also to the administration of their communities in worldly matters. The taxed peasantry was represented in parliament, although with little influence, but commoners without taxed property had no suffrage. The creation of the short-lived Corsican Republic in marked the first nation in modern history to adopt a democratic constitution all men and women above age of 25 could vote [62]. This Corsican Constitution was the first based on Enlightenment principles and included female suffrage , something that was not granted in most other democracies until the 20th century. In the American colonial period before , and for some time after, often only adult white male property owners could vote; enslaved Africans, most free black people and most women were not extended the franchise. Athena has been used as an international symbol of freedom and democracy since at least the late eighteenth century. This was particularly the case in the United States , and especially in the last fifteen slave states that kept slavery legal in the American South until the Civil War. A variety of organisations were established advocating the movement of black people from the United States to locations where they would enjoy greater freedom and equality. Universal male suffrage was established in France in March in the wake of the French Revolution of Fascism and dictatorships flourished in Nazi Germany , Italy , Spain and Portugal , as well as non-democratic governments in the Baltics , the Balkans , Brazil , Cuba , China , and Japan , among others. The democratisation of the American, British, and French sectors of occupied Germany disputed [82] , Austria, Italy, and the occupied Japan served as a model for the later theory of government change. However, most of Eastern Europe , including the Soviet sector of Germany fell into the non-democratic Soviet bloc. The war was followed by decolonisation , and again most of the new independent states had nominally democratic constitutions.

Chapter 2 : Authoritarian, Democratic & Laissez-Faire Leadership Research Paper Starter - calendrierdelascience.com

*A Better Democratic Model [Thomas J. Coffey] on calendrierdelascience.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. This thought-provoking study analyzes the challenges facing democracy, such as the lack of political accountability to voters due to the strength of party discipline.*

Bell, the author of *The China Model: The event*, co-hosted by the New York Review of Books, also included panelists Timothy Garton Ash, Zhang Taisu, Andrew Nathan, and others, who discussed with Bell the question his book addresses – “does China have an identifiable political model, and if so, what is it? The following ChinaFile conversation includes excerpts, edited for clarity, of that discussion. For much of Chinese imperial history, public officials were selected first by examination and then by performance evaluations at lower levels of government. I call my method contextual political theory: I happen to find myself in China, so what are the leading political ideals of Chinese society? But there is still a huge gap between the ideal and the practice. This ideal is good, at least reasonably good, and can and should continue to inspire political reform in China in the foreseeable future. This is the idea that democracy works well at lower levels of government. But, in a huge country, as you go up the political chain of command, the issues become more complex and mistakes become more costly. Let me say a little bit about the gap between the reality and the ideal. I am not defending the status quo. I am defending this ideal that I use as a standard to evaluate the status quo. How could it be improved? For one thing, democracy at the lower levels of government: All these tools are very important, as well as certain levels of democratic elections at higher levels of government. I think we owe Daniel a debt of gratitude for giving us a much more sophisticated version of the China model than Eric Li , Zhang Weiwei , or the egregious Col. This is at least one we can engage with rationally. Secondly, I think it would be a very good thing if there were a China model. It would be good for China, because it would increase the probability of a peaceful evolution. I would argue many of the problems of the West – the hubris of the Iraq invasion, the financial crisis – are partly derived from the fact that after the end of the Cold War we did not have a serious competitor. So, it would be great if it existed. Thirdly, and this is in agreement with Daniel, clearly there has been significant political reform and change. This is not a version of the Soviet Union. He just said political meritocracy is not working as well as it should. Let me give you one example from the book. He describes a meeting with the minister responsible for the organization department of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party CCP , who describes the selection process for the secretary general of that important department. Nominations from all sides. Examinations put out in the corridor for public scrutiny. A wonderful meritocratic process. There is massive factionalism, factional struggle, clientelism, patronage, and corruption. We know that from numerous studies of the party, and indeed from books the party itself has published. So we know that the selection of that very important person was not the glorious theory described by the ministry of the organization committee. Daniel also mentioned the lack of free speech, the worsening lack of free speech. How you can have a genuine meritocracy, when you cannot publicly canvas all the credible policy alternatives, is very hard to see. So I wish it were true. Nathan , professor of political science at Columbia University: Daniel has said correctly that this is a book of political theory. His training at McGill and his early writing was to promote and explain a theory called communitarianism, which is a critique of liberal democracy that is internal to the West. So this is not really a book about the real China. I want people to understand that Daniel himself is describing the book as a book of theory. What is the theory behind it? Bell mentions three levels: It is chiefly a defense of political meritocracy. And what is meritocracy? My big disagreement with the book is whether the meritocratic selection of people by ability and virtue produces a better form of government. And I think the core fallacy in that argument as theory is that it overlooks the exercise of power. Whether the Chinese system or whether an imaginary meritocratic system could actually select better people than democracy selects is speculative. Whether Xi Jinping is a man of ethical superiority, I doubt, and I think Obama is probably a more virtuous person than Xi Jinping, but who knows? The key to democracy is not in the selection of leaders. The selection of leaders is very important, but what makes democracy better than authoritarianism is the checking of leaders by the

freedom of others, and this is a point I think that Daniel overlooks, though he has acknowledged what he calls a gap between the ideal and the practice in China. That gap is not an accident. That gap is produced by the structure of the political system. He just talks about the imperfections of actual liberal democracies, as they are in practice, and those imperfections exist. I want to further follow on this theoretical discussion. One theoretical concern I had reading the book was whether the book is actually comparing apples to apples and oranges to oranges. The argument of the book goes like this: There is a theory of political meritocracy, which is partially embodied in the Chinese system. It has the potential to generate better governance results, better governance outcomes than this arguably flawed model of Western democracy. In a sense, you are judging both the Chinese model and the Western model on whether it generates good governance results. But that is, to some political theorists, kind of a strange way to judge the Western democratic model, because the Western democratic model initially conceived, especially for example in the early American republic, was not necessarily purely or even primarily designed to generate good governance results. It was designed to further the democratic ideal of one person, one vote, of representative government. The core virtue of democratic government was in the innate legitimacy and the innate justice of elections, of the selection process. In which case, arguing that democracy tends to generate bad governance results tends to miss the theoretical point of what actually makes democracy go in democratic countries. And you could even further this point to discuss whether this also overlooks some certain theoretical aspects of the meritocracy model. For example, if you look at the meritocracy model and how it functions in late imperial China by the examination system, because of the shrinking of the size of the state throughout the Qing [dynasty], the state goes from extracting eight to nine percent of GDP per year as state revenue to pretty much less than one percent by the end of the dynasty. The increasing insignificance of the state meant that generating good governance via the state itself was of increasing less importance. But that said, the overwhelming social importance of the examination still held. And why was that? Because in the mind of Chinese elites, this is the only just way, the only socially legitimate way to select leaders, through an open, transparent, free-for-all academic examination. So there is also an element of selection-based legitimacy in the meritocracy model as well. Even purely evaluating that model on the basis of whether it generates good governance results may be overlooking some of the other things that go into whether that model actually functions or not. Perhaps a separate question the book should perhaps ask, but at this point does not fully ask, is “does either model agree with the perceived social legitimacy of selection in either society? Are they actually selecting leaders in a perceived-to-be legitimate way, based on the conditions of their own society? Of course what is perceived to be a legitimate way of selection evolves over time, and you could argue that in China today, what may be the most socially legitimate way and socially popular way of selecting leaders may be considerably more democratic than the party allows. That could be a problem.

Chapter 3 : LOL: Democrats Roll Out Their New Slogan, and It's hilariously Bad

Is the China Model Better Than Democracy? But that is, to some political theorists, kind of a strange way to judge the Western democratic model, because the Western democratic model initially.

These three styles of leadership comprise the classical styles of leadership seen in traditional groups and organizations. The sociology of authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership is explored in four parts: Understanding the role that authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles play in groups is vital background for all those interested in the sociology of social interaction in groups and organizations. Different leadership styles or behaviors have different effects on the dynamics of groups and organizations. There are three classical leadership styles or behaviors: Authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership. For instance, authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership vary in the degree of control that they give their followers. Authoritarian leaders give their followers little to no control of their environment. Democratic leaders give their followers partial control over their tasks and decision-making process. Laissez-faire leaders give their followers almost total control over their environments. Kurt Lewin " was the pioneering social psychologist credited with defining and differentiating between the three classical leadership styles or behaviors. Lewin, considered by many to be the founder of social psychology, made significant contributions to leadership studies, organizational theory, and management theory. Based on extensive leadership and group dynamics experiments, Lewin developed the concept of leadership climates. Lewin characterized leadership climates as authoritarian, democratic, or laissez-faire Lewin et al, Critics of Lewin argue that he never developed his classical leadership model beyond a rough conceptual sketch. This article introduces authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles. The sociology of authoritarian, democratic and laissez-faire leadership is explored in four parts: An overview of the basic principles of the authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles; A discussion of the sociology of group and organizational leadership; A review of the ways in which social scientists apply authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire theories of leadership to research setting and questions; and An exploration of the issues associated with choosing a particular leadership style. Authoritarian Leadership Authoritarian leaders, also referred to as autocratic leaders, are characterized as domineering. Authoritarian leaders make policies and decide appropriate division of labor from afar. They tend to be distant and aloof from their group. Authoritarian leadership is gained through punishment, threat, demands, orders, rules, and regulations. Authoritarian leadership is appropriate in settings with a constant stream of new employees, limited decision-making time or resources, and the need for large-scale coordination with other groups and organizations. Authoritarian leadership is not suited to environments in which members desire to share their opinions and participate in decision-making processes. Critics of authoritarian leadership argue that the leadership style leads to high member dissatisfaction, turn-over, and absenteeism Gastil, Democratic Leadership Democratic leaders are characterized by collective decision-making, camaraderie, active member or follower involvement, fair praise, and restrained criticism; they facilitate collective decision-making. Democratic leaders offer their followers choices and support. Democratic leadership, also referred to as participative leadership, reflects democratic principles and processes including inclusiveness, self-determination, and equal participation. That said, democratic leaders should not be confused with those who hold elected positions of power. Democratic leaders often lack formal position and power. For example, Mohandas Gandhi " , an Indian peace activist and leader, was a democratic leader who lacked a formal position of power. Democratic leadership gains its authority through accountability, active participation, cooperation, and delegation of tasks and responsibilities. The functions of democratic leadership include distributing responsibility within the group or organization, empowering members, and facilitating group deliberations. Democratic leadership is appropriate in particular settings such as an international association, a democratic nation, a worker-owner corporation, a public university, a close-knit neighborhood, or a cooperative social group or organization. Democratic leadership is not useful or required in groups and organizations with clearly defined and unchanging guidelines, roles, and practices. Ultimately, the role of a democratic leader is ideally shared in a group or organization. Democratic

leadership is distributed and changing. Within a democratic leadership climate or environment, there will be multiple leaders and every member will be a leader at some point during their membership in the group Gastil, Laissez-Faire Leadership Laissez-faire leaders are characterized as uninvolved with their followers and members; in fact, laissez-faire leadership is an absence of leadership style. Leaders of this style make no policies or group-related decisions. Instead, group members are responsible for all goals, decisions, and problem solving. Laissez-faire leaders have very little to no authority within their group organization. The functions of laissez-faire leadership include trusting their members or followers to make appropriate decisions and bringing in highly trained and reliable members into the group or organization. The roles of laissez-faire followers include self-monitoring, problem solving, and producing successful end products. Laissez-faire leaders are most successful in environments with highly trained and self-directed followers. Laissez-faire leadership is appropriate in particular settings such as science laboratories or established companies with long-term employees. Laissez-faire leadership is not suited to environments in which the members require feedback, direction, oversight, flexibility, or praise Gastil, Bass " in Bass based his model on the work of social scientist James MacGregor Burns b. Burns argued that every leadership process may be classified as transactional, transforming, or laissez-faire leadership. Transformational leadership refers to a leadership style in which the leader encourages his or her subordinates to achieve increasingly higher levels of performance for the sake of the organization The entire section is 4, words.

Chapter 4 : Democracy - Wikipedia

Is the China Model Better Than Democracy? Daniel A. Bell, Timothy Garton Ash, Andrew J. Nathan and Taisu Zhang, because the Western democratic model initially conceived, especially for example.

Toggle display of website navigation ChinaFile: Meritocracy could avoid the pitfalls of American-style politics -- at least in theory. October 19, , 5: Bell, the author of *The China Model*: The event, co-hosted by the New York Review of Books, also included panelists Timothy Garton Ash, Zhang Taisu, Andrew Nathan, and others, who discussed with Bell the question his book addresses "does China have an identifiable political model, and if so, what is it? The following ChinaFile conversation includes excerpts, edited for clarity, of that discussion. For much of Chinese imperial history, public officials were selected first by examination and then by performance evaluations at lower levels of government. I call my method contextual political theory: I happen to find myself in China, so what are the leading political ideals of Chinese society? But there is still a huge gap between the ideal and the practice. This ideal is good, at least reasonably good, and can and should continue to inspire political reform in China in the foreseeable future. This is the idea that democracy works well at lower levels of government. But, in a huge country, as you go up the political chain of command, the issues become more complex and mistakes become more costly. Let me say a little bit about the gap between the reality and the ideal. I am not defending the status quo. I am defending this ideal that I use as a standard to evaluate the status quo. How could it be improved? For one thing, democracy at the lower levels of government: All these tools are very important, as well as certain levels of democratic elections at higher levels of government. I think we owe Daniel a debt of gratitude for giving us a much more sophisticated version of the China model than Eric Li , Zhang Weiwei , or the egregious Col. This is at least one we can engage with rationally. Secondly, I think it would be a very good thing if there were a China model. It would be good for China, because it would increase the probability of a peaceful evolution. I would argue many of the problems of the West "the hubris of the Iraq invasion, the financial crisis" are partly derived from the fact that after the end of the Cold War we did not have a serious competitor. So, it would be great if it existed. Thirdly, and this is in agreement with Daniel, clearly there has been significant political reform and change. This is not a version of the Soviet Union. He just said political meritocracy is not working as well as it should. Let me give you one example from the book. He describes a meeting with the minister responsible for the organization department of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party CCP , who describes the selection process for the secretary general of that important department. Nominations from all sides. Examinations put out in the corridor for public scrutiny. A wonderful meritocratic process. There is massive factionalism, factional struggle, clientelism, patronage, and corruption. We know that from numerous studies of the party, and indeed from books the party itself has published. So we know that the selection of that very important person was not the glorious theory described by the ministry of the organization committee. Daniel also mentioned the lack of free speech, the "worsening lack of free speech. How you can have a genuine meritocracy, when you cannot publicly canvas all the credible policy alternatives, is very hard to see. So I wish it were true. Nathan , professor of political science at Columbia University: Daniel has said correctly that this is a book of political theory. His training at McGill and his early writing was to promote and explain a theory called communitarianism, which is a critique of liberal democracy that is internal to the West. So this is not really a book about the real China. I want people to understand that Daniel himself is describing the book as a book of theory. What is the theory behind it? Bell mentions three levels: It is chiefly a defense of political meritocracy. And what is meritocracy? My big disagreement with the book is whether the meritocratic selection of people by ability and virtue produces a better form of government. And I think the core fallacy in that argument as theory is that it overlooks the exercise of power. Whether the Chinese system or whether an imaginary meritocratic system could actually select better people than democracy selects is speculative. Whether Xi Jinping is a man of ethical superiority, I doubt, and I think Obama is probably a more virtuous person than Xi Jinping, but who knows? The key to democracy is not in the selection of leaders. The selection of leaders is very important, but what makes democracy better than authoritarianism is the checking of leaders

by the freedom of others, and this is a point I think that Daniel overlooks, though he has acknowledged what he calls a gap between the ideal and the practice in China. That gap is not an accident. That gap is produced by the structure of the political system. He just talks about the imperfections of actual liberal democracies, as they are in practice, and those imperfections exist. I want to further follow on this theoretical discussion. One theoretical concern I had reading the book was whether the book is actually comparing apples to apples and oranges to oranges. The argument of the book goes like this: There is a theory of political meritocracy, which is partially embodied in the Chinese system. It has the potential to generate better governance results, better governance outcomes than this arguably flawed model of Western democracy. In a sense, you are judging both the Chinese model and the Western model on whether it generates good governance results. But that is, to some political theorists, kind of a strange way to judge the Western democratic model, because the Western democratic model initially conceived, especially for example in the early American republic, was not necessarily purely or even primarily designed to generate good governance results. It was designed to further the democratic ideal of one person, one vote, of representative government. The core virtue of democratic government was in the innate legitimacy and the innate justice of elections, of the selection process. In which case, arguing that democracy tends to generate bad governance results tends to miss the theoretical point of what actually makes democracy go in democratic countries. And you could even further this point to discuss whether this also overlooks some certain theoretical aspects of the meritocracy model. For example, if you look at the meritocracy model and how it functions in late imperial China by the examination system, because of the shrinking of the size of the state throughout the Qing [dynasty], the state goes from extracting eight to nine percent of GDP per year as state revenue to pretty much less than one percent by the end of the dynasty. The increasing insignificance of the state meant that generating good governance via the state itself was of increasing less importance. But that said, the overwhelming social importance of the examination still held. And why was that? Because in the mind of Chinese elites, this is the only just way, the only socially legitimate way to select leaders, through an open, transparent, free-for-all academic examination. So there is also an element of selection-based legitimacy in the meritocracy model as well. Even purely evaluating that model on the basis of whether it generates good governance results may be overlooking some of the other things that go into whether that model actually functions or not. Perhaps a separate question the book should perhaps ask, but at this point does not fully ask, is “does either model agree with the perceived social legitimacy of selection in either society? Are they actually selecting leaders in a perceived-to-be legitimate way, based on the conditions of their own society? Of course what is perceived to be a legitimate way of selection evolves over time, and you could argue that in China today, what may be the most socially legitimate way and socially popular way of selecting leaders may be considerably more democratic than the party allows. That could be a problem. He is the author of *The China Model*: Nathan is a professor of political science at Columbia University.

Chapter 5 : Is the China Model Better Than Democracy? – Foreign Policy

An inclusive democracy today can only take the form of a confederal democracy that is based on a network of administrative councils whose members or delegates are elected from popular face-to-face democratic assemblies in the various demoi.

Democratic Leadership Style What is it? The democratic leadership style is a very open and collegial style of running a team. Ideas move freely amongst the group and are discussed openly. Everyone is given a seat at the table, and discussion is relatively free-flowing. This style is needed in dynamic and rapidly changing environments where very little can be taken as a constant. In these fast moving organizations, every option for improvement has to be considered to keep the group from falling out of date. The democratic leadership style means facilitating the conversation, encouraging people to share their ideas, and then synthesizing all the available information into the best possible decision. The democratic leader must also be able to communicate that decision back to the group to bring unity the plan is chosen. When is it Used? When situations change frequently, democratic leadership offers a great deal of flexibility to adapt to better ways of doing things. Unfortunately, it is also somewhat slow to make a decision in this structure, so while it may embrace newer and better methods; it might not do so very quickly. Democratic leadership style can bring the best out of an experienced and professional team. It capitalizes on their skills and talents by letting them share their views, rather than simply expecting them to conform. If a decision is very complex and broad, it is important to have the different areas of expertise represented and contributing input –” this is where democratic leader shines. Good fits for Democratic Leadership: Creative groups advertising, design: Much of the Service industry: How to be effective with this position: If the marketplace of ideas is going to be open for business, everyone needs to feel comfortable enough to put their ideas on the table. The democratic leadership style thrives when all the considerations are laid out for everyone to examine. If the conversation begins to stray, remind everyone of the goal on hand and then steer it back. Make sure to take note of off-topic comments and try to return to them when they are pertinent. Be ready to commit: In the democratic leadership style, you get presented with so many possibilities and suggestions that it can be overwhelming and difficult to commit. But as the leader, when the time comes, you have to choose and do so with conviction. The team depends on the clear and unambiguous mandates to be committed. It is important, however, that you create a healthy environment where those ideas are entertained and considered --not maligned-- or the flow of ideas will slow to a trickle. You want the advocates of the solutions that were not selected to understand that their thoughts were considered and had validity, but that ultimately you had strong reasons to go a different direction. To learn more about leadership, please sign up for our newsletter!

Chapter 6 : The Social Change Model of Leadership Development | Central Michigan University

A democratic leadership style is an open approach to leading, where decision making is shared and the views of a team or group are valued and contribute to the vision, goals and decision that are made.

Home About organisations Autocratic versus Democratic leadership: Are you the right tool for the right job? Autocratic versus Democratic leadership: The best leadership is said to be situational, with effective leaders changing their approach to accommodate their situation. This can become a challenge when the situation changes rapidly or when the leader is capable of only one approach. According to Bernard Bass , an author and researcher of all things leadership, the autocratic leader tends to: Democratic leaders on the other hand demonstrate the following attributes: So which is better according to research? While the autocratic approach is best applied when organisations need to be turned around quickly, it is also most frequently associated with workers quitting their jobs. Autocratic leadership tends to be more punitive and the inherent close supervision increases role ambiguity, reduces productivity, and decreases group harmony. The democratic approach on the other hand works best when it is visibly supported by higher authority, members are well-educated, leaders have the skills to conduct meetings with the members, and time can be afforded for trust to develop. If these factors exist, then the democratic approach results in higher rates of productivity, reduced personnel turnover, reduced absenteeism, and better employee physical and mental health. Which approach is appropriate depends in part on the nature of the follower and the environment. Democratic leadership is desirable in situations where the workforce becomes educated and seeks greater participation, when business becomes more complex, and when the use of advanced technology increases and there is greater emphasis on team expertise. Immature, dependent, and inexperienced subordinates are more likely to expect and accept authoritarian direction, whereas a democratic approach results in more rapid employee development. We are often presented with a value judgement of autocratic leadership as bad and democratic leadership as good. This is not always the case. Authoritarian leadership works best with authoritarian followers in an authoritarian culture. There are times when an authoritarian approach is appropriate, as the leader of a high performing group can afford to be more democratic than the leader of a poor performing group. The right tool for the right job I question how much a leader can operate outside of their preferred method, and to what extent a new leader is necessary when the situation changes. I also question the extent that the leader creates situations that best suits their approach. A strict collaborative democratic approach is not always the answer either. Practical application can be seen as unrealistic, encouraging passivity, and not being appropriate for all situations or serving the wrong cause. Leadership studies identify that great leaders derive pleasure from developing the innate potential of others and operate with an integrity and authenticity that comes from being true to themselves. The success of the approach depends not only on the situation but also on the alignment within the leader. Autocratic leaders create top-down, command-and control-situations best suited for their leadership style. Democratic leaders create collaborative, people-focused environments aligned with their mode of operation. What kind of leader do you think you are and what kind of leader would your followers say you are? Can you and do you change to accommodate your situation? If you are feeling democratic, feel free to collaborate with me in the comments below. If you are overly autocratic, tell me how it is and leave it at that.

Chapter 7 : Democratic leadership style - getting the best from those around you

This involves a "vertical democratic meritocracy," as he puts it, with open democratic elections at the local level, meritocratic assessment (like China's civil-service exam) to choose top.

Change, in other words, is the ultimate goal of the creative process of leadership - to make a better world and a better society for ourself and others. Congruence refers to thinking, feeling, and behaving with consistency, genuineness, authenticity, and honesty towards others. Congruent persons are those whose actions are consistent with their most deeply-held beliefs and convictions. Clearly, personal congruence and consciousness of self are interdependent. Commitment is the psychic energy that motivates the individual to serve and that drives the collective effort. Commitment implies passion, intensity, and duration. Without commitment, knowledge of self is of little value. And without adequate knowledge of self, commitment is easily misdirected. Congruence, in turn, is most readily achieved when the person acts with commitment and knowledge of self. Collaboration is to work with others in a common effort. It constitutes the cornerstone value of the group leadership effort because it empowers self and others through trust. Collaboration multiplies group effectiveness by capitalizing on the multiple talents and perspectives of each group member and on the power of that diversity to generate creative solutions and actions. Collaboration empowers each individual best when there is a clear-cut "division of labor. Common purpose is best achieved when all of the members in the group share in the vision and participate actively in articulating the purpose and goals of the leadership development activity. Recognizing the common purpose and mission of the group helps to generate the high level of trust that any successful collaboration requires. Controversy with Civility recognizes two fundamental realities of any creative group effort: This is best achieved in a collaborative framework and when a common purpose has been identified. Controversy conflict, confrontation can often lead to new, creative solutions to problems, especially when it occurs in an atmosphere of civility, collaboration, and common purpose. Citizenship is the process whereby the individual and the collaborative group become responsibly connected to the community and the society through the leadership development activity. To be a good citizen is to work for positive change on behalf of others and the community. Citizenship thus acknowledges the interdependence of all who are involved in or affected by these efforts. Good citizenship thus recognizes that effective democracy involves individual responsibility as well as individual rights. Permission for use granted by Helen Astin, January

Chapter 8 : New Jersey - Senate Forecast | FiveThirtyEight

repeating Kurt Lewin's earlier "call for a better understanding of the de-tailed nature of democratic leadership and followership through social science research" (p.

At a time when the growing gap between the rich and poor has become a political hot button in developed nations, the region known as Scandinavia has been cited by many scholars as a role model for economic opportunity and equality. These benefits are funded by taxpayers and administered by the government for the benefit of all citizens. The citizens have a high degree of trust in their government and a history of working together to reach compromises and address societal challenges through democratic processes. The model is underpinned by a capitalist economy that encourages creative destruction. While the laws make it is easy for companies to shed workers and implement transformative business models , employees are supported by generous social welfare programs. The result is a system that treats all citizens equally and encourages workforce participation. Gender equality is hallmark trait of the culture that not only results in a high degree of workplace participation by women but also a high level of parental engagement by men. History Helps What makes the Nordic model work? Unlike areas that developed around the formation of large corporate-owned farms, the history of Scandinavia is largely one of family-driven agriculture. The result is a nation of small entrepreneurial enterprises directed by citizens facing the same set of challenges. Solutions that benefit one member of the society are likely to benefit all members. This collective mentality results in a citizenry that trust its government because the government is led by citizens seeking to create programs that benefit everyone. Accordingly, the citizens willingly chose to pay higher taxes in exchange for benefits that they and their family members will get to enjoy. This mindset remained intact as capitalist enterprises developed. Challenges The Nordic model faces some notable pressures to its sustainability. Two of the largest concerns are an aging population and influx of immigrants. In terms of an aging population, a large base of young taxpayers and a smaller population of older residents receiving services is the ideal scenario. As the population balance shifts the other way, benefit reductions are a likely outcome. Fortunately for their citizens, the Nordic nations have willingly chosen a path of greater equality for all citizens and have demonstrated an ability to work through their political differences for the greater good of all. In terms of immigration, Scandinavia attracts a notable influx of newcomers seeking to enjoy the generous public benefits. These new arrivals often come from nations that do not have a long, shared history of making decisions on behalf of the common good. While native Scandinavians tend to have a high degree of participation in the workforce as part of their collective decision to support the amenities their society offers, immigrants do not always share this vision. These new arrivals present a significant burden to the system and could, ultimately, result in its demise. How Globalization Affects Developed Countries Two other concerns include native citizens taking advantage of the generous benefits system and the impact of poor global economic conditions. Again, the culture of cooperation and shared interest in a strong social safety net has enabled these countries to adjust their benefit programs and continue to deliver a wide range of services even in the aftermath of the Great Recession. A Model for Other Nations? The Nordic model has attracted a significant amount of attention from other nations. Many wonder if it provides a template for smaller countries where citizens are more homogeneous in terms of their opinions and experiences yet live in poverty or repression as a result of Marxist government policies. Others believe it provides a template for reforming the unchecked capitalism that has created notable income inequality and dramatic differences between the quality of life between the rich and the poor in prosperous nations. They point out that public services, such as education and government run programs in America are of poor quality and that the rich have access to far better resources than the poor and that implementation of the Nordic model could solve these issues. Opponents of the Nordic model criticize the high taxes, high degree of government intervention and relatively low gross domestic product and productivity, noting that these all limit economic growth. They point out that the Nordic Model redistributes assets, limits the amount of money available for personal spending and consumption and encourages reliance on government subsidized programs. The inability of developed nations to move beyond vitriolic political rhetoric coupled with their

lack of shared culture due to geographically and ethnically diverse populations that lack shared experiences will similarly serve as barriers to implementation of the Nordic model in those countries. In any event, while outsiders argue vigorously in favor of social democracy or against so-called welfare states, the Scandinavians themselves make no effort at all to induce or coerce other nations into adopting the Nordic model. Rather, they seem content to work through their problems together in a collective manner that consistently results in placing them at the pinnacle of global surveys of the happiest people in the world. Trading Center Want to learn how to invest? Get a free 10 week email series that will teach you how to start investing. Delivered twice a week, straight to your inbox.

Chapter 9 : What is Democratic/Participative Leadership? | St. Thomas

I believe Democratic Socialism would be a better form of government because it allows The people adequate representation while at the same time maintaining uniformity throughout the entire country. The difference between Marxian socialism and democratic socialism is that under Marx The Government owns The product of the people.

Participation is key to all successful democratic enterprises. One of the clearest definitions of democratic leadership comes from John Gastil. His article, "A Definition and Illustration of Democratic Leadership" for the Human Relations journal remains relevant to private industry and the free market. Gastil, a professor at Penn State University, has written extensively about jury selection and democratic participation in the deliberations process. His succinct definition of democratic leadership explains that it is conceptually distinct from positions of authority. Locke, a professor emeritus of leadership and motivation at the University of Maryland, offers an expanded definition of democratic leadership by adding participative to the equation. The key to letting subordinates take part in decision-making is to build mature teams with experienced and cooperative people. It empowers employees to have a strong hand in managing organizations. Based on interviews with business leaders and employees, Lewin, Lippitt and White concluded that the democratic leadership style was the most popular among subordinates. Successful democratic leaders differ from autocratic and laissez-faire leaders in two important ways. Unlike autocrats, democratic leaders expect people who report to them to have in-depth experience and to exhibit self-confidence. Unlike the laissez-faire style, which delegates authority to experts, democratic leaders are involved in the decision-making process. Organizations that incorporate the democratic style still need strong leaders who know how to avoid the pitfalls that can trip up collaborative teams when they lose their compass. Apple was a successful company from to , before it almost failed in the mids. Then it became enormously successful again -- precisely because it faltered. In other words, Apple had a vision. Apple lost its vision. Apple regained its vision. In the mids Gateway, Microsoft, Sun Microsystems and other companies reportedly zeroed in on Apple as an acquisition target. Years later, many of those brands disappeared. Apple survived because Steve Jobs learned how to adapt. He hired other experienced leaders and entrusted them to excel. He let them make key decisions. Most of these presidents exhibited traits that reflected a variety of leadership styles. Unlike commanding troops during the American Revolution, Washington was notably democratic when guiding the U. He showed early signs of his democratic leadership style by appointing strong leaders to his staff. His decision not to serve a third term exemplified a democratic leader who knows when to pass the torch. As president, Jefferson was both an authoritarian and democratic leader. As primary author of the U. Declaration of Independence in , Jefferson left no ambiguity about his devotion to democracy: Often considered the epitome of a democratic leader, Lincoln was autocratic in his decisions throughout his presidency. Although his character and principles were democratic in nature, Lincoln was an autocratic leader as president out of necessity. The Civil War demanded decisiveness. Patton, Eisenhower was a strategist and consensus builder. A charismatic leader at heart, Kennedy displayed characteristics of laissez-faire and democratic leadership styles. In other cases, he showed autocratic leadership tendencies, such as his quick decisions during the Cuban Missile Crisis. He surrounded himself with some experienced staff, but he often deferred to inexperienced subordinates when acting authoritatively would have been a better choice. The participatory style works best with experts who know their jobs and carry out their responsibilities under minimal supervision. This is true for: Pharmaceutical companies have educated chemists who work well in collaborative teams on development projects. Such companies also require autocratic leaders who supervise subordinates in automated assembly-line operations. Hospitals and healthcare testing facilities call for a blend of leadership styles. Hospital administration " requires autocratic leadership to ensure consistency and accountability. Many are startups with engineering and software development teams that work collaboratively under democratic leaders. In successful cases, these firms evolve from laissez-faire startups to democratic-led enterprises to mature autocratic companies. Companies that reflect democratic leadership principles Most successful companies evolve, and their leaders

display a mix of leadership styles. Founders Sergey Brin and Larry Page developed their Internet search engine while pursuing their doctorates at Stanford. After obtaining initial financing, they did something unusual. Brin and Page followed the advice of experienced entrepreneurs and hired Eric Schmidt to jump-start their company. A pioneer in the discovery and development of restriction enzymes to develop biological drugs, Genentech was started by Robert Swanson and Herbert Boyer. They faced competition for financial resources and talent when they launched the company in Recombinant DNA technology was a mystery to all but a few forward-looking biologists and chemists. William Mayo and his family, the hospital, healthcare and research facility attracts some of the most brilliant minds in the medical field because it gives them opportunities to work collaboratively among peers on democratic teams. When it launched, Amazon was known for selling books. It started as a laissez-faire company, with Jeff Bezos as final arbitrator of all key decisions. Today, Amazon sells everything imaginable, including cloud services and big data security storage. Amazon is necessarily autocratic because of its commitment to timely customer service. At its core, however, the company retains its democratic values among C-suite executives, division heads and project directors. The participatory leadership style is also well-suited for educational institutions with collaborative environments. She has also made fans of investors with smart divestitures and acquisitions, such as Tropicana, Quaker Oats and Gatorade. Now a professor at Harvard Business School, George says he felt hamstrung by the bureaucratic processes before joining Medtronic. A successful baseball pitcher before coaching, Lasorda bonded with his players. As manager of the Los Angeles Dodgers from to , Lasorda won two World Series championships, four National League pennants and eight division titles. Most managers would not have sent an injured batter to the plate against an ace pitcher. Gibson hit a home run and helped the Dodgers win the series. She has made the tough decisions expected of IBM CEOs, such as selling its profitable but slowing server business and reducing staff. IBM is partnering with healthcare companies, government enterprises and social media firms to leverage its strengths in cognitive computing. He has a reputation for seeking input from others on key decisions. Kent has an inclusive style that reflects his commitment to diversity. The New York-born executive is as committed to improving managerial processes and manufacturing efficiencies as he is to teamwork. As CEO, Kent built collaborative management teams to address slowing sales growth and tackled challenges from global competitors, reflecting a blend of autocratic and democratic styles. Democratic leaders seek participation from a wide range of people, including women. Many of them blended different leadership styles or evolved to adopt the characteristics of democratic leaders. Here are some quotations that reveal their devotion to democratic and participatory leadership: There has to be a business, and the business has to make sense. You do it because you have something meaningful that motivates you. Squeeze too hard and you kill it, not hard enough and it flies away. And also from the man who makes the same mistake twice. Twitter It should come as no surprise that a company devoted to instantaneously spreading the word about anything and everything in characters or less has a reputation for being collaborative. Twitter, which has seen fits and starts since its founding nearly a decade ago, has a shared leadership style that starts at the top. It remains so today. Dorsey, who has been called "the real core co-founder," never wavered from his vision of Twitter as a text-messaging service that would change the world as we know it -- or as the young Dorsey knew it when he started coding Twitter two decades ago. Dorsey is both a democratic and a laissez-faire leader. A consummate multitasker, his family and peers know him as a utilitarian hipster with fashion sense. He dislikes all waste and cherishes his haircuts. He grew up listening to C-band radio dispatches of emergency personnel responding to crimes and fires, false alarms and deadly events. Although Dorsey has returned in the role of executive chairman, Twitter remains minimalist and collaborative. Like Dorsey, Twitter has taken several years to find its compass. Brevity is imperative in the new world of social media.