

Theoretical Foundations of Interactive Leadership

in Catholic Social Teachings

Dr. Mary Elsbernd, OSF

Loyola University, Chicago

This paper explores some existing connections and possible future links between Catholic Social Teachings and a particular school of leadership theories, namely interactive leadership. After a brief survey of interactive leadership models and theories, we will look at five recurring components in interactive leadership theories and in Catholic Social Teachings. Our examination of Catholic Social Teachings will be drawn primarily from the social encyclicals beginning with Pope Leo XIII's *Rerum novarum* and continuing through the social encyclicals of Pope John Paul II. The five recurring components we have noted include: 1) a transforming vision; 2) participation in decision-making; 3) power; 4) affirmation of others' worth or dignity; and 5) conflict resolution.

Interactive Leadership Theories

As a concept, **interactive leadership** has its roots in participative management approaches, in transformational leadership theories, and in situation - contingent models of leadership. Its links to participative management approaches are quite clear in Judy Rosener's (1990) description of interactive leadership. Rosener's description notes the following characteristics of interactive leadership: 1) encouragement of participation in all aspects of work; 2) wide-spread sharing of information and power; 3) efforts to enhance self-worth of employees; and 4) energizing employees for the task.

In the same article, Rosener also links interactive leadership to the transformational leadership theories of James McGregor Burns (1978) and Bernard Bass (1985). She portrays a transformational leader as one who is able to shift the needs, self-interest, values, and beliefs of individual followers into the interest or vision of the group. (Cf. Tichy and Devanna, 1986; Nanus, 1992; Nygren and Ukeritis, 1993; Rhodes, 1993). Transformational leaders exhibit personal charisma, self-confidence, dominance and a conviction that their vision is morally right. Avolio, Waldman, & Yammarino (1991) talk about the characteristics of the transformational leader mnemonically: individualized attention, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation and idealized influence. And finally, some transformational leadership theories emphasize change and transformation as the role of the leader (Nanus, 1992, Tichy & Devanana, 1986).

Anne Staham (1987), in turn, links interactive leadership to social structural theories of symbolic interactionism (Stryker, 1980) which hold that social structure and behavioral

interaction mutually influence each other. Staham recognizes earlier, foundational contributions of both Fiedler (1967) and House (1971) in situation - contingent leadership theories.

Given these roots, Klenke (1996) speaks of a "complex pattern of interactions among leaders, followers, and situations," all of which are played out within a broader framework of gender role expectations (Cantor & Bernay, 1992; Rosener, 1990; Sagaria, 1985), organizational contexts, and cultures. In this approach, organizational context refers to the location of the organization in its political, economic, social, religious, business, global, sports, community, technological, historical, artistic, scientific, media or public sector arenas. For Klenke context, culture, gender, and leadership/followership as well as the tasks, the specific organizational structures and personalities are all components in the social construction of leadership. All of these components mutually interact in the practice and the resultant theories of leadership.

Klenke dares to sketch some properties of the vision and some values of this interactive leadership model. Interactive leadership entails the formulation and communication of a shared vision of the future which is capable of creating common ground out of diversity and which offers creative response to change. The exact content of the vision is unclear, although terms like "higher levels of moral development," "noble ideals", and the embrace of all humanity are mentioned in reference to the vision. Nanus (1992) maintains that transforming visions must 1) be appropriate for the future of the organization, 2) provide a clear purpose or direction; 3) inspire and urge commitment; 4) be articulated and communicated; and 5) be ambitious.

According to Klenke, the interactive leader typically holds the values of participation in decision-making, empowerment of followers, mutuality and reciprocity in leader-follower relations, and consensus-building. This listing of values finds resonance in other interactive as well as transformational leadership theories. For example, Rosener (1990) mentions participation, sharing power and information, enhancing others' self-worth, and energizing others for the interest and goals of the group. Helgersen (1990) includes principles of caring, conscious letting go of hierarchy by attending to the web-like relationships, information sharing, and collaborative negotiation. Haines (1994) calls for the ability to use power wisely, skills in conflict resolution and participatory decision-making. Nygren and Ukeritis (1993) note the following characteristics in outstanding leaders of religious congregations: understanding and use of power as access to available resources, consensus-building, affirmation of others' worth, shared power and information.

From this brief survey of interactive leadership models and theories, we identified five recurring components to explore in Catholic Social Teachings. First with regard to **vision**, we expect to conclude that Catholic Social Teachings do identify some specific content to the vision, although the function of vision remains directional and inspirational. Second, we expect to determine that **participation**, especially in decisions which impact employees' lives, has long been supported in Catholic Social Teachings as an implication of human dignity. Third, we expect to discover that **power** has not been addressed at

length in Catholic Social Teachings and hence an understanding of power as sharing resources and information is not a significant theme. Fourth, with regard to the affirmation of human **dignity and worth**, we expect to confirm its firm foundation in Catholic Social Teachings, especially *Gaudium et Spes* (1965). And finally we expect to find that since **conflict** is typically decried in Catholic Social Teachings, conflict resolution plays a minimal role in Catholic Social Teachings.

Thus it seems that Catholic Social Teachings' statements on human dignity, vision, and participation may well provide a Christian and social ethical foundations to enhance the practice and theories of interactive leadership. In contrast, interactive leadership could well contribute the fruits of their practice and theory with regard to power and conflict resolution toward the continuing development of Catholic Social Teachings.

Vision in Catholic Social Teachings and Interactive Leadership Theories

Vision plays a constitutive role in distinguishing transformational leadership from management (Brown, 1986; Tichy & Devanna, 1986). Vision as it is used of a leader includes abilities such as: 1) imaging concrete results that could be defined and achieved by the enterprise in a future state; 2) sensitivity to the essence of the system or a systematic viewpoint; 3) creation of a collective viewpoint which satisfies individual wants and key values; and 4) communication so as to challenge and engender commitment to the project. This concept of vision has been critiqued as a one-way street, a detached clear seeing by the leader who then imparts the vision to the others (Belenky et al, 198X). Some interactive leadership theorists prefer the image of voice, understood as emphasizing both listening, communication, and dialogical interaction (Helgersen, 1990). In this metaphor, the vision is not created by the charismatic leader, but is rather listened into existence by the whole enterprise. In addition, there is a growing sense that "voice" must be connected to something larger than the immediate corporate future, i.e., that it is about justice (Rhodes, 1993) or a better world (Nygren & Ukeritis, 1993) or at least a contribution to society. These latter two dimensions may have some connection to the use of vision in Catholic Social Teachings.

In contrast, Catholic Social Teachings use images from the Jewish and Christian scriptures to describe an eschatological vision, that is, a vision of the end of time, or the fulfillment of what was inaugurated in Jesus or in God's covenants with the human community. The metaphoric visions "reign of God," "the heavenly city Jerusalem," and "a new heavens and a new earth" are not understood as the utopias created by human longing but rather as a God-given eschaton already begun and not yet fulfilled. Consequently the whole human community contributes to the articulation of the vision by listening for God's word in the unfolding events and crises of human history. As eschatological, the vision both describes "the way things ought to be," and invites human persons to embody that vision already now in their attitudes, behaviors and choices.

The visions of "reign of God," "the heavenly city Jerusalem," and "a new heavens and a new earth," as they are used in Catholic Social Teachings set before the Christian and human communities qualities and characteristics of the "better world" inaugurated in

God's covenants with humanity. The "reign of God" (*Mater et Magistra*, #261; *Justice in the World*, #76; *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, #48.2) is established on justice, truth, life, love, peace, freedom, and community. The "heavenly city Jerusalem" (*Gaudium et Spes*, #40.2 & 43; *Octagesimo Adveniens*, #37.1) is marked by peace, justice, community, freedom as well as healing, meaning, human rights and dignity, and "living exchange" between the divine and human. The "new heavens and the new earth" (*Justice in the World*, #75; *Laborem Exercens*, #27.4; *Centesimus Annus*, #62.1) are recreated in justice, peace, love, dignity, community and freedom.

The contributions of Catholic Social Teachings undergird some of the shifts which interactive leadership is beginning in its reformulation of transformational leadership. These contributions include: 1) the vision is already given to the community or the enterprise and needs to be listened into articulation, but not created single-handedly by a charismatic leader; 2) the vision must be linked to flourishing of the whole human community, and not merely the enterprise; 3) the vision provides recurring values, namely, justice, peace, love, community, dignity and freedom, rather than strategies to ensure corporate survival into the future.

Power in Catholic Social Teachings and Interactive Leadership Theories

Leo XIII primarily discussed political and public power and not economic power; however, this understanding of power was taken over into the economic sphere by later Catholic Social Teachings, so we must begin with it. In Leo XIII's thought the source of all power proceeded from God, who alone could give one person power over another (*Immortale Dei*, #3; #30; #35). Power entailed the ability to enforce law, be it civil, natural, divine, or ecclesial law through which the people came to know and experience God.

Leo rejected the concept of the people being the source of public power as a notion which lacked proof according to reason and therefore the power to insure public order (*Immortale Dei*, #31). The source of political power in God did not prevent the people's participation in choosing the holders of political authority (*Diuturnum*, #6; *Pacem in Terris*, #52) who along with the laws represented God's power and consequently necessitated obedience (*Pacem in Terris*, #50), unless they required what was contrary to eternal law (*Sapientiae Christianae*, # 10).

A similar source of power was articulated by John XXIII as late as 1963 (*Pacem in Terris*, #46) who grounded this understanding in Romans 13.1-6 and St. John Chrysostom's commentary on that passage. While John Paul II would probably agree that God is the source of all power, the encyclical *Redemptor Hominis* provided a more nuanced understanding, namely that society and people composing it are "master and sovereign of their own destiny;" John Paul II continues that such sovereignty remains unrealized if imposition of power by one group over other groups replaces the "exercise of power with the moral participation of the society or people" (#17.5). *Redemptor Hominis* thus recognizes that power can be "imposed" by one group over the other or "exercised with participation" of the people. Interactive leadership theorists make a

similar distinction, although the vocabulary would more likely be in terms of power as domination over and power as relationships which enable agency or creative transformational efficacy (Hinze, 1992).

The purpose of power is the promotion of the common good with particular attention to those who are unable to defend their legitimate interests (*Pacem in Terris*, #56) and the protection of human rights (*Ibid.*, #60). In somewhat circuitous fashion and with the questionable attribution of rights to power, *Redemptor Hominis*, #17.6 also links together the purpose of power, respect for human rights, and solicitude for the common good:

... The fundamental duty of power is solicitude for the common good of society; this is what gives power its fundamental rights. Precisely in the name of these premises of the objective ethical order, the rights of power can only be understood on the basis of respect for the objective and inviolable rights of man (sic). The common good that authority in the state serves is brought to full realization only when all of the citizens are sure of their rights.

Perhaps a similar purpose is reflected in the description of power as "getting things done so as to make a difference or to make others' lives better" (Canter and Bernay, 1992).

Although it may be understandable, when economic power is mentioned in the social encyclicals, it is in the context of abuse of power or the injustices resulting from the abuse of power (*Gaudium et Spes*, #65; *Populorum Progressio*, #9 & 21; *Dives in Misericordia*, # 11; *Laborem Exercens*, 8.3). This may explain the lurking sense that the use of power in Catholic Social Teachings typically reflects an understanding as power as domination, the ability to control and command. So we read in *Mater et Magistra* that economically developed nations must resist the temptation to give "technical and financial aid with a view to gaining control over the political situation in the poorer countries, and furthering their own plans for world domination" (#171). *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* calls the thirst for power and the all-consuming desire for profit examples of actions and attitudes opposed to the will of God and the good of neighbor (#37). *Gaudium et Spes* warns that although culture has its own autonomy, it ought not become an instrument of economic power (#59.2). *Pacem in Terris* states that only God can force internal compliance on another (#48), albeit in the context of requiring states to exercise their authority in keeping with eternal, divine and natural laws. Power understood as domination views power as a zero sum quantity, that is, whenever one persons gains power, another of necessity must lose power. *Evangelii Nuntiandi* reflects this approach when it says that in order to recognize the power of human persons, secularism must deny God (53.2).

Attention to the abuses of (economic) power probably is connected to the responsive or reactive nature of Catholic Social Teachings, that is, the encyclicals were written in response to major socio-economic events, the Industrial Revolution, the 1929 Depression, the globalization of the economy, the economic gap between so called developed and underdeveloped nations, etc. In the face of such events, the abuse of power is a likely

theme. An understanding of power as domination or the ability to control and command remains a consistent description of power, although this definition is called into question by both feminist social ethicists^s and interactive leadership theories.

Catholic Social Teachings could well benefit from the contributions of both groups in its presentations of power. How much richer Catholic Social Teachings would be, if the foundational understanding of power was not domination of a limited resource, but sharing of information and resources which multiplies efficacy and agency. This is the emerging understanding of power in interactive leadership theories (Klenke, 1996; Rosener, 1990; Helgersen, 1990; Rost, 1991) as well as in feminist social ethics and other liberationist ethics.

The concept of power as agency is not completely absent in Catholic Social Teachings, although it is only used in the discussion of moral choices, i.e, moral power. In its discussion of socio-economic life, *Gaudium et Spes* laments the extremes of economic conditions which allows a few to enjoy "very great power of choice, (while) the majority are deprived of almost all possibility of acting on their own initiative and responsibility, and often subsist in living and working conditions unworthy of a human person" (#63.2; Cf. *Dives in Misericordia*, #11.1). Although this use of power is associated with the human person as moral agent, its use comes out of an understanding of power as a limited commodity, that is, if the few have too much power, the majority have almost no possibility of power.

Participation in Catholic Social Teachings and Interactive Leadership Theories

Rerum Novarum states: "all and each have a right to participate in the common good in a proportionate degree" (#49). According to Leo XIII, all citizens without exception were required to make some contribution to the common good according to varying skills and gifts (#35). He goes on to make particular mention of the contribution of unpropertied workers through their labor in the production of material goods; their contribution to the common good is so significant that the state ought to make sure that these workers participate in the benefits of the common good, at least through housing, clothing, a better life, and less hardship (#36). This perspective is grounded in natural law, the natural propensity to associate with others, the Thomistic notions of contributive and distributive justice as well as the scriptural traditions (Ecclesiastes 4:9-10).

Rerum Novarum also speaks at length about self-governance in associations, although it is not clear whether the associations were groups of workers alone or mixed groups of employers and employees, or religious groupings. Such associations ought to choose freely how to manage their affairs and how to attain their goals (#55). Mutuality in relationships ought to mark the distribution of tasks and offices so that discord is minimized (#57). Some of the tasks noted included: spiritual goods of all workers (#56); regulation of hours; health and safety safeguards (#46); provision of jobs; relief in cases of accident, sickness, old age or distress (#57); care for the poor; provision for the future (#58); and a general opportunity for a better life (#58.1). It is granted that these statements do not reflect participation in decision-making typically conveyed in interactive

leadership models of the 1990's; however it is worth noting that employees, either alone or with employers, were seen as capable of participating in decisions with what today would be termed benefits issues in the workplace.

Forty years later *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931) essentially reiterated Leo XIII's points with two additions. First, Pius XI extended the notion of participation to include political governance (#86); and second, he offered a specific system of employer - employee participation, namely "syndicates and corporations" (#91- 98). Although the corporative political-economic system did not spread beyond a few rightist dictatorships of that era, Pius XI 's dream of a reconstructed socio-economic system was rooted in employer - employee participation for a better socio-economic system.

Thirty years after *Quadragesimo Anno*, John XXIII specifically addressed employee participation in his inaugural encyclical, *Mater et Magistra* (1961). In addition to the previously mentioned responsibility of all persons including employees to contribute to the common good through their work, the dignity of employees as persons and as workers capable of exercising personal initiative required opportunities for employees to participate in the economic enterprise (#83). These foundations of human dignity, responsibility to contribute and personal initiative are threaded through the following quotation from that document (#91-93) on employee participation:

We, no less than our predecessors, are convinced that employees are justified in wishing to participate in the activity of the industrial concern for which they work. It is not, of course, possible to lay down hard and fast rules regarding the manner of such participation, for this must depend upon prevailing conditions, which vary from firm to firm and are frequently subject to rapid and substantial alteration. But we have no doubt as to the need for giving workers an active part in the business of the company for which they work -- be it a private or a public one. Every effort must be made to ensure that the enterprise is indeed a true human community, concerned about the needs, the activities and the standing of each of its members.

This demands that the relations between management and employees reflect understanding, appreciation and good will on both sides. It demands, too, that all parties co-operate actively and loyally in the common enterprise, not so much for what they can get out of it for themselves, but as discharging a duty and rendering a service to their fellow men (sic). All this implies that the workers have their say in, and make their own contribution to, the efficient running and development of the enterprise. ... Obviously, any firm which is concerned for the human dignity of its workers must also maintain a necessary and efficient unity of direction. But it must not treat those employees who spend their days in service with the firm as though they were mere cogs in the machinery, denying them any opportunity of expressing their wishes or bringing their

experience to bear on the work in hand, and keeping them entirely passive in regard to decision that regulate their activity.

We would observe, finally, that the present demand for workers to have a greater say in the conduct of the firm accords not only with man's (sic) nature, but also with recent progress in the economic, social and political spheres.

Specific examples of this "recent progress" which form a basis for employee participation included increased interdependence (socialization) given the advances of science, technology and communications. The real significance of this statement is the recognition that Catholic Social Teachings do come about through the practice and daily experience of real people as well as principles deduced from human nature.

Also in *Mater et Magistra*, John XXIII called for two specific models of employee participation which would satisfy the demands of distributive justice, which was understood as employee participation in the benefits of the common good created by their labor. While admittedly not the only possible models, the two models mentioned were shares of company stocks and gradual ownership of the company (#32, 77, & 85-103). Some twenty years later, John Paul II continues in a similar vein in his call for workers having a "share in running businesses and in controlling their productivity" (*Laborem Exercens*, #8.3; Cf. #14).

Before John XXIII died in 1963, he wrote a final encyclical, *Pacem in Terris*, in which he included participation in public life and contribution to the common good as rights of human persons, given their dignity, social nature, and the growing democratization in political, economic, racial, and gender spheres.

Gaudium et Spes sets forth some principles for participation of employees in economic enterprises: first, according to their unique "prerogatives," owners, employers, managers and laborers all actively share in the administration and profits; second, the workers ought to have a voice in determining conditions of work; and third, participation includes founding and actively taking part in union activities (#68 and 68.1). In addition, the duty and right of persons to contribute to the economic development of their communities, particularly in underdeveloped regions, is urged in strong language (#65.2). *Economic Justice for All* (1986) re-iterates the above principles and examples of employee participation and adds partnership (#299), profit-sharing, stockholding, and cooperative ownership, (#300) as means of greater worker participation and employer accountability.

In 1971 Paul VI departed from John XXIII's identification of participation as a right, which was confirmed by 1971 Synod of Bishops' document, *Justice in the World*, #18; instead he calls participation, as well as equality, an aspiration reflecting human dignity and human freedom (*Octagesimo Adveniens*, #22); they are thus a basic demand of human nature (#47). These human aspirations require concrete deeds and structures, such as political and economic rights, forms of government and economic structures. Paul VI

does not develop the management and business implications of these demands of human nature.

The United States Bishops' Pastoral Letter, *Economic Justice for All* (1986) also address participation in the socio-economic arena. Their statements reflect some of the previous encyclical statements but weave them together in a new and integral way. Because human persons are socially constituted, life in society is a necessity and requirement for human existence, growth and fulfillment. This social anthropological foundation demands that persons actively and productively contribute to our social or common life; that is contributive justice requires persons to participate in the building up of the human community. Such a social anthropological understanding further demands that societies, according to distributive justice, provide what is necessary so that persons can participate in the building up of the human community (#71). This includes the organization of economic institutions in such a way that persons can contribute to society in freedom and dignity (#72).

#77-78: Basic justice demands the establishment of minimum levels of participation in the life of the human community for all persons. The ultimate injustice is for a person or a group to be treated actively or abandoned passively as if they were nonmembers of the human race. To treat people this way is effectively to say that they simply do not count as human beings. This can take many forms, all of which can be described as varieties of marginalization, or exclusion from social life. ... Stated positively, justice demands that social institutions be ordered in a way that guarantees all persons the ability to participate actively in the economic, political, and cultural life of society. The level of participation may legitimately be greater for some persons than for others, but there is a basic level of access that must be made available for all. Such participation is an essential expression of the social nature of human beings and of their communitarian vocation.

Participation in the life of the community calls for the right to employment, for healthful working conditions, For wages and benefits sufficient to provide individuals and their families with a standard of living in keeping with human dignity, and for the possibility of property ownership (#80). Economic participation can be enhanced through employment, widespread ownership of property, and increased participation by those entails "real freedom a person currently excluded or marginated (#91). The United States' Bishops insist that partnership and power to influence decisions" about working conditions or even plant closings (#302-303).

The brief survey of participation in Catholic Social Teachings can provide some solid foundations for what interactive leadership might practice under the vocabulary of 'participatory decision-making,' consensus-building,' 'engendering commitment to the common task,' 'sharing responsibility,' 'supportive interactions,' or 'collaboration.' These foundations include: first, the dignity of all persons which is the source of aspirations, rights, personal initiatives and abilities; second, an anthropological

understanding of the human person as socially constituted; third, an understanding of justice as contributive, that is, requiring the contribution to the life of the whole human community; and fourth, an understanding of justice as distributive, that is, access to the benefits of the social enterprise which have accrued in part through the contribution of human work. In turn, the practice of participatory decision-making in the workplace could provide ecclesial leaders both with models and theory-laden practices from interactive leadership.

Conflict resolution in Catholic Social Teachings and Interactive Leadership Theories

When Catholic Social Teachings address conflict in the economic sphere, the context is typically a struggle between groups, be they unions, classes, or nations. On the contrary, the context of conflict resolution in interactive leadership models more typically appears as face to face, daily struggles within the work setting. This difference of context may actually provide a place for mutual influence between Catholic Social Teachings and interactive leadership. Yet conflict resolution in the economic arena is not a major theme in Catholic Social Teachings.

Both *Rerum Novarum* (#40) and *Quadragesimo Anno* (#94) looked to public authorities to intervene in conflictual situations in an effort to preserve social peace and common good. The social encyclical tradition demonstrates a clear preference for non-violent conflict resolution and an equally clear suspicion of revolutionary uprisings. Slow, deliberate, gradual growth from within is set forth as the law of nature with regard to the development process (*Pacem in Terris*, #162). While admitting the ultimate necessity of strike, dialogue, negotiation, and discussion are held up as an ideal peaceful settlement of socio-economic disputes (*Gaudium et Spes*, #68.2).

In contrast to these preferred ways, revolutionary tactics are seen as violent changes merely in the perpetrators of injustice (*Quod Nunquam*, #7; *Octagesimo Adveniens*, #45; *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, #37), except in the case of "manifest, long-standing tyranny" which damaged personal rights and the common good (*Populorum Progressio*, #30-31). In the encyclicals of John Paul II, this position is mitigated somewhat and struggle is recognized as normal and inevitable (*Laborem Exercens*, #20.2; *Centesimus Annus*, #14).

Scattered throughout the documents, however, are some principles guiding the resolution of conflicts. A first principle is the primacy of the person (*Laborem Exercens*, #13.4), respect for their dignity (*Centesimus Annus*, # 14.1 and 23.1), and their well-being (*Gaudium et Spes*, #78.1). Secondly, the goal of the conflict must be justice (*Gaudium et Spes*, #78.1; *Laborem Exercens*, #20.2; *Centesimus Annus*, #14) or the common good (*Mater et Magistra*, #238; *Centesimus Annus*, #23.1) or building up the community (*Gaudium et Spes*, #85); the goal may not be the struggle itself or the elimination of the opponent (*Laborem Exercens*, #20.2). Third, suggested strategies include negotiation, dialogue, witness to the truth (*Centesimus Annus*, #23.1; *Gaudium et Spes*, #68.2), "mutual assessment of arguments and feelings on both sides, a mature and objective investigation of the situation, and an equitable reconciliation of opposing views" (*Pacem*

in Terris, #93). Fourth, attitudes of respect and esteem must prevail (*Mater et Magistra*, #238) And finally the documents call for ending injustices (*Pacem in Terris*, #96; *Populorum Progressio*, #30; *Gaudium et Spes*, #83). The United States' Bishops in *The Challenge of Peace* (1983) specifically called for widespread training in conflict resolution by churches, education institutions and government agencies (#223 & 229).

The brief survey of conflict resolution in Catholic Social Teachings provides some principles for the practice of what interactive leadership describes as "the ability to negotiate," "honoring differences," "compromise" or "a conciliatory style under stress." Although conflict resolution is the subject matter of workshops, courses, and endless conversations in the workplace, current interactive leadership articles did not describe how conflict resolution skills are developed. Rather compromise and negotiation of differences were treated as inherent leadership assets. I would conclude that interactive leadership theory could benefit from an inclusion of these competencies and that Catholic Social Teachings would benefit from the reflective practice of conflict resolution by interactive leaders for whom negotiation, compromise, and conciliatory styles are daily honed skills.

Human Dignity in Catholic Social Teachings and Interactive Leadership Theories

If we look at the beginnings of modern Catholic Social Teachings, we learn that human dignity is not a foundational concept. Rather Leo XIII saw a certain Christian dignity resulted from creation in the image of God, redemption in Christ Jesus, and final destiny with God (*Rerum Novarum*, #24), which urged employers to reverence their workers as persons and not instruments for profit and production (#17).

The influence of philosophical and theological personalism during the subsequent forty years established human dignity as a central concept in the encyclical writings of Pius XI. In *Divini Redemptoris* (1937), Pius sets forth a human anthropology built on the truths of nature and grace, namely that the human person was endowed from creation with an immortal soul as well as physical and mental gifts (#27). The resultant dignity of the human person thus had its roots both in the natural order of creation and in the supernatural order of grace, final destiny and participation in the reign of God (*Quadragesimo Anno*, #28). As a consequence of this human dignity, human persons had human rights (*Ibid.*; *Laborem Exercens*, #4.1; *Centesimus Annus*, #22; and *Gaudium et Spes*, #24).

John XXIII (1963) calls human dignity from nature and grace the fundamental principle for life together and the basis of human rights (*Pacem in Terris*, #9-10):

... each individual man (sic) is truly a person. His is a nature, that is, endowed with intelligence and free will. As such, he has rights and duties, which together flow as a direct consequence from his nature. These rights and duties are universal and inviolable, and therefore altogether inalienable.

When, furthermore, we consider man's (sic) personal dignity from the standpoint of divine revelation, inevitably our estimate of it is incomparably increased. Men (sic) have been ransomed by the blood of Jesus Christ. Grace has made them sons and friends of God, and heirs to eternal glory.

The above paragraphs serve as an introduction to John XXIII's listing of human rights; other passages from his encyclicals spelled out additional implications of human dignity: freedom and personal initiative (*Pacem in Terris*, #34), equality (*Ibid.*, #44), participation in the business enterprise (*Mater et Magistra*, #92), and the very structuring of economic systems (*Ibid.*, #83).

Vatican Council II devoted a complete chapter to "The Dignity of the Human Person" in its landmark document, *Gaudium et Spes* (*The Constitution of the Church in the Modern World*). Human dignity remains founded in creation and grace (#12 and 19) and linked to human freedom (#17). *Gaudium et Spes*' original contribution, however, rests in its statements of the "practical and particularly urgent consequences" (#27) of human dignity, namely:

- availability of everything necessary for a truly human life, including employment (#26.1)
- obligation to help the least among us (#27.1)
- work to end those things which oppose life, including "disgraceful working conditions, where men (sic) are treated as mere tools for profit" (#27.2)
- tolerance (#28)
- forgive injuries and love enemies (#28.2)
- overcome discriminatory practices (#29.1; Cf. Octagesimo Adveniens, #13.2-16)
- establish human institutions to protect and promote human dignity (#29.3)

The lengthy statement provides a high point in Catholic Social Teachings on human dignity. Subsequent documents reiterated the above points or addressed similar issues with other vocabulary. Paul VI prefers the terms "true humanism" or "full-bodied humanism" (*Populorum Progressio*, #42-43) in part caused by his idealistic world view which believed that what was authentically human could be transformed into Christian virtue through intentional embrace by persons of good will.

John Paul II, in turn, emphasizes the dignity of the person in Christ (*Redemptor Hominis*, #10-12.1), without denying dignity from creation in the image of God (*Centesimus Annus*, #22). Many of the consequences and implications which previous Pontiffs associated with human dignity, John Paul II names demands of justice. For example, *Centesimus Annus*, #34 notes that dignity demands that persons have the possibility to survive and to make an active contribution to the common good. Immediately preceding this sentence the same paragraph refers to the provision of basic human needs and skills training as a "strict duty of justice." Perhaps one could say that for John Paul II the human dignity of persons requires just treatment.

Catholic Social Teachings treatment of human dignity provides some foundations for what interactive leadership might name 'individual consideration,' 'enhance members' self-worth,' or 'concerned care in dealing with people.' These foundations include: personal giftedness from creation, redemption by Jesus, and indwelling presence of the Spirit. Catholic Social Teachings spell out some principles which ought to govern dealings with persons so gifted in human dignity. Of particular importance to management might be: equitable treatment, opportunities for participation, tolerance, ending discriminatory practices, promotion of human rights, the creation of structures which enhance dignity, and justice.

Conclusions

In this paper we examined five key dimensions of the emerging interactive leadership theories for foundations or at least links with Catholic Social Teachings, namely vision, participation, human dignity, conflict resolution and power. With regard to vision, we found that Catholic Social Teachings identified specific content for vision and gave support to interactive leadership theories positions that leaders listen to emerging visions (not create them) and that visions are linked to the whole human community (not only the corporate future).

We found that the affirmation of others' dignity and worth has a firm foundation in creation and in the traditional doctrines of Redemption in Jesus and Indwelling Spirit. We also determined that participation, especially in decisions which impact employees' lives, has long been supported in Catholic Social Teachings as a consequence of human dignity. It is less clear, however, that participation as it is used in interactive leadership theories conveys some of the other meanings uncovered in Catholic social teaching. In particular, we refer to participation's underpinnings in a social anthropology, contributive and distributive justice.

Although neither Catholic Social Teachings nor interactive leadership theories devoted much shrift to conflict resolution, we can conclude that both interactive leadership theories and Catholic Social Teachings would benefit from some mutual interaction and from experience-based efforts at conflict resolution. With regard to power we discovered that power in Catholic Social Teachings come out of a model of power as a limited resource and hence an understanding of power as sharing resources and information is not a significant theme. Consequently, interactive leadership theories can offer an

alternative understanding of power as a sharing of information and resources which multiplies efficacy and agency. Such an understanding would both enrich the understanding of power in Catholic Social Teachings and reflect a relational, self-giving, creating God at the center of the Christian traditions.

References Cited

Avolio, B, Waldman, D. And Yammarino, F. (1991). "Leading in the 1990's: The four I's of Transformational Leadership" in European Industrial Training 15, 9-16.

Bass, Bernard (1985). Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations. New York: Free Press.

Belenky, Clinnchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (198X). Women's Ways of Knowing.

Brown, M. Diane (1986). Leadership and Organization Transformation: A Competency Model. An Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation for The Fielding Institute.

Burns, James McGregor (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.

Cantor, Dorothy W. & Toni Bernay (1992). Women in Power. The Secrets of Leadership. Boston, New York & London: Houghton Mifflin.

Fiedler, F. (1967). A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Haines, Denise G.(1994). "The Power to Lead. Forming Women for Public Ministry" in Journal of Supervision and Training 15, 190-199.

Helgersen, Sally (1990). The Female Advantage. Women's Ways of Leadership. New York: Doubleday.

Hinze, Christine (1992). "Power in Christian Ethics" in Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics, 277-290

House, R.J. (1977). "A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership" in Leadership: The Cutting Edge. J. G. Hunt and L. L. Larson eds. Carbondale, IL: Southern University Press.

House, R. J. (1971). "A Path-goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness" in Administrative Science Quarterly 16, 321-338.

Klenke, Karin (1996). Women and Leadership. A Contextual Perspective. New York: Springer Publishing Company.

Namus, Burt (1992). Visionary Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nygren, David and Miriam Ukeritis (1993). "Religious Leadership Competencies" in Review for Religious 52, 390-417.

Rhodes, Lynn (1993). "Leadership From a Feminist Perspective" in Word and World 13, 13-18.

Rosener, Judy B. (1990). "The Ways Women Lead" in Harvard Business Review 68, 119-125.

Rost, Joseph C. (1991). Leadership for the Twenty-First Century. New York, Westport, CT, London: Praeger.

Sagaria, Mary Ann D (1985). "The Managerial Skills and Experiences of Men and Women Administrators: Similarities and Differences" in Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership 5, 19-30.

Staham, Anne (1987). "The Gender Model Revisited. Differences in the management styles of Men and Women" in Sex Roles 16, 409-429.

Stryker, S. (1980). Symbolic Interactionism: A Social Structural Version. Menlo Park, CA: Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company.

Tichy, Noel and May Anne Devanna (1986). The Transformation Leader. New York: Wiley.

Walsh, Michael and Brian Davies, (eds.) (1991). Proclaiming Justice and Peace. Papal Documents from Rerum Novarum through Centesimus Annus. Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications.