Sue L.T. McGregor. (1998). Embracing a new future: A leadership imperative. Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, 89(3), 12-18.

NOTE that this version includes some extra tables that are not in the published version.

Abstract

A multifaceted blueprint for new directions for family and consumer practitioners is profiled against principles set out in Stephen Covey's (1992) revolutionary principle-centered leadership paradigm. Extrapolating Covey's paradigm to our paradigm for practice helps us appreciate the merits of and means of consciously adopting a new way of practising in today's complex, changing world. We face a challenge to grow in new directions, to embrace a new mind set and a new skill set. This revamped professional repertoire should better prepare each of us to understand and affect the profound transformation in the nature of families and the context within which they live.

The persistent theme from the literature that the profession has not yet done enough to create conditions which enable families to cope with, adapt to and affect change (e.g., Baldwin, 1991; Brown, 1993) prompted this article. Rapid and insidious change *is* commonplace as society approaches the next millennium and we[1] are indeed challenged as we strive to help individuals and families gain a sense that they can take control of their own lives and make a difference for themselves and others. Helping families embrace the future is a leadership imperative we can continue to fulfil if we persist in adopting new ways of seeing families in relation to the world and in changing the way we serve families. To that end, family and consumer science and home economics/human ecology visionaries (especially those cited in this paper) are advocating that we must make a fundamental transformation in our belief system, in the way we practice, and the knowledge base we use to practice. Most importantly, we must appreciate that our current modes of practise are not wrong, per se; rather, they may no longer be sufficient, in and of themselves, in today's world of relentless change.

As we embrace this change, or at least talk about it, we are compelled to retain those aspects of practice which are still pertinent and germane to the demands placed on us and families while bringing into our professional repertoire a collection of innovative and empowering approaches to serving individuals, families, communities and society. To that end, due consideration needs to be given to the collection of ideas espoused in the literature about changing our way of practice with an eye to deliberating the merits of at least seven components paramount to enabling the profession to deliver services to changing families and society. While running the risk of oversimplifying these complex concepts, principles and the relationships between them, they are introduced here with extensive referencing enabling the reader to augment their own background as appropriate.

Seven Proposed New Directions for Practice

First, appreciating that all things are related to all other things and that relationships between individuals and families and families and their environments are evolutionary, never

---

[1]As a point of clarification, "we" and "our" refer to professionals practising in the field of family and consumer science and home economics/human ecology.

ending and happening in context is the crux of the new *contextual paradigm.* Badir (1991) Baldwin (1991), Engberg (1993) and Istre and Self (1990) are vocal proponents of this new approach to practice claiming that it augments the scientific and developmental paradigms through which we currently see the world. Second, adopting a *practical problem solving approach* to serving families provides a perspective from which we can enlighten ourselves and family members about the ways in which larger society has created conditions which make daily life difficult. It enables us to conceive that all individuals are capable of participating fully in working towards changes for the better for all. This takes us beyond the technical and theoretical approaches to solving problems; that is, doing things for or showing people how to do things and explaining why things are the way they are without any critique or dialogue (Engberg, 1994; Hultgren & Wilkosz, 1986).

Third, we need to move beyond acting from habit or simply providing a family with technical information to solve the problem. This can be facilitated by embracing a *critical, reflective approach to practice* which means we have to seriously ponder and deliberate on meanings, norms and values leading to revelations which direct our ethical actions (Bubolz & Sontag, 1988; Morgaine, 1992; Vaines, 1990). Fourth, adding a *global perspective* into our professional repertoire entails bringing into focus the aspects of global systems, issues and problems, history, and human and universal values such that individuals are better able to understand and influence their condition in the community and the world (Crawford, 1993; Frazier, 1986; Murray, 1986; Smith, 1989, 1993; Smith & Peterat, 1992). Currently, people make many resource management decisions without due consideration of the implications on the future, other people or the environment (Engberg, 1993). Fifth, the *human ecology perspective* enables us to appreciate that the family ecosystem interacts reciprocally with its near environments (natural, human built and socio-cultural) to access, generate, use and restore resources to meet basic needs (Bailey, Firebaugh, Haley & Nickols, 1993; Bubolz & Sontag, 1988, 1993; Goldsmith, 1996; Touliatos & Compton, 1988).

Sixth, the *systems of actions approach* to practice, very succinctly, means that we create situations where families can be empowered to take control of their lives, using situationally appropriate combinations of: (a) coping skills, (b) talking about values, meanings, attitudes, et cetera and then adapting to change and/or (c) getting involved so that things change for the better for everybody (Brown, 1993; Hultgren & Wilkosz, 1986; Morgaine, 1992; Vaines, 1990). This aproach allows us to appreciate that no two people bring the same set of skills, experiences and opinions to a problem, that each context is different and that the people are different from the last time they solved a problem; hence, no two problems get solved exactly the same way. What worked before for a problem does not necessarily apply to the same problem in another context. Finally, embracing a *social change perspective* when influencing policy takes us beyond managing issues (symptons of larger societal ills) and enables us to sensitize governments to the merits of embracing family principles and familial and human betterment values when making policy decisions. Our objective, simply put, is to get government to adopt a value system based on family empowerment rather than opting for the quick fix, based on economics and "power over" people (Baldwin, 1995; McGregor, 1994, 1995a,b,c).

Exciting Corroboration from the Management Literature

It can be empowering to know that members of the profession are not alone in their call for different ways of practising; they are on the "leading edge" of change. This multifaceted direction proposed for practitioners serving consumers and families has credible parallels to

those set out in Stephen Covey's revolutionary principle-centered leadership (PCL) paradigm (1989, 1992; Covey, Merrill, & Merrill, 1994). The same message, albeit using different jargon, is being touted as the new management/leadership paradigm for the future. It is being embraced enthusiastically by some members of the family and consumer sciences profession (e.g. O'Neal & Burdette, 1995; Coffey, 1995) as well as members of the corporate world. However, if the allegation is true, that families are in trouble partially due to our inability to personally and/or professionally keep up with change, we could assume that the *same leadership message* coming from advocates in family and consumer sciences has yet to be collectively embraced or practiced by a significant number of practitioners in the field.

We continue to face the challenge to grow in new directions and to embrace a new mind set and a new skill set that continues to prepare us to keep pace with change. We cannot help families change unless we change ourselves, personally and professionally (Bateman-Ellison & McGregor, 1966). We need to be able to continue to deal with the profound transformation in the nature of families as they reciprocally relate with each other at home and with others at work, in the community, the marketplace, governments and society. This paper offers an extrapolation of Covey's (1992) PCL paradigm to our practice as a way of showing that there is merit in considering the adoption of a new way of practising in today's complex, changing world, and that we are not alone in our deliberations and dialogue.

Principle Centered Leadership Paradigm Paralleled with New Professional Directions

Covey's (1992) basic argument is that we can deal more successfully with the phenomenal changes affecting society if we each personally start from a sound foundation of four principles: (a) personal trustworthiness, (b) relational trust, (c) empowerment, and, (d) alignment of our personal, organizational and professional systems and infrastructures with these three principles. This solid foundation ensures that we are not caught shifting in the sand as we deal with each new challenge to individual and familial well-being. Seven of the key building blocks in Covey's argument will be outlined and correlated with the seven family and consumer science and home economics/human ecological initiatives identified at the beginning of this discussion.

Leadership and Management

First, Covey (1992) made a clear distinction between leadership and management. Fundamentally, leaders provide direction for transformation based on principles while managers provide control of resources used in transactions based on methods and procedures. Leaders adapt to situations, striving to share power while strengthening people. Managers react to situations, striving to maintain power while minimizing costs and maximizing benefits. Leaders work on changing the system and the infrastructures by looking at the lens and saying it is right for us. Managers work within the system and structures by looking through the lens, directing the producers to do the work. Both roles are necessary, sometimes done in tandem by the same person or via a team approach. Families *manage* their own resources and our role as *leaders* is to enable them to improve their quality of life through this resource management process (Goldsmith, 1996). We then stand a better chance of enabling families to change their resource and change management styles. Our pioneers on the leading edge are not alone in their intent or their ideas. For instance, Covey's discussion of the four management/leadership paradigms (Table 1) has interesting parallels to Istre and Self's (1991) and Baldwin's (1990) discussion of the three fundamental knowledge bases in home economics (mechanistic (scientific), developmental (organismic) and contextual (empowerment)).

<div align="center">Insert Table 1 about here</div>

Empowerment

Second, Covey (1992) provided a full description of empowerment. It encompasses helping people acquire principles to use as they solve problems, ensuring that they are internally grounded and not unduly influenced by external sources. He called this a compass to navigate change versus a road map which may be inappropriate for a continually changing landscape. He identified six conditions of empowerment: character, skills, win-win agreements, self supervision, supportive organizational structures and systems, and accountability.

Family and consumer science visionaries have been arguing that we need to use the empowerment model when we serve individuals and families. This means that we see people as victims of problems created by society (structural changes) but that these people are active in solving their own problems by building on their internal energy, networks, and strengths. Delivering empowering practice means we build on what they bring to the situation, we incorporate them into the solution (not our solution), we facilitate participation and collaboration, and we develop interactive interventions (Berenbaum, 1995; Kieren, 1994; McGregor, 1995c, Morgaine, 1993; Vaines, 1993; Vincenti, 1993).

People need to want to change, be able to change and be supported if they are to move from a dis-empowered to an empowered state. Covey (1992) tendered a profile of the characteristics of someone with the internal strength to embrace change. He suggested four dimensions of internal personal power (power, wisdom, security and guidance) and suggested that we can place ourselves on a continuum as regards each power dimension (see Table 2). We all need to take a personal inner strength inventory and help families do the same. As a practitioner, we also need to appreciate that the disadvantaged are likely positioned at the low end of the continuum or in the middle with circumstances compromising their attempts to exercise full internal personal power. They may be perceived as a victim or see themselves as a martyr, sensing no control over their lives or the situation. A practitioner who is empowered can work to change personally and then to help change the profession and families; an individual or family who has been empowered can work to change the world.

<div align="center">Insert Table 2 about here</div>

Synergistic Creative Problem Solving

Third, Covey (1992) contrasted synergistic problem solving, during which people advocate *why they need* something (their interest), with positional decision making where people argue their position (*what they want*). By adopting a synergistic approach to problem solving we automatically open ourselves to consideration of how to satisfy both wants and needs using creative alternatives for long term solutions. Two close parallels in our literature are: critical, reflective and creative thinking and the practical problem solving approach (Baldwin, 1991; Engberg, 1994). Both approaches advocate that we seriously evaluate conditions that contributed to a given situation and then strive to involve those affected in the creation of alternative and innovative solutions such that everybody benefits, now and in the future. Also, taking part in the cooperative, creative solution to a problem leads to ownership of the problem with a higher chance of future avoidance of the problematic situation or a sense of empowerment to personally solve the new problem.

Capabilities of Effective People

Fourth, Covey (1989, 1992) identified seven habits of effective people and the respective capabilities they have to enable them to turn these habits into behaviour (Table 3). A

predisposition to certain habits affects one's future commitment to and ability to manifest a planned change in behaviour. For example, habits could influence determining what is important, doing what is important, finding a balance in life, making effective decisions, setting goals and assessing values, managing time and stress and managing and nurturing relationships.

This powerful framework seems like an excellent yardstick against which to measure one's own effectiveness and is a very appropriate tool to use when working with families. It complements the systems of actions approach that is recommended for family and consumer science and home economics/human ecology practice. We need to take measure of each unique situation and, working with families, determine what combination of the three ways of thinking is best in that context: (a) cope with change by learning a new skill or technique; (b) change personally, or collectively as a family, after deliberating on values, meanings, attitudes and perceptions of self or group in relation to the world; and/or (c) engage in actions that change the situation and the values of those driving or constraining change so that others in the community or society are better off, now and in the future (Vaines, 1990).

<u>Insert Table 3 about here</u>

Human Resource Accounting

Fifth, Covey (1992) argued that we must supplement financial accounting with human resource accounting, a sentiment expressed by McGregor in her arguments for influencing policy based on a social change perspective (1994, 1995b,c). Financial accounting deals with measuring the bottom line (profits and return on investments), while accounting for human resources embraces the philosophy that people are the most important resource. His idea of making deposits into an individual's 'emotional bank account' is especially appealing. We can do this for each other and we can teach families how to do this. The result is people who feel rewarded for: being creative, taking initiative, cooperating with others, developing their potential, expanding their capabilities, and increasing their resourcefulness, to name just a few empowering activities (Covey).

Abundance Mentality

Sixth, Covey's (1992) position that a scarcity mentality needs to be replaced with an abundance mentality mirrors the collective call for a global perspective in family and consumer science and home economics/human ecology practice (Crawford, 1993; Engberg, 1994; Smith, 1993). Assuming that "there is a lot to go around that can be shared" rather than "only a little that must be competed for" means that we practice and behave very differently. An abundance mentality ensures that we do not assume that human, material nor environmental resources are limited and must be controlled; instead, we assume that we can share resources and power and collectively develop creative means to meet respective interests without compromising future generations, those in other countries or environmental, personal or professional integrity.

To facilitate the adoption of an abundance mentality, Covey (1992) suggested steps to be taken to release the creative potential in people as they engage in the steps of the traditional decision making process: (a) capture the content and logic (intent) of material and seek to understand basic principles as you gather and diagnose data; (b) add your own ideas and thoughts as you select priorities, values and objectives; (c) share material with others to increase mutual understanding and create a common vocabulary as you identify and evaluate alternatives; (d) apply principles and test them in immediate circumstances as you plan and decide action steps; and, finally (e) monitor the results while you compare results with the original goals and objectives. This approach very much parallels the moral value reasoning approach to critical

reflective practice and creative thinking espoused by Crawford (1993), Eghan (1995) and Engberg (1994).

Ecological Perspective

Finally, Covey (1992) embraced the ecological perspective. He modeled a principle-centered leadership environment, attributing reciprocal responsibilities to key stakeholders (p.307). He argued that, if principle-centered leaders (whether they be academics, corporate executives, general practitioners or grassroots community workers) act as catalysts for change and if those they target embrace the need for change, they can collectively alter the energy balance of the whole ecosystem such that all benefit. This argument should sound very familiar since practising family and consumer science and home economics from a human ecology perspective is rapidly gaining credence world wide (Bubolz & Sontag, 1988, 1993; Eghan, 1995; Engberg, Beckerson & François, 1994). It is a powerful tool for leadership and for facilitating empowerment within the profession, families, communities and societies, even more so when it is combined with a global perspective and a contextual philosophy.

Discussion and Conclusions

This paper has illustrated that there is a provocative, collective vision being espoused by leaders in the field. They are presenting a compelling collection of perspectives from which to view our practice with families and society: contextual, practical problem solving, critical reflective, global, human ecosystem, systems of actions and social change for policy. Family and consumer scientists and home economics/human ecology visionaries *are* on the leading edge as evidenced by the parallels to Covey's (1992) PCL paradigm: leadership, empowerment, synergistic problem solving, effective habits, human resource accounting, abundance mentality and an ecological perspective.

As a practitioner and a professional community, we cannot effectively empower families to cope with, adapt to and affect change if we do not change ourselves. Our personal and professional obligation is to make the commitment to critique our own professional and community repertoire of perspectives and competencies to determine if they are appropriate and sufficient for our respective and collectives practice (see Table 4 for a rudimentary tool to aid in this self assessment process and the references in this paper for further reading and reflection). Someone who placed a number of checkmarks in the aware column but not in the understand or use columns, is dealing with a different scenario than another who indicated understand but do not use, or use but to not reflect. Examining the package of perspectives reflective of your situation (e.g. the collection of perspectives you checked off) provides insights into where you have to seek further information, dialogue or practice. Part of the learning process could be to read more widely to garner dimensions of each perspective, their interdependencies and overlap. Each person will want to prioritize which concept they need to learn more about first or in what combinations. Your personal collection of habits (see Table 3) will profoundly affect this reflective process making you more or less receptive to changes in your approach to day to day practice with families or for families.

<u>Insert Table 4 about here</u>

Conclusion

In conclusion, collectively and individually, we need to examine the context of family life, our personal skills, the existing curricula, textbooks, conference agendas, continuing education programs and the like and, if found lacking, we must concede that a change is necessary. Accepting that change may be necessary, in varying degrees and over time, makes it

easier to make a deep internal and professional commitment to change, to critique, embrace and then learn the new ways, and use this revised and revamped professional repertoire as we work with individuals and families until it becomes our new mode of professional practice. We can meet the challenge to grow in new directions, embracing a new mind set and a new skill set that prepares us to keep pace with relentless familial and societal change.

References

Badir, D. (1991). Research: Exploring the parameters: A challenge for home economics. Canadian Home Economics Journal, 41(2), 65-70.

Bailey, L., Firebaugh, F.M., Haley, E.G., & Nickols, S.Y. (1993). Human ecology in higher education: Surviving beyond 2000. Journal of Home Economics, 85(4), 3-10.

Baldwin, E.E. (1991). The home economics movement: A "new" integrative paradigm. Journal of Home Economics, 83(4), 42-48.

Baldwin, E.E. (1995). Home economics education and public policy formation. Journal of the Home Economics Institute of Australia, 2(1), 4-13.

Bateman-Ellison, M., & McGregor, S.L.T. (1996). Home economics in transition: Managing change, a practical problem of daily living. In L. Engberg, J. Varjonen, and H. Steinmuller (Eds.), Family resource management issues (pp.19-29). Bangkok, Thailand: Phannee Saecngchak Pub.

Berenbaum, S. (1995). Empowerment and the home economist. Canadian Home Economics Journal,45(2), 46-49.

Brown, M.M. (1993). Philosophical studies of home economics in the United States: Basic ideas by which home economists understand themselves. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Bubolz, M., & Sontag, S. (1988). Integration in home economics and human ecology. Journal of Home Economics and Consumer Studies, 12, 1-14.

Bubolz, M., & Sontag, S. (1993). Human ecology theory. In P. Boss, W. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. Schumm, & S. Steinmetz (Eds.), Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach. New York: Plenum.

Coffey, K.R. (1995). The place of family and consumer sciences in the small, private college. Kappa Omicron Nu FORUM, 8(1), 63-71.

Covey, S. (1989). The seven habits of highly effective people. NY: Simon and Schuster.

Covey, S. (1992). Principle-centered leadership. NY: Simon and Schuster (Fireside).

Covey, S., Merrill, A., & Merrill, R. (1994). First things first. NY: Simon and Schuster (Fireside).

Crawford, G. (1993). Developing student global perspectives through undergraduate family resource management. Journal of Home Economics, 85, 9-15.

Deacon , R., & Firebaugh, F. (1988). Family resource management (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Eghan, F.R. (1995, June). How can Malawi, in light of its plans for development of the nation, further address the needs of the changing family from an educational perspective? [Invitational position paper for Malawian Minister of Education]. Halifax, NS: Author.

Engberg, L. (1993). Home economics and environmental issues - A discussion paper. Canadian Home Economics Journal, 43(1), 10-12.

Engberg, L. (1994). Home economics: Global trends. Irish Home Economics Journal, 4(1), 2-13.

Engberg, L., Beckerson, S., & François, E. (1994). Women and household production: An ecosystem perspective with a comparison of two studies from Africa. In H. Dagenais & D. Piché (Eds.), Women, feminism and development (pp.152-178). Montreal, QU: McGill University Press.

Frazier, G. (1985). Global awareness in home economics education. Unpublished

doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University.

Goldsmith, E. (1996). Resource management for individuals and families. Minneapolis, MN: West Publishing.

Hultgren, F., & Wilkosz, J. (1986). Human goals and critical realities: A practical problem framework for developing home economics curriculum. Journal of Vocational Home Economics Education, 4(2), 135-154.

Istre, S.M., & Self, P.A. (1990). Toward a more unified discipline of home economics. Journal of Home Economics, 82(4), 4-9.

Kieren, D. (1994). Enriching the internal family environment: Striving for family health under conditions of adversity. Canadian Home Economics Journal, 44(1), 11-17.

McGregor, S.L.T. (1994). Influencing and shaping policy from a Hestian perspective. Canadian Home Economics Journal, 44(2), 78-80.

McGregor, S.L.T. (1995a). Family principles and family policy. Canadian Home Economics Journal, 45(1), 27-29.

McGregor, S.L.T. (1995b). Home economists in public policy. Journal of the Home Economics Institute of Australia, 2(1), 14-18.

McGregor, S.L.T. (1995c). Influencing public policy using the social change model: A comparative analysis. Canadian Home Economics Journal, 45(3), 109-113.

Morgaine, C.A. (1992). Alternative paradigms for helping families. Family Relations, 41, 12-17.

Morgaine, C.A. (1993). A language of empowerment. Home Economics FORUM, 6(2), 15-20.

Murray, E. (1986). Home economics and families in global perspective: 1986 AHEA commemorative lecture. Journal of Home Economics, 78, 51-56.

O'Neal, G., & Burdette, P.A. (1995). Managing change: The key to empowerment. Kappa Omicron Nu FORUM, 8(1), 72-82.

Smith, M.G. (1989). Global concepts: Do they have a place in home economics education? Canadian Home Economics Journal, 39(3), 109-112.

Smith, M.G. (1993). A conception of global education: A home economics education imperative. Irish Home Economics Journal, 3(1), 18-26.

Smith, M.G., & Peterat, L. (1992). Developing global/development perspectives in home economics education. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Home Economics Association.

Touliatos, J., & Compton, N. (1988). Research methods in human ecology/home economics. Ames, IO: Iowa State University Press.

Vaines, E. (1990). Philosophical orientations and home economics: An introduction. Canadian Home Economics Journal, 40(1), 6-11.

Vaines, E. (1993). An empowerment orientation for home economics. Home Economics FORUM, 6(2), 21-25.

Vincenti, V.B. (1993). Empowerment: Its history and meaning. Home Economics FORUM, 6(2), 7-14.

Table 1

Covey's four leadership/management paradigms and aspects of well-being contrasted with three home economic's paradigms (in italics) (extrapolated from Covey, 1992, p.176; Baldwin, 1991; Istre & Self, 1990)

Physical/Economic well-being (body)	Social/emotional well-being (heart)	Psychological well-being (mind)	Spiritual well-being (whole person)
Scientific (authoritarian)	**Human relations paradigm (benevolent, yet authoritarian)**	**Human resource management paradigm (developmental, delegate)**	**Principle-centered leadership paradigm (empowerment)**
Scientific, mechanistic, empirical, paradigm *Individuals are empty vessels to be moulded and filled up; relationships are predictable and controllable* *Striving for personal well-being*	*Developmental or organismic paradigm* *Individuals are self directing organisims interacting with greater life environments; lives and relationships develop towards a final goal but follow through predictable stages* *Striving for personal as well as familial well-being*		*Contextual paradigm* *Individuals and relationships are evolutionary, never ending and happen in a changing context (vary with time, life events and age cohorts)* *Striving for global, societal well-being*
. fairness . pay me well . conform . perform . economic needs . know what's best . wield power . stimulus/response	. feelings . treat me well . comply . feel . social needs . know what's best . wield power . comply with objectives	. efficient (doing things right) . use me well . contribute . think . creative needs . go along . use talents of people . set goals together	. effective (doing right things) . let's talk . commit . create with purpose . spiritual needs . participate . see people's potential . self directed by principles

Table 2

<u>Four dimensions of internal power along a continuum</u> (extrapolated from Covey, 1992)

Dimension of internal power	Low end of internal power continuum	High end of internal power continuum
POWER capacity to overcome outmoded habits and cultivate new, more effective ones	. reflect not project . reacts to what has happened to them . life is buffeted by external forces . dependent on circumstances . is a reflection of other's opinions and directions	. has a vision . is disciplined . acts on personal decisions not external conditions . chooses responses . makes things happen . is accountable
WISDOM balance judgements with comprehension (holistic)	. repeats mistakes . uses inaccurate maps . values are discordant with principles	. adopts a practical, sensible approach to reality . distinguishes pure joy from temporary pleasure . all four dimensions are integrated
SECURITY self esteem	. threatened by change, comparison or any criticism . emotionally dependent, maybe even co-dependent; low sense of self worth	. is not threatened by change, comparison or criticism . has a sense of high intrinsic worth; is independent
GUIDANCE direction which governs decision making	. follows trends . fails to finish and start . strong physical addictions . centers on social life style	. writes own script after discovering own mission . guidance comes from internal and inspired sources

Table 3

Seven habits of effective people with respective human capacities to turn these into behaviours (extrapolated from Covey, 1992)

HABIT of behaviour one wants to create	ENDOWMENT - possession of this human capacity enables one to convert behaviour into habit	LOW effectiveness	HIGH effectiveness
1. knowledge of internal self	proactive	. blames others or environment so as not to be responsible . feels they are victims of others . hot reactor . does not know what pushes their buttons . are products of what happens to them	. is a creative force and chooses response . knows internal script so cannot be victim . cool chooser . knows when buttons are being pushed and disallows it . makes careful decisions based on principles and values; produce what they want to happen
2. imagination and conscience	begins with end in mind	. feels futile about goals, purpose, improvement efforts . "what can I do about anything"? attitude "the wanderer" . relies on memory not imagination .tied to past and old habits	. inner security, hope, and purpose . imagines and creates a new course of action and pursues it with full awareness of consequences . looks to future learning from the past
3. willpower	puts first things first	. floats and coasts . avoids responses . takes easy way out . no initiative . "can't do it or won't do it"	. disciplined . "can do it, possible to do it, potential is there"
4. abundance mentality	thinks win-win	. hogs power . accuses others . believes in limited resources . self interest	. shares power . shares recognition . believes in abundance and alternative resources . desire for mutual benefit/interest

5. understand then be understood	courage and consideration	. no empathy . does not 'walk the talk' . 'fight and flight' mentality . needs approval . lacks courage . listens within their own history . frames own reply rather than hearing other person . needs to control	. thinks before speaking . has courage to listen to understand and then gives considered reply in other's context . lets other tell their story . restraint . respect . reverence . empathy and sympathy
6. creativity	synergy	. I want . react . position (want) . negotiate . compromise . give and take . strives for short term fix . transfer	. I need . think . interest (why) . satisfy both using creative alternatives . respect for other's interests . don't defend a position (want) . give up short term for long term . transform
7. self renewal	sharpens the saw with six types of exercise: aerobic, resistance, weight bearing, spiritual, emotional and intellectual)	. closed system (entropied and imbalanced) . static . stagnant . unoccupied, unfocused or wayward	. open system (dynamic and balanced) . improvement . innovation . continual refinement of self to maintain balance

Table 4

Rudimentary self-assessment instrument to gauge professional repertoire, with examples

	Unaware of concept	Aware of concept but do not understand it	Understand and can explain concept in own words but do not use it	Use concept in daily practice	Critique and justify concept in principle and in use
Contextual, eco-centric paradigm	✞				
Practical problem solving approach					
Critical reflective practice			✞		
Global perspective					
Human ecosystem perspective					✞
Systems of actions approach		✞			
Social change perspective to policy					
Leadership/management				✞	
Empowerment					
Synergistic (creative) problem solving					
Effective habits					
Human resource accounting					
Abundance mentality					
Others???					

Table

Process for releasing potential in people's decision making abilities (extrapolated from Covey, 1992)

Traditional decision making process	Steps to release potential in people
1. gather and diagnose data	1. capture content and logic (intent) of material and seek to understand basic principles
2. select priorities, values and objectives	2. add your ideas and thoughts
3. identify and evaluate alternatives	3. share material with others to understand and create common vocabulary
4. plan and decide action steps	4. apply principles and test them in immediate circumstance
5. compare results with original goals and objectives	5. monitor results

Three types of power

Coercive power	Utility power	Principle centered power
Uses force and is negatively reactive in nature	Conditional choice and positively reactive	free choice based on principles and proactive in nature
. fear something will happen . go along . pay lip service . big stick approach LEADS TO: . sabotage . destruction . resistance . suspicion . temporary control . deceit . dishonest . dissolution	. exchange goods and services . court enforced fairness . equity . exchange of resources . compliance . influence not control LEADS TO: . individualism not team work . commitment as long as there is pay off . situational ethics	. action is for a larger purpose . values of leader equal values of followers . based on trust and honor . self control LEADS TO: . inspiration . creativity . purpose . vision . ethical behaviour . sharing

Table 1

Characteristics of a leader versus a manager (both roles are necessary)

LEADERSHIP	MANAGEMENT
. transforms using principles	. transacts (event centered)
. looks at lens and says "it's right for us"	. looks through lens, directs producers to work
. works on changing systems and structures	. works within established systems & structure
. direction	. control
. vision, mission, principles and values	. logistics, methods, procedures and policies
. purpose (effective - doing right thing)	. efficiency (doing things right)
. top line (strengthen people)	. bottom line (increase profits)
. reads situation and adapts	. reacts to situation; not as flexible
. emotional banks accounts	. financial bank accounts
. breakthrough thinking	. conventional thinking
. abundance thinking	. scarcity thinking
. proactive	. reactive
. concerned with decreasing the restraining forces shaping change	. concerned with decreasing the driving forces shaping change
. collaborative relationships	. adversarial relationships
. developer	. manager
. consultant	. hero
. value clarification	. decision making
. emphatic dialogue	. confrontational dialogue
. share power	. maintain power