

Chapter 1: Quantum Storytelling Consulting and Ensemble Leadership Theory

Authors: David M. Boje

This chapter relates quantum storytelling consulting (QSC) to ensemble leadership theory (ELT). What kinds of leadership does it take to have the fore-caring in advance of quantum storytelling? In a music ensemble, no one musician is the star. They are equally, all are the stars of the show, emerging as star, then taking a supporting role, in cyclic rotation. I will contrast ELT with more familiar models of leadership: dispersed, distributed, and relational. One primary difference is ELT includes both community and ecology, and is rooted in Indigenous Ways of Knowing (IWOK), that extend from the ancient Southwest. My contribution here is to recognize that ELT is rooted in the rhizomatic fractal, where the others (dispersed, distributed, and relational) are linear-, cyclic-, or spiral-fractal waves. For this contribution I will look to Deleuzian rhizomatic-fractals, which ELT purports to be, and make an observation. ELT revived and reinvented in late modern capitalism, must be a correlate with the dominant kinds of leadership of here and now, which is this information resolution we are in. And does not each revolution (steam, diesel/gas combustion, and now cyber-machinic) create anew, the enslavement of human beings?

QSC helps us see waves arriving from the future. I see a wave arriving from the future, and it's called 'Trump-Land', a newly arrived (United) States apparatus. QSC helps us collapse futural waves using an ethics of care, which sees all people as linked and attends to the vulnerable ecology (see Preface of this book).

Ensemble leadership theory (ELT) is a form of sociomaterial 'collective' intelligence that is fractally-rhizomatic (Rosile, Boje, & Nez, 2016). Rather, than the authoritarian leaders driven by the organization (branching or other fractals) of industrial revolution origins (1st industrial revolution the steam machine for farming; 2nd industrial revolution the gas & diesel machines for transportation; and now our very own 3rd industrial revolution the information machines our cell phone), rather the ensemble leadership pre-exists industrial revolutions and has its origin of participation in the premodern, in the ancient indigenous Southwestern history, long before all three industrial revolutions. ELT is not just rooted in an indigenous worldview, it is grounded in "overcoding already coded flows" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987: 459). ELT assumes leadership to be a collective processes, and does not center leading in a particular 'hero.' However, we have to be realistic. ELT is reasserting itself in an ontology of three industrial revolutions, and must therefore be a correlate with the one happening now, the Third Industrial Revolution.

What happens when the ELT rhizomatic fractal correlates with the Third Industrial Revolution machinic existence, all those cell phones and virtual realities of the Information Age?

ELT is dynamic rather than static. It is said to be compatible with quantum storytelling, for ELT has an 'antenarrative' fore-caring analyses, and a rhizomatic-antenarrative-fractality. ELT decenters leader participation, and is more accurately described as multi-centered, rather different than the strongman, and strongwoman, and the autocratic, authoritarian, bully boss leadership that shuns collective participation in most every structural-functional corporate, governmental, school and university organization. Ironically, most leadership theorists profess that we have left strongman and strongwoman leadership behind in order to cope with the turbulent and complex situations, so that only transformational participation are style-in-fashion.

Let's focus attention here a moment on how ELT is coming 'back to the future' to encounter more embedded industrial revolution leadership, command and control approaches. In terms of antenarrative fractality, ELT is a premodern, even nomadic rhizomatic leadership assemblage. ELT is also heterarchic rather than a single hierarchical structural-functionalism (see Preface of this book). And this antenarrative-rhizomatic-fractality being heterarchic must now time travel forward from the Premodern Hispanic Southwest temporality into the timescape of the Third Industrial Revolution (think cellphones), and the remnants of the Second Industrial Revolution (Transportation and Agribusiness responsible for so much CO₂ that a global warming is happening).

The premodern ELT is a heterarchy, a collective-intelligence-system of leadership where units (elements) of the organization are unranked (non-hierarchical). And where rank must be important (as in ceremony), there are still diverse heterarchic ways of ranking are enacted collectively. ELT is not human-centric, as it includes the reverence for ecosystem, where trees, rocks, animals, birds, fish, reptiles, rivers, mountains, and so on, have life and even have spirit. As such, ELT is posthumanist. These ELT qualities of collectivist, relational, dynamic, and heterarchic draw on the archeology of the prehispanic southwest. From these ancient roots, ELT emerges to break new ground in collective leadership theories. ELP leadership can be compared to dispersed, distributed, and relational leadership models.

You can see where this essay is going. The Premodern ELT is going to be dialectical to the Second and Third Industrial Revolutions, and as rhizomatic-antenarrative-fractality,

ELT will clash with the fractals that are linear, cyclical, spiralic, and even with other rhizomes. In this correlation of Premodern with two Industrial Revolutions (I assume 1st steam revolution is over), then the dialectical development that is now unfolding must be our focus of attention. It's a state of affairs in a State still comprehending and learning to be cellular, using apps for cell phones, lap tops, and within automobility transportation devices.

Next, let's compare it to dispersed, distributed, and relational leadership models and their respective fractalities, then return the relation of quantum storytelling and leadership in multifractality.

Dispersed leadership Barry's (1991) and Bryman's (1996) dispersed leadership model is an 'individual' self-leadership approach, where leader functions are diffused throughout an organization, a kind of (invisible agential) cutting up the leader role into various functions. Structural-functionalism, the recurring self-sameness can repeat across scales of the organization, but magically, here the individuals take up the leadership, informally. Dispersed leadership, is a within-the-person model. Each person has been delegated or just appropriated some aspect of overall leadership, such as in a professional group, doing accounting or legal work, influencing the bottom line. Rosile,

Rosile, Boje, and Nez (2016) are not specific about the exact fractal nature of distributed leadership. Boje and Nez (2016) do say its a 'fractal complex of repeating patterns.' Dispersed leadership is such a recent theory (except for the informal leadership part), spreading leadership throughout the entire organization's participants, making strategy, task, goals, and such their joint self-managed focus, has to be something fractal. If leadership is dispersed, what kind of fractality is it? Dispersed leadership is 'informal' where the leaderly roles are dissociated from the formal hierarchy of command and control, and people at all levels and in all roles do leadership to influence colleagues to influence the whole organization (Stephen Warrilow website).¹

The problem we face in the dispersed leadership model, is there is no theory of power. Ray, Clegg, and Gordon's (2004: 324) critique of 'dispersed leadership' is that (along with distributed leadership) it lacks a critical discussion of the connection of power and leadership. Notions of self-leadership, power-sharing are another attempt at decentralization of leader skills and responsibilities to empower. As Boje and Rosile (2001) critique it in 'where's the power in empowerment', noone with power can

¹ Stephen Warrilow website

<http://www.evancarmichael.com/library/stephen-warrilow/Leadership-Theories--What-Does-it-Take-to-Be-an-Effective-Leader.html>

empower someone else, rather power is taken by those who grasp it. "If this is to have any real meaning, we see the need to understand it alongside issues of power, knowledge and context" (Ray, Clegg, & Gordon, 2004: 320). "Dispersed leadership raises questions about how the 'rules of the game' enable and constrain the process of leadership in a particular context" (IBID.: 323).

"When introducing dispersed leadership, one is left pondering questions such as 'what happens to the reality of leadership when power is shared between the leader and the follower?' If the identity of leaders and followers is no longer differentiated, who leads and who follows? Is the sharing of power between leaders and followers not unlike the shifting limits to power in organizations, rendering leadership an untruth?" (IBID.: 325). Then, is dispersed leadership, just an ideology of 'free' market-rational individualism?

Distributed leadership Peter Senge's (1999), Gronn (2002), Harris (2003), and Bennett et, al's (2003) Distributed Leadership, Nottingham: National College for School Leadership. distributed leader model is still power shared among an in-group against an out-group that is powerless, such as the executive committee, or president-elect Trump's in-group cabinet, and his appointment of corporate and hawk-general leaders to various government institutions and councils. Distributed leadership has clearly-defined leader roles in the top echelons of selected individuals. It is much like a business college, where the dean distributed leadership roles to department heads (or chairs). Distributed leadership is still very hierarchical. There is an in-group and an out-group, and its definitely zero-sum, not win, win. Managerial categories of shared/team leadership and pooled top echelon leadership both fall into distributive leadership model. In fractal terms, distributed leadership is linear, a Beginning-Middle-End. The distributed leadership cause-effect is more of a branching fractal (the head divides roles among salaried division leaders, who delegate roles/tasks/outcomes to salaried department leaders, who divide them among salaried managers and supervisors of the various wage slaves).

Dispersed and distributed leadership cut-up-the-leadership pie of roles in ways distinctly different from the relational and ensemble models of leadership. Why? The dispersed and distributed leadership models hold out the myth of empowerment used by the reengineers (and big 10 Consultancy Giants, see Preface of this book) can gain lots of 'empowerment-leader' training revenues, because everyone must become a leader, and stop defending silos and turf, because the ERP does all the assignments, outcomes assessment, and executives can return from micromanaging to their 'real' tasks, to empower workers and brand things for customers (Champy, 1994).

Patton, Taylor, and Storey (2004: 118) put the connection between ERP, empowerment, and elite leadership this way:

“Such programmes aim to promote distributed leadership and employee empowerment at the same time as giving renewed emphasis to high potentials and elite leaders. They are multi-track and multi-method, making commodified learning resources on leadership widely available, while also targeting high cost elements more selectively, on the basis of different forms of assessment.”

Glatter (2004: 2012) disagree with Leithwood’s (2001: 231) thesis that distributed leadership is the antithesis of ‘great man’ leadership, and Glatter also acknowledges that distributive leadership can fit right in with ‘strongman’ and ‘strongwoman’ leadership styles:

“However, Bennett et al. (2003) point out that there is no necessary contradiction between the concept of distributed leadership and strong senior leadership: disparities of power may still exist even where leadership is distributed.”

Dispersed and distributed leadership models are often defined as emergent property of a relationship, a model we address next.

Relational leadership Mary Uhl-Bien (2006) assumes leadership is a relational process, co-created in the moment, by the interaction of individuals. Relational leadership is interpersonally co-negotiated, typically not along predetermined categories, as in the more functional approaches (dispersed and distributed). “Applied to leadership, a relational perspective changes the focus from the individual to the collective dynamic” (Uhl-Bien, 2006, p. 662). Uhl-Bien combines two relational models (realist entity & relational constructivism) into her next-step overarching framework of relational leadership: First, a much older interpersonal relational processes model centered on perceptions and cognitions (sensemaking in dyads such as leader-follower or just between participants) with a Second, much newer ‘in’ processes model in which the sensemakers are not the makers ‘of’ the processes, rather processes of larger social system construct meaning and relational reality of leadership (p. 655). “This perspective does not restrict leadership to hierarchical positions or roles. Instead it views leadership as occurring in relational dynamics throughout the organization” (IBID, p 655). In fractal terms, relational leadership is cyclical (recurring cycles) processes, but can morph into fractal-spiral-leadership relationality (see Preface in this book).

ELP and relational leadership are co-created in a community of practice.

ELT Rosile, Boje and Nez's (2016) ELT is farthest from dispersed and distributed leadership models. ELT is closest to relational leadership model, in that it is relational and dynamic, but there several important differences. Most important, ELT is a community of practice, inclusive of ecology, and community-leadership is among all, in a social, collectivist process. It is therefore different than relational leadership because it not about creating corporate order, rather it's Indigenous Ways of Knowing (IWOK) community of practice that is of primary importance in ELT. ELT is a process of co-creation collectively within the entire community. Egalitarianism is stressed, whereas in relational it is still the leadership dyadi-to-whole system function that is paramount. ELP is about fore-caring not just for others in community, but the ecosystem context of place, which community is all life. ELP is more of a rhizomatic fractal, leadership growing every which way in the community and its ecology.

For example, Ray, Clegg, and Gordon (2004: 321) harken back to a collective learning self-organizing community with a code of practice (call it ethics of care) that is self-sustaining:

“Consider the context of collective learning in self-organizing communities of practice that generates knowledge held in common by insiders. Such knowledge generation is ‘self-policing’—participants have to demonstrate themselves to be competent and trusted to contribute, according to the insider’s implicit code of practice; those who fall short of the mark risk being marginalized or ignored. Self-sustaining communities can emerge as significant social ‘containers’.”

ELT is what Ray, Clegg, and Gordon (IBID.) have called a “knowledge-generating ‘ecology’” and I will add its in particular context, a community of fore-caring practice.

In this next section, I want to shore up the relationship between quantum storytelling ELT.

Quantum Storytelling and Ensemble Leadership

I will focus here on the antenarrative-rhizomatic-fractal connects between quantum storytelling and ensemble leadership. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) connect their rhizomatic critique of capitalism as schizophrenic to fractality. In 7000 B.C. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) tell the history of flow of naked labor make people into a people of the State apparatus, animated by a “curious rhythm” and affairs of State

always getting mixed up in organizing war (p. 424). This is true even of the State apparatus situated in the agricultural communities, as counter-State communities form, it's always "dialectical schemas" in "the convergent wave and the anticipated potential" the zigzags (p. 431). As we loop at 'capture' the collective assemblage begins to grope and feel about in the dark, anticipating some new "assemblage component" to be captured, integrated, and produce a new assemblage (p. 439). There are two movements of the assemblage, descending and ascending [spiral] of "surplus profit accruing to the best lands", and it's "a process of relative deterritorialization" in the agrarian Hispanic Southwest (p. 441) where Rosile, Boje, and Nez reclaim ensemble leadership. But, it's not only the surplus profit of land, some communities or practice settle around having surplus profit from big families of workers, and others have the surplus profit of being incredible artisans, while others glean profit from being ceremonial, perhaps Shamanic communities of practice. Each has an "apparatus of capture, inseparable from a process of relative deterritorialization" (p. 441). Of course surplus land, labor, ceremonial and artistic prowess can capture more surplus by capture, and there is also the market for trading among tribes.

This is where the apparatus of capture in the ancient agrarian Hispanic Southwest indigenous communities coincide with "an agency of overcoding" (p. 444) in their long-distance trading (p. 450). And it is this overcoding in the premodern communities, the flows of trading, that make possible, according to Marx, the primitive accumulation that makes possible modern industrial capitalism, production and consumption, by "*regimes of violence*" as rural living gives way to urban living (p. 447, 454). I will provide some propositions.

Proposition 1: "*the overcoding of the archaic State itself makes possible and gives rise to new flows that escape from it*" (p. 449). The State does not create large-scale works of surplus profit without bureaucracy, where "even the slaves belong to the community of the public function" (p. 449).

Proposition 2: "It is the flow naked labor that makes the people, just as it is the flow of Capital that makes the land and its industrial base" (p. 456).

The State and the Corporation, are collectives of subjectification, and the process of subjection in the capitalist axiomatic, are not just about capture, but enslavement. Some under organizational subjection are salary-slaves, most are wage-slaves, and a few are unpaid slaves. Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) is able to enslave them all in the software-hardware machine, while declaring falsely, that people are empowered, self-leaders. Meanwhile public and private organizations of all types are often linked to an exterior object of accreditation, and how many faculty are enslaved by AACSB, and any universities by some other accreditation agency, and how many classes and consultancy big ten training teach enrollees compliance with accounting, trade, ISO quality and ecology standards, set from some outside organization?

Proposition 3: “The wage regime can therefore take the subjection of human beings to an unprecedented point and exhibit a singular cruelty, yet still be justified in its humanist cry: “No, human beings are not machines, we don’t treat them like machines, we certainly don’t confuse variable capital and constant capital” (p. 457).

Variable capitals is invested in hiring labor power (not just wage-slaves, but also salary-slaves) known as labor power, and embodied in subsistence necessary for reproduction of surplus profit. Constant capital, on the other hand, is invested in the means of production (embodied in the processes of equipment, tools like ERP, cellular phones, computers, Internet, Taylorism recast as TQM and reengineering, Fayolism Weberism as the newest multidivisional form). Cellphone enslavement is now the newest machinic-addiction. Try going without your phone for an hour, a day, or a week. Cell phone withdrawal is now considered a traumatic stress disorder.

Three types of coding While ELT in his original Hispanic Southwest indigenous state of affairs, was the over-coding of flows, making surplus profit from land, big family labor force, artisans or ceremonialist, industrial capitalism is about decoding the flows. “Capitalism arises as a worldwide enterprise of subjectification by constituting an axiomatic of decoded flows” (p. 457).

C1 = In the first age of agrarian premodern communities of practice, ELT over-coding of already coded flows of surplus (land, family workers, artisans, ceremonialists).

C2 = In the second age of motorized machines, the decoded flows of the 2nd Industrial Revolution (gas, oil, coal fossil fueled machines) and

C3 = In the third age, cyper decoding flows taken to a whole new plateau 3rd Industrial Revolution (cyber, Internet, knowledge workers on cell phones and computers).

C3 is all about isomorphy self-sameness between virtual-real and material-real, and heteromorphy different from the norm or standard. Both are kinds of fractal patterns. C3 is what Deleuze and Guattari (1987: 458) call “the new kind of enslavement” a surplus value that “reconstructs a generalized regime of subjection: recurrent and reversible” ‘humans-machines systems’ or what we now call cyber-humans. C3 enslavement is becoming worldwide in a kind of “transspatiotemporal unity”, a capitalism “reawakened the *Urstaat*” and given it new strength” (p. 459-460).

The *Urstaat*-State is the further evolution of Oedipus, the spiritualization and privatization, the market representation and commodification of desire (Oedipus a private figure) and slave labor of all sorts (public figure). In Oedipus territorialization of desire, the private world is subject to all kinds of servitudes in the logic of exchange, invoking the transcendental principle of servitude and Oedipus the fulfillment if nihilism.²

Deleuze and Guattari (1987: 486-487) include Von Koch’ fractal curve, Sierpinsky’s triangle and sponge fractal, and Mandelbrot’s fractal. “Fractals are aggregates whose number of dimensions is fractional rather than whole, or else whole but with continuous variation in direction” (p. 486). The rhizomatic fractal proceeds in all directions of striated space, smooth space, holey space of self-sameness repeating patterns, with vortices and turbulence, the swells and flows defy Newtonian physics, Euclidean and Archimedean geometries (p. 489). What is the result of the rhizomatic-fractal” “in the capitalist regime, surplus labor becomes less and less

² Deleuzian Encyclopedia http://www.encyclopedianomadica.org/English/gilles_deleuze.php

distinguishable from labor 'strictly speaking,' and totally impregnates it" (p. 491). Many kinds of enslavement replace the plantation slaves in lines of deterritorialization and reterritorialization.

Without an ethics of fore-care (see Preface of this book), the rhizomatic-fractals, are all about more and more kinds of enslavement.

References

Barry, D. (1991) 'Managing the bossless team: lessons in distributed leadership', *Organisational Dynamics* 20:31–47.

Bennett, N., C.Wise, P.A.Woods and J.A.Harvey (2003) *Distributed Leadership*, Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.

Bryman, A. (1996). 'Leadership in organizations', in S.R.Clegg, C.Hardy, C. and W.R. Nord, *Handbook of Organization Studies*, London: Sage.

Boje, D. M.; Rosile, GA. (2001). Where's the Power in Empowerment? Answers from Follett and Clegg, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, issue on Historical Perspectives of Workplace Empowerment. March, Vol. 37(1): 90-117.
http://business.nmsu.edu/~dboje/papers/CleggFollett4_index.html

Champy, J. (1994). 'Time to re-engineer the manager?', *Financial Times*, 14 January: 17. Ray, T., Clegg, S., & Gordon, R. (2004). A new look at dispersed leadership: power, knowledge and context. *Leadership in Organizations*, 319-36.

Deleuze, Gilles; Guattari, Felix. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated and foreword by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press.

Glatter, Ron (2004). Leadership and leadership development in education. Pp. 206-225 in John Storey (ed.) *Leadership in Organizations: Current Issues and Key Trends*. NY/London Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Gronn, P. (2002). 'Distributed leadership', in K. Leithwood, P.Hallinger, K.Seashore Louis, G.Furman-Brown, P.Gronn, W.Mulford and K.Riley (eds) *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*, Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Harris, A. (2003) 'Distributed leadership in schools: leading or misleading?', *Management in Education* 16(5): 10–13.

Leithwood, K. (2001) 'School leadership in the context of accountability policies', *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 4(3): 217–35.

Paton, Rob; Taylor, Scott; Storey, John. (2004). Corporate universities and leadership development. Pp. 104-126 in John Storey (ed.) *Leadership in Organizations: Current Issues and Key Trends*. NY/London Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Ray, Tim; Clegg, Stewart; Gordon, Ray. (2004). A new look at dispersed leadership: power, knowledge and context. Pp. 320-337 in John Storey (ed.) *Leadership in Organizations: Current Issues and Key Trends*. NY/London Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Rosile, Grace Ann; Boje, David M.; Nez, Carma Claw. (2016). "Ensemble Leadership Theory: Collectivist, Relational, and Heterarchical Roots from Indigenous Contexts." *Leadership journal*.

Salaman, Graeme. Competences of managers, competences of leaders. Pp. 58-79 in in John Storey (ed.) *Leadership in Organizations: Current Issues and Key Trends*. NY/London Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Senge, P.M. (1999) 'Towards an ecology of leadership: developmental journeys of three leaders', *Change and Development Journeys into a Pluralistic World*, Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Chicago, 6–11 August.

Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *The leadership quarterly*, 17(6), 654-676.