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This chapter provides perspectives on a more integral understanding of practice and theory of leadership and organization. Based on a critical overview of the fragmented contours of practice and research of organization and leadership, an integral framework with specific multidimensional and interconnected spheres will be outlined. The task of this integral perspective is to bring together many of the core practical domains and theoretical positions for coexisting and understanding the activities of organizing and managing. Furthermore, the integral orientation emphasizes the developmental potentials of organizations, members, leaders, and leadership in general. Finally, theoretical and methodological implications of an integral theorizing for leadership and organization studies and practices are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

An organization can be metaphorically construed as a great “house” where the residents share and quarrel, work together, and lead each other toward common goals. In this specific lifeworld of the organization, members are involved and engaged, managing and performing their tasks and jobs, and developing social relations in various realities through many different experiences. Unfortunately, organizations are also sites of dislocation, where many of their members do not feel “at home.” With the rapid and unexpected workplace changes of the past decades, involving so many renovations and restorations, many have lost their sense of belonging to that house. Members of organizations often have the impression that their everyday world of work is a collection of isolated fragments, without any shared meaning or overarching coherence. This situation is mirrored in the theoretical research into organizations and their leadership. As a theoretical building, the house of organization and leadership studies might also be characterized by fragmented specialization. From a metatheoretical perspective, we can see a prevailing fragmentation that is bound to particularized ontological, epistemological, and methodological assumptions and orientations. All of this results in a kind of sectarianism, where the various schools and paradigms of leadership and organization theory live in their separate rooms and do not frequently converse with each other. The state of affairs in the lifeworlds of organization and leadership mirrors and is part of the societal
context. Likewise, organization and leadership boundaries, as a general theory, reflects and is related to major trends that have recently emerged in the social sciences.

Bringing the house "in order," and governing it in an integrative way, refers to the genuine task of "eco-norms." Originating from the Greek for "for" ("oikos"; house) and "rules of the house," economics refers to the knowledge about appropriate "household" governance. How can we find our way in our house with its conceptualizing organizations and leadership? How can we use the different rooms? How can we feel "at home" in them? How can we develop a more integrative understanding of, and practice within, the household of organizations and leadership. The following does not focus on particular organizational topics, but instead reflects the generation and status of practice and theory itself as an "object." It aims to open up new possibilities for a more comprehensive framework for dealing with these rooms. Here refers to the "comprehensive," of a comprehensive and inclusive approach, in which the constituent "parts" and "whole of" and within leadership and organization are not fragmented. The term "in an integral orientation, micro-, meso-, and macro-dimensions, as well as their interrelations, are brought together. Thus, briefly stated, integral means bringing together and strategically linking apparently contradictory or seemingly divergent perspectives, concepts, and practices to create a realistic, workable, and dynamic understanding and practice. Based on the groundwork of past and present contributions to organization and leadership frameworks and discourse, the integral approach, as proposed in the following, serves as a kind of "working philosophy." With this orientation, the fields of inquiry into organization and leadership phenomena can be explored and disclosed in a more comprehensive way. First, we present an overview of the fragmented contexts of practices and research of organization and leadership. Second, we outline an integral framework covering the multidimensional spheres involved. Third, we describe a developmental model of leaders and leadership, and of organizational members and organizations. Finally, we discuss some theoretical and methodological implications of an integral perspective for the future of leadership and organization theory and practice.

CONTEXTS OF ORGANIZATION AND LEADERSHIP PRACTICE AND THEORY

The Fragmented Status of Practices

Organizational practice refers to daily activities and a vital "household" that has many, often narrow, compartmental and specialized rooms situated in isolation. Living in this building is currently intensified by many conflicting imperatives, dynamics, and pressures of change, making it increasingly uncomfortable and unworkable as an environment. In other words, "comfort zones" are questioned. Over the past decades, organizations and their members have been "living in a house of change" (Bacharach & Staw, 2000). This "blending" consists of an acceleration of discontinuous changes in social transformation and transformation endeavors like downsizing, delegating, and outsourcing. However, this blurring of the edges has its roots in the very social challenges that face modern corporations. Organizations operate in more complex environments, where the roles of individuals, groups, and organizations in the environment, the need to change, strategies, processes, and to respond to the business challenges increases accordingly. That shifting realities of the workplace are marked by greater pressure on individuals and teams to work harder and to "deliver" more while facing greater job insecurity. As a result, many workplaces are characterized by daily stress, work-life imbalance, personal well-being, interpersonal tensions, and a severe dislocation between organizational and personal life. Many managers and employees are facing contradictory performance imperatives and complex economic, social, and moral dilemmas, while at the same time experiencing increasing levels of dissatisfaction and failing to find meaning or fulfillment in their work. These results in such things as loss of motivation, burnout, and lack of meaning or purpose. Even for "high-performance" practices like organizational misbehavior, organizational devotions, and bullying behavior. All this culminates in a perpetuating cycle of conflict, distrust, and demotivation. Such problems are not only in the personal affected, including her well-being and that of individuals and the entire organization in a dangerous, self-perpetuating cycle. Collectively, this adds up to decreased performance, a climate of distrust, and reduced creativity, and the organization then becomes passive and devalued, undermining the best intentions for change and the most carefully constructed programs for renewal. This situation is confirmed by the findings of a new type of employee, the actively disengaged worker, who is so unhappy and tuned out that they willfully undermine coworkers and employers alike (Krueger & Killian, 2005).

With regard to leadership, Kellerman (2004) has described how many practices of bad management show tos, corrupt, incompetent, or even evil sides. Hidden below the more obvious forms of leadership incompetency lies a common form of "leadership" that is simply ineffective or lacking in the skill or will to sustain effective action, unable or unwilling to adapt to ideas and new information or change, or to develop self-confidence in the face of the challenging. Not only are there specific types of leaders who show these problematic kinds of leadership practices, but there are also followers who contribute to these problems and who must share responsibility in the challenges of leadership. Additionally, specific factors such as the rise of corporate scandals; the growing awareness of environmental, social, and ethical issues; and questions about (corporate social) responsibility manifest a heightened uneasiness and a hope for another kind of organization and leadership. Nevertheless, organizations and their members and leaders at all levels continue to create wealth, opportunity, meaning, and employment. Organizations and work are becoming more important as sources of meaning in people's lives. Organizations also sustain economic networks and create goods and services that help civil society to pursue its goals in educational, artistic, and environmental stewardship. Organizations reflect societal values and appetites and they legitimize the current systems and structures of the communities in which they function. Thus, the spiral of organizational development reflects the spiral of new: increasingly important, national, and international arrangements. Within this social complex diversity and within the context of these positive and negative aspects of organizations and their leaders, organizational and leadership theories have attempted to develop their understandings and explanations.

The Fragmented Status of Theory and Research

The challenges facing organizations and leaders are mirrored in the fragmented scientific context of economic, organizational, and management theories. The plethora of organizational theories is based on such diverse premises, seemingly unconnected assumptions, and contrasting worldviews that it is difficult to see how they might ever be seen as related or contributing to each other. In some way, the diversity of pluralism of views that is the problem here, but the lack of connection between them—the absence of conceptual positions that might form an overall perspective on any part of organizational thinking, and research not only limits communication and collaboration, but also constrains the ways we deal with current and future challenges.

As an organization theory and discourse emerges from the fields of sociology and engineering, it absorbed a mechanistic and functionalistic paradigm that has shaped its canon to this day. Organizations are conceptualized as machines, and are studied according to objective, performance-based criteria on how they achieve specific predetermined, market-driven goals. These goals are set and governed through instrumental and technical rationality and a type of organizational thinking that follows a quantifying, means-ends variety of formal logic. Such worldviews often inadvertently result in short-sighted policies that neglect important longer-term opportunities and issues. Furthermore, much of the prevailing economic and business research adopts a reductionist approach that does not recognize the interconnectedness of individual, interpersonal, societal, and environmental phenomena. The boundaries of organizations find their correspondences in the leadership discourse. The scientific study of leadership has contributed significantly to the understandings and explanations of these fields. Academic scholarship has also provided innovative and evidence-based intervention strategies for attaining the conventional organizational goals of increased efficiencies and effectiveness through improving aligned leadership and management practices. However, it is also clear that management theories and their espousal and apply in their research and teaching—are unable to meet the challenges facing contemporary leaders and their organizations. In his book titled "Bad Management Theories Are Destroying Good Management Practices," Ghosal (2005) proposed, "Many of the worst excesses of recent management practices have been traced back to business school academicians over the last 30 years" (p. 76). Prevaling leadership approaches are bound to fragmented or mutually exclusive paradigm parameters, and they lack an overarching orientation toward leadership. This results in an incomplete approach of leadership phenomena and can lead to inappropriate investigations, simplistic understandings, invalid conclusions, and managerialistic implications, which have been criticized. Fragmented and trivial leadership concepts and "research" are often informed by superficial ideas of management and the latest prepackaged list of "essential" qualities deemed necessary for solving all leadership problems. To avoid such simplistic and reductionistic perspectives, leadership studies require more expansive conceptual frameworks and discourses. Leadership literacy is currently characterized by competing approaches that emphasize different aspects of leadership. Each approach has its own insights and shortcomings. Space precludes a comprehensive review of these approaches here; however, the following discussion illustrates some of the main lines of inquiry and the rich tapestry of the more contemporary approaches take a person-centered, dyadic perspective and follow a "allopathic leadership" conceptualization. This understanding sees influence as flowing from the individual leader to the individual follower, and represents an entitative, egocentric, and mono- logical view. In conventional leadership-centered frames, leaders are positioned as knowing and followers are positioned as subjects of these processes. Consequently, little attention is paid to followers despite their co-constructive role in, and interdependence with, the leadership process. Moreover, leadership has been typically considered as a collective phenomenon, and there has been a neglect of forms of group-level and organizational leadership, whereas, in fact, leadership is an inherently communal capacity and achievement. Recognizing that most people have, or may develop, both a leader and a follower in the same organization becomes especially relevant for the increasing number of organizations using self-managed teams, executive teams, flexible structures, and joint ventures, both organizational and leadership discourse tend to underestimate human development issues—particularly those concerning the embedded and emotional dimensions—while privileging a disembodied rationality and cognitive approaches. Integrating Pluralism: Toward an Integral Perspective on Leadership and Organization • 313
context. Likewise, organization and leadership management theory, as a general discourse, reflects and is related to major trends that have recently emerged in the social sciences.

Bringing the house “in order,” and governing it in an integrative way, refers to the genuine task of “eco-nomics.” Originating from the Greek for “oikos” (“house” and “νομος” (“law”), hence “rules of the household,” “economics” refers to the knowledge about appropriate “household” governance. How can we find our way in our house with its many rooms? How can we use the different rooms? How can we feel at home in them? How can we develop a more integrative understanding of, and practice within, the household of organization and leadership? The following does not focus on particular organizational topics, but instead reflects the generation and status of practice and theory itself as an “Object.” It aims to open up new possibilities for a more comprehensive framework for conceptualizing organizations and leadership. It does not claim to solve all inclusive problems and quandaries; it proposes an integrative understanding and approach for organization and leadership practice. The theoretical framework here refers to the “completeness” of a comprehensive and integrative approach, in which the constituent “parts” and “whole” of and within leadership and organization are seen as part of each other. In an integrative approach, orientation, micro-, meso-, and macrodimensions, as well as their interrelations, are brought together. Thus, briefly stated, integrative means bringing together and strategically linking different theories, perspectives, concepts, and practices to create a realistic, workable, and dynamic understanding and practice. Based on the groundwork of past and present contributions to strategic management and management practice, the integrative approach, as proposed in the following, serves as a kind of “working philosophy.”

With this text, the fields of inquiry into organization and leadership phenomena are being reconnected and tasked in a more comprehensive way. First, we present an overview of the fragmented contexts of practices and research of organization and leadership. Second, we outline an integral framework covering the multidimensional spheres involved. Third, we describe a developmental model of leaders and leadership, and of organizational members and organizations. Finally, we discuss some theoretical and methodological implications of an integral perspective for the future of leadership and organization theory and practice.

CONTEXTS OF ORGANIZATION AND LEADERSHIP PRACTICE AND THEORY

The Fragmented Status of Practices

Organizational practice refers to daily activities and a vital “household” that has many, often narrow compartmentalized and specialized rooms situated in isolation. Living in this building is currently intensified by many conflicting imperatives, competing priorities, making it increasingly uncomfortable as conventional practices and “comfort zones” are questioned. Over the past decade, organizations and their members have been “living in a blender” (Brignall & Cenky, 2003). This “blending” consists of an acceleration of discontinuous change processes and transformation endeavors like downsizing, delaying, and outsourcing. This blending has its roots in the many social challenges that face modern organizations. As organizations operate in more complex, competitive, and volatile environments, the need to change strategies, structures, and processes and to respond to the business challenges in order to change (Brignall & Cenky, 2003). The blending is marked by greater pressure on individuals and teams to work harder and to “deliver” more while facing greater job insecurity. As a result, many workplaces are characterized by daily stress, work-life imbalances, powerlessness, interpersonal tensions, and a severe dislocation between organizational and community life. Many managers and employees are facing contradictory performance imperatives and complex economic, social, and moral dilemmas, while at the same time experiencing increasing levels of dissatisfaction and failing to find meaning or fulfillment in their work. This results in such things as loss of motivation, burnout, fatigue, and based on current trends, the lack of meaningful practices like organizational mishandling, organizational violations, and bullying behavior. All this culminates in a perceiving sense of conflict, distrust, and demotivation. Such crises and problems imply the disintegration of the coherence of the work of the organization, and in particular of leadership. In view of the problems that many organizations face and the diversity of different organizational settings, the disintegration of leadership and of the leadership context is not only about leadership, but also about how individuals and teams work together and on the entire organization in a dangerous, self-perpetuating cycle. Collectively, this adds up to decreased performance, increased stress, and reduced creativity. The organization then becomes passive and debilitated, undermining the best intentions for change and the most carefully constructed programs for renewal. This situation and the more obvious forms of leadership incompetency ties a common form of “leadership” that is simply ineffective or lacking in the skill or will to sustain effective action, unable or unwilling to adapt to ideas and information or change, or to develop self-confidence in the face of ongoing change. Not only are there specific types of leadership that show these problematic kinds of leadership practices, but there are also followers who contribute to these problems. These are the additional specific factors that the rise of corporate scandals, the growing awareness of environmental, social, and ethical issues, and questions about (corporate social) responsibility manifest a heightened uneasiness and a hope for another kind of organization.

Nevertheless, organizations and their members and leaders at all levels continue to create wealth, opportunity, meaning, and employment. Organizations and work are becoming an increasingly important social institution of meaning in people’s lives. Organizations also sustain economic networks and create goods and services that help civil society to pursue its goals in education, artistic endeavors, and scientific research. Organizations reflect societal values and aspirations and they legitimate the current systems and structures of the communities in which they function. The spiral of organizational development reflects the shifting forces of structural change and incompatible arrangements. Within this social complex diversity and within the context of these positive and negative aspects of organizations and their leaders, organizational and leadership theorists and practitioners have attempted to develop their understandings and explanations.

The Fragmented Status of Theory and Research

The challenges facing organizations and leaders are mirrored in the fragmented scientific context of economic, organizational, and managerial theories. The plethora of organizational concepts, management frameworks, and based on these concepts, divergent perspectives, practices, and thought experiments, among others. This has led to various premises, seemingly unrelated assumptions, and contrasting worldviews that it is difficult to see how they might ever be seen as related or as contributing to each other. This has led to a number of problems in the field of leadership research. One view is that there is a problem here, but the lack of connection between them—the absence of metaheoretical positions that might bring some sense of relationship between such diverse theoretical assumptions. The disjoint in theory and research, not only limits communication and collaboration, but also constrains the ways we deal with current and future challenges.

As organization theory and discourse emerged from within the fields of sociology and engineering, it absorbed a mechanistic and functionalist paradigm that has shaped its canon to this day. Organizations are conceptualized as instrumental in reducing uncertainty. They are assessed according to objective, performance-based criteria on how they achieve specific predetermined, market-driven goals. These goals are often not governed through instrumental and technical rationality and a type of organizational thinking that follows a quantifying, means-ends variety of formal logic. Such worldviews often inadvertently result in shortsighted policies and neglect important longer-term opportunities and issues. Furthermore, many of the prevailing economic and business research adopts a reductionist approach that does not recognize the interconnectedness of individual, interpersonal, sociocultural, and environmental phenomena. These phenomena cannot be considered in the leadership discourse. The scientific study of leadership has contributed significantly to the understandings and explanations of these fields. Academic scholarship has also provided innovative and evidence-based intervention strategies for improving the congruence of organizations and management practices. However, it is also clear that management schools—and the leadership programs and curricula that they espouse to students—are bound up in their research and teaching—are unable to meet the challenges facing contemporary leaders and their organizations. In his paper titled “Bad Management Theories Are Destroying Good Management Practice,” Ghorshad (2005) proposed, “Many of the worst excesses of recent management practices have their roots in a set of ideas that have emerged from business school academic over the last 30 years” (p. 76). Prevailing leadership theories are bound up in the research and teaching practices that shape leadership knowledge and are reflective of these flawed paradigms. The question of evaluating these paradigms and embracing new kinds of leadership and organizational theory is the focus of the following discussion.
The impact of these underlying presumptions can be seen in the empirical focus on ratings of individual abilities, traits, characteristics, and behaviors via cause-effect relations and purely cognitive variables. These types of data reflect limited theoretical views that are inadequate for studying organizations and leadership as a dynamic processes embedded in turbulent and complex social and institutional environments.

The foregoing has identified some serious social challenges and theoretical shortcomings in the current state of organization and leadership theory and research. This calls for a more integral approach that will enable a more inclusive position for investigating and enacting the interrelated processes of leadership and organizing.

AN INTEGRAL FRAMEWORK FOR LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONS

One of the most important capacities for any metatheoretical framework is to be able to provide nonreductive understandings and explanations. The integral approach draws on the "holon" concept to achieve this holistic/analytical capability. Although they can be used to represent entities, processes, and events, holons are essentially abstract ways of representing integrative part/whole relationships (Koestler, 1967). They can be used to accommodate divergent and often opposing understandings within a single conceptual framework. Holons can be seen as possessing structure and as subject to processes that are simultaneously autonomous and dependent, characterized by differentiation and integration.

For example, organizational change has been understood and researched in terms of individual agency, collective structure, and as combinations of both views. The holon construct can accommodate these varying conceptualizations within a nonreductive framework (Edwards, 2005). A holonic understanding brings together and utilizes the many different theoretical lenses that have been developed for understanding organizational and leadership phenomena. These lenses are the domain assumptions that theories within particular paradigms use to understand, explain, and research their "data." Two very important and commonly applied lenses are the interior-exterior dimension, which considers subjective and objective worlds, and the individual-collective dimension. These two lenses can be juxtaposed to form a framework for connecting not only relevant practical domains, but also all those theories and paradigms that adopt some
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Explanatory position using these dimensions (see Wilber, 1999-2000). The holon construct allows for the creation of complex models that have the conceptual power to accommodate many different practical and theoretical conclusions for describing social relationships and behaviors. On one hand, a great deal of the work of organizations and leaders involves managing and dealing with the dynamics between individual parts and collective wholes. On the other hand, "part" (the constitutive elements) and "whole" (the entire system) in organizations and leadership are not separate, static structures, but actively constitute each other—that is, they are primarily entangled and entangled. For example, leadership is a whole system of followership, and vice versa: followership is integral to leadership. Therefore, both are interrelated phenomena best described as a holarchical process, which is a more accurate and comprehensive conception (Küppers, 2007). Figure 8.1 shows the moment-by-moment "occasions of practice" that constitute individual and collective leadership.
The impact of these underlying presumptions can be seen in the empirical focus on traits of individual attributes, traits, characteristics, and behaviors via cause-effect relations and purely cognitive processes. These types of data reflect limited theoretical views that are inadequate for studying organizations and leadership as a dynamic process embedded in turbulent and complex social and institutional environments.

The foregoing has identified some serious social challenges and theoretical shortcomings in the current state of organization and leadership theory and research. This calls for a more integral approach that will enable a more inclusive position for investigating and enacting the interrelated processes of leading and organizing.

AN INTEGRAL FRAMEWORK FOR LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONS

One of the most important capabilties for any meta-theoretical framework is to be able to provide nonreductive understandings and explanations. The integral approach draws on the "holistic" construct to achieve this holistic-analytical capability. Although it can be used to represent entities, processes, and events, holons are essentially abstract ways of representing integrated part/whole relationships (Koestler, 1967). They can be used to accommodate divergent and often occurring in a single conceptual framework. Holons can be seen as possessing structure and as subject to processes that are simultaneously autonomous and dependant, characterized by differentiation and integration. Organizational change has been understood and researched in terms of individual agency, collective structure, and as combinations of both. The holon construct can accommodate these varying conceptualizations within a nonreductive framework (Edwards, 2005).

A holonic understanding brings together and utilizes the many different theoretical lenses that have been developed for understanding organizational and leadership phenomena. These lenses are the domain assumptions that theories within particular paradigms use to understand, explain, and research their "data." Two very important and commonly applied lenses are the interior-exterior dimension, which considers subjective and objective worlds, and the individual-collective dimension. These two lenses can be juxtaposed to form a framework for connecting not only relevant practical domains, but also those theories and paradigms that adopt some explanatory position using these dimensions (see Wilber, 1999–2000). The holon concept allows for the creation of complex models that have the conceptual power to accommodate many different practical and theoretical orientations for describing social relationships and behaviors.

On one hand, a great deal of the work of organizational members and managers involves managing and dealing with the dynamics between individual parts and collective wholes. On the other hand, "part" (the constitutive elements) and "whole" (the entire system) in organization and leadership are not separate, static structures, but actively coconstitute each other—that is, they are mutually defined and entangled. For example, leadership (a holonic part of followership), and vice versa: followership is integral to leadership. Therefore, both are interrelated phenomena best described as a holarchical process, which is a more accurate and comprehensive conception (Kopers, 2007). Figure 8.1 shows the moment-by-moment "occasions of practice" that constitute individual and collective leadership.

As already mentioned, one of the most important joint combinations for exploring organizations and leadership is produced by bringing together the two dimensions of interior-exterior and individual-collective. The four resulting quadrants representing four fundamental aspects of any "occasion" (Wilber, 2006). These are (a) the interior of the individual, or the consciousness quadrant; (b) the exterior of the individual, or the behavioral quadrant; (c) the interior of the collective, or the cultural quadrant; and (d) the exterior of the collective, or the social quadrant. Because
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consciousness Quadrant (IL)</th>
<th>Behavioral Quadrant (UF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual (IL)</td>
<td>Behavior (UF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Occasion of Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Quadrant (LL)</td>
<td>Social System Quadrant (LF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective (IL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Consciousness Quadrant

This quadrant represents the interior individual aspects of organizational members. It involves the introspective or subjective experiences of persons and their attitudes, intentions, meanings, unconscious feelings, cognitions, volition, motivation, knowing, and memory. Importance for the business context, it refers also to the readiness for motivation and commitment to self, to a goal, or to an organization. This inner world has specific relevance for leadership. For example, a longitudinal study carried out by Torbert and his colleagues (2004) showed that the success of organizational transformation efforts was dependent upon the level of consciousness of leadership. However, leadership development and practice are most effective when the individual-interior dimensions are linked and supported by external action and tangible. In this quadrant, the focus is on helping organizational leaders see what their leadership style might be so that they can transform into themselves and their followers. It also deals with the psychological dimensions of an individual leader and how those influence on the organization and its development. Methodologically, this inner world of each individual requires holism and neurology to be uncovered. Practically, it is only accessible through self-reporting techniques or profound dialogues with a person, access to her private writing, speeches, or other productions; or through interviews with her and her close associates.

The Behavioral Quadrant

The behavioral quadrant treats the external aspects of individual members and leaders, referring to all objective and behavioral activities. This is the performance domain of individual skills, competencies, and all those embodied actions of behavior that can be measured and refined. Training and development opportunities that support the development and enactment of competencies and peak performance are part of this quadrant, as well as coaching, consultation, communication, goal setting, and skills that develop effective practice. The role of leadership in this realm of performance management requires the management and monitoring of specific tasks, competencies, and actions in order to achieve the goals of the organization. In this capacity, the leader functionally manages material and substantive resources, human resources, and checks if goals are being met and tasks carried out. In terms of method, this quadrant is the domain of empirical observation and quantitative measurement. The methods of behavioral sciences are employed here to measure and assess leadership performance via such methods as individual performance appraisals.

The Cultural Quadrant

The cultural quadrant deals with the intersubjective space of mutual recognition and internal collective aspects of organization and leadership. The transsubjective realm of shared history, myths, stories, and values are all part of this quadrant. It is also the domain of systems beliefs, shared meanings, and worldviews, and it also includes tacit and informal customs that can be discerned from how people explain and do things. This domain considers the deeper significance of collective rituals, ceremonies and symbols, sociocultural purposes, and visions. Crucial ingredients for sustainable organizational success, such as collective morality and meaning making, are located here. This quadrant is characterized by a common language and signs that can be understood, communicated, and shared with others. The focus here is on groups or teams as a collective of individuals, who are interdependent and interact on a face-to-face or virtual basis with one another. Leadership exerts various influences upon this aspect of organizational life and the social life-world of structure and roles and also determines the entire culture. However, a leader cannot manipulate this sphere directly, because it is a large extent, determined and controlled by the collective cultural identity of the organization and its social environment. As a form of "soft management," leadership here requires coaching and working with employees to cultivate teamwork and communication. Furthermore, leadership here may take new collective forms such as those of shared or distributed team leadership. The personal modeling of values and integrity and their ongoing iteration from leader to follower(s) is also an important element here.

The methods used to discover the "data" in the cultural quadrant are interpretative approaches like phenomenology (the art and science of interpretation), interpersonal dialogue, collaborative inquiry, action research, and certain forms of anthropology, each of which focuses on some aspect or other of the human intersubjective realm. Corresponding interview techniques—like depth and narrative interviewing—serve to disclose multiple voices about collective meaning making.

The Social/System Quadrant

The social quadrant covers those aspects of organizational and leadership that are collective and exterior, those aspects that are observable and shaped by the structural patterns of social reality. This is the world of organizational structures and systems of all kinds—managerial, financial, technological, and informational. It is also the face of
the organization that is seen in job roles, procedures, and workplace practices. This aspect of organizational life is attainable, but it requires systems theories and is often represented as quantities and qualities of inputs, throughputs, and outputs. In other words, this is where thinking about the organization as a performance system is important. The leadership-related focus of this idea is on issues such as how to redesign or reengineer the organizational system so that it performs at higher levels. For this purpose, it covers managerial functions, such as the structuring of management and organizational strategies, financial strategies, organizing means of production, techniques of marketing, information, and communication technologies. This domain "involve[s] the organizing's relationships with the external world of markets and stakeholders. It includes relations and negotiations with industrial stakeholders to obtain resources and factors relevant for the organization. This includes keeping in contact with customers and ensuring that services and products are meeting their needs. As this realm refers to the concrete collective world of that which is tangible, measurable, and quantifiable, it can be studied with objective research methods. The "new science" approaches of chaos, complexity, and system theories are relevant here. As the social system quadrant concerns the objective features and operational domain of the exterior world, fields such as structural functionalism and the ecocentric sciences, among others, provide methodological approaches for investigating this field. From this perspective, leadership and organizations here are more likely to be thought of as transforming systems in various states of dynamic (dis)equilibrium than as rigid forms of social "inertia." As such, they are characterized by irreversible, progressive contexts within an emerging order. This implies that chaos and complexity are not problems to be solved, but the engines of evolution, adaptation, and renewal in organizations.

INTERRELATING SPHERES AND THEORIES OF ORGANIZATIONAL AND LEADERSHIP PRACTICE AND STUDIES

Each of the four quadrants depends on the others for its basic existence and sustenance. Integral theorist Ken Wilber (1999-2000) says that the quadrants "tetra-interact and tetra-evolve"—and an integral approach is sensitive to those richly textured patterns of "infinite interaction." What is therefore needed is an approach that considers all quadrants, to show that organizational and leadership practices and developments are carried and played out within and between all these four domains. Thus, an integral approach explores the embeddedness of these various spheres within and between one another and the degree to which the levels mutually influence or constrain each other. Figure 8.1 shows the different spheres of integral leadership and organization, where the horizontal axis presents a continuum between "interior" and "exterior" realities and the vertical axis a continuum between "individual" and "collective" realities.

In our view, the question of what constitutes effective and sustainable organization and leadership practice and theory requires giving answers from different perspectives, compromising all of the domains and all the conceptual lenses that can be assembled within the integral framework. Various research traditions and developments of organization and leadership studies have made tremendous contributions to each of these different domains; however, each has limitations, particularly in terms of modeling, assessing, and developing of an integral comprehension. Due to its specialization and shortcomings, conventional approaches tend to perceive issues of organization and leadership from selective fields only. They often focus on a particular feature or causal process, and then either implicitly or explicitly assert that this is the main or only causal factor. In a way, each approach is "true," yet only partially. The task will be to figure out how to fit these partial truths together and how to integrate them inclusively, not how to pick one and get rid of the others. The exterior and objective perspectives on individual and collective behavior have become the prevailing canon in dominant functionalist approaches in organization and leadership studies. However, to understand organization and leadership as a holistic, "four-quadrant affair" requires us to embrace the interior dimensions as well, including their inner meanings. Conversely, the often-neglected inner lives of organizational members and leaders and the collective spheres of leadership must also be seen as equivalent in radical and codetermined by behavioral and exterior dimensions. To privilege one quadrant over another is to distort the delicate integration, complementary relationships, and interconnectedness of effective organizational and leadership practice and theory. Recognizing the underlying principle of fundamental interconnectedness, an integral approach recognizes that pathologies in any quadrant will reverberate through all others. From an integral perspective, all dimensions of organization and leadership cocreate each other and unfold and develop holistically. Thus, specific dimensions of organization and leadership are not narrowly located in one quadrant, but need to be studied from the perspective of each quadrant, as well as from their complex interactions. Therefore, the different spheres between the individual and collective and subjective and objective identities need to be seen as an interwoven nexus as shown in the following figure.

An integral approach aids the exploration and facilitation of an understanding that is more in tune with the diversity and ambiguity of organizational life and with the corresponding intricacies of leadership practices. By applying varied lenses and perspectives, integral researchers are more adequately equipped to shed light on tensions that exist along with organizational and leadership practices, e.g., by exposing conflicting demands as complementary, and by demonstrating that apparently opposing interests are actually interwoven in a process. But an integral conception is not a "harmony" model, as it does consider relations, disparities, and conflict. Although the framework can generate quite a degree of complexity (especially with...
INTERRELATING SPHERES AND THEORIES OF ORGANIZATIONAL AND LEADERSHIP PRACTICE AND STUDIES

Each of the four quadrants depends on the others for its basic existence and sustenance. Integral theorist Ken Wilber (1994a-2001) says that the quadrants "interact and inter-evolve"—and an integral approach is sensitive to these richly textured patterns of "infinite interaction." What is therefore needed is an approach that considers all quadrants, so that organizational and leadership practices and developments are carried out within and between all these four domains. Thus, an integral approach explores the embeddedness of these various spheres within and between one another and their impacts on other domains. Therefore, the different theories and models of leadership and collective behavior need to be seen as interwoven as shown in the following figure.

An integral approach aids the exploration and facilitation of an understanding that is more in tune with the diversity and ambiguity of organizational life and with the corresponding approaches of leadership practices. By applying varied lenses and perspectives, integral researchers are more adequately equipped to shed light on tensions that come along with organizational and leadership practices, e.g., by exposing their cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components, and by demonstrating that apparently opposing interests are actually interwoven in a process. But an integral conception is not a "harmony" model, as it does consider relations, dynamics, and the foci of the framework can generate quite a degree of complexity (especially when other important conceptual lenses are combined with the quadrants framework). This does not exclude specific focus and investigation of particular domains of dissonances and conflict-shaped realities. To take an example, an integral understanding of influence and power in organization and leadership would include, for instance, a phenomenological analysis of the dimension of the subject-object relationship, collective meaning and projections of individuals (Consciousness Quadrant) and empirical observations and measurement of the enactment of the individuals' behaviors (Behavioral Quadrant), an interpretative and etiographic investigation of power within organizational culture (Culture Quadrant), and the functional and structural aspects of power as it appears in institutionalized forms within social systems (Social System Quadrant). The integration of these different quadrants would reveal the intertwined complexities of influence and power processes. The same quadrant-specific and interrelated investigations could be applied to various other organization leadership and follower-related phenomena. Additionally, using an integral inquiry of this type can diagnose various problems, pathologies, and conflicts, as well as provide ways for dealing with them.

As organizations make the transition to meet today's challenges, they must consider which aspects of organizational members' consciousness, their action, and the organization's culture and social system are being impacted in order to set priorities and enact practices. With this as an overall adaptive approach it is an essential presupposition for effective organizational and leadership-related practice. Organizations and leadership that embark on comprehensive and sustainable change and development must address these through holistic, holonically interleaved and between and within them. Actual experience and practice always encompass not only all four quadrants as basic lenses that frame perception along certain perspectives, but also its evolutionary potential as expressed in the integral lenses of developmental stages and lines. These dynamic processes—as outlined in the following—refer to two important conceptual lenses that build on the quadrant framework for organization and leadership that we have focused on to this point.

DEVELOPMENTAL STAGES AND LINES OF LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION WITHIN AN INTEGRAL CYCLE

All four quadrants show growth, development, or evolution. That is, they all can be seen as transforming through various stages or levels of development, not as rigid points in a ladder, but as fluid and flowing waves of unfolding. Thus, the quadrant framework can be dynamically extended by a series of different developmental stages or levels of development of organizational members and organizations. Each stage represents a level of organization or a level of complexity. The word "level" is not meant in a rigid or exclusionary fashion, but simply to indicate that there are important emergent qualities that tend to come into being in a discrete fashion, and that these are important at many different levels. The levels of development refer to what is being developed (matter, body, mind, soul, and "spirit") as generalized "wave" of existence, thus, the levels are being achieved through stages of development by transcending and inclining. The levels mark out new capacities and emergent qualities through the lives of organizational members and leaders situated in their specific contexts. Furthermore, these basic levels, though described differently at different stages, can be seen as fluid, flowing, overlapping waves in an overall spectrum of transformation.

Developmental studies within psychol- ogy and sociology have focused on several developmental dimensions as basic components of individual and collective human functioning and overall growth. These developmental dimensions are what Wilber (2005) refers to as "developmental lines or streams." These developmental lines reflect increasing capacities and functions within the stages. As such, they codetermine a human being's capacity to perform successfully in various circumstances. The developmental lines are cognitive (e.g., strategic thinking), emotional (e.g., emotional intelligence), interpersonal (e.g., social awareness, empathy), behavioral (e.g., management), knowledge, and learning developments, or ethical/moral lines of organizational members and their processes. Most of these lines develop in a relatively independent fashion at their own.

Figure 8.1.2: Interrelations Within Framework of Integral Leadership and Organization
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vus with their own dynamics. Some lines are necessary but are not sufficient for others, while some develop closely together (Wilber, 1999–2000).

Collectives such as organizations can be regarded as developing through these multidimensional capacities (Cacoppe & Edwards, 2005). For organizations, these can include lists of education, medicine, technology, leadership, politics, governance, religion and spirituality, public morality and ethics, economics, international relations, law and legal process, media, and entertainment. All of these areas of social activity are subject to developmental growth in that they can be regarded as moving through regular patterns of systematic change. Edwards (2005) made the point that "as with individuals, the healthy organization will develop in a balanced way across a number of key lines" (p. 282). For example, an organization whose ethical line of development is severely out of step with its financial systems would evidence considerable problems across many important facets of its operations and culture.

As capacities increase in a developmental line, it moves to a more integrative stage in the overall spectrum. Accordingly, the lines develop over time through increasingly complex levels of maturity, education, and skill. But this is a very idiosyncratic process, and no two individuals or groups navigate their way through these developmental complexities in the same way. There are also "lagging lines" of development that represent specific weaknesses. These underdeveloped capacities may be a limiting factor for both leaders and organizations, and they may impact significantly on their overall behavioral effectiveness, state of well-being, cultural balance, and social functioning. Understanding the concepts of levels and lines of development can be beneficial for leaders in their own development, as well as for influencing and motivating followers. Comparing stage-based theories across different developmental lines shows that there is a tendency for individuals and groups to move from egocentric views (e.g., trait models), through ethnocentric views (e.g., group dynamics models), to world-centric views (e.g., transformational or servant leadership model, organizational wisdom). An integral organization and leadership theory acknowledges that organizational agents, leaders, and followers as complex beings who mature and develop over time in relationship to physical, emotional, cognitive, social, and spiritual lines, and who recognize that they have desired transcendence-related work accomplishments progressing through the stages of human development. Unpacking the significance of "levels and lines" simply means that a leader, a follower, or a group or organizational system can be at a fairly high level of development in some lines (e.g., cognitive), at a medium level of development in other lines (e.g., interpersonal), and at a fairly low level in yet others (e.g., moral). This makes intuitive sense, as we all know persons or groups who are advanced in some skills (e.g., they are highly intelligent), but not as developed in other capabilities or competencies (e.g., they are less empathetic or ethical). As characterizations of organization and leadership capacities, the lines of development also influence how well members (e.g., leaders, followers, groups) and entire organizations perform. These developmental lines can therefore be measured using "levels of proficiency." For example, a leader may possess a high "level" of proficiency in cognitive ability (e.g., high IQ) but may have a low level of proficiency at interpersonal skills (e.g., low EQ). With this there is the need to assess and identify levels of proficiency on each major line of development of leaders and of their followers. Having some understanding about the multidimensional nature of human development can help leaders to be better informed about delegating, supporting, and coaching individual staff and teams in regard to their specific configurations of capacities, or to determine the need for training to strengthen proficiency on selected lines. In turn, these understandings may support the self-development and self-understanding of others. Furthermore, the levels, lines, and quadrants are energized by the dynamics of growth and integration within an "Integral Cycle" (Edwards, 2005), which keeps all of these elements hanging together in a coherent and dynamic system and coordinates the interaction between the four quadrants and the holistic developmental levels and lines.
Integrating Pluralism: Toward an Integral Perspective on Leadership and Organization

With its capacity to analyze, categorize, and synthesize, the concept of an integral cycle is a way of representing the mutual interpenetration of quadrants. Furthermore, it covers the component structures and the integrative and growth dynamic relationship that exists between the domains and its involutionary and evolutionary pathways. Each of the holon develops simultaneously through all four quadrants involving in an intimate cycle of mutual interpenetration. To understand how these spheres are dynamically and "holonomically" interrelated, we would need to follow a processual turn. While such a task is beyond the scope of the present article, the issues of relationality and process need to be seen as core aspects of an integral approach to organizational and leadership studies.

THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND METHODOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

As mentioned before, innovative metatheoretical positions need to be developed and described, which can build conceptual bridges between the pluralities of constructs and models that characterize contemporary organization and leadership research. There are two general alternatives that have been put forward for dealing with the challenge of theoretical pluralism. The modernist position is that it seeks a single monolithic and model dependent on empirical evidence and rational criteria for evaluating theory. The postmodernists' position is one that supports this diversity and sees this state of affairs as healthy, desirable, and to be encouraged. Both of these alternatives have their merits and disadvantages, their potentials and limitations. Ultimately, however, these approaches end in either a dogmatic positivistic purism where specialization reigns within a dominant theoretical paradigm, or an unbounded relativistic pluralism, where fragmented diversity holds sway. How to avoid the specialization trap and the fragmentation trap? In metaphorical terms, what is needed is a third alternative that is neither a sterile, overcoded, monocular culture nor a scruffy weed pauch where anything grows. We need grounded conceptual frameworks that elicit from organizational and leadership theory their complementarities and correspondences. We need a shift toward innovative paradigms that can transcend paradigm incommensurability and/or reductionistic narrowness. Such a shift requires juxtaposing and connecting partial understandings and representations so that various multiparadigm research combinations and integral connections can emerge.

As we have seen, integral methods for investigating theoretical positions of organization and leadership are multifaceted in that they utilize multiparadigm and metatheoretical research designs. Multiparadigm because they review and analyze extant leadership and organizational theory of all kinds, and metatheoretical because they build on these analytical studies to propose overarching frameworks that recognize the plurality of theoretical views. One important conceptual lens for multiparadigm review and metatheory building is the personal perspective. Integral methods for investigating leaders and organizations are pluralistic in that they can inquire into first-person, external, group, and trans-person relational aspects of these areas. Each of these perspectives (singular and plural forms) carries with it inherent methodologies or modes of inquiry. They can all help to inform the way research seeks out different approaches for understanding the complex dimensions of organization as well as leadership and its followership connection (Kopera, in press-a). The first-person world of subjectivity includes the qualitative and experiential aspects of life. First-person methods inquire into subjective awareness and the meaning of personal experience and action. Leadership theory here is concerned with the emotional, phenomenal experience and the existential realities of being in a position of leadership. First-person research methods such as autobiographical methods and journaling are becoming increasingly important in the academic study of leadership. The populization of autobiographies in particular has contributed much to our understanding of how leaders experience their roles and how they cope with, and succeed to, the complexities and challenges that they meet on a daily basis. The first-person world of subjectivity includes all those interpersonal and group-based experiences that comprise so much of the day-to-day pragmatics of leadership. The capacity to communicate, inspire, and be effective in the workplace are hallmarks of authentic forms of leadership. Relational methods such as 360 evaluation techniques, group process, personal and unstructured interview techniques, and peer-group interviews open a window into the second-person world of relationality and a means for disclosing the multiple voices individual and collective sensibilities. The third-person world of objective methods focuses on the empirical, behavioral, and statistical methods of quantity analysis leadership and organizational reality. Here, the emphasis is on the behavioral investigation of leadership through such means as psychometrics, situational analysis, and detailed observation. Third-person methods can be used for investigating quantitative data with rigor. An integral methodology recognizes the validity of behavioral, functionalist, and reductionist and quantitative investigations. In turn, each of these first-, second-, and third-person methods can be combined with other paradigm lenses to develop overarching frameworks. For example, they can be combined with multiparadigm research methods to develop overarching frameworks.
integral tapestry, a unity-in-diversity that slights neither the unity nor the diversity. An IPM provides a comprehensive framework for identifying methodologies for investigating basic "lifeworlds" that together form a comprehensive methodological framework for studying leadership and organizational life. Organization and leadership researchers, therefore, need to engage with ideas and standpoints from different inquiry paradigms that are characterized by different assumptions about actors and relations. The challenge will be to link the various elements of the spheres that have been too separately addressed within an explicitly integrative context, for this integral theory does not assume that paradigms are incomensurable. Even if the underlying paradigms are based on a set of apparently opposing metatheoretical assumptions, an integral metaparadigm can accommodate conflicting knowledges and disparities. Using second-order constructs, integral metathesorizing provides a reference system for linking disparate representations (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). This position is in contrast to Barrett and Morgan (1979), who have advocated "paradigmatic closure" and "isolationism" between paradigms that they see as "mutually exclusive views of the social world."

In contrast, an integral perspective of holistic complementarity questions this assumed incomensurability and supports research strategies that transcend the incomensurability argument.

Multiparadigm methods of researching leadership and organizations require a close familiarity with the core characteristics of major theories in these fields. Such immersion and constant reexamining and questioning foundational assumptions of various theories and practices enables experiential learning that further elevates "paradigm consciousness." This in turn protects self-reflective researchers from becoming trapped within a peripheral vision or limited range of conceptual possibilities and to understand leadership theory from a more integral perspective. An integral paradigm imbeds and does not merely synthesize other paradigms and theories into some artificial unity. By accommodating various theories, methodologies, and insights holistically, they can find their place in a broader, integrative scheme. For example, the presence of the interior-exterior dialectic in the structure of a holon provides an opportunity for disclosing and integrating subjective, interpretive data, as well as objective, behavioral data in understanding organization and leadership. Additionally, with its multi- and metaparadigm capacity, the integral framework encourages greater awareness of theoretical and methodological alternatives. Thereby, it facilitates discourse and/or inquiry across paradigms ("paradigm interplay"), fostering greater understanding within pluralist and even paradoxical organizational and leadership contexts (Lewis & Kelemen, 2002).

In applying a multiparadigm and metatheoretical framework, integral researchers may develop multired accounts that depict the diversity and complexity of organizational life. Even though integral theorists cannot shed their prepositions, they can contrast or relate their preferred representations to those of other paradigms. With this capacity, an integral perspective strives for an expanded range, allowing alternatives to coexist and engage in potentially more insightful and creative orientations and interactions. Being critically self-reflective, integral theorists learn to view and depict paradigms as detailing different layers of meanings, which also facilitates a more reflexive exploration of leadership and organizational practice. Methodologically, to grow into a more multi-and interdisciplinarity endeavor, future organization and leadership research needs to break its largely univocal narrative and open up to multiple and innovative methods. Bringing these perspectives together highlights the different possibilities that exist for investigating how they might interrelate for a better understanding of organization and leadership. Furthermore, the outlined premises and arguments make it possible to view organization and leadership research as a process of social construction and practice itself, and to view this research as part of the investigated and mediated relational process. Hence, the research process can be interpreted as a way of going on in relationship, constructing knowledge and social validation. To facilitate methodological variability, the research methodology of participatory action research and the deployment of further qualitative and interpretive research strategies, with a strong "situationality" and case study focus, seem particularly suitable. Moreover, from an integral perspective, quantitative and qualitative research can be mutually informative and illuminating in the study of organization and leadership. In a similar way to multiparadigm inquiry (Lewis & Grimes, 1999), an integral orientation may help theorists to gain an appreciation of new fields of knowledge and reduce their commitment to a favored and "provincial" point of view. An integral approach facilitates a shift from parochialism toward a more rich, contextualized, and multidimensional theory (building), offering a greater explanatory potential. For this, the complex framework needs of course to be methodologically operationalized in detail, in terms of determining constructs and variables setting and testing hypotheses, antecedents, moderators, mediators, outcomes, and their interrelations. Furthermore, considering the developmental levels of organizational members allows a more dynamic understanding of the processes involved. Exploring organization and leadership as a processesual event implies a methodological focus on relations, connections, dependences, and reciprocities, investigating specific encounters, and relational issues or situations. Integral methods not only provide the possibility of a shared language for addressing the basic patterns and problems of organizational and leadership practices, they can also be used as a functional guideline that is careful not to render, oversimplify, isolate, or fragment our understanding of organization and leadership. By offering multidimensional perspectives and developmental orientations, integral frameworks can illuminate our blind spots, revive our otherwise reductionistic picture of reality, and challenge our limiting assumptions about the nature of leadership and organizational systems.
INTREGATING PLURALITY: TOWARD AN INTEGRAL PERSPECTIVE ON LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION

PERSPECTIVES AND CONCLUSION

This article has argued that an integral framework enables a more inclusive approach to the understanding and study of organization and leadership. An integral framework provides the base for a substantial theoretical advancement of the general knowledge around these topics. However, research and theorizing about organizations and leaders from an integral perspective needs that corresponding practice and development is more complex and difficult to design and implement. To realize such an extended understanding and corresponding sustainable practice of an integral organization leadership requires an even deeper experiencing of the role of personal, interpersonal, sociocultural, and systemic issues around these topics. Difficulties are not unresolvable, they are put up considerable barriers to the reality appreciation of integral approaches. Because we are in the early stages of moving into an integral approach to the study of organization and leadership, there are many open questions and fields of applications to be explored. Further detailed mapping is required for moving through the conceptual landscape of an integral understanding. There is the need to examine the contingency between the different dimensions of individuals (leaders and followers) and their external tasks and actions, as well as the role to collective spheres. Further research will have to investigate ways to go to a better understanding of individuals and their behavior, as well as groups in various interpersonal arrangements and systemic organizational settings, constitute experience, and exist, and process practices. Conversely, understanding conditions in terms of both sociocultural and systemic spheres—for example, relation between individuals or groups to formal organizations and the "space in-between" (Bradbury & Lichteinste, 2000)—will be worthwhile in investigating the effect that power relations, sociopolitical tensions, and conflicts have on the connections between inner processes (e.g., feelings or emotional disturbances) and their expressed action along those avenues. Thus, the complex framework needs of course to be methodologically operationalized in detail, in terms of determining constructs and variables-setting and testing hypotheses, antecedents, mediating, and outcomes, and their interactions. Furthermore, considering the developmental levels of organizational members allows for a more dynamic understanding of the process involved. Exploring organization and leadership as a developmental process involves a methodological focus on relations, connections, dependences, and reciprocities of a specific encounter, and relational issues or situations. Integrating methodology not only provides the possibility of a shared language of addressing the basic patterns and problems of organizational and leadership practices, but they can also be used as a functional indication of a holistic worldview. This involves more and more into one of converging evidence and integration, the challenge will be to synthesize accumulated knowledge and develop further knowledge in such a way that we can begin both to recognize and premise a number of integral theories of organization and leadership covering diverse perspectives. With this, researchers, and also organizational members, can not only integrate and connect existing concepts, but can also use the diagnostic, integrative power of the qualitative and evaluative potential of an integral approach. Integral approaches are likely to serve as a helpful antidote to short-term, fragmented, and one-sided orientations. Even more, employing the proposed framing and emerging integral theory and its corresponding practice will provide a base on which to build a more sustainable and rewarding worldview of organizations. In other words, effective and successful leadership members and leadership processes of the 21st century will be those that understand, foster, and help create and enact a more integral way of organizing, leading, and following. Moreover, an integral organization and an integral leadership will be those that realize practical wisdom (Küppers, in press b). Such a "wise" organization looks to developing its staff, its teams, its culture, and its social systems toward more embracing forms of well-being. Forms that contribute to enhancing the leadership potential of all its members and the well-being and sustainability of the communities and stakeholder in which it operates. In addition to such contributions, the outlined integral framework offers challenges for developing a more comprehensive and accurate research methodology that can honor the many different theories and corresponding practices of the complex nexus of organization and leadership. In this way, we might be able to find our way around the bewildering complexities of organization and leadership practices and studies, and also rebuild and shape these lifeworlds in a more adequate way, fulfilling the task of genuine "economy" as the art of appropriate "housekeeping."
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