The Self-Action Leadership Existential Paradigm
Introducing a Post-Postmodern Pedagogical Philosophy in Promotion of Self-Leadership and Character Education

Jordan R. Jensen
Freedom Focused,
LLC, USA

Christopher P. Neck
Department of Management, W. P.
Carey School of Business,
Arizona State University, USA

Rodney J. Beaulieu
Human Development Department,
College of Education, Health &
Human Service,
School of Health Sciences and Human Services,
California State University San
Marcos, USA

ABSTRACT

Despite being a burgeoning qualitative research method, autoethnographic research has largely been sequestered in education and social justice domains. This paper applies autoethnography to mainstream management theory by reviewing an original philosophy, theory, and model of personal management, self-leadership, and character education grounded in autoethnography, action research, and existential philosophy. This new subset of action research and self-leadership theory is called Self-Action Leadership (SAL) and serves as a comprehensive, academic template promoting a universal pedagogy of personal leadership and character education and development. SAL's aim is to enter the executive suite, board room, conference hall, training space, office, classroom, hall of government, and home as a preeminent and holistic—yet practical—pedagogical plan and self-leadership process that significantly and meaningfully influences positive changes in society by effectively combatting organizational, managerial, educational, and societal mores marked by moral relativism and clouded by cultures of irresponsibility, victimization, laziness, subterfuge, salacity, unscrupulousness, corruption, criminality, and abuse. The practical and immediate purposes of SAL include bolstering individual and organizational character, capacity, and growth through an education in SAL principles. Its ultimate aim is to move beyond postmodern thinking to a new era referred to as the *Age of Authenticism*.

Keywords: Autoethnography, existential philosophy, self-leadership, action research, Self-Action Research (SAR)[1], Self-Action Leadership (SAL), SAL philosophy, SAL model, SAL theory, existential growth, pedagogy of personal leadership and character development, postmodernism, Age of Authenticism

Correspondence address:

Jordan R. Jensen, Ed.D.
Founder, CEO, & Master Facilitator,
Freedom Focused LLC,
Conroe, Texas 77385, USA
e-mail: jordan.jensen@freedomfocused.com

Rodney J. Beaulieu, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
School of Health Sciences and Human Services,
California State University San Marcos,
San Marcos, CA 92096, USA
e-mail: rbeaulieu@csusm.edu

Christopher P. Neck, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
W. P. Carey School of Business,
Arizona State University, Tempe,
AZ 85287, USA
e-mail: christopher.neck@asu.edu

---

1 Self-Action Leadership and Self-Action Research will be capitalized throughout this paper to further distinguish these terms from their academic progenitors: *self-leadership* and *action research*.

1. Introduction

Once a fledgling scholarly scion of ethnography, autoethnography (Jones, Adams and Ellis, 2013) has, in recent decades, become a burgeoning method of qualitative research (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011) in academia. Despite its increasingly warm reception in a variety of scholarly circles, it has, to date, remained largely ensconced in fields of research related to education and social justice. Nevertheless, a growing number of articles (Lopez, 2016; Starr, 2014; Chang, Longman and Franco, 2014; Kempster and Iszatt-White, 2012; McClellan, 2011; Kempster and Stewart, 2010; Starr, 2010; Forest, 2009; Parry, 2008; Murphy, 2008; Garza, Jr., 2008; Boyle and Parry, 2007; Theoharis, 2007; Pepper and Thomas, 2002), dissertations (Starr, 2014; Kiel, 2013; Gilbert, 2013; Jensen, 2013; Mundell, 2010; Griffin, 2009; Lance, 2009; Quinn, 2008), and even some books (Jackson and Parry, 2011; Klenke, 2008) have appeared in recent years that utilize autoethnography in leadership related studies.

Given its growing scholarly acceptance and practical utility, we suggest the time has come to introduce autoethnographic research into mainstream management theory. This paper accomplishes this objective by reviewing a theory (Jensen, Neck and Beaulieu, 2015) and model (Jensen, Beaulieu and Neck, 2018) of self-leadership and action research that is grounded in autoethnography, action research, and existential philosophy. This theory and model provide a fresh and original paradigm shift regarding a human being's potential for personal development and existential growth. Its aim is to influence a universal audience of leaders, managers, workers, scholars, practitioners, educators, parents, and students in achieving just means and virtuous ends in a holistic array of life arenas. Additionally, it aims to fill a present gap in the literature by presenting a scholarly treatise on character education as it relates to self-leadership (Manz, 1983) and, by extension, leadership development (Northouse, 2007).

2. A Pedagogical Driven Character Development Movement

As the #METOO movement of 2017-2018 took center stage in the media spotlight, workplace sexual harassment (Boland, 2005) rose to the top of an ever-growing list of troubling trends plaguing contemporary professional arenas of all kinds. This vexing list includes: corporate social irresponsibility (Ormiston and Wong, 2013), corporate greed and political corruption (Huffington, 2009; Dorgan, 2006), legitimized corporate unethicality (Mohliver, 2012)

and other sordid individual and organizational practices. Add to these corporate calamities other profound problems we face as a society, such as school and other mass shootings (Fox and DeLateur, 2014), and the raging opioid epidemic (Nelson, Juurlink and Perrone, 2015), and you end up with a collective organizational, Occidental, and global culture in turmoil. In the words of Manz, "all too often corruption and unethical behavior have dominated the business news … [with] the recent discouraging image of self-empowered business executives as greedy power abusers who pursue unreasonable and unsustainable financial returns from lavish executive suites" (Manz, 2015: 140). According to Manz: "An emerging literature reflects a response to the prevalence of irresponsibility in organizations (Ormiston and Wong, 2013), which includes coining the term *corporate social irresponsibility* [italics added], defined by Pearce and Manz (2011) as, "unethical executive behavior that shows disregard for the welfare of others, that at its extreme is manifested when executives seek personal gain at the expense of employees, shareholders and other organization stakeholders, and even society at large (p. 563)" (Manz, 2015: 140).

In recent years and decades, such collapses of character have occurred with an accelerating regularity and increasing frequency, causing virtuous, principle-centered leaders and educators to become increasingly alarmed and introspective with regards to a perpetually simple, yet perennially perplexing question: what are WE going to *do* about it—and not so much in terms of short-term salves, but with regards to long-term solutions. This article attempts to answer this question by reviewing an original theory (Jensen, Neck and Beaulieu, 2015) and model (Jensen, Beaulieu and Neck, 2018), of self-leadership (Manz, 1986; Manz, 1983) and action research (Reason and Bradbury, 2008) aimed at providing a specific, pedagogical road map for moving forward toward a brighter future where we are better equipped and more committed and determined to treat each other with dignity and respect. This road map serves as a guide and aid for all of us to increasingly exert the moral courage to do what is right in the personal leadership of our own lives, in the interplay of our relationships with others, and in the management and leadership influence we exert in organizational units and systems – with the recognition that "no man [woman, boy, or girl] is an *Island*, entire of itself, every [person] is a piece of the *Continent*, a part of the *main*" (Donne, 1990: 58). It is our hope that by so doing, we may all come to a greater understanding of the extent to which our individual thoughts, speech, and actions cause all of us to be "involved in Mankind," whether we know it or not, like it or not, or want to be involved, *or not*. As

such, we each carry an existential and deontological categorical imperative (Kant, 2016) to ourselves and to each other such that we need "therefore never send to know for whom the bell [of decency, conscience, and the law] tolls; [because] It tolls for [YOU and ME]" (Donne, 1990: 58).

In light of the pressing need and timing of this unique contribution, we hypothesize that the character-based, self-leadership-oriented theory and model reviewed in this paper has the potential to not only serve as a complementary construct to Maslow's hierarchy of needs introduced nearly four score years ago (Maslow, 1943), but also on a cultural scale of Covey's (Covey, 1989) personal leadership groundswell a generation ago (Covey, 1989).

3. Postmodernism vs. Authenticism

Before introducing this new construct of self-leadership and action research, it bears answering the question *why* (do we need it?) from a macro, philosophical standpoint. The answer is: if we as scholars are to successfully combat the deeply entrenched problems outlined in the previous section, we must spend less time "hacking at the leaves" of the problem and invest more time, capital, and sweat equity "hacking at [their] roots" (Thoreau, 2001: 62). What then, are the roots of our deepest individual and collective problems in the Western World and beyond? The answer lies in philosophical postmodernism.

3.1. Philosophical Postmodernism

In the decades following World War II, a cynical literary and philosophical movement known as poststructuralism (Peters, 1996; Poster, 1989; Agger, 1991), and its companion movement, postmodernism (Lyotard, 1984; Jameson, 1991; Bertens, 1995), arose as a response to the structuralist and modernist movements that preceded it. Marked by a sense of cynicism and derision for its cultural predecessor (modernism), postmodernism sought to deconstruct (Derrida, 2016) many long-held views about life, literature, reality, and the world. Docx deftly summarized the inception and proliferation of postmodernism when he wrote: "In the beginning, philosophers, linguists, writers and musicians were bound up in a movement of great force that sought to break with the past, and which did so with great energy. A new and radical permissiveness was the result. Postmodernism was a high-energy revolt, an attack, a strategy for destruction. It was a set of critical and rhetorical practices that sought to destabilise the modernist touchstones of identity, historical progress and epistemic certainty" (Docx, 2011: 1).

Broadly postured, postmodernism is a sophisticated and erudite academic field that welcomes anyone who questions traditional notions of *truth*. To a postmodernist, the idea of "Truth" (spelled literally or assumptively with a capital "T") is both anathema and heretical. The only absolute in postmodernism is, ironically, that there are no absolutes. To a postmodernist, so-called *reality* must condescend and make obeisance to deconstructed interpretations of that "reality."

A primary problem with postmodernism is that its promotion of caprice, deconstruction, unreality, and negation left it bereft of any foundation—practically or functionally speaking—which has proven to be perennially problematic for its articulators. This is why, according to Docx, much "of the stuff written about postmodernism is nonsensical, incoherent, self-contradicting or otherwise emblematic of the crap that has consumed the academic world of linguistics and 'continental' philosophy for too long" (Docx, 2011: 2). As such, however interesting, thought provoking, or sophisticated-sounding postmodern premises may be, the harvest of its husbandry has largely consisted of confusion, nihilism, narcissism, selfishness, hedonism, and permissiveness – not exactly a lustrous legacy, academically or culturally speaking.

3.2. A Philosophical Alternative to Postmodernism: Cognitive, Behavioral, Moral, and Ontological Authenticism

Fortunately, there are signs that postmodernism is in decline. Docx takes it a step further to suggest that "Postmodernism [may already be] dead." Says Docx: "[The] power [of postmodernism] has been diminishing. The postmodern solution will no longer do as a response to the world we now find ourselves in. … If the problem for the postmodernists was that the modernists had been telling them what to do, then the problem for the present generation is the opposite: nobody has been telling us what to do. If we tune in carefully, we can detect [a] growing desire for authenticity all around us." To evince his hypothesis, Docx points to a burgeoning societal desire for specificity, values, and authenticity—*not to be confused with postmodern notions of authenticity, which usually refer to thinking, saying, doing, or being whatever one pleases (consequences to self and others be damned)*—all of which "are at odds with postmodernism," for making an epic claim. According to Docx, "We are entering a new age. Let's call it the Age of Authenticism and see how we get on" (Docx, 2011: 1-4).

Jensen further advocates for Docx's *Age of Authenticism* by championing society's need for "unsophisticated

truisms": "The world has enough sophistication and rationalization; it needs more common sense and integrity. It has enough selfishness and hedonism; it needs more self-restraint and honor. It has enough sarcasm and greed; it needs more sincerity and goodness. It has enough derision and deception; it needs more encouragement and truth telling. The world has enough fake; it needs more real. It has enough authoritative caricature; it needs more authentic character. In short, the world needs more self-action leaders. … The time has come for the candor and actuality of authenticity to eclipse the pernicious perjury [and permissiveness] of postmodernism. It is time for something *real*. The dawning of a new age—an AGE OF AUTHENTICISM—answers this clarion call of the cynical, sarcastic, synthetic, and even sinful era in which we live. The Self-Action Leadership Theory and Model [are] designed to serve as … intellectual [and practical] exponent[s] of this new movement that is rejecting "postmodernism with all its detachment and deconstruction" [Pastabagel, blog], and entering a nobler place where "some things are pure and some things are right" [Arcade Fire, no page number] (Jensen, 2015: 52, 55).

3.3. Postmodernism in Perspective

In light of such a scathing critique, it is worth noting that postmodernism is not *all* bad; indeed, we would be unwise to toss the proverbial "baby out with the bathwater." As is the case with most theoretical constructs and intellectual movements, including lackluster or subpar ones, there is usually a sliver of silver or granule of gold that can be mined from whatever mountains of ore may exist within a given field's expansive parameters. Thus it is with postmodernism. Postmodern thinking challenged us to rethink how subjectivities influence scientific research and reaffirms our quest to dig further for objective facts. Aside from influencing existential philosophy, which, as a later section will illustrate, has significant redeeming qualities, it also serves as an academic grounding point for autoethnography (Wall, 2006)—*the* primary research method utilized in the construction of the theory and model reviewed in this article. And this is to say nothing of postmodernism's influence on art, literature, drama, graphic design, architecture, urban planning, social justice, inclusion, and other fields where compelling arguments could be made for the existence of various benefits.

We need not disregard an entire movement just because some of its core premises lack the foundation and integrity we seek and need. The goal of SAL is not so much to take sides as it is to attain a balance—the *Golden Mean* (Aristotle, 2009)—between two (or among various) schools of thought

that can unitedly bring something legitimate and applicable to the table of discussion. According to Aristotle, virtue, or *the ultimate good*, is accessed by locating that elusive equilibrium. In an era where hyper-divisiveness already dominates the political landscape, journalistic world, and socio-cultural environment, the last thing we need is another fight over who is right and who is wrong, who is smart and who is stupid, or who is prescient and who is myopic. A better approach would be to end the name calling and start identifying the strengths and virtues that each entity affords. Our own attempt at deconstructing postmodernism without entirely destroying it is an illustration of this approach. For example, while postmodernists will undoubtedly squirm at a theory and model that is so blatantly structural and didactic in its purpose, design, and proposed end-game, we must simultaneously thank them for aiding our efforts by virtue of their contributions to existential philosophy and autoethnography, two fields that have clearly empowered our cause. Doubt in how knowledge is acquired and used is a cautionary heuristic for postmodern thinkers. Belief in one's own agency to acquire and apply knowledge is a guiding assumption in Self-Action Leadership – for personal development and for helping others with theirs. What, then, is *Self-Action Leadership?*

4. Self-Action Leadership

Self-Action Leadership (Jensen, 2015), or SAL, is a comprehensive conceptualization of personal leadership derived from self-leadership theory (Manz, 1986; Manz, 1983) and action research theory (Kuhne and Quigley, 1997). It has roots in existential philosophy (Roubiczek, 1964) and was constructed over the course of an extended, 30-year analytic autoethnographic (Anderson, 2006), action research study conducted by Jensen (Jensen, 2013).

SAL is defined as: "Morally informed self-leadership that is action-oriented, focused on long-term results, and aimed at a continual rise in the Existential Growth of self and others" (Jensen, Neck and Beaulieu, 2015: 15). Existential growth is defined as: "The holistic (spiritual, physical, mental, emotional, social, moral, and financial) growth of personal character, capacity, and integrity" (Jensen, Beaulieu and Neck, 2018: 49.). Before introducing the SAL theory and model, it bears briefly reviewing the fundamentals of SAL's scholarly progenitors: self-leadership and action research.

4.1. Self-Leadership Theory

Self-leadership theory consists of a comprehensive framework (Neck, Manz and Houghton, 2017: 181) of

personal influence designed to facilitate "a process through which individuals control their own behavior, influencing and leading themselves through the use of specific sets of behavioral and cognitive strategies" (Neck and Houghton, 2006: 270). The field was pioneered by Manz (Manz 1992; Manz 1986; Manz 1983) "as an expansion of self-management (e.g. Manz and Sims, 1980) … rooted in clinical self-control theory (e.g. Cautela, 1969) and inspired by Kerr and Jermier's (1978) notion of 'substitutes for leadership'" (Neck and Houghton, 2006: 270). Self-leadership theory is further anchored in the fields of social cognitive theory, intrinsic motivation theory, self-determination theory, motivation theory, and leadership theory (Neck, Manz and Houghton, 2017). According to Jensen, Beaulieu, and Neck: "Academia's initial reception of self-leadership as an independent framework and subject of scholarly inquiry was tepid. Over time, however, this response warmed due to increasing scholarly coverage (Neck and Houghton, 2006), expansion (Manz and Sims, Jr., 2001), (Houghton and Neck, 2002), (Houghton and Yoho, 2005), (DiLiello and Houghton, 2006), and diversification (Alves, Lovelace, Manz, Matsypura, Toyasaki and Ke, 2006; Georgianna, 2007; Pattni and Soutar, 2009). Stewart, Courtright, and Manz's (2011) 30-year multilevel review of self-leadership in the *Journal of Management* (JOM) evinced the field's burgeoning scholarly status amid related topics of inquiry. Clawson's (2008) humble scholarly admission further illuminated academia's growing accession toward, not to mention the practical utility of, self-leadership-oriented scholarship and training: 'I remember when Manz (1983) first came out with his work on self-leadership. At the time it seemed odd to me. I will admit I am a slow learner on some things. I have come to believe that one of the biggest leadership issues is the inability of people – even and especially managers and executives – to lead themselves [effectively]' (Clawson, 2008: 175)." (Jensen, Beaulieu and Neck, 2018: 16).

4.2. A Moral Component as Addendum

Perhaps the most distinguishing differentiator between Neck, Manz, and Houghton's (Neck, Manz, and Houghton, 2017) *Self-Leadership Framework* and the SAL theory and model is the latter's explicit invocation of a moral imperative (Kant, 2016). While authors of the S-L framework, and other S-L scholars, have implicitly seasoned their writings with suggestions that S-L should be used for constructive, upright, and morally palatable purposes, they have ultimately equivocated on making the point explicit. It is hard to blame them for doing so in a postmodern academic environment where the mere suggestion that sin might

actually exist in a moral sense is, ironically, the cardinal "sin" itself. After all, Peck (1978, 1983 1987, 1993a, 1993b, 1997) became something of a pariah among traditional psychiatrists and was blacklisted by many academics for having the audacity to invoke the word "evil" in his discussion of treating some insidious varieties of mental illness (Peck, 1983). If that was not bad enough in the view of the scholarly intelligentsia, his temerity to imply that the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) ought to begin qualifying and codifying "evil" as a credible mental disorder certainly was! Given the postmodern culture and professional atmospheres within which they operated—Manz was beginning his work on self-leadership during the same years that Peck was unsuccessfully lobbying the psychiatric world to expand their purview to include his insights on, and conceptions of, evil—it is a credit to these visionary and capable scholars that they were able to gradually inch their way closer to making the moral component explicit.

As a co-author of this and related works, Neck's contributions to what we may refer to as the *Scholarship of Morality* are clear (*see*: Houghton, Neck and Krishnakumar, 2016; Manz, Manz, Marx and Neck, 2004; Manz, Manz, Marx and Neck, 2001; Neck and Milliman, 1994). Others have added their voices to this choir by invoking and researching related concepts, such as "Personal Sacrifice" (Dawley, Houghton and Bucklew, 2010), "Proactive Caring" (Houghton, Pearce, Manz, Courtright and Stewart, 2015), "Virtuous Values" (Manz, Anand, Joshi and Manz, 2008), and even "Spirituality in the Workplace" (Houghton, Neck, and Krishnakumar, 2016).

Manz, who has been particularly proactive in his pursuit of a *Scholarship of Morality*, has become increasingly explicit in his efforts to align self-leadership concepts with moral means and ends by addressing "the concept of higher-level self-leadership (supported by the metaphor of a self-leadership high road)" (Manz, 2015: 132). According to Manz, the S-L "high road" is marked by "the notion of higher-level standards" (Manz, 2015: 138), "a sincere deeper commitment to living in a just and humane way" (Manz, 2015: 139), and "the degree to which self-influence processes are characterized by authenticity, responsibility, and increasing capacity" (Manz, 2015: 132). Says Manz: "Authenticity encompasses the significance of addressing higher-level standards (e.g., considering the why and what of self-influence beyond the how)" (Manz, 2015: 132). He then elaborates by explaining that, "The why aspect of self-leadership is a central distinguishing feature of higher-level self-leadership, and it often determines the nature

of what is pursued and how. The why stretches the focus of self-leadership by incorporating deeper personal [and moral] factors such as values, ethics, wellness, mutual benefit, and sustainability" (Manz, 2015: 139).

According to Manz, higher-level self-leadership should "bolster results reflecting authentic and responsible ends, … [and include] specific facets … [such as] the pursuit of virtue" (Manz, 2015: 132). The three "fundamental components," (Manz, 2015: 134) of the self-leadership high road—"Authenticity," "Responsibility," and "Expanded Capacity" (i.e. growth) (Manz, 2015: 134)—are all implicitly ubiquitous throughout the philosophy, theory, and model reviewed in this paper.

Manz (2015) is well aware that "the concept of virtue has for many years largely been dismissed within the academy, … [a fact that] is possibly due to an implicit association with oft-avoided concepts such as over-conservatism, moral dogmatism, religion, and scientific irrelevance" (Chapman and Galston, 1992; MacIntyre, 1984; Schimmel, 1997). He notes, however, that when individuals and corporations aspire towards "concepts that reflect greater moral neutrality" negative consequences emerge. For example, "One consequence has been that more clearly virtuous aspects of organizations that might "move individuals toward better citizenship, responsibility, nurturance, altruism, civility, moderation, tolerance, and work ethic" (Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi, 2000: 5) have been largely left out of the research literature (Manz, 2015: 140). As a result, Manz encourages those approaching tasks and objectives "from a self-leadership perspective" to "examine one's own values, and, if authentic, choose virtuous action as an intentional self-leadership strategy" (Manz, 2015: 141).

It was Manz who pioneered the self-leadership field; he is its father. And it was Manz and his colleagues that molded the concept of self-leadership into a nascent (Manz and Sims, 1980; Manz, 1983), then fledgling (Manz, 1986), then burgeoning (Neck and Houghton, 2006) and finally a bona fide (Stewart, Courtright and Manz, 2011) topic of scholarly inquiry. These same scholars also deserve credit for gradually closing the gap between self-leadership constructs and the moral imperatives that must accompany them to ensure positive and constructive long-term ends. Such a closure is essential in order to differentiate between a Hitler-esque exercise of self-leadership and a Mandela-esque exercise of SAL (Jensen, Neck and Beaulieu, 2015). Despite this progress, Manz (2015) recognizes and acknowledges that his work is only the beginning of what is to come: "Overall, we have only just begun our

exploration of the vast potential of the self-leadership high road. I believe there are many new self-leadership insights and strategies left to be discovered that will allow customized application that especially fit the unique circumstances and needs of those involved. … Considering the various potential self-leadership choices available can help widen the self-leadership high road, allowing for greater evolution, development, and freedom than we normally allow ourselves to consider when studying aspects of careers, working, and living. In doing so, many new facets of real self-empowerment may be revealed" (Manz, 2015: 146).

Based on Manz's recent work (i.e. Manz, 2015), it is becoming increasingly evident that a concrete confluence via a theoretical merger is destined to occur that combines the extant self-leadership framework and scholarship (S-L theory) with a new-age addition of a moral imperative. Self-Action Leadership is this new-age addition, or at very least, is an attempt to become such. SAL is the next step in the evolutionary development and piecemeal progression of self-leadership theory. It is a fresh, original, twenty-first century paradigm-shifting construct aimed at galvanizing the twentieth century theories of self-leadership and action research into the next generation and beyond to effectively meet the needs of a new millennium and its inhabitants and cultures that are, at present, so conspicuously confused, concerned, and morally adrift. Such a construct could not be more desperately needed, nor better timed in terms of its entrance onto the academic and cultural stage. As Emerson once tersely quipped: "Civilization depends on morality." Self-Action Leadership positions morality back into focus for a culture at-large that has misplaced its moral moorings and is currently suffering the concomitant consequences—consequences that could be largely avoided in the future with a collective commitment to a more principled way of thinking, speaking, acting, and living.

4.3. Action Research Theory

Action Research (Beaulieu, 2013; French, 2009; Reason and Bradbury, 2008; Altrichter, Kemmis, McTaggart and Zuber-Skerritt, 2002; McKay and Marshall, 2001; Kuhne and Quigley, 1997; Whyte, 1991; Fals-Borda, 1984) is defined in many ways. Despite its various definitional nuances, it always involves a process of planning and executing specific action steps aimed at improving performance or solving a problem. Beaulieu has written that AR can be "accomplished through a collaborative process … [or] done alone as an independent process" (Beaulieu, 2013: 29). SAL-oriented AR, referred to as *Self-Action Research*—or SAR—primarily utilizes the latter, independent approach.

SAR is defined as: "Action Research applied by, to, and for the self to gain self-awareness, aid self-improvement, and solve personal problems" (Jensen, Neck and Beaulieu, 2015: 22). Working in concert with autoethnography, Self-Action Research (SAR) served as a research engine driving both the theoretical design and practical implementation of the SAL theory and model in Jensen (2019); Jensen (2015); and Jensen (2013). It was particularly influenced by Kuhne and Quigley's concrete model of AR, which arranges four quadrants to form a sequential AR process that include "Four Core Processes," namely: 1). *Planning*, 2). *Acting*, 3). *Observing*, and 4). *Reflecting* (Kuhne and Quigley, 1997). In addition to these four core processes, 20 action-oriented sub-steps are identified to serve three overall action phases (i.e. planning phase, action phase, and reflection phase), which are in turn broken down into six steps (i.e. problem identification, project planning, establishment of metrics, implementation and observation, evaluating results, and transitioning to a new cycle of action). As will be shown in a later section, the SAL model mirrors this step-by-step, cyclical AR model by producing its own four core stages and 23 subsidiary action-oriented "step-habits," all of which are designed to help individual practitioners grow and progress in their personal and professional lives.

4.4. Existential Philosophy

Introducing an explicit moral imperative into any secular, academic construct is admittedly audacious. To add an entire framework of metaphysical laws, corollaries, principles, and practices—that are, to a large extent, nomologically networked (Furtner, Rauthmann and Sachse, 2011)—to that imperative in an attempt at scholarly legitimizing the framework may be viewed by some as the height of scholastic temerity. While we will not apologize for our work, we do recognize that a sensible, scholarly apology of our efforts is merited if legitimate academic inclusion is our expectation. In producing this apology, a temporary hiatus from the locale of leadership and management theory precedes a courageous foray into the realms of existential philosophy (Oberman, 2010; Hoffman, Stewart, Warren and Meek, 2008; Kotarba and Johnson, 2002; Roubiczek, 1964) where a creative synthesis of the two fields yields a fascinating merger enabling SAL to gain more scholarly grip.

According to Roubiczek, "Existentialism can best be understood as a reaction against the Age of Reason" (Roubiczek, 1964: 1). A centrist on the matter, Roubiczek was no enemy of reason or rationality, but a reasonable existentialist who recognized that the best approach—as is the case with most things—is found in an Aristotelian balance (Aristotle, 2009) between two (or among multiple) extremes. Therefore, despite his enthusiastic identification with the movement, he simultaneously abjured a wholesale embrace. In his own words: "We shall not rely on the Existentialists alone; as they often go too far, they often let us down" (Roubiczek, 1964: 16). Nevertheless, Roubiczek recognized that reason alone possesses ponderous limitations and therefore sought to eradicate its erroneous aura of absoluteness: "As long as external thinking alone is employed, transcendental reality … remains inaccessible, for the question 'Why?' can never be answered in any fundamental context. … Yet obviously all [the 'Why?'] questions, when they haunt us as personal experiences, point towards some wider spiritual reality. We may never be able to [definitively] answer them, but we want, at least, to find an answer to the desire for meaning. … For there is meaning in many of our experiences, of nature and of human nature, in works of art, in books of literature or wisdom or religion; thus the urge to find meaning is so strong that it is part of our make-up, an undeniable experience. … All these experiences demand the acceptance of something which goes beyond reason—the acceptance of the limits set by our human nature, of the absolute values which can be neither derived in a rational nor proved in a scientific way, of a transcendental reality which, by definition, must transcend reason immeasurably. In short, reason must not dominate, but serve. … Philosophy, therefore, should start from one's own experience, one's own inner knowledge, and it is this inner knowledge which should be qualified, enlarged, and in this way enriched. One's own experience must be admitted as evidence. Reason … can serve this approach, but it must never [exclusively] dictate" (Roubiczek, 1964: 6-7, 10-11).

Ironically, or perhaps fittingly, both academic forebears of SAL (self-leadership [S-L] and action research [AR], which will be reviewed in a later section), and its primary research method—autoethnography—have, since their inception in academia, been marginalized or sequestered to various degrees in scholarly circles. This estrangement has occurred in part because of these field's emphasis on personal experience over, or in conjunction with, quantitative research data and other empirical evidence. Despite this marginalization, all three fields (S-L, AR, and autoethnography) remain burgeoning topics of scholarly inquiry that are in the academy to stay. It is from the nexus of these three fields that the unique theory and model reviewed in this paper was forged and organized. And it is by invoking Roubiczek's brand of existential logic that affords us a philosophical foothold upon which we can begin to legitimize the invocation of a suprarational (albeit

non-denominational) conscience back into the scholarly conversation (Roubiczek, 1964). This we absolutely must do; it is a *categorical imperative* (Kant, 2016) upon which the fundamental substance of the Self-Action Leadership theory and model rests. Without it, all of our abstract reasoning and sophisticated analysis will perpetually fail us and prove perennially and perplexingly meaningless. Again, in the words of Roubiczek: "Our age is still largely dominated by abstract thinking, by impersonal, scientific, deterministic thought … by rationalism. We rarely pay enough attention to the deeper meaning of our personal experience and of our feelings; we disregard inner knowledge, but we are beginning to feel, I believe, that this emphasis on abstract thought is impoverishing or even endangering the human world. The whole world seems to lose significance, and man is estranged from himself. Our domination over nature is becoming more and more complete; man can make use of the most minute particles and, perhaps soon, of outer space; he is encroaching on the very structure of the universe and, by means of new medical techniques and new drugs, on human character. Yet while the enigmas of nature are solved one by one, each man becomes to himself a greater enigma, and there is more and more chaos in our own inner lives and in human affairs" (Roubiczek, 1964: 11-12).

Roubiczek then poses a piercing question: "Are we still able to solve moral problems? … The power to interfere with man's character brings with it a new and very great responsibility. All such problems, however, are outside the scope of science; we cannot begin to grasp their true meaning as long as we rely on abstract thought alone" (Roubiczek, 1964: 12).

The theory and model reviewed in this paper provide a framework for accessing and articulating what Roubiczek referred to as "basic truth[s]" (Roubiczek, 1964: 15) and "absolute standards" (Roubiczek, 1964: 16). It is a way to bridge the gap between extreme modes of thinking which have "always driven [Western] thought into one-sidedness" (Roubiczek, 1964: 16). It is a way to "establish a balance" (Roubiczek, 1964: 16) that leads to "positive results" (Roubiczek, 1964: 17), and ultimately, to meaningful personal and professional growth, which is the end-game of Self-Action Leadership. The method of SAL's construction, as well as its intended purposes in the lives of its practitioners, illustrates that it implicitly accedes the inherent value of real-life experience working in concert with academic research and other scientific and empirical evidence. It is an academic exemplification of Aristotle's virtuous ideal—*the Golden Mean* (Aristotle, 2009).

4.5. Autoethnography as Research Method

The Self-Action Leadership theory and model were constructed vis-à-vis an analytic autoethnographic (Anderson, 2006), action research (Kuhne and Quigley, 1997) oriented, qualitative research (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011) method. Like self-leadership, autoethnography (Doloriert and Sambrook, 2011; Muncey, 2010; Chang, 2009; Wall, 2008; Ellis, 2004; Nash, 2004; Holt, 2003; Bochner and Ellis, 2002; Reed-Danahay, 1997) is a relatively new scholarly construct that has been bandied about academia for only the past few decades. The scholarly roots of autoethnography lie in ethnography (Atkinson and Hammersley, 2007), a scholarly derivative of anthropology (Geertz, 1995). Additionally, autoethnography is related to a wide-range of other related fields, including, but not limited to: autobiology, complete-member research, experiential texts, lived experience, literary tales, personal narratives, radical empiricism, self-stories, sociopoetics, *etc*. (Chang, 2008: 47-48). Like action research, authoethnography has been defined in various ways. Wall has contributed a couple of illuminating definitions, as follows: 1) "An intriguing and promising qualitative method that offers a way of giving voice to personal experience for the purpose of extending sociological understanding" (Wall, 2008: 38); and 2) "An emerging qualitative research method that allows the author to write in a highly personalized style, drawing on his or her experience to extend understanding about a societal phenomenon" (Wall, 2006: 1).

While autoethnography is a fluid research method with numerous ways in which research may be conducted and presented (i.e. scholarly writing, "performative, artistic, and poetic," [Ellis and Bochner, 2006: 435], etc.), it is theoretically divided into two general camps: evocative autoethnography (Ellis and Bochner, 2006; Bochner and Ellis, 2002) and analytic autoethnography (Anderson, 2006). In evocative autoethnography, the author might choose to incorporate fictional narrative elements to make a point or blur the boundaries between empirical research and artistic literature. The analytic brand, championed by Anderson, adheres more closely to traditional, scholarly methods of research employed in ethnography and anthropology (Anderson, 2006). Self-Action Leadership is a product of the analytic brand of autoethnography. According to Anderson, "The purpose of analytic [auto]ethnography is not simply to document personal experience, provide an 'insider's perspective,' or to evoke emotional resonance with the reader, … [but] to use empirical data to gain insight into some broader set of social phenomena than those provided by the data themselves" (Anderson, 2006: 386-387). Analytic

autoethnography incorporates the concept of a "Complete Member Researcher" (CMR) (Anderson, 2006: 379), thus creating a merger between the researcher and the subject. As Jensen points out: "Unlike anthropological or ethnographic studies, where the researcher is usually a passive observer—an outsider looking in on the research subjects [or objects]—autoethnographic studies require that the researcher *is* also the research subject. Autoethnography, therefore, allows the researcher to *become* the researched" (Jensen 2013: 239).

Elements of Anderson's (2006) *Complete Member Researcher* include: "analytic reflexivity" (Anderson, 2006: 382), "narrative visibility of the researcher's self" (Anderson, 2006: 383), "dialogue with informants beyond the self" (Anderson, 2006: 385), and a "commitment to an analytic agenda" (Anderson, 2006: 386).

Because "autoethnographic approaches are flexible, reflexive, and reflective of life as lived; [and] … do not follow a rigid list of rule-based procedures" (Ellis, 2009: 16), they are sometimes "controversial" (Nash, 2004: 5) in academic circles and criticized as being non-scholarly in nature. Nash accedes that "some have called it soft. Others think it touchy-feely. Still others describe it as easy. A few think it is anti-intellectual. Some question its reliability and validity" (Nash, 2004: 4). Despite these criticisms, Nash concurrently insists that these "stereotypes are unfortunate" and offers a cogent apology for the legitimacy, validity, and utility of autoethnographic writing, or as he calls it, *"scholarly personal narrative" (SPN)* (Nash, 2004: 4). Regardless of anyone's opinion of autoethnography, no one can argue with its burgeoning status as a new-age qualitative research method, as evinced by a growing number of academic journal articles, dissertations, and scholarly books that either promote autoethnography or utilize it as a research tool.

Jensen's method of autoethnographic research (Jensen, 2013; Jensen, 2015) flexibly applied Anderson's analytic approach (Anderson, 2006) in a variety of ways that aided in his creative construction of the SAL theory and model over a long period of time (three decades). Specifically, his methodology included accessing and organizing personal memories, written records, personal journals, discussions with close relatives and friends, and a variety of "official documents" (Chang, 2008: 107) and "other artifacts" (Chang, 2008: 109) such as photos, newspaper clippings, certificates, awards, report cards, past school work, personal projects, *etc*. It also involved conducting specific Self-Action Research projects, goal setting, values identification, clarification, and prioritization, personal planning, collecting empirical data, analyzing the results,

and synthesizing new knowledge into growing SAL constructs. In harmony with Anderson's analytic approach (Anderson, 2006), Jensen further engaged in "dialogue with informants beyond the self" (Anderson 2006: 385) by conducting relevant personal interviews, collecting data there from, and recording the results. Throughout the process, Jensen maintained a firm "commitment to an analytic agenda" (Anderson 2006: 386), of which the SAL theory and model are a tangible outgrowth. In conjunction with these many and varied research efforts, Jensen also read widely and deeply in an effort to scour and familiarize himself with a broad sampling of academic and wisdom literature spanning a wide variety of topics. These subjects, which include geography, history, literature (fiction and nonfiction prose and poetry), science (astronomy and physics), philosophy, psychology, sociology, economics, theology, leadership, management, and self-help, significantly influenced his theoretical designs and writing style.

Of the many ways in which autoethnographic research can be presented (i.e. scholarly writing, "performative, artistic, and poetic," [Ellis and Bochner, 2006: 435], *etc*.), Jensen favors scholarly writing, and to a lesser degree, poetry. Autoethnographic scholarly writing often utilizes what is referred to as the "vignette" (Kien, 2008: 1444) in its presentation. The inclusion of autoethnographic vignettes is beyond the scope of this paper; however, extended examples can be found in Jensen (Jensen, 2019; Jensen, 2015; Jensen, 2013), Anderson and Glass-Coffin (2013), Anderson (2011), Wall (2006), Muncey (2005) and many others. On the surface, these "autoethnographic vignettes" (Humphries, 2005: 840) may appear to be little more than prosaic personal narratives with some reflective commentary affixed. But they are usually much more than this, especially when they are supported by an analytic research approach and agenda.

Having introduced all relevant prefacing material, we now present a review (in brief) of the SAL theory and model themselves. These two theoretical constructs serve as holistic academic syntheses and comprehensive creative products of Jensen's 30-year analytic autoethnographic, action research study.

5. The Self-Action Leadership Philosophy, Theory, and Model

5.1. The Self-Action Leadership Philosophy

SAL theory and model are concrete academic constructs rooted in the SAL Philosophy. Unlike the theory and model, the SAL Philosophy is not a concrete academic

construct, but a thematic concept that serves as a contouring preface and backdrop to the more academically rigorous theory and model. The essence of the SAL philosophy can be captured in two separate quotes. First: "Things don't change; we change" (Thoreau, 2001: 271); and second, "What you become inwardly changes your outer reality" (Plutarch and Otto Rank). Unlike the SAL theory and model, which serve as concrete academic constructs replete with explicit cognitive, behavioral, and existential or ontological directives, the SAL philosophy is more of a general, implicit way of thinking, acting, and being. It is a metaphysical guide to personal change through education and action with a focus on taking personal responsibility for virtually everything in one's life. By *everything*, we mean elements in life that one can manage within the scope of one's cognitive, emotional, and physical capacity.

Peck described neurosis as a "disorder of responsibility" (Peck, 1978: 35), a concept that is rooted in Jung's (Jung, 1966) earlier supposition that, "Neurosis is a substitute for legitimate suffering" (Jung, 1966: 92). As Peck (Peck, 1978) famously noted, "Life is Difficult" (Peck, 1978: 15) and *how* we deal with life's inevitable obstacles will largely determine how mentally healthy—or neurotic—we will be over the course of our lives. Peck (Peck, 1978) employs a metaphor of *The Road Less Traveled* to describe the pathway of behavior and habits of those who readily accept reality, take personal responsibility for their problems, and exercise the individual discipline required to solve them. His was a coherent and clarion call for practical solutions to *real* problems: "We cannot solve life's problems except by solving them. This statement may [sound obvious] … yet it is seemingly beyond the comprehension of much of the human race. This is because we must accept responsibility for a problem before we can solve it. We cannot solve a problem by saying 'It's not my problem.' We cannot solve a problem by hoping that someone else will solve it for us. I can solve a problem only when I say 'This is *my* problem and it's up to me to solve it.' But many, so many, seek to avoid the pain of their problems by saying to themselves: 'This problem was caused me by other people, or by social circumstances beyond my control, and therefore it is up to other people or society to solve this problem for me. It is not really my personal problem' … [and] the extent to which people will go psychologically to avoid assuming responsibility for personal [or organizational] problems, while always sad, is sometimes almost ludicrous" (Peck, 1978: 32-33).

Before a problem can be effectively solved, it must be accurately identified. And if a long-term solution is sought, the core cause must be unveiled. "Hacking at the leaves of evil" is no use; there must be "hacking at the roots" (Thoreau, 2001: 62). What, then, are the "roots" of our greatest problems in the West and beyond? As previously stated, we suggest the answer to this question lies in moral relativism—an implicit assumption of postmodern philosophy (Lyotard, 1984; Jameson, 1991; Bertens, 1995). In a morally relativistic society, moral metrics are, like witches or heretics, burned at the proverbial stake. Without any absolute standard to base one's individual or organizational thoughts, speech, or actions, a slippery moral slope materializes until eventually "anything goes." When anything goes, moral chaos inevitably ensues, the practical repercussions of which can prove devastating to both the individual and the group. The negative consequences that we as a society currently confront are a direct result of the morally relativistic, anything goes culture that postmodernists have so diligently and successfully cultivated throughout the postmodern period. If, as scholars, we seek to be part of the solution rather than the problem, then we must be willing to do something different than we have in the past. The Self-Action Leadership philosophy provides a general purpose and implicit theme—and the SAL theory and model provides a specific guide and explicit road map—for traveling that different and *difficult*, albeit highly satisfying, rewarding, and fulfilling road, even *The Road Less Traveled* (Peck, 1978).

5.2. The Self-Action Leadership Theory

The Self-Action Leadership theory is a nomologically (Furtner, Rauthmann and Sachse, 2011) constructed self-leadership hierarchy rooted loosely in atmospheric and astronomical science (Lutgens and Tarbuck, 2010; Tarbuck and Lutgens, 2009), and broadly in atmospheric and astronomical metaphor. Similar to Maslow's (Maslow, 1943) highly acclaimed theory of human motivation, the SAL theory focuses on the growth of a human being through various stages of holistic, existential development. Specifically, the SAL theory codifies nine separate stages of EXISTENTIAL GROWTH (Figure 1.) attainable by human beings over the course of their lifetimes. Existential growth is defined as: "The holistic (spiritual, physical, mental, emotional, social, moral, and financial) growth of personal character, capacity, and integrity" (Jensen, Beaulieu and Neck, 2018: 49). Each stage represents an extended existential growth experience and is presented as a metaphorical analogue to various layers of the earth's atmosphere (including the Earth's surface [level 1] and deep Outer Space [level 9]. These levels include:

LEVEL 1:	The Earth's Surface...	**Education Stage**
LEVEL 2:	The Troposphere..	**Beginner's Stage**
LEVEL 3:	The Stratosphere...	**Practitioner's Stage**
LEVEL 4:	The Mesosphere..	**Refining Stage**
LEVEL 5:	The Ionosphere...	**Polishing Stage**
LEVEL 6:	The Thermosphere...	**Actualization Stage**
LEVEL 7:	The Exosphere..	**Leadership Stage**
LEVEL 8:	Deep Outer Space...	**Self-Transcendence**
LEVEL 9:	Other Astronomical Bodies.............................	**Creation Stage**

Figure 1. Stages of Existential Growth

The purpose of the SAL theory is to broaden the perspective and bolster the motivation of individuals in pursuit of greater levels of personal growth, capacity, integrity, and freedom. Additionally, its aim is to provide general explanations for why human beings are likely to experience certain kinds and degrees of adversity in various stages of life and over the course of one's journey toward existential growth. With broad, illuminating brushstrokes, the theory paints a picture not only of what life's journey *is* (generally and philosophically speaking), but even more importantly, what that journey can *be* (based on our existential potential as human beings), and what we can *become* through the diligent and committed exercise of Self-Action Leadership practices over long periods of time. The theory also explains why it can be so difficult for individuals to rise above one's initial station in life while simultaneously offering hope—and a tangible, practical road map—to everyone who desires to rise to higher levels, regardless where one may presently find oneself, existentially speaking.

Jensen, Neck, and Beaulieu further posture the theory as a vehicle to "positively influence nations of the world [and corporations] that have, in recent years, given way to a troubling trend of moral back-peddling in relation to the value placed on human life and other issues impacting the growth, development, liberty, and freedom of individual human beings" (Jensen, Neck, and Beaulieu, 2015: 13). While this existential hierarchy forms the hallmark of the SAL theory, its particulars dig much deeper and include 13 metaphysical natural laws and their concomitant corollaries (Jensen, 2015)—the detailed explication of which is beyond the scope of this paper. For full coverage of the SAL theory's detailed particulars, (*see*: Jensen, 2019; Jensen, 2015: 159-426; and Jensen, Neck and Beaulieu, 2015).

5.3. The Self-Action Leadership Model

Jensen, Beaulieu and Neck say that The Self-Action Leadership model "introduces an accompanying, practitioner-based model of Self-Action Leadership rooted in self-leadership theory and action research theory. It provides individuals and organizations with a comprehensive personal leadership framework complete with actions to take and habits to develop in pursuit of the highest levels of existential growth as outlined in the SAL theory. Existential growth is defined as: The holistic (spiritual, physical, mental, emotional, social, moral, and financial) growth of personal character, capacity, and integrity. The SAL Model is an explicitly universal construct designed to serve as a general, pedagogical template that leaders, managers, and educators can learn, apply, and teach at the individual and group level in an ongoing quest for – and attainment of – long-term team and organizational results related to efficiency, effectiveness, viability, relevance, sustainability, change, and growth" (Jensen, Beaulieu and Neck, 2018: 10).

The SAL model is a nomologically (Furtner, Rauthmann and Sachse, 2011) constructed self-leadership framework rooted in action research theory and construction science (Ascher, 2013) and metaphor. Significant parallels to Project Management Science (PMI, 2013) are also struck. This framework employs a construction metaphor likening the education and personal and professional (i.e. existential) development of a human being to the various stages involved in building a skyscraper. Mirroring Kuhne and Quigley's Action Research model (Kuhne and Quigley, 1997), the SAL model incorporates four general stages of the construction process that serve as theoretical analogues to four general stages of SAL development in pursuit of existential growth. More specifically, the model incorporates 23 specific construction sub-processes that serve as theoretical analogues to 23 SAL *step-habits*. Jensen, Beaulieu, and Neck (2018) explicate a "step-habit" thusly: "'Habits' may be a more accurate term than 'Steps' in the sense that each step is more of a characteristic to be developed—and then indefinitely repeated—than it is a task to be completed once and then disregarded. Since there theoretically is no ceiling to a human being's potential for existential growth, there is likewise no end to the cyclical application of the four stages and 23 steps; they are designed to be continually cultivated—as habits would be—throughout one's life. Despite this fact, the steps are intentionally ordered to

STAGE 1: Preconstruction .... Planning & Preparation

- Gathering information .... • Self-education
- Consultation .... • Build Relationships
- Acquiring and allotting financial resources .... • Self-awareness
- Obtaining approvals and permits .... • Self-organization
- Planning and scheduling .... • Self-recording
- Assembling a cohesive team and crew .... • Self-oneness
- Drafting architectural/engineering blueprints .... • Self-constitution

STAGE 2: Constructing the Foundation .... • Developing Integrity-Based Character

- Conducting geological surveys .... • Honesty
- Drilling down to bedrock .... • Humility
- Anchoring concrete/steel piles to bedrock .... • Reverence
- Correcting errors that arise & pouring a steel-reinforced concrete slab .... • Rectification
- Earthquake proofing .... • Service

STAGE 3: Constructing the Superstructure .... • Taking Action

- Punctually showing up to the work site .... • Self-discipline
- Concrete, steel, wood, glass, brick, mortar, and drywall .... • Self-action in public
- Plumbing, wiring, and insulation .... • Self-action in private
- Carpeting, painting and interior decoration .... • World-altering strategies (*see*: Neck, Manz and Houghton, 2017)
- Landscaping .... • Self- and natural rewards (*see*: Neck, Manz and Houghton, 2017)

STAGE 4: Maintenance & Upgrades .... • Observation, Analysis & Change

- Security .... • Self-observation (*see*: Neck, Manz and Houghton, 2017)
- Structural reviews, safety checks, and quality controls .... • Self-analysis
- Maintenance .... • Self-renewal
- Blueprints review .... • Purpose examination (*see*: Neck, Manz and Houghton, 2017)
- Inventory and change recommendations .... • External feedback
- Replacements, renovations, and upgrades .... • Self-alterations

Figure 2. SAL stages and step-habits

create a meaningful sequence designed (at least initially) to be practiced in order, thus maintaining a semblance of 'steps.' To capture the dual nature of these unique 23 action items, we hereafter invoke the hybrid term, *step-habits*, in describing them" (Jensen, Beaulieu and Neck, 2018: 20).

The four stages and 23 steps of the construction stage and their corresponding SAL model stages and step-habits are shown in Figure 2.

Many details are involved in a comprehensive explication of the SAL model and its many particulars, especially with regards to the last step-habit in stage one, which involves the drafting of a personal declaration of independence and self-constitution. These details are beyond the scope of this paper, but can be accessed in other works (Jensen, 2019; Jensen, 2015: 427-529; Jensen, Beaulieu and Neck, 2018: 49-69).

Toward a Universal Pedagogy of Personal Leadership and Character Development

Manz has written that "education and development efforts … can help address potential corruptive leadership tendencies associated with CSIR (Corporate Social Ir-Responsibility)" (Manz, 2015: 142). He has further noted that, "education and training can help block power abuse and provide an opportunity for shared influence and virtue at work" (Manz, 2015: 142). The SAL theory and model are intended to serve as a universal pedagogical matrix that facilitates the character education, self-leadership development, and existential growth of leaders, managers, educators, parents, students, and individuals everywhere. Instruction, mastery, repetition, analysis, and synthesis of the material are all keys to animating, vivifying, and enlarging SAL's capacity to instruct, guide, enrich, empower, and ennoble its students and practitioners—regardless of their ages and backgrounds.

6.1. The Self-Action Leadership Pedagogical Philosophy

The Self-Action Leadership theory and model serve as an Aristotelian balanced framework for a universal, self-leadership-oriented, character-based, secular curriculum that we suggest all reasonable leaders and educators can promote, regardless of their race, ethnicity, background, political persuasion, philosophical leaning, cultural connection, sexual orientation, or religious affiliation (or lack thereof). A *Pedagogy of Personal Leadership and Character Development* is defined as: Educational curricula that focuses a student's attention and efforts on taking individual responsibility and developing an integrity-based character.

Fortunately, like self-leadership, Self-Action Leadership can be taught. According to Manz: "Effective self-leadership can be learned and is not restricted to people we describe as 'self-starters,' 'self-directed,' self-motivated,' *etc*." (Manz, 1983: 289). The Self-Action Leadership Pedagogical Philosophy, and SAL Educational Vision is simple: to LEARN, MODEL, EXEMPLIFY, and then TEACH the SAL theory and model in nations, communities, corporations and other organizations, universities, schools, homes, and individual lives. It all starts with learning, but that is just the beginning. In the words of Covey: "To know and not to do is really not to know. To learn and not to do is [really] not to learn. In other words, to understand something but not apply it is really not to understand it. It is only in the doing, the applying, that knowledge and understanding are internalized" (Covey, 2004: 343).

Authentic learning must be accompanied by modeling and exemplification. From there, students can begin teaching what they have learned, modeled, and exemplified, to others. There is a deontological element to teaching, a conscience-rooted *categorical imperative* (Kant, 2016) that impels the learned to lift others by virtue of one's own acquired knowledge and experience. But we teach for more than just this; we also teach because it is the consummate learning tool; "*you learn best when you teach another*" (Covey, 2004: 32).

The essence of the SAL pedagogical philosophy involves learning the difference between beneficial behaviors versus destructive ones and striving to think, say, and do that which leads to healthy development and existential growth. It also involves taking complete personal responsibility for *virtually everything* in one's life (past, present, and future). This does not mean that one must agree with, or like, or take explicit blame for, or seek to perpetuate any particular element of one's past or present life; it merely means that one must accept the reality of one's present life situation, circumstances, history, and other variables, and then be willing to focus and direct a majority of one's time, effort, energy, and focus on what one *can* control (i.e. one's thoughts, speech, actions, and attitude) while spending a minority of one's time, effort, energy, and focus on what one *cannot* control, such as the past, one's physical, cognitive or emotional limitations, other people's thoughts, speech, and actions, macroeconomics, institutions, societal structures, the weather, *etc*. By so doing, individuals will not necessarily be able to overcome every obstacle or transcend every difficulty in their lives—SAL is not a silver bullet or cure-all—but they will at least find themselves empowered in a newfound and profound way that can considerably improve the overall quality, success, happiness, and fulfillment of their holistic life experiences. For a detailed list of SAL variables (including limitations and benefits), *see*: Jensen, 2019; Jensen, 2015: 148-158.

6.2. Learning

Learning anything can and ought to be an enjoyable and stimulating process on the part of both teacher and learner. Authentic learning, however, always requires a good-faith effort on the part of the learner and demands a measure of diligent and dedicated hard work in the form of reading, studying, cross-referencing, reviewing, repeating, and memorizing. While there will be endless opportunities to think critically about and creatively dialogue the SAL theory and model's many particulars and tangents (a *Socratic* pedagogical approach), a good place to start is to engage in rote learning strategies (an *Aristotelian* pedagogical approach) whereby one becomes familiar with and proficient in the academic components of the theory and model and their principles and practices (including laws and corollaries) as well as their related vocabulary and vernacular. In the words of Woolbert and Smith: "the [learning] process must be by way of education in ideas, of fertilizing the thinking process, of enriching the imagination, the memory, and one's store of facts. On top of all must come drill and criticism [e.g. constructive feedback from self and others], practice and analysis, observation, study, and much repetition" (Woolbert and Smith, 1934: 26). The best way to accomplish this task is to carefully read and study Jensen, which serves as *the* seminal and comprehensive textbook on Self-Action Leadership (Jensen, 2019; Jensen, 2015). The purpose of this tome is to serve as a primary text in a whole host of educational settings where leaders and educators may choose to promote SAL to their constituents, colleagues, subordinates, and students. As part

of the reading and studying process, we further encourage readers to complete the SAL Master Challenge (SAL-MC). The SAL-MC provides a series of homework assignments that allow a student or practitioner to put SAL principles into extensive practice over an extended period of time. It is an ambitious, but highly doable, challenge and opportunity that allows a student or other practitioner to take one's understanding of Self-Action Leadership to the next level and immediately promote one's own existential growth. Individuals tackling the SAL textbook by themselves may pursue the SAL-MC on their own. Those undertaking the SAL-MC as a group can operate under the guidance and direction of their teacher or supervisor.

6.3. Modeling and Exemplification

Upon completion of the SAL Master Challenge, one will have become well-versed in SAL principles and well-practiced in their accompanying behaviors. The next step – which can begin the moment one begins a serious study of the material – is to begin modeling the thoughts, speech, and behaviors championed in the theory and model in one's own conduct and life. As one persists in doing so, one will, over time, begin to increasingly exemplify them. In addition, one will begin to access the enormously positive consequences that tend to result from engaging diligently in SAL practices and habits over time, foremost of which is the attainment of higher levels of existential growth. The better one's exemplification, the more effectively one will be able to teach the principles to others, thereby inspiring them to engage in the practices themselves.

6.4. Teaching

Like modeling and exemplifying, the teaching process does not have to be delayed to some future point in time. It can begin as soon as one grasps a principle oneself. One will discover the capacity to teach is not so much inherent in one's capacity for preparation, organization, articulation, oratory, or rhetoric, but rather on the discipline and diligence one invests oneself in the processes of learning, modeling, and exemplifying.

6.5. Repetition: A Never-Ending Pedagogical Pursuit

After one's completion of the SAL textbook and SAL-MC, is all done? Of course not! Such an arrival, while exciting, and indicative of a significant investment of time, effort, and energy on the part of a student or practitioner, is *only* the beginning of one's never-ending journey into

a comprehensive SAL-Education. From there, the goal is five-fold. First, a continual review of the material already covered should be perpetuated indefinitely. An old adage states: *repetition is the key to reception*, or as Woolbert and Smith put it: "repetition makes for learning" (Woolbert and Smith, 1934: 40). Second, SAL-oriented (or related) group discussions should be launched in classrooms, training rooms, lunchrooms, restaurants, offices, cubicles, hallways, automobiles, planes, trains, et cetera, to expand upon what one is learning by synthesizing and synergizing with the learning processes, experiences, input, and wisdom of others. Third, an extension of the learning process may take place indefinitely into the future by searching widely and deeply into the capacious caverns and wondrous wells of related learning. This process is best engaged initially by enthusiastically digging into the citations and other recommended resources cited in this paper and other related works (*see*: Jensen, 2019, Appendix A; and Jensen, 2015: 651-653, for an extended list of recommended resources). Fourth, one should continue to engage in lifelong journaling efforts and perpetually apply the useful pondering and reflection exercises concomitant thereto. Fifth, and most importantly, one must seek out opportunities to instruct, enlighten, lift, inspire, and empower others by teaching SAL-oriented principles and practices to others. A human being filled with the light of truth will not be satisfied by mere self-immersion and application; one will naturally feel that light guide them to seek out and take advantage of opportunities to teach others in the same ways of enlightenment, growth, and freedom that have lifted oneself to higher planes where life's more picturesque existential vistas are unveiled.

7. Implications for Practice and Limitations

The implications for practice and implementation of this proposed *Pedagogy of Personal Leadership, Character Education, and Moral Instruction* are limitless, and we have little intention of dictating specifics to educators aside from providing general structures and other templates in concert with offering training and consultation services to help interested organizations get started. For now, a general template for learning, modeling, exemplifying, and teaching will suffice. The goal of this paper is to present the SAL philosophy, theory, and model and encourage leaders, managers, educators, parents, and individuals to begin learning, modeling, exemplifying, and then creatively teaching this material to their constituents, colleagues, subordinates, students, children, and themselves.

It should also be noted that the qualitative nature of the theory and model engenders certain limitations. These

limitations arise largely from the fact that the theory and model's qualitative and purposely approximated metrics will inevitably remain open to subjective interpretation and will therefore vary according to the unique experiences and perspectives of different scholars and practitioners.

8. Suggestions for Future Research

Like SAL's implications for practice, its implications for future research are endless. This is due to the fact that Self-Action Leadership (similar to its academic forbearers: autoethnography, action research, and self-leadership) is a nascent field of inquiry. Having just been introduced in the past few years, the research horizon remains almost entirely untapped, as an academic virgin forest or scholarly wilderness. Only time can tell the tale on the potential for further research and development of this unique and much-needed pedagogical construct.

Suggestions for research in the near future would be best directed at studying the pedagogical processes and forthcoming consequences of disseminating the material to a diverse subset of audiences spanning not only a variety of races, ethnicities, cultures, ages, religions, et cetera, but also settings that span the corporate world (including the board room, training room, office, cubicle, podium, plant/factory, laboratory, testing ground, field, *etc.*), the school house, classroom, and athletic arena, the community, and the home. In other words, initial research should focus on questions such as: Does SAL training lead to a marked difference in the results we are getting in our organization, school, home, individual life, *etc.*? If so, is it a positive change. And if it is, to what extent is the difference, how are we able to measure it, and is the difference an improvement of *degree*, *kind*, or both?

9. Conclusion

Our current cultural-moral conundrum in the West and beyond is marked by a rampant lack of civility and self-control, profound problems with drug abuse and addiction, dramatic divisiveness in our political processes, socio-political injustices, and an overall sense of collective moral inebriation. The time has come for us as scholars to contribute something substantive that addresses the *roots* of these deep and troubling issues. To accomplish this ambitious objective, we must abandon the bandage and tonic solutions of the past. Specifically, the fickle elixirs of postmodernism (i.e. moral relativism) are proving themselves to be absolutely insufficient in addressing the profound individual and collective moral problems we face. Moreover, simplistic societal salves aimed at treating symptoms rather than healing root causes have proved pathetic panaceas to deep collective wounds incurred across multiple generations. The only real solution lies in a pedagogical revolution that fundamentally recasts and then reconstructs our institutional and instructional frameworks—and the moral philosophy undergirding them.

The world has enough moral relativism; it needs more moral circumspection. It has enough *de*construction; it needs more *re*construction. It has plenty of *laisser-aller* moral mindsets; it needs more conscious commitments to conscience. Finally, it has had more than its fill of postmodernism and its progeny of prurience, abuse, and despair; and now it cries out in utter desperation for a new *Age of Authenticism* (Docx, 2011) and the individual virtue and collective character required to animate it. The Self-Action Leadership philosophy, theory, and model can help serve this purpose, with innumerable benefits forthcoming for all of us.

References

Agger, B. (1991). "Critical Theory, Poststructuralism, Postmodernism: Their Sociological Relevance." *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 17, pp. 105–131.

Altrichter, H., S. Kemmis, R. McTaggart, and O. Zuber-Skerritt. (2002). "The Concept of Action Research." *The Learning Organization*, 9(3), pp. 125–131.

Alves, J. C., K. J. Lovelace, C. C. Manz, D. Matsypura, F. Toyasaki, and K. G. Ke. (2006). "A Cross-Cultural Perspective of Self-Leadership." *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(4), pp. 338–359.

Anderson, L. (2006). "Analytic Autoethnography." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35(4), pp. 373–395.

Anderson, L. (2011). "Time is of the Essence: An Analytic Autoethnography of Family, Work, and Serious Leisure." *Symbolic Interaction*, 34(2), pp. 133–157.

Anderson, L., and B. Glass-Coffin. (2013). *I Learn by Going: Autoethnographic Modes of Inquiry*, in: S. H. Jones, T. E. Adams, and C. Ellis.

(eds.). (2013). *Handbook of Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

Arcade Fire (Rock Band). *Month of May*. Written by: Win Butler, Regine Chassagne, William Butler, Tim Kingsbury, Richard R. Parry, Jeremy Gara.

Aristotle. (2009). *Aristotle: The Nicomachean Ethics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ascher, K. (2013). *The Heights: Anatomy of a Skyscraper*. New York: Penguin Books.

Atkinson, P. and M. Hammersley. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. New York: Routledge.

Beaulieu, R. B. (2013). "Action Research: Trends and Variations." *Canadian Journal of Action Research*, 14(3), pp. 29–39.

Bertans, H. (1995). *The Idea of the Postmodern: A History*. New York: Routledge.

Bochner, A. P., C. Ellis. (eds.). (2002). *Ethnographically Speaking: Autoethnography, Literature, and Aesthetics*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira, pp. 1–10.

Boland, M. L. (2005). *Sexual Harassment in the Workplace*. Naperville: Sphinx

Booty, J. (ed.). (1990). *John Donne: Selections from Divine Poems, Sermons, Devotions, and Prayers*. New York: Paulist Press.

Boyle, M., and K. Parry. (2007). "Telling the Whole Story: The Case for Organizational Autoethnography." *Culture and Organization*, 13(3), pp. 185–190.

Cautela, J. R. (1969). *Behavioral Therapy and Self-Control: Techniques and Applications*, in: C. M. Franks. (1969). (ed.), *Behavioral Therapy: Appraisal and Status*. New York: McGraw-Hill, pp. 323–340.

Chang, H. (2008). *Autoethnography as Method*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

Chang, H., K. A. Longman, and M. A. Franco. (2014). "Leadership Development Through Mentoring in Higher Education: A Collaborative Autoethnography of Leaders of Color." *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 22(4), pp. 373–389.

Chapman, J. W., and W. A. Galston. (1992). *Virtue*. New York: New York University Press.

Chaucer, G. (2017). *The Canterbury Tales*. Retrieved from: https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/basis/canterbu.txt.

Chesterton, G. K. (2008). *Geoffrey Chaucer*. Cornwall: House of Stratus.

Clawson, J. G. (1999). *Level Three Leadership: Getting Below the Surface*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Clawson, J. G. S. (2008). "Leadership as Managing Energy." *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 16(3), pp. 174–181.

Cook, R. J. (ed.). (1997). *One Hundred and One Famous Poems: With a Prose Supplement*. Lincolnwood: Contemporary Books.

Covey, S. R. (1989). *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People: Powerful Lessons in Personal Change*. New York: Fireside.

Covey, S. R. (1990). *Principle Centered Leadership*. New York: Fireside.

Covey, S. R. (2004). *The 8th Habit: From Effectiveness to Greatness*. New York: Free Press.

Covey, S. R., R. A. Merrill, and R. R. Merrill. (1994). *First Things First*. New York: Fireside.

Dawley, D., J. D. Houghton, and N. S. Bucklew. (2010). "Perceived Organizational Support and Turnover Intention: The Mediating Effects of Personal Sacrifice and Job Fit." *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 150(3).

Denzin, N. K., and Y. S. Lincoln. (eds.). (2011). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Derrida, J. (2016). *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

DiLiello, T. C., and J. D. Houghton. (2006). "Maximizing Organizational Leadership Capacity for the Future: Toward a Model of Self-Leadership, Innovation and Creativity." *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(4), pp. 319–337.

Docx, E. (2011). "Postmodernism is Dead." *Prospect*. August Issue. Retrieved from: https://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/magazine/postmodernism-is-dead-va-exhibition-age-of-authenticism.

Doloriert, C., and S. Sambrook. (2011). "Accommodating an Autoethnographic PhD: The Tale of the Thesis, the Viva Voce, and the Traditional Business School." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 40(5), pp. 582–615.

Dorgan, B.L. (2006). *Take This Job and Ship It: How Corporate Greed and Brain-Dead Politics Are Selling Out America*. New York: Thomas Dunne Books.

Dreher, D. (1996). *The Tao of Personal Leadership*. New York: Harper Business.

Durkheim, E. (1925). *Moral Education: A Study in the Theory and Application of the Sociology of Education*. New York: Free Press.

Ellis, C. (2004). *The Ethnographic I: A Methodological Novel About Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira.

Ellis, C. (2009). *Revision: Autoethnographic Reflections on Life and Work*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

Ellis, C. S., and A. P. Bochner. (2006). "Analyzing Analytic Autoethnography: An Autopsy." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35(4), pp. 429-449.

Fals-Borda, O. (1984). "Participatory Action Research." *Development: Seeds of Change*, 2, pp. 18–20.

Forest, H. (2009). "Artful Leadership for Creating Positive Social Change: Reflections on an Arts-Based Autoethnography." *Storytelling, Self, Society: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Storytelling Studies*, 5(2), pp. 72–89.

Fox, J. A. and M. J. DeLateur. (2014). "Mass Shootings in America: Moving Beyond Newtown." *Homicide Studies*, 18(1), pp. 125–145.

French, S. (2009). "Action Research for Practising Managers." *Journal of Management Development*, 28(3), pp. 187–204.

Furtner, M. R., J. F. Rauthmann, and P. Sachse. (2011). "The Self-Loving Self-Leader: An Examination of the Relationship Between Self-Leadership and the Dark Triad." *Social Behavior and Personality*, 39(3), pp. 369–379.

Gardner, J. W. *Leaders and Followers*, in: J. T. Wren (ed.). (1995). *The Leader's Companion: Insights on Leadership Through the Ages*. New York: Free Press, pp. 185–188.

Garza, Jr., E. (2008). "Autoethnography of a First-Time Superintendent: Challenges to Leadership for Social Justice." *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 7(2), pp. 163–176.

Geertz, C. (1995). *After the Fact: Two Countries, Four Decades, One Anthropologist*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Georgianna, S. (2007). "Self-Leadership: A Cross-Cultural Perspective." *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(6), pp. 569–589.

Gilbert, N. L. (2013). *The Challenges of Starting and Leading a Charter School: Examining the Risks, the Resistance, and the Role of Adaptive Leadership—An Autoethnography*. ProQuest Dissertation. The University of Pennsylvania. 3562369.

Griffin, R. H. (2009). *The Work of High School Counselors' Leadership for Social Justice: An Analytic Autoethnography*. ProQuest Dissertation. Washington State University. 3382098.

Hoffman, L., S. Stewart, D. Warren, and L. Meek. (2008). "Toward a Sustainable Myth of Self: An Existential Response to the Postmodern Condition." *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*. 49(2), pp. 135–173.

Holt, N. L. (2003). "Representation, Legitimation, and Autoethnography: An Autoethnographic Writing Story." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 22(1), pp. 18–28.

Houghton, J. D., and C. P. Neck. (2002). "The Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire: Testing a Hierarchical Factor Structure for Self-Leadership." *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17(8), pp. 672–691.

Houghton, J. D., and S. K. Yoho. (2005). "Toward a Contingency Model of Leadership and Psychological Empowerment: When Should Self-Leadership Be Encouraged?" *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 11(4), pp. 65–83.

Houghton, J. D., C. L. Pearce, C. C. Manz, S. Courtright, and G. L Stewart. (2015). "Sharing is Caring: Toward a Model of Proactive Caring Through Shared Leadership." *Human Resource Management Review*, 25(3), pp. 313–327.

Houghton, J. D., C. P. Neck, and S. Krishnakumar. (2016). "The What, Why, and How of Spirituality in the Workplace Revisited: A 14-year Update and Extension." *Journal of Management, Spirituality, and Religion*, 13(3), pp. 177–205.

Huffington, A. (2009). *Pigs at the Trough: How Corporate Greed and Political Corruption are Undermining America*. New York: Three Rivers Press.

Humphries, M. (2005). "Getting Personal: Reflexivity and Autoethnographic Vignettes." *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11(6), pp. 840–860.

Jackson, B., and K. Parry. (2011). *A Very Short, Fairly Interesting and Reasonably Cheap Book About Studying Leadership*. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism: Or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Jensen, J. R. (2005). *I Am Sovereign: The Power of Personal Leadership*. Charleston: Booksurge.

Jensen, J. R. (2007). *Leaders for Life: The Complete Step-By-Step Guide to Personal Leadership*. Unpublished manuscript.

Jensen, J. R. (2013). *Self-Action Leadership: An Autoethnographic Analysis of Self-Leadership Through Action Research in Support of a Pedagogy of Personal Leadership*. Doctoral dissertation. Fielding Graduate University: Santa Barbara.

Jensen, J. R. (2013b). *Self-Action Leadership: The Key to Everything: The World's Most Comprehensive Guide to Self-Leadership*. Bloomington: AuthorHouse.

Jensen, J. R. (2015). *Self-Action Leadership: The Key to Personal, Professional, & Global Freedom*. Bloomington: AuthorHouse.

Jensen, J. R. (2019). *Self-Action Leadership: The Key to Personal, Professional, and Global Freedom. The Definitive Textbook for Personal and Life Leadership: A Comprehensive Resource for Leaders, Managers, Workers, Educators, Parents, and Students*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Jensen, J. R., and C. P. Neck. (2017). "The Relation of Religion and Spirituality to Time Management: Examining the Lives and Careers of Franklincoveyco-Founders – Hyrum W. Smith & Stephen R. Covey." *Journal of Management, Spirituality, & Religion*, 14(4), pp. 281–294.

Jensen, J. R., C. P. Neck, and R. J. Beaulieu. (2015). "Self-Action Leadership: A Qualitative, Nomological Expansion of Self-Leadership Theory Rooted in Atmospheric and Astronomical Metaphor." *Journal of Leadership and Management*, 3(1), pp. 67–78.

Jensen, J. R., R. J. Beaulieu, and C. P. Neck. (2018). "The Self-Action Leadership Model: A Qualitative, Nomological Expansion of Self-Leadership Theory Rooted in Action Research." *Journal of Leadership and Management*, 2(11), pp. 10–30.

Jung, C. G. (1966). *Psychology and Religion*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Kant, I. (2016). *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.

Kelley, R. E. (1995). *In Praise of Followers*, in: J. T. Wren. (ed.). (1995). *The Leader's Companion: Insights on Leadership Through the Ages*. New York: Free Press, pp. 193–204.

Kempster, S., and J. Stewart. (2010). "Becoming a Leader: A Co-Produced Autoethnographic Exploration of Situated Learning of Leadership Practice." *Management Learning*, 41(2), pp. 205–219.

Kempster, S., and M. Iszatt-White. (2012). "Towards Co-Constructed Coaching: Exploring the Integration of Coaching and Co-Constructed Autoethnography in Leadership Development." *Management Learning*, 44(4), pp. 319–336.

Kerr, J., and J. M. Jermier. (1978). "Substitutes for Leadership: Their Meaning and Measurement." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 22(3), pp. 375–403.

Kiel, D. F. (2013). *The Leadership Experience of a Principal Using Technology to Change a School: An Autoethnography*. ProQuest Dissertation. Northcentral University. 3538180

Kien, G. (2008). "Father John, Technology, and God: An International Christian Mission in the Lobby of the Juyoh Hotel." *Qualitative Inquiry*, 14(8), pp. 1444–1457.

Klenke, K. (2008). *Qualitative Research in the Study of Leadership*. Bingley: Emerald.

Kotarba, J. A. and J. M. Johnson. (eds.). (2002). *Postmodern Existential Sociology*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Kuhne, G. W., and B. A. Quigley. (1997). *Understanding and Using Action Research in Practice Settings*, in: A. B. Quigley, and G. W. Kuhne. (eds.). (1997). *Creating Practical Knowledge Through Action Research: Posing Problems, Solving Problems, and Improving Daily Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 23–40.

Lance, A. (2009). *The Influence of life Experiences on Educational Leadership Practice and Evolution of that Practice: An Autoethnography*. ProQuest Dissertation. The University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Lopez, H. (2016). "Authoethnography of an Escaped Latino Statistic: From High School Dropout, to Alternative School Graduate, to Educational Leader." *National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal*, 29(1-2), pp. 13–20.

Lutgens, F. K., and E. J. Tarbuck. (2010). *The Atmosphere: An Introduction to Meteorology*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Lyotard, J-F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

MacIntyre, A. (1984). *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Manz, C. C. (1983). "Improving Performance Through Self-Leadership." *National Productivity Review*, 2(3), pp. 288–297.

Manz, C. C. (1986). "Self-Leadership: Toward an Expanded Theory of Self-Influence Processes in Organizations." *Academy of Management Review*, 11(3), pp. 585–600.

Manz, C. C. (1992). *Mastering Self-Leadership: Empowering Yourself for Personal Excellence*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Manz, C. C. (2015). "Taking the Self-Leadership High Road: Smooth Surface or Potholes Ahead." *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 29(1), pp. 132–151.

Manz, C. C., and H. P. Sims, Jr. (1980). "Self-Management as a Substitute for Leadership: A Social Learning Theory Perspective." *The Academy of Management Review*, 5(3), pp. 361–367.

Manz, C. C., and H. P. Sims, Jr. (2001). *The New Superleadership: Leading Others to Lead Themselves*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Manz, C. C., K. P. Manz, R. D. Marx, and C. P. Neck. (2001). *The Wisdom of Solomon at Work: Ancient Virtues for Living and Leading Today*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Manz, C. C., K. P. Manz, R. D. Marx, and C. P. Neck. (2004). "Spiritual Beliefs and Scholarship: A Journey with the Wisdom of Solomon." *Management Communication Quarterly*, 17(4), pp. 611–620.

Manz, C. C., V. Anand, M. Joshi, and K. P. Manz. (2008). "Emerging Paradoxes in Executive Leadership: A Theoretical Interpretation of the Tensions Between Corruption and Virtuous Values." *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(3), pp. 385–392.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). "A Theory of Human Motivation." *Psychological Review*, 50(4), pp. 370–396.

Mastrangelo, A., E. R. Eddy, and S. J. Lorenzet. (2004). "The Importance of Personal and Professional Leadership." *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(5), pp. 435–451.

McClellan, P. (2011). "Race, Gender, and Leadership Identity: An Autoethnography of Reconciliation." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 25(1), pp. 89–100.

McKay, J., and P. Marshall. (2001). "The Dual Imperatives of Action Research." *Information Technology & People*, 14(1), pp. 46–59.

Mohliver, A. C. (2012). *Legitimized Unethicality: The Divergence of Norms and Laws in Financial Markets*. Columbia University. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. UMI #3542593.

Muncey, T. (2005). "Doing Autoethnography." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 4(1).

Muncey, T. (2010). *Creating Autoethnographies*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Mundell, T. W. (2010). *Principal Leadership in a Middle School Culture: An Autoethnography*. ProQuest Dissertation. Northcentral University. 3416858.

Murphy, S. A. (2008). "The Role of Emotions and Transformational Leadership on Police Culture: An Autoethnographic Account." *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 10(2), pp. 165–178.

Nash, R. J. (2004). *Liberating Scholarly Writing: The Power of Personal Narrative*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Neck, C. P., and C. C. Manz. (2004). *Mastering Self-Leadership: Empowering Yourself for Personal Excellence*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Neck, C. P., and C. C. Manz. (2007). *Mastering Self-Leadership: Empowering Yourself for Personal Excellence*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Neck, C. P., and C. C. Manz. (2010). *Mastering Self-Leadership: Empowering Yourself for Personal Excellence*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Neck, C. P., and C. C. Manz. (2012). *Mastering Self-Leadership: Empowering Yourself for Personal Excellence*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Neck, C. P., and J. D. Houghton. (2006). "Two Decades of Self-Leadership Theory and Research: Past Developments, Present Trends, and Future Possibilities." *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(4), pp. 270–295.

Neck, C. P., and J. F. Milliman. (1994). "Thought Self-Leadership: Finding Spiritual Fulfillment in Organizational Life." *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 9(6), pp. 9–16.

Neck, C. P., C. C. Manz, and J. D. Houghton. (2017). *Self-Leadership: The Definitive Guide to Personal Excellence*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Nelson L. S, D. N. Juurlink, and J. Perrone. (2015). "Addressing the Opioid Epidemic." *JAMA*, 314(14), pp. 1453–1454.

Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Oberman, W. (2004). "Existentialism Meets Postmodernism in Paul Auster's the Music of Chance." *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, 45(2), pp. 191–206.

Ormiston, M. E. and E. M. Wong. (2013). "License to Ill: The Effects of Corporate Social Responsibility and CEO Identity on Corporate Social Irresponsibility." *Personnel Psychology*, 66(4), pp. 861–893.

Parry, K. W. (2008). "Viewing the Leadership Narrative Through Alternate Lenses: An Autoethnographic Investigation." *Management Revue*, 19(1-2), pp. 126–147.

Pastabagel (pseudonym) Partial Objects (blog). August 19, 2011. Retrieved from: http://partialobjects.com/2011/08/what-comes-after-postmodernism/

Pattni, I., and G. N. Soutar. (2009). "The Effectiveness of Self-Management Training in Organisations from Two Culturally Different Countries." *Journal of Management Development*, 28(7), pp. 633–646.

Pearce, C. L. and C. C. Manz. (2011). "Leadership Centrality and Corporate Social Ir-Responsibility (CSIR): The Potential Emeliorating Effects of Self and Shared Leadership on CSIR." *Journal of Business Ethics*, 102(4), pp. 563–579.

Pearce, C. L. and H. P. Sims, Jr. (2002). "Vertical Versus Shared Leadership as Predictors of the Effectiveness of Change Management Teams: An Examination of Aversive, Directive, Transactional, Transformational, and Empowering Leadership Behaviors." *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 6(2), pp. 172–197.

Peck, M. S. (1978). *The Road Less Traveled: A New Psychology of Love, Traditional Values, and Spiritual Growth*. New York: Touchstone.

Peck, M. S. (1983). *People of the Lie: The Hope for Healing Human Evil*. New York: Touchstone.

Peck, M. S. (1987). *The Different Drum: Community Making and Peace*. New York: Touchstone.

Peck, M. S. (1993a). *A World Waiting to be Born: Civility Rediscovered*. New York: Touchstone.

Peck, M. S. (1993b). *Further Along the Road Less Traveled: The Unending Journey Toward Spiritual Growth*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Peck, M. S. (1997). *The Road Less Traveled and Beyond: Spiritual Growth in An Age of Anxiety*. New York: Touchstone.

Pepper, K., and L. Hamilton Thomas. (2002). "Making a Change: The Effects of the Leadership Role on School Climate." *Learning Environments Research*, 5(2), pp. 155–166.

Peters, M. (1996). *Poststructuralism, Politics, and Education: Critical Studies in Education and Culture*. Westport: Bergin & Garvey.

Poster, M. (1989). *Critical Theory and Poststructuralism*, in: *Search of a Context*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Project Management Institute (PMI). (2013). *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK® Guide)*. Newtown Square: Project Management Institute.

Quinn, M. L. (2008). *Autoethnography: My Journey from Educator to Educator-Activist*. ProQuest Dissertation. Lewis and Clark College. 3320017.

Reason, P. and H. Bradbury. (eds.). (2008). *The SAGE Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice*. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Reed-Danahay, D. E. (ed.). (1997). *Auto/Ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social*. New York: Berg.

Rohn, J. (2000). *Building Your Network Marketing Business* [compact disc recording]. USA: Video Plus.

Rost, J. C. (1995). *Leaders and Followers Are the People in This Relationship*, in: J. T. Wren, (ed.). (1995). *The Leader's Companion: Insights on Leadership Through the Ages*. New York: Free Press, pp. 189–192.

Roubiczek, P. (1964). *Existentialism: For and Against*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Russell, R. (1996). *The Miracle of Personal Leadership: Revolutionary New Personal Leadership Secrets to Energize and Empower Your Work and Life*. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt.

Schaetti, B. F., S. J. Ramsey, and G. C. Watanabe. (2008). *Personal Leadership: Making a World of Difference: A Methodology of Two Principles and Six Practices*. Seattle: Flying Kite Publications.

Schimmel, S. (1997). *The Seven Deadly Sins: Jewish, Christian, and Classical Reflections on Human Nature*. New York: Free Press.

Seligman, M. E. P., and M. Csikszentmihalyi. (2000). "Positive Psychology: An Introduction." *American Psychologist*, 55(1), pp. 5–14.

Starr, L. J. (2010). "The Use of Autoethnography in Educational Research: Locating Who We Are in What We Do." *Canadian Journal for New Scholars in Education*, 3(1), pp. 155–166.

Starr, L. J. (2014). "Informing Education Research and the Praxis of Leadership Through the Use of Autoethnography and Phenomenology." *Canadian Journal for New Scholars in Education*, 5(3).

Stewart, G. L., S. H. Courtright, and C. C. Manz. (2011). "Self-Leadership: A Multilevel Review." *Journal of Management*, 37(1), pp. 185–222.

Tarbuck, E. J. and F. K. Lutgens. (2009). *Earth Science*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Prentice-Hall.

Theoharis, G. (2007). "Social Justice Educational Leaders and Resistance: Toward a Theory of Social Justice Leadership." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(2), pp. 221–258.

Thoreau, H. D. (2001). *Walden and Other Writings*. New York: MetroBooks.

Wall, S. (2006). "An Autoethnography on Learning About Autoethnography." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(2), pp. 1–12.

Wall, S. (2008). "Easier Said than Done: Writing an Autoethnography." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 7(1), pp. 38–53.

Whyte, W. F. (ed.). (1991). *Participatory Action Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Woolbert, C. H., and J. F. Smith. (1934). *Fundamentals of Speech: A Textbook of Delivery*. New York: Harper & Brothers.