

# LEADERSHIP IS THE KEY TO SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN ECUADOR\*

Cornell Menking

This work is produced by OpenStax-CNX and licensed under the  
Creative Commons Attribution License 2.0<sup>†</sup>

## Abstract

I come to the field of educational administration from a rather unorthodox background. The search which led me to education began as a Peace Corps Volunteer in Sierra Leone. I left there frustrated with what passed as “development”. I heard the term “sustainability” thrown around and saw nothing sustainable about what was being done. I saw not only short-term improvement in people’s lives, but also an incredible waste of resources and a feeding frenzy of development officers getting fat on NGO and western government funding. Sadly, in the years following my service in Sierra Leone, I also saw the peaceful Sierra Leoneans turn into symbols of humanity’s darkest side (referring to the gruesome civil war in Sierra Leone). It was depressing, really.

Fate took me next to working with immigrants in New Mexico with a literacy project. I found the results of education much more rewarding and tangible. My belief in the potential of education was confirmed once again as I next worked with English teachers in northeastern Siberia in the Sakha Republic from 1993-1996. I decided education was always the common denominator in any “sustainable development” approach, so I returned to the U.S. and the University of New Mexico for graduate degrees in education. It was my doctoral research on an educational project aimed at sustainable community development via “moral leadership” and “personal and social transformation” that is the topic of this article. In my opinion, this is an example of a community development project that deserves the blue ribbon label of “sustainable”.

My purpose here is to simply introduce educational leaders, as briefly as possible, to this model. I will conclude by suggesting how further exploration of “moral leadership” might help educational administrators and professors improve their practice.



NOTE: This module has been peer-reviewed, accepted, and sanctioned by the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) as a scholarly contribution to the knowledge base in educational administration.

## BACKGROUND: THE PROGRAMA LIDERAZGO EDUCATIVO

\*Version 1.1: Jun 24, 2008 9:10 pm -0500

<sup>†</sup><http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>

The influences of the electronic age are, more and more, challenging our traditional assumptions of the profile of the teacher and the pupil. In developing countries, where education is notoriously rote, the implications for change are exciting. In the case of “The Training Program in Leadership, Education and Community Development Studies”, which was conducted in Ecuador between 1998 and 1999, the project designers approached teachers as agents of community change. Their reasoning was simple: Who are a community’s natural leaders? Teachers are, of course. They are respected and educated. Why not target teachers as agents of change in the larger community? Why not have these teachers initiate small community development projects that they themselves, in collaboration with the members of their community, design and execute? But the vision did not stop there. For teachers to be effective agents of change they must a) be prepared as leaders, and b) be given the practical tools necessary to do the job.

The program, which was commonly referred to simply as the “Programa Liderazgo Educativo”, or Educational Leadership Project (PLE hereafter), set out on its ambitious undertaking with 1,000 teachers scattered throughout the small Andean nation of Ecuador. Most would also finish the program with a Masters degree. The key institutional players were Núr University, a private university in Santa Cruz, Bolivia with which I have no connection, and the Ecuadorian Ministry of Education. The key architect of the program was Dr. Eloy Anello, an Ed.D. from the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, and founder of Núr University. Anello and Núr have developed outstanding reputations as innovators in rural development and community leadership.

My study, finished in 2003, was a qualitative, in-depth study of ten graduates of the PLE. It almost exclusively focused on the aforementioned goal of preparing teachers as leaders - the theoretical portion of the program. Because of the PLE’s profound attempt to achieve community development through personal and social transformation, I felt that prolonged engagement with a small number of participants who reported a positive individual affect on their lives would help us understand this process better. It is not the purpose of this article to report those findings, but suffice it to say that the program definitely affected their work as educational leaders in a positive way and they continued to strive to mine the gems within themselves and those around them. You will see in the section ahead that this is ultimately the purpose of the PLE.

## 1 ANELLO AND THE FRAMEWORK FOR MORAL LEADERSHIP

Anello is well-published in Latin America, but less known in the United States. Reading his work through an academic lens, one quickly notices that his writing lacks what the academy often wants in terms of academic rigor and citations (not to be confused with lacking meaningful content). This lack of dialogue with the academy stems from his motivation to write in an accessible manner that facilitates applied solutions, as opposed to publishing and theory-building. Reading the first module of the PLE program, one immediately notices the simple, to-the-point language designed not to exclude audiences with unnecessarily sophisticated vocabulary.

Because these materials are not yet widely available in English, and because Module 1 is the most important in terms of framing the philosophy of the program, the remainder of this section gives the reader at a brief overview of it. Module 1 was written by Anello and Hernández (A&H hereafter), entitled *Liderazgo Moral* (1996). I will intersperse the outline with my own commentary and comparison with the literature.

The 346 page Spanish version of the book opens with “An Overview of Our Age”, a discussion that gives the participants an historical perspective. It paints our age as one of simultaneous integration and disintegration, an age of “interwoven strands of light and darkness” (p.21). The section unequivocally asks us to align ourselves with those processes that seek to integrate and unify humankind. This understanding, the authors argue, lends us a sense of hope in the face of increasing social breakdown. The book then progresses into a discussion of “The Need for Moral Leadership”, in which they cite the World Health Organization’s call for moral leadership. A&H’s introduction concludes with this strong statement:

It is not money, or organizational competence, or even knowledge that is lacking to better the world, but the necessary moral leadership (p.31).

A&H then identify the three essential qualities of a moral leader. These are the very core of the PLE’s ideology, and I have tried to connect them to the wider body of academic literature (paraphrased below from

p.31-32).

Before listing them, it's interesting to note the language used. A&H "invite" the reader to "unite with [them] in a process of reflection and dialogue, which may lead to enriched learning and understanding." The language itself is very process-oriented.

1) Moral leaders must be aware of the aforementioned "twin processes" and align their visions with the integration side. Similarly, Greenleaf (1996) proposes asking ourselves, "Do I have a sense of history?" and notes the importance of recognizing the opportunities offered in this terrible period in which we live (p.43), as well as the importance of being able to define "growth in the right direction" (Greenleaf, 1991, p.174).

2) Moral leaders must "have a clear vision of the society [they] want to create." Again, most leadership authors recognize this element, but getting there varies. In the PLE, vision is informed by the sense of history in #1 and must be constructed with those being "led".

3) Moral leadership must also

...entail a deep personal commitment to strive for individual transformation through the development and exemplification of a life based on ethical and moral principles, characterized by qualities of both uprightness and kindness, and to strive for collective transformation through actions which promote unity and justice (p.32).

This values-based self-improvement is, arguably, where one finds the most diversity in the literature and where Greenleaf and Covey seem to take the strongest stand. A&H quote Covey:

Our effectiveness is predicated upon certain inviolate principles [italics in original] – natural laws in the human dimension that are just as real, just as unchanging, as laws such as gravity are in the physical dimension. These principles are woven into the fabric of every civilized society and constitute the roots of every family and institution that has endured and prospered (Covey, 1990, p.18; quoted in, p.99).

Anello believes this commitment to individual transformation is a prerequisite to social transformation. Greenleaf (1991) likens it to the concept of Alcoholics Anonymous in which the alcoholic's faith in transformation comes from his or her knowing, first hand, that alcohol can be overcome. In other words, faith in others reaching their potential comes from first focusing on and releasing one's own. It is reciprocal healing and service, something that money cannot buy (p.36).

Having established the moral leader's three essential qualities, Module 1 then proceeds to facilitate transformation by making participants aware of "mental models", beginning with a discussion of the "prevailing models of leadership". And since "leadership cannot exist in a vacuum" (p.37), they begin by defining the three primary functions of any group:

- 1) Conserving and strengthening the unity of the group.
- 2) Carrying out those tasks for which the group was created
- 3) Developing the potentialities of the members of the group (p.37)

Having said that, the four major categories of the prevailing mental models of leadership are listed: authoritarian, paternalistic, know-it-all, manipulative (see Table 5). Each one of these is presented as not adequately releasing –of limiting – the potentialities of the members of the group in some way. Democratic leadership is discussed last, and the pros and cons of what we know as democratic leadership are examined. The pros being, basically, that the ideal democratic leader is something of a facilitator of consultation among members in a system where all members are encouraged to contribute and work together. The cons, however, relate to democracy as it is practiced. In "pseudo-democracies" (p.54) leaders are often given great authority and find themselves inadvertently adopting the aforementioned mental models of leadership which limit human potential. Also, candidates in modern democracy frequently become more concerned with self-promotion and winning than serving their constituencies. This is inconsistent with the type of humble leadership the PLE calls for.

The system of nominations, propaganda, and campaigns generally does not favor honest candidates who are characterized by a spirit of service, but rather those candidates who are characterized by egocentric behavior and the love for power, who say and believe that "I'm the best" and who will do anything necessary to win. These are not the characteristics of the kind of leader that we need today. As a result, all too often none of the eligible candidates are really suitable (1996, p.55).

The PLE, in contrast, promotes election without candidates, where all eligible members of the group are voted for without any campaigning.

**2 Table 5: Four Prevalent Leadership Models Matrix Source: (A&H, 1996, p.50). Exercise from Module 1. Boxes completed by author.**

Prevalent Mental Model of Leadership	Conduct that characterizes the mental model	Prototype of this mental model of leadership	Reaction of the group members to the leadership	Effects on group functioning
Authoritarian	Gives orders. Expects immediate obedience.	Military Slavery	Resentment. Submission or rebelliousness.	“Mysterious” problems and slow-downs. Frustration impedes group. No focus on developing potential of other members.
Paternalistic	Often sincere-Genuine love may exist Over-protective May give illusion of democratically soliciting opinions of members, but ultimately paternalistic leaders make decisions.	Religious and charitable organizations- Government programs Non-Governmental Organization programs	Illusion of unity maintained, but non-sustainable since dependent on the leader. “Cultivates attitudes of dependency and helplessness that paralyzes creative initiative and a sense of personal responsibility.”	Comfortable Members accustomed to leader’s care and may come to expect it as their right. Resist taking responsibility
<i>continued on next page</i>				

50Know-it-all	“Leader may seize every opportunity to boast of his knowledge, studies, or previous experience...Often attempts to diminish the credibility of other members of the group by subtly ridiculing their ideas and suggestions, by making jokes about them and their contributions.”	“Experts” Consultants(Frequently brought in from outside)	Feelings of inferiorityFear that their ideas will be of little consequence	Group’s experiential knowledge on the subject is lost.Leader discouraged, complains that nobody participates or contributes. Lack of integration between the leader and members of the group affects unity of the group and execution of tasks.
Manipulative	InsincereSelf-motivated	Politics	Distrustful, disillusioned and mistrustful. Cynical and suspicious.	Damage to trust makes it hard to recover faith and hope.

**Table 1**

“Democratic” box added here for convenience – not listed in this manner in the original.

Democratic	True democratic governance is ideal and representative governance encourages participation and a service orientation. However, what we often have is “pseudo-democracy” where elected individuals frequently revert to aforementioned leadership styles.	In vogue. Today almost all leaders call themselves democratic. Often disguises other styles.Candidates rarely chosen democratically, campaigning susceptible to corruption.Decisions frequently favor a chosen few, not the average constituent.	Depending on implementation it may lead to empowerment and synergy, or may lead to aforementioned responses. Vast majority of individuals are left out of the decision-making process and feel disconnected from their leaders.	“Democratic leadership takes several steps in the right direction, but it is still incomplete, subject to manipulation, capable of being misused and too often limited to those who hold some kind of formal leadership position in the political sphere” (p.55).
------------	--	--	---	---

**Table 2**

Module 1 then proceeds to the heart of the “conceptual framework for moral leadership”. In framing why this new type of moral leadership is needed, the authors point to the way in which we unconsciously adopt the prevalent mental models of the society in which we live, and that when contradictory information presents itself we tend to dismiss it as false. Their point is that our mental models are reflected in our actual behavior. And if we expect to change behavior, we must change our mental models. Allow me a lengthy

quotation from the unpublished English version of the first module that clarifies the important connection between mental models and personal transformation:

The first step in the process of transforming a mental model consists in becoming aware that the mental model exists. One must become consciously aware of the characteristics of the mental model and the behavior patterns that it tends to produce. One must identify the assumptions, beliefs, concepts, attitudes and prejudices that contribute to the mental model. Then, the validity and truth of each of these elements must be questioned and critically analyzed. At times this process can be painful and can even provoke a sort of personal existential crisis. All of this is to be expected and is an essential part of the process of personal transformation.

It is not sufficient, however, to just shake the ground that we have been walking on. It is also necessary to search for and consciously establish a new basis for our behavior. This is why a new conceptual framework is needed to replace the mental model in question and to guide and consolidate the process of personal transformation. The construction and adoption of a conceptual framework is a conscious and deliberate exercise that must draw on our best intellectual and spiritual resources.

In the following sections, we propose six elements which we believe are essential for a new conceptual framework of moral leadership. Since these elements are related systemically, it is difficult to speak of one without referring to others. Therefore, we will first list all six elements and then explore the importance and implications of each one.

- 1) Belief in the essential nobility of human nature,
  - 2) Service-oriented leadership,
  - 3) The purpose of leadership: personal and social transformation,
  - 4) The fundamental moral responsibility of investigating and applying truth,
  - 5) Transcendence,
  - 6) The development of capabilities.
- (Anello and Hernandez, in-press, pp.64-65)

## **2.1 A. The Six Basic Elements of the Conceptual Framework of Moral Leadership**

Because of the foundational importance of the remaining “basic concepts”, I will expound on them in the following six sections – although I would like to reiterate the limitations of this brief overview and recommend once again that if the reader is interested in working with these concepts they refer to the published versions of A&H’s Moral Leadership.

### **2.1.1 1. Belief in the essential nobility of human nature**

As mentioned, essential nobility is a foundational principle of this program. A&H begin with Douglas McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y (cited in Luthans, 1977). This theory explains how our expectations of others affect their behavior. If we believe people are inherently lazy and must be motivated through extrinsic rewards or punishments, then this is the behavior they will, in turn, manifest. If, however, we believe they possess an inherent need to participate in self-fulfilling work, that is to say Maslow’s higher-order needs, then they will actually perform better when given the freedom to do so. This is a question of what we believe about human nature. Unfortunately, outside of philosophy we rarely discuss the nature of human beings, and even more infrequently do we question our own beliefs on the subject. Psychology explores the topic and identifies a hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1954), but mostly operates on the assumption that we are social animals. Our essential nature motivates us and the literature on leadership and SED offers one of the wealthier stockpiles of discussion on the subject (Arbab, 2000). In education, Sergiovanni (1992) spoke of the studies that found a huge majority of teachers were motivated by a higher calling – i.e., not money (p.22, Susan Moore Johnson cited in). Covey (1990) said people, in addition to having lower-order wants, “are spiritual beings; they want meaning, a sense of doing something that matters” (p.178).

Human nature is, in fact, an ancient religious and philosophical topic of discussion. St. Thomas Aquinas said that in a moral act there is no distinction between self and other, which is the heart of my point:

What we believe about ourselves we will project onto others. A&H (1996; in-press), in years of conducting leadership workshops, developed a list of the basic ways in which most people identify and perceive their fellow humans. They are normally discussed at great length within a matrix that examines the basic concept of the mental model, the view of self and others within the model, the treatment of others, and the use of will and reason. Because, once again, a full discussion is beyond the scope of this study, they are briefly described below (paraphrased from A&H, 1996, p.66-75):

### 2.1.1.1 a) Personal Mental Models Examined in the PLE

**Racist:** Our perception of others is determined by skin color. Seemingly simple to define, it is actually a very complex and pathological worldview that sees skin tone as the defining characteristic of an individual's entire being. In this worldview we project our shortcomings conveniently onto a racial group and thereby retain our own integrity.

**Determinist:** There exists some predetermination for one's station in life; frequently a religious doctrine has created this view (God wants you this way – accept it.). P. Watkins (1986), a critical theorist writing in the area of leadership, called this “opacity of action” a failure to recognize one's role in the reproduction of social systems (p.5). Watkins also explains that leadership theorists are frequently criticized for failing to address questions of power, something the PLE cannot be accused of since it directly addresses this issue (via its mental models and its service-oriented leadership).

**Sinner:** This view sees people as “only human”, which can have positive implications, but is unfortunately and most often connected to a “right” way to religious salvation. A&H state:

It can lead to feelings of self-righteousness and of intolerance, and to criticism and condemnation of those who do not share one's beliefs. This world view usually considers faith and reason as antagonistic and tends to put faith above reason. This can lead to fanatical behavior that discredits the true nature and role of religion in society (p.71).

**Rational Animal:** Common in academic circles, this view is basically Darwinian. It excuses competition and aggressive behavior as the nature of the beast (literally) and does not serve the disadvantaged well. Sergioivanni, Watkins, Starratt, Greenleaf and Covey all condemn the man-is-selfish view of human nature as counter-productive, or even wrong, and propose to elevate to equal stature a morals-motivation, yet they do not go quite as far as Anello in naming the next view of human nature.

**Essential Nobility:** This is the core of transforming PLE participants' “mental models”. This view, Anello says, is essential to establishing a new paradigm. Without giving it a name, many leadership authors refer to the need for some alternative view of human nature. The PLE's outlook resembles Senge's call for an intellectual “shift of mind” (to acceptance of our interconnectedness), and McGregor's Theory Y, but appears to go a bit further.

[Those who accept human nature as essentially noble] recognize that humans have a higher and a lower nature; however, they choose to focus their thoughts and actions on the development of the potentialities of the higher nature, based on the conviction that light eliminates darkness (p.72).

This view, the authors believe, leads to a more optimistic worldview. If humanity is essentially noble, it follows that there is an over-riding “goodness” in humanity's effort to improve and carry forward an ever-advancing civilization (Greenleaf's “social amelioration”). The ultimate motivation is growth – both socially and individually – which Dewey (1938) would argue is synonymous with education.

### 2.1.2 2. Service-oriented leadership

Very much aligned with the philosophies of Robert K. Greenleaf (1991; 1996) and Stephen Covey (1990), this concept challenges the vertical power-seeking, control-based leadership style and argues that true leadership comes from exemplifying a more horizontal spirit of service. The section uses illustrations from various religious figures and anecdotes of selfless service to illustrate its point. The motivator, they argue, is our internalization of the concept of serving God and all humanity.

### 2.1.3 3. The Purpose of Leadership: Personal and Social Transformation

The third element of the framework of moral leadership is reminiscent of the work of Paolo Freire (1970). It is a discussion of the question that has haunted human beings since the dawn of time: Why are we here? Briefly stated, this section argues we exist to participate in individual and social transformation. Later the reader will hear an interesting participant discussion about the difference between “transformation” and “improvement”, but the PLE unmistakably focuses on, and prefers, the term transformation. The essential duality of this stems from the conviction that without a constant focus on social improvement, “a person runs the risk of falling into self-centeredness” (p.87). It goes on to state that “no man is an island” and that

The path to personal transformation is not to be found in living a lonely existence in a mountain cave, but rather through interacting with other human beings in society. In the final analysis, they argue that individual transformation is best fostered by engaging in the process of social transformation (p.89).

Additionally, the authors argue, true social change comes from the initiative of small “creative groups” (p.89, Toynbee, 1966, cited in). For these reasons, the program has a constant emphasis on group work and social projects (called “Cooperative Learning Groups” in the PLE/Ecuador).

### 2.1.4 4. The Moral Responsibility of Investigating and Applying Truth

In this section A&H identify two fundamental moral responsibilities:

- 1) A commitment to the search for truth and the acceptance of those truths which have been verified by the individual through his independent investigation, and
- 2) The faithful application in the process of individual and social transformation and in all other aspects of one’s life of the truths one has accepted (p.95).

While they argue that this is not necessarily a religious doctrine, it does seem to slightly differ from Senge (1990), who says, “commitment to the truth does not mean seeking the ‘Truth’, the absolute final word or ultimate cause” (p.159). The PLE, by contrast, accepts the existence of principles that are capital T truths, but says individuals have the obligation to seek them, embrace them when found, and then apply them:

The ancient and haunting question is then posed: what is truth? We do not presume to answer this question, but rather assert that it is the moral responsibility of every individual to search for the answer to this question and to live consistently with the conclusions to which his independent investigation has led (1996, pp.95-96).

The section argues that “truth is one”, and therefore, there can be “no irresolvable contradictions between scientific truth and religious truth” (p.100). They both complement our search for one truth. “Scientific truth provides us with the practical means and spiritual truth with the moral guidance to create a just, harmonious society that benefits all its members.” However, one operates at the level of “contingent truth” (current facts, always susceptible to revision – science) and the other at the level of “ideal truth” (principles – spiritual traditions, religions). Our responsibility, then, is to constantly move from contingent truth towards ideal truth. There is one key passage that indirectly speaks to the social critics and leftist traditions that are prevalent in Latin American society.

The lack of definition of an ideal truth, or vision, may cause well-intentioned individuals, who desire a better world, to limit themselves to protesting or fighting against what they deem bad or wrong. But, they often do not have a clear proactive plan for positive development to which they can devote their energies in creating a viable alternative to the “evil” they are attacking. Similarly, a lack of knowledge of the contingent truth of a situation may also lead to erroneous decisions, since strategies may be applied in the attempt to transform a situation, which worked in other circumstances, but do not take into account important aspects of the current situation. Only when both types of truth are clearly understood is it possible to devise viable strategies leading from one to the other (A&H, 1996, p.102).

I have made the observation that these dual responsibilities seem to promote consistent “identity achievement”, to use Erikson’s (1963) and Marcia’s (1966) term (see Table 6). Adults often exist in a state of “foreclosure”, accepting whatever is convenient or whatever the social context deems appropriate, which is to say they have never critically examined their belief systems; or, people live in a perpetual state of crisis and



“moratorium” (refusing to decide who they are and what they believe). By initiating “a sort of personal existential crisis” (Anello, 1997, p.108) through self- and group-reflection in the first module, PLE participants begin the process of independently deciding what they believe about heavy issues such as human nature and the direction of the planet. Following this commitment (i.e., identity achievement) they translate and apply this knowledge into action. The Ecuadorian government contracted the PLE, in part, to carry out its goal of increasing critical thinking to stimulate national curriculum reform, and according to surveys they were successful in doing so.

**3 Table 6: Marcia’s Identity Achievement Matrix**

	No Crisis Experienced	Crisis Experienced
No Commitment Made	DIFFUSION STATUSNo thought given to the issue. Ideally leads to “identity crisis”. Has been called “hanging out”. Refers to the status of someone who has not made commitments and is unable or unwilling to make them. This person may or may not have experienced a crisis.	MORATORIUM STATUSIn a state of identity crisis and refusing to decide while exploring options. Often linked to high school and college state of mind.
Commitment Made	FORECLOSURE STATUSUncritically accepts without really thinking it through (e.g. accepting religious beliefs only because parents believed like this). Classified this when he or she has made commitments without ever having gone through a period of crisis and exploration.	IDENTITY ACHIEVEMENT STATUSHaving passed through crisis stage the individually has intelligently chosen his/her own beliefs and resolved the crisis. Commitment made.[Valde: Open & Closed, see note]

**Table 3**

Note: Valde (1996) has added a fifth identity status to Marcia’s matrix. In that research it is argued that there are two possible types of identity achievement status: open and closed. In the closed state, the individual refuses to continue considering alternative identities, or truths, which apply to themselves (and the world), whereas an open state a commitment has been made, but there is room for re-evaluation and even a return to the moratorium stage. In other words, the commitment is not necessarily permanent (and, it seems, not a very strong commitment). It seems that Senge advocates such an open stage, which Valde sees as superior. Anello, on the other hand, is adhering to both the responsibility of an individual to openly investigate the truth as well as make a serious commitment to that truth following the investigation. While, as stated, A&H (1996) “do not presume” to define truth (p.95), the first PLE module does promote making a commitment to “enduring truths” (verdades perdurables), or principles, that a common vision can be centered upon (p.105).

**3.1 5. Transcendence**

Their “practical definition” of transcendence is to “detach oneself from ‘actual reality’” (p.104) and to connect with those values which one believes to be of eternal worth. The section, which cites John W. Gardner, the Bible, Bahá’í scripture, and Stephen Covey, goes on to point out the importance of keeping in perspective

the daily problems that can obscure our greater vision and purpose that compels us. This detachment can be facilitated, they say, by “various means”. For the religiously inclined, it might be prayer and meditation, but it can also be, “communing with nature, taking a walk, listening to music, becoming stirred by works of art that express values and principles similar to one’s own, imagining as a living reality the vision which one is working to achieve, and consulting with a person who has greater vision or spiritual maturity than oneself” (p.107).

### 3.2 6. The Development of Capabilities

By focusing on developing capabilities, A&H say they hope to change the traditional notion of the good person as a passive, obedient citizen that “doesn’t make waves” to “something more active” (p.110). They say that by examining the exemplary lives of certain individuals who were moral leaders, they identified certain capabilities which “allowed them to exert their influence”. While they state they have not created a definitive list, they have identified the aforementioned 18 capabilities to work towards. They say, however, that “before trying to apply a capability, one must clearly understand what it consists of, and have a clear idea of what the capability looks like in practice” (p.111). Therefore, four elements of a capability are delineated (summarized from pp.112-113):

Concepts: Understanding the purposes and importance of the capability.

Skills: The “mechanical or functional abilities necessary for implementing a capability.”

Attitudes: The “affective aspect of some capabilities... habitual patterns of emotional response”.

Qualities: The “spiritual virtues or attributes that reflect ideal human behavior” that lie within the capability. For example, honesty, patience, justice, courtesy, etc.

The 18 capabilities (Appendix A) are then broken down into those that contribute to personal transformation, those that contribute to better interpersonal relations, and those that contribute to social transformation.

After a brief discussion of the “process of action-reflection-action”, which is an introduction to the “learning cycle” of experience-reflection-conceptualization-action that is explored again in the next module (Anello, 1998), A&H end Module 1 with a discussion of the “Danger of Ambition”. They explain that while it can serve to motivate in the early stages of personal growth, if it is not outgrown it can eventually destroy the individual because “ambition masks the desire for domination” (p.207). Ambition destroys trust because its motives are not “pure”. Pure motivation, they argue, is the desire to serve one’s fellow human beings. They go on to say that, “The spirit of service can inspire greater sacrifices and do much more for collective transformation than personal ambition could ever achieve.” Why? Because such “noble-minded behavior” inspires others to emulate it (p.208). Such a humble motivation is accompanied by a certain modesty. It calls for acting with “impartiality” and “detachment” from our self-interested motivations – which stand in stark contrast to accepted motivators of reward and punishment – and calls on us to focus on the needs of others.

It is interesting to note that according to Affolter (1999) the PLE’s Learning Cycle follows Kolb’s (1984) experiential learning cycle. However, no reference is made to Kolb in Núr’s modules.

Before its detailed discussion of the 18 capabilities, Module 1 ends its introduction to the framework for moral leadership on the following note:

We affirm that acts of service that are motivated by love reflect purity of motive in its highest form. As a mystic poet once wrote: The fire of love burns away the veils of self. This love that motivates the desire to serve others and to consider the needs of others before one’s own is the greatest antidote to the poison of ego-driven ambition.

The greater the capacity a person has, the more conscious must be his choice to oppose his egocentric inclinations and his tendencies towards self-glorification. The relative advantages conferred by his knowledge,

wealth, or position, present him with the temptation to consider himself superior and more worthy than others and to seek to exalt himself even more. Thus, the more capacity one acquires, the deeper must he infuse his being with the qualities of modesty, detachment, impartiality, and purity of motive, if he wishes to exercise moral leadership. This requires the conscious decision to cultivate these qualities through daily practice and evaluation (p.210).

#### CONCLUSION

In my work as an education professor I have incorporated the concepts of moral leadership into almost every one of my classes –Philosophy of Education, Global Education, Social Foundations of Education, and of course Educational Leadership. I find that it sets the moral tone for the rest of the class, but without dogmatism. Like the original instructors of the PLE itself, I have also never had a student protest that I was indoctrinating them in some kind of imposed morality. That is not the spirit, nor the tone, of the PLE. It is a framework for self-exploration and self-evaluation. How do I want to lead? What are my goals? Ultimately, we all find that they are similar goals when we think about it rationally. We want to get the most out of each learner, out of each member of the team, for the purpose of elevating us all just a little bit higher and reaching just a little bit closer to our potential as a human race.

#### References

- Affolter, F. W. (1999). *Moral Leadership: a conceptual review of the literature on the use of the term 'moral leadership', as well as the justifications of its use in different epistemological and thematic traditions*, Center for International Education School of Education University of Massachusetts (pp. 49). (Unpublished Paper), Amherst.
- Anello, E., & Hernández, J. B. (in-press). *Moral Leadership*. West Palm Beach, FL: Development Learning Press.
- Anello, E., & Hernández, J. d. (1996). *Module 1: Liderazgo Moral (2a ed.)*. Santa Cruz: Universidad Núr, Imprenta Sirena.
- Anello, E., & Hernández, J. d. (1998). *Conceptos de Aprendizaje y Desarrollo*. Quito: Ministerio de Educacion y Cultura del Ecuador.
- Arbab, F. (2000). *Promoting a Discourse on Science, Religion and Development*. In S. Harper (Ed.), *The Lab, The Temple, and the Market: reflections at the intersection of science, religion and development* (pp. 149-237). Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Covey, S. R. (1990). *Principle-Centered Leadership*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience & Education*. New York: Macmillan Company.
- Erikson, E. (1963). *Childhood and Society*. New York: Norton.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans. 1996 ed.). New York: Continuum Publishing Company.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1991). *Servant Leadership: A Journey Into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1996). *On Becoming A Servant Leader: the private writings of Robert K. Greenleaf* (1 ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: experience as a source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Luthans, F. (1977). *Organizational Behavior*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Marcia, J. E. (1966). *Development and Validation of Ego Identity Status*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3, 551-558.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality* ([1st ] ed.). New York,: Harper.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: the art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday Currency.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral Leadership: getting to the heart of school improvement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Toynbee, A. (1966). *Change and Habit: the challenge of our time* (2nd, 1992 ed.). Oxford: Oneworld Publications, Ltd.

Valde, G. A. (1996). Identity closure: A fifth identity status. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 157(3), p245-255, 243 charts.