

version of the Civil Rights Act. This version of the act permitted the federal government to cut off aid to school districts that segregated by race. In 1965, Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which provided more than \$1 billion annually for school districts with high percentages of low-income students. This immense carrot-and-stick approach helped decrease the level of segregation. By 1968, approximately one third of the black students in the South attended public schools with whites.

Still, U.S. public schools have never completely desegregated. By the 1970s, legally sanctioned segregation was gone, but U.S. society was again becoming more segregated. White, wealthier suburban communities were ringing urban, poorer black and Latino ones. When social activists sought desegregation between districts in the same state, a more conservative Supreme Court in *Milliken v. Bradley* in 1974 rejected their claims, stating that only intentional acts of segregation by school officials were unconstitutional. Segregation caused by changing social patterns were not actionable when they occurred between, not within, school districts. By the 1980s and 1990s, with a growing conservative judiciary and many resistant or indifferent suburban white communities, attempts to desegregate schools were declining.

The legacy of school desegregation as a social movement exemplifies the complex role of law in social movements. Despite the Supreme Court's inability to directly desegregate public schools, it would likely be wrong to say that the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown* was initially unimportant or distracting to the civil rights movement. *Brown* gave the early civil rights movement a needed legal victory that provided a protective zone in which the movement built momentum. Yet, absent other sociopolitical action, *Brown* or any progressive legal victory is not enough to ensure that change endures. Social values and beliefs must change at a fundamental level. This level of change requires continual action across the sociopolitical spectrum, including, but not limited to, legal activism.

—Eric M. Haas

See also Abortion; American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU); Anti-Busing Movement; Bill of Rights; *Brown v. Board of*

Education; Civil Rights Acts; Civil Rights Movement; Disability Rights Movement; Free Speech Activism; *Gideon v. Wainwright*; Judicial Activism; Labor Law; Living Wage Movement; Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF); *Miranda v. Arizona*; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP); *Roe v. Wade*; Southern Poverty Law Center

Further Readings

- Heubert, J. (1999). *Law and school reform: Six strategies for promoting educational equity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- McCann, M. W. (1994). *Rights at work: Pay equity reform and the politics of legal mobilization*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rosenberg, G. N. (1991). *The hollow hope*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Welner, K. G. (2001). *Legal rights, local wrongs*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

LEADERSHIP, PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRATIC

Participatory democratic leadership is an elusive construct, at once rooted in ancient Western traditions and yet constantly evolving in the context of contemporary globalizing understandings of the challenges, relationships, and needs of social systems. The term is situated within various notions about how to understand leadership. The information related to these notions has grown tremendously even during the past decade, with a plethora of buzzwords and concepts vying for attention and modeling. Although the term *democratic leadership* often shows up in scholarly writings, encyclopedias, and academic databases, the phrase *participatory leadership* is less likely to result from a Google search. By itself, each term can perhaps serve as either an umbrella concept for leadership approaches or as an aspect of leadership. One might ask which approaches to leadership are more or less democratic or more or less participatory, or which include democratic or participatory components. To stop there, however, would be to miss the

essence of participatory democratic leadership as an emergent concept in itself. Rather, once a categorization is isolated from existing understandings of leadership, the terms *participatory* and *democratic* come to ask different questions of our current ways of leadership.

Leadership Categorization

Scholars are following a number of paths for understanding leadership. The evolving stands are not temporally distinct but occur and develop alongside each other, sometimes in concert and sometimes in tension. There are countless ways to categorize these understandings. Some ways to examine leadership have been to categorize it in typologies; to address it within the context of processes; to consider it as a relationship between individuals and between leaders themselves, their tasks, larger structures, and self-concepts; and as a means of meaning making as it is culturally bound, changes, or comes to be intertwined with social identity and societal notions as interpreted in time and space. In doing so, scholars have established a broad field of study, activity, and praxis.

Typologies

Typologies of leadership are numerous and can focus on *characteristics* of individuals known as leaders. Through these, dissection of the personality of a leader occurs. Often called "great man" or trait theories, these approaches highlight the leader as a distinctly powerful individual, particularly in their personality attributes, such as being charismatic, visionary, passionate, reflective, and self-monitoring. Alternatively, typologies may focus on *competencies* or *behaviors*, the ways in which a leader puts into practice traits in order to influence other people. A few examples are motivating, inspiring, collaborating, communicating, and empowering. Still other typologies focus not on the leader, but on the *situational variables* that influence leader acts and thus present leadership outcomes as contingent in acknowledgment that traits, behaviors, and competencies may not consistently produce results across various circumstances. Rather, issues like the

level of structure, crisis, diversity, and variation exemplify just some of the potential influences upon leader tasks. Leadership *styles* or *approaches* also can form typologies, as the bringing together of traits and behaviors in situations. Here the lists and literature are abundant, with buzzwords and comparisons of styles expanding at a rapid pace, particularly within the mass marketing of leadership literature, and sometimes with no or only small distinctions being made between concepts. Just a few of these types of leadership styles are (in alphabetical order): adaptive leadership, authoritarian leadership, collaborative leadership, cooperative leadership, directive leadership, distributed leadership, invisible leadership, principle-centered leadership, results-based leadership, servant leadership, shared leadership, socioemotional leadership, spiritual leadership, transactional leadership, and visionary leadership. Typologies, whether of characteristics, competencies and behaviors, situational variables or styles, share the notion that leadership can be dissected, that it is divisible into observable components.

Process

Process is another focus of leadership understanding. The highlighting of process pushes individuals to the background, bringing forward activity as the center of leadership understanding. *Action planning* has become a spotlight of much process literature with various stages established and questions raised about the steps taken in decision making. Groups are described as defining a vision, a mission, goals, and outcomes for evaluating their work, with planning becoming the basis for viewing and critique. When the emphasis on planning combines with the external relationships necessary to engender support and implementation of the plans, *organizing strategy* becomes the process concept. When the human interactions occurring within the planning and strategizing are the focus, a notion of group *empowerment* becomes the process to be understood as groups develop collective competence in stating and realizing their action goals. Process understandings all include an awareness of leadership as concerned with activity occurring in relation to time and, particularly with empowerment approaches, change occurring over time.

Relations

Yet another approach to leadership understanding focuses on relations. Beyond the individual leader, participant *roles* can become very important—one's relationship to the work of the group. The leader here is understood not in isolation, but in a relationship with followers and their tasks. Within *group dynamic* understandings, myths and unconscious patterns are foregrounded as group members are understood to interact in highly stable, but often unconscious, ways. The emphasis is one of participants in structured relation to each other. When the nature of representation through language becomes key, and groups are understood as arenas of storytelling through interaction with each other and through conveyance of their stories to others, *communication* becomes the center of relational understandings of leadership. Alternatively, relational understandings may come to be focused on *reflection* or the relationship of each participant, including the leader, to himself or herself, a notion of self-concept. Each emphasis in relational understanding addresses some concept of human interaction as the focal point of leadership, although these often stop short of interpretation of the meaning made through relations and relational structures.

Meaning Making

Predominant in contemporary leadership literature are approaches that focus on meaning making, often in concert with aspects of the typological, process, and relational understandings of leadership, but with emphasis on social cognition as an inherent structure. *Cultural* understandings address the role of aspects such as ritual and value within group structuring. Forms of personality, behavior, styles, and process are portrayed as requiring group acceptance, acceptance that is situated within established cultural contexts that shape views of leadership as well as its credibility and legitimacy. Although cultural understandings have had wide appeal, one of the most cited leadership ideas, which is closely tied to relational approaches to leadership understanding, is that of *transformational leadership*. Transformational understandings are examples

of a meaning-making emphasis that focuses on change occurring in leader-follower relations, whereby each raises the other to a higher sense of moral purpose. Transformation occurs within the space of the group and affects the values of the group itself.

Constructivist approaches to understanding leadership open up the potential of transformation by addressing social cognition through taking up issues of social identity and the interpretation of essential notions (e.g., hope, power, trust, community, and authority). When concerned with nondominant groups, constructivist approaches often take a critical stance seeking to represent the experience of traditionally underrepresented groups as they interact with gendered, classed, and racialized structures of leadership. Age is becoming a distinction of growing popularity, because of rapid technological change and information transfer, with attention placed on various generational shifts, such as the generational difference in cognitive structures exhibited in interacting with leadership. In their various forms, meaning-making approaches to understanding leadership present leadership as a concept situated within social structures, sometimes with understandings open to reflection and critique. Particularly in constructivist approaches, there is an underlying assumption that once revealed, these structured concepts can be changed, and that it is through this change that leadership emerges.

The Challenges to Existing Understandings of Leadership

These understandings of leadership have been incorporated into work in various sectors (private, public, non-profit), have been adopted by, and developed within, various disciplines (sociology, political science, psychology), and have been applied to various fields (e.g., business, education, military). Nevertheless, explanations of leadership have tended toward within-group understandings, with less clarity about the nature of network interaction and the movement of ideas and activity across sector, discipline, and field. Much of the writing about leadership has remained securely entrenched in existing frames with limited attention to the creativity required to capture leadership as it is

challenged by the pressures of rapid change, pressures that lead to decreases in institutionalization and group structure by necessitating increasingly flexible patterns of practice and more amorphous and shifting boundaries. In addition, throughout much of what has been written about leadership, save some of the constructivist work, an underlying dichotomy has become prevalent. Examples are leader versus follower, vertical versus horizontal, power versus authority, masculine versus feminine, and authoritative versus collaborative.

It is not surprising that participatory democratic leadership is often missing from the leadership discussion, appears only as disjointed or separated in its location with pieces of the term alternatively positioned in leadership scholarship and popular venue, or is subsumed within other approaches that co-opt pieces of the concept without its holistic intent. In these intra-group, institutionalized, and dualistic understandings, participatory democratic leadership has perhaps not been omitted from representation as much as it has resisted representation in leadership scholarship. Indeed, the ideas of participatory democratic leadership do not fall neatly into the existing leadership classifications, into stagnant boundaries, or into the either-or questions of dichotomous thinking. Rather, ideas of participatory democratic leadership emerge through the often messy collective questioning of quality and value within larger social contexts and in relation to the various dimensions, rather than dualities, of those contexts.

Participatory Democratic Questioning as Engagement Through Agency

Etymologically, the word *participatory* emerges from the idea of sharing or taking part in, with the word *democratic* embracing a notion of governance or power by people. To ask then about how people take part or share in power is the heart of both participatory democratic questioning and the associated task of leadership. This questioning is both collectively and individually reflexive as people come to understand and voice their own values in the context of their

understandings of the values of others. It is a questioning that is thus socially focused and socially situated.

Understanding social questioning prompts a better identifying of the dimensions of the construction of social identity and marks a questioning through which participatory democratic leadership practice might emerge. Within which cultural structures emerges leadership? In whose and what values of the collective is leadership? Through whose learning styles does development for collective action occur? Through what medium (media, education, politics, etc.) is the collective understood and represented? Embracing of what forms of diversity and collective boundaries? Through whose voice, and in what ways, communicative of the collective?

When based on the idea of a collective's coming to consciously question social construction, it is not surprising to find that many current approaches to leadership are structurally restrictive, prohibiting participatory democratic dialogue rather than encouraging it. Leadership understandings themselves, especially those that are captured within bureaucratic or market structures, or those that resist the questioning of notions of paternalism, verticality, or ideology, often preclude participatory democratic questioning altogether, thereby restricting agency. Most leadership practice, already restricted by its understanding of leadership, is further narrowed as group dialogue is implicitly or explicitly constrained, with the group's tasks becoming only ones of the efficient acceptance of institutionalized conceptions of morality, existing patterns of anti-social practice, or of construction of a reality for passive perpetuation of dominant mechanisms of control.

Instead, participatory democratic leadership, no matter the scholarly categorization or buzzword given, reclaims social questioning. Participatory democratic questioning begins with the assumption of agency, the belief that all human beings have the ability to effect change and to do so consciously, an option chosen in the face of the alternatives of passive acceptance or covert resistance. The extent of change, the goodness of change, the price of change, and the processes of that change are just some of the tensions that are reopened. Once agency through social questioning is

established, however, the typologies, processes, relations, and meaning making of leadership categorizations can more clearly illuminate the engagement necessary for participatory democratic leadership to emerge.

The concept of engagement is rooted in a notion of pledging oneself. Participatory democratic leadership then becomes a pledge that people make, a conscious pledge, to take part in social creation through questioning and dialogue. It is a human evolutionary pledge, made repeatedly, to asking the questions of the collective and remaining open to the enduring social question—if not alone, then how together? Through this enduring questioning, we come to experience participatory democratic leadership, even if we may never come to a stagnant definition, concrete categorizations, or tidy timeless answers.

—Angela K. Frusciante

See also Civil Society; Coalition Building; Community Organizing; Participatory Action Research

Further Readings

- Brown, K. M. (2004). Leadership for social justice and equity: Weaving a transformative framework and pedagogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40, 77–108.
- Dantley, M. E. (2005). African American spirituality and Cornel West's notions of prophetic pragmatism: Restructuring educational leadership in American urban schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41, 651–674.
- Goethals, G. R., Sorenson, G., & Burns, J. M. (Eds.). (2004). *Encyclopedia of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Shields, C. M. (2004). Dialogic leadership for social justice: Overcoming pathologies of silence. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40, 109–132.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

As World War I ground to a halt, the subsequent peace process opened the door to the establishment of a League of Nations. The horror and devastation of

world war created an opportune environment for the promotion of the formation of an international organization to address the peaceful arbitration of traditionally violent economic, political, and diplomatic disputes. The failure of pre-World War I nation state alliances to resolve boundary disputes did little to promote international peace. The league represented the first permanent international organization, in modern times, committed to resolving international disputes, through a complex system of arbitration. Despite the commitment to promote permanent peace, the league faced numerous challenges and failed to prevent World War II. In part, the failure of the league was preordained by the Paris Peace Treaty. Born of war, the league structure reflected the victors, reinforced the artificial division of new territories, and exacted heavy war reparations on Germany. These decisions gave rise to extreme nationalism and to world war. As result, the league never completely succeeded in its mission to promote justice or peace. It nevertheless provided the foundation for the formation of the United Nations in 1946, and led to a worldwide commitment to promote human rights.

President Woodrow Wilson and his cabinet played a key role in the development of the League of Nations. In 1918, before the war ended and prior to U.S. involvement in World War I, Wilson articulated his vision of world peace in his January 8 14 Points Speech to Congress. In this speech he summed up the U.S. war aims, based largely on his belief in self-determination and free trade. Wilson believed that a league of nations would promote his vision of free navigation, lower trade barriers, fewer armaments, and a foundation for peaceful negotiations between nations.

The Paris Peace Conference set the stage for the development of the League of Nations. While President Wilson has been credited as the architect of the league, its formation was a result of international collaboration. In the United States, the formation of the League to Enforce Peace organized and influenced the American intellectual movement to promote a permanent league. This same group became a primary supporter of Wilson's plan for peace and endorsed the ratification of the Treaty of Versailles. After its defeat