The Leadership Quarterly 19 (2008) 514–529

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

The Leadership Quarterly

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/leaqua

Sensegiving and the role of cognitive shifts in the work of leadership

Erica Gabrielle Foldy [a,*], Laurie Goldman [b], Sonia Ospina [a]

[a] Wagner School of Public Service, New York University, The Puck Building, 295 Lafayette St., 2nd floor, New York, NY 10012, USA
[b] Department of Urban and Environmental Policy and Planning, Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
Sensegiving
Work of leadership
Cognition
Sensemaking
Cognitive shift

ABSTRACT

Sensegiving—shaping how people understand themselves, their work, and others engaged in that work—is critical to the work of organizational leadership. We propose the "cognitive shift," a change in how an organizational audience understands an important element of the organization's work, as a desired outcome of the sensegiving process. Organizations try to spur these shifts in two categories: about their issue and about their primary constituency, the population it is designed to serve or mobilize. This approach makes two contributions: It re-directs attention from individual leaders' behaviors and characteristics to the *work* of leadership, as opposed to the agents through which it is carried out. Second, it operationalizes the intangible process of meaning-making by breaking it down into discrete units that are relatively equivalent and, therefore, comparable, providing a systematic way to analyze and map cognitive leadership processes.

© 2008 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Ever since the "cognitive revolution" in leadership research (Lord & Emrich, 2000), scholars have highlighted the importance of leaders as "sensegivers" (Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991). Research shows that influencing followers' perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs can strengthen their commitment to their organization's goals, spurring them to embark on new directions with enthusiasm instead of resistance (Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Gardner & Avolio, 1998; Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993).

Therefore, shaping how people understand themselves, the work they do, and others involved in that work is a critical leadership task. Significant research, much of it about "charismatic" or "transformational" leadership (e.g., Bass, 1985; Bono & Judge, 2003; Bryman, 1993), has investigated how leaders engage in meaning-making activities (Smircich & Morgan, 1982). This work has changed how we understand leadership, but it has largely explored the characteristics and behaviors of individual leaders. At this juncture, many see research on the *work* of leadership—as opposed to the individual agents who carry it out—as central to deepening our understanding of leadership processes (Gronn, 2002; Heifetz, 1998; Pearce & Conger, 2003).

In this paper, we propose a flexible and robust construct, the "cognitive shift," that allows scholars to analyze the leadership work of meaning-making, whether that work is carried out by individuals, teams of people, or communities working collectively. A desired outcome of the sensegiving process, a cognitive shift is a change in thinking or perception. Focusing on cognitive shifts allows us to consider a wide variety of arenas in which such shifts can take place: about the work, about oneself, about others engaged in the work. It also allows us to distinguish between the shift itself as a desired outcome and particular framing strategies that spur or legitimize the shift. Our approach illuminates sensegiving processes by providing a systematic way of analyzing the intangible, often obscure dynamics of meaning-making.

Our approach is influenced by extensive sociological research on framing in social movements (Benford & Snow, 2000). This scholarship has many similarities to cognitive understandings of leadership, but, to our knowledge, has yet to be fully explored as a resource in the leadership literature. This work is particularly appropriate because our sample includes 20 nonprofit, social change

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 212 998 7436.
E-mail address: erica.foldy@nyu.edu (E.G. Foldy).

1048-9843/$ – see front matter © 2008 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.07.004

organizations, similar to those found in the social movement literature. Yet, as we suggest in our discussion, our study has implications for a wide variety of organizations.

We begin with an overview of the leadership literature on sensegiving and cognitive processes. We then buttress this discussion with contributions from the sociological literature on framing in social movements. Following that, we describe the study and then present a framework of cognitive shifts, with extensive illustrations. We then illustrate how one organization combines different kinds of shifts. We conclude with discussion of the contributions of our approach, areas for further research, and how the framework can apply to for profit and public sector leadership.

2. Cognition, sensegiving and leadership

Over the past several decades, scholars have rethought traditional constructs of leadership to improve our understanding of how individuals enact change in both organizational and societal environments. This re-thinking began with seminal work by Smircich, Pfeffer and others that emphasized the role of meaning-making in leadership processes (e.g., Smircich & Morgan, 1982; Smirch & Stubbart, 1985; Pfeffer, 1981). From this foundation, the transformational and neo-charismatic leadership paradigms explored this approach in greater depth.[1] Sometimes termed "new leadership" (Bryman, 1993), these theories depart from prior emphasis on the personality traits of effective leaders or on the environmental contingencies of successful leadership to focus on the cognitions, behaviors and relationships of leaders and followers.

New leadership theory describes how leaders influence followers' values and perceptions in several analytically distinct but inter-related areas: perceiving leaders as individuals they would want to follow (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Gardner & Avolio, 1998); perceiving the leaders' vision as attractive and meaningful (Bass, 1985; Berson, Shamir, Avolio, & Popper, 2001); and perceiving themselves, the followers, in new ways: as part of a larger collective (Podolny, Khurana, & Hill-Popper, 2005; Shamir et al., 1993; Yammarino, Spangler, & Dubinsky, 1998; van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, De Cremer & Hogg., 2004); and as capable and effective (Engle & Lord, 1997; Shamir et al.,, 1993; Lord & Emrich, 2000, Bono & Judge, 2003; see also research on empowerment, e.g., Thomas & Velthouse (1990) and Spreitzer, (1995)).[2]

This work investigates the characteristics and behaviors of individual leaders that allow them to act successfully as sensegivers (Gioia & Chittipedi, 1991). "Sensegiving-for-others" is the process of disseminating new understandings to audiences to influence their "sensemaking-for-self" (p. 444). While this research is critical to understanding leadership, the focus on individual leaders obscures collective leadership processes that may also be in play. Scholars are increasingly calling for research that explores the *work* of leadership, conceptualizing it "as less the property of individuals and more as the contextualized outcome of interactive, rather than unidirectional, causal processes" (Gronn, 2002; p. 444). While terms vary, ranging from socially constructed leadership to shared, collective, distributed, and co-leadership, there is a growing sense that investigation into this phenomenon is one of the important frontiers of leadership study. As one review stated, "the field of shared leadership holds remarkable opportunities for researchers in the future" (Conger & Pearce, 2003, p. 301).

Justifications for this claim vary, and are linked to how shared work of leadership is conceptualized. Some argue that such leadership is increasingly common and important, given today's complex, networked organizations and rapidly changing environment: "[The] duality of differentiation–integration inherent in a division of labor is the source of emerging new forms of role interdependence and coordination which have resulted in distributed patterns of leadership" (Gronn, 2002; p. 428). Others argue that co-leadership has a long history—in that multiple individuals often share responsibility for a group's actions, even if only one person acts as the visible representative—and has been overlooked because of a bias towards "heroic" leaders (Fletcher & Kaufer, 2003). Using a social construction approach, others suggest that all leadership is collectively construed, in that all those involved must in some way participate in the existing arrangement: "even the most autocratic and vertical forms of leadership can be conceptualized as shared so long as others agree to go along with it" (Day, Gronn, & Salas, 2004, pg. 876; see also Drath, 2001; Ospina & Sorenson, 2006).

Uniting these scholars is a concern that the field's focus on individual leaders has drawn attention away from new conceptualizations that could enrich our understanding of leadership. Further, all agree that collective leadership remains relatively unexplored empirically (Pearce & Conger, 2003, 13), particularly cognitive leadership processes.

What is needed is an approach to leadership as sensegiving that transcends level of analysis, which can be used to analyze the work of leadership whether accomplished through the actions of individuals, co-leaders or even large groups who find a way to move in concert. The rich literature on framing in social movements provides support for such an approach (Snow, Rochford, Worden, & Benford, 1986; Benford & Snow, 2000; Snow, Soule, & Kriesi, 2004).

Work on "framing processes" has highlighted how social movement organizations position their work to reach and mobilize new adherents. A "frame" is an "interpretive scheme" (Bartunek, 1984) or "knowledge structure" that individuals use "to represent their information worlds and, thus, facilitate information processing and decision-making" (Walsh, 1995; p.281); "framing" is a process through which particular frames or interpretations are conceptualized and disseminated (Benford & Snow, 2000; Fairhurst

[1] For historical reviews and critiques of the trends in leadership scholarship and the place of the neo-charismatic and transformational theories within those trends see Conger, 1999; Shamir, 1999; Lord & Emrich, 2000; Lowe & Gardner, 2001, and House & Aditya, 1997. These reviews suggest that the convergence of the two theories represents a new theoretical paradigm. They also stress that there is still much theoretical and empirical work left to pursue.

[2] A parallel literature analyzes strategy, through narrative and discourse methods, as sensegiving and sensemaking, a socially constructed set of meanings among managers and organizational members (Barry & Elmes, 1997; Hardy, Palmer, & Phllips, 2000; Dunford & Jones, 2000). Both this and the leadership-as-sensemaking approaches were influenced by a broader interest in narrative and social constructionist approaches, building on the work of Berger and Luckmann (1967), Bruner (1986), Blumer (1969) and others.

& Saar, 1996; Crosby & Bryson, 2005). Social movement researchers argue that framing processes "activate adherents, transform bystanders into supporters, exact concessions from targets and demobilize antagonists" (Snow, 2004, 385).

These framing processes attempt congruence between followers' interests, values, and beliefs and the organizations' activities, goals and ideology—a process familiar to "new leadership" scholars looking at how leaders attempt a similar alignment between themselves and their followers (e.g., Smircich & Morgan, 1982; Gardner & Avolio, 1998; Shamir et al., 1993; Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004). What unites new leadership and social movement theories is the recognition that convincing individuals to engage in organizational or social change requires the legitimation of new assumptions and perspectives in relation to existing norms, beliefs and values (Suchman, 1995). However, the social movement literature provides a way to move beyond individual conceptions of leadership since it focuses on organizational processes, as opposed to individual characteristics and behaviors. While other leadership scholars have referenced this work (Fiol, Harris, & House, 1999; Shamir et al., 1993), to our knowledge no one has applied it in depth to the domain of leadership.

This literature is extensive. We drew primarily on the notion of "core framing tasks," which address the *content* of the material being framed. Benford & Snow (1988, Snow & Benford,2000) distinguish among three core framing tasks: "diagnostic framing" or how organizational actors frame the problem, "prognostic framing" or how they frame the solution or strategic approach, and "motivational framing" or how organizations provide a "'call to arms' or rationale" for engaging in collective action (Benford & Snow, 2000, 617). Because it focuses on movements and movement organizations rather than individuals, this literature implicitly recognizes a collective understanding of leadership in which visible leaders simply represent the synthesis of multiple contributions from many players, though for the most part it does not reference the concept of leadership directly (exceptions include Morris & Staggenborg, 2004; Nepstad & Clifford, 2006).

We built on this work to introduce the building block concept of "cognitive shifts," a change in how an organizational audience views or understands an important element of the organization's work. A cognitive shift can also be understood as a change in frame (Snow et al., 1986; Goffman, 1974; Schön & Rein, 1994) or mental model (Senge, 1990). Cognitive shifts are the desired outcomes of the key leadership task of sensegiving. As we detail further in the methods section, we use the "cognitive shift" as the unit of analysis and then illustrate how organizations try to prompt shifts in how audiences perceive their work. We also look at the strategies used to legitimate these shifts.

This approach advances leadership scholarship in two key ways. First, focusing on cognitive shifts as desired outcomes redirects our attention from individual leaders' behaviors and characteristics to the actual work of leadership (Heifetz, 1998), regardless of the agents through which it is carried out. Second, this approach breaks down the broad swath of leadership as sensegiving into discrete units that are relatively equivalent and, therefore, comparable. It operationalizes the immaterial, intangible process of meaning-making, providing a systematic way to analyze and map cognitive leadership processes and allowing for a thorough investigation of the territory.

We apply this concept to a dataset of 20 nonprofit, social change organizations, a relatively rare population in leadership research (cf. Chetkovich & Kunreuther, 2006). However, we also propose how our approach is applicable to a wide range of organizations.

3. Methods

This paper is based upon data from the Leadership for a Changing World (LCW) program, funded by the Ford Foundation. Between 2001 and 2005, the Ford Foundation recognized 17 to 20 leaders or leadership teams per year as LCW award recipients. While the award was given to individuals, those individuals had to represent a community-based, social change organization. The broad goal of the program is, according to its website, to "recognize, strengthen, and support leaders, and to highlight the importance of leadership in improving people's lives" (http://leadershipforchange.org/program/faq/).

3.1. Sample

Awardees underwent a rigorous selection process which began with 1000–1500 nominations per year, whittled down to the 17–20 individual or teams of awardees by national and regional selection committees. (The research team played no role in the selection process.).[3] Selection criteria stated that award recipients should be leaders or leadership teams tackling tough and critical social problems with effective, systemic solutions. Given the high nominee to awardee ratio (at least 50:1), the rigor of the selection process, and the selection criteria, these organizations can be considered leadership exemplars and, therefore, suitable subjects for leadership research. However, the selection process introduced biases. Most importantly, the Ford Foundation chose awardees whose work, from the Foundation's perspective, promoted causes such as social and racial justice, environmental stewardship, and community challenges to corporate abuses. Conservative social change organizations were not included.

As part of this program, Ford charged a research team based at the Wagner School of Public Service at New York University to develop new knowledge about leadership, based on the study of this particular leadership population (Schall, Ospina, Godsoe, & Dodge, 2004). This paper represents analysis of data from LCW's 2001 cohort.[4] (See Appendix A for an overview.)

[3] The process began when individuals and teams were nominated by colleagues or supporters. A national committee selected about 250 top candidates who moved on to one of six regional selection committees. The regional committees, using newly submitted essays from each nominee, selected 5 primary and 4 secondary regional finalists. These were whittled down to 36 semi-finalists who hosted site visits from the reviewers. A national selection committee reviewed all the materials from the semi-finalists, and by consensus recommended 24 finalists, 17 to 20 of whom made the final cut.

[4] The total number of awardees includes 164 individuals from 92 organizations. The research team is currently engaged in data analysis on the later cohorts.

3.2. Collection

The primary data source is interview data from site visits to each of the 20 organizations named in the 2001 cohort. Researchers conducted group and individual interviews with the award recipients, organizational staff and board members, and representatives of various stakeholder and observer groups including members, clients, funders, allies, public officials, and others.

These interviews sought a balance between the consistency required across the dataset for generalizability and the flexibility necessary to capture the particular aspects of leadership that each organization illustrated. The sample included service, advocacy, community development and organizing groups that worked on issues ranging from immigration, the environment and homelessness to AIDS, Native American culture, labor and substance abuse. Further, each organization had its own particular way of organizing its work and framing its approach. Given this variety, we realized that we could not ask the same questions of each organization nor would it make sense to have the same roles represented across organizations.

Instead, we worked with the award recipients from each organization to identify several dimensions of their work on which we should focus, to decide who among various stakeholders and observers could speak to these aspects of their work, and then to decide how many informants should be included. A focus of one organization, for example, was how it used a community organizing approach to foster grassroots democracy. Given that focus, we interviewed staff and board members on how this approach was intended to work, as well as entry-level members and activists who could speak with authority on whether they felt they could have an impact on organizational decision-making. For another organization, which highlighted its influence on federal policy, we included staff from an agency who could speak to the group's influence on policy-making. The number of interviewees per organization varied, from a low of four to a high of 19; the average was between 8 and 9, the median and mode were both 8, and the total number of interviewees was 173.

Including a range of stakeholders and observers—rather than focusing only on award recipients—not only helped the validity of our findings (cf. Dunford & Jones, 2000), it reflected our intent to understand the work of leadership rather than individual-level characteristics and behaviors (Drath, 2001; Meindl, 1995; Denis, Lamothe, & Langley, 2001; Schall et al., 2004). From this perspective, which sees leadership as the property of a collective rather than an individual, the awardees were visible leaders who represented a synthesis of multiple contributions from many players. They often served as the voice of shared sensemaking and decision-making within a larger group. Therefore, our data collection went beyond the perspectives of the award recipients and included multiple stakeholders from each organization in order to ensure a more multi-faceted picture of the organization.

Based on the highlighted dimensions and invited participants, we developed interview protocols tailored to each organization. However, the basic structure of those protocols remained consistent: We garnered some background information on each organization and then asked about each highlighted dimension separately, ascertaining why it was important to the organization, what kinds of organizational efforts illustrated or epitomized that dimension, what processes lay behind those efforts, and how that kind of work could be improved. We saw each dimension as a manifestation of the work of leadership and explored how that manifestation came about. We focused not on individual actors or actions, but on organizational strategies and activities, because we saw these as evidence of collective leadership. We gathered data on three highlighted dimensions for each organization.

Buttressing the interview data is a wide assortment of archival material, such as the organization's LCW application, reports from participants in the selection process, web-based information, and other organizational documents.

3.3. Data analysis

Once the interviews were transcribed, two researchers carefully read through the transcripts and developed an “analytic memo” for each organization that described the organization, gave an overview of its work, and discussed the three highlighted dimensions in some depth. These memos represent first-order analysis of the data, roughly equivalent to a case description that would be used in a multiple case study design (Eisenhardt, 1989). This paper draws both on the original transcripts and these analytic memos to develop a second-order, more conceptual interpretation.

For this paper, the authors used a combination of deductive and inductive analytic methods. We began with a coding scheme drawn from the social movement literature on the three “framing tasks.” Therefore, we looked for examples of organizations conveying an understanding of some kind of problematic situation (diagnosis), a solution or way to address this problem (prognosis), and an impetus to action (motivation), while remaining open to other kinds of content.

We began with the two first authors coding transcripts from the same three organizations in the sample. We chose organizations that were as different from each other—in the activities they engaged in and the issues they worked on—as possible in order to best approximate the range of groups represented. Comparing notes, we recognized that, while the three tasks seemed to cover the range of framing attempts in the dataset, the three-pronged framework muddied an interesting distinction, conflating attempts to frame the issue with attempts to frame the key constituency affected by the issue. While of course intrinsically linked, differentiating between issue and constituency clearly highlighted the leadership work of shaping meaning about both the mission and the population involved. Making this distinction allows for a more fine-grained analysis of sensegiving and ensures attention to how constituents are framed, an area of sensegiving that gets less attention.

Therefore, we developed a new construct, the “cognitive shift,” or a change in how an organizational audience views or understands an important element of the organization's work, whether related to its issue or its constituency. This is a clear-cut concept which operationalizes or breaks down the slippery, hard-to-define arena of sensemaking into discrete events or units, that can be independently isolated, compared and analyzed. Further, it is a flexible construct since it can encompass any particular content, and allows us to map the full territory of meaning-making.

Based on the construct, we developed five codes to capture the five types of cognitive shifts identified in the database. Two of the codes related to the organization's issue focus, so we called these Issue-Related Cognitive Shifts. These were clearly linked to the concepts of diagnostic, or problem, framing and prognostic, or solution, framing. Therefore our category of Issue-Related Cognitive Shifts included the codes Issue—Problem and Issue—Solution.

The three other codes related to the organization's primary constituency—the population it is designed to serve, mobilize or advocate for. Therefore, we put these in the category of Constituency-Related Cognitive Shifts. One code refers to efforts to change the way the constituency views itself. This encompasses the idea of "motivational" framing that spurs supporters into action by convincing them that their actions can make a difference. However, we identified two types of constituency-related shifts that fit less neatly into the "core framing tasks" model. These included attempts to shift how one part of the constituency views another part of the constituency, and to shift how other, outside, audiences view the constituency. Therefore, Constituency-Related Cognitive Shifts had three sub-categories: how constituents see themselves (encompassing the concept of "motivational framing"), how one part of the constituency views another other part of the constituency, and how other audiences see the constituency. Table 1 provides a hypothetical example which illustrates the coding categories.

Once we had our revised coding categories, the next round of data analysis was conducted on all twenty organizations of the 2001 cohort. Each data analyst was responsible for between four and nine organizations. For each organization, the analyst read and coded the transcripts, using the five key codes, looking for evidence that the organization was trying to prompt a particular kind of cognitive shift within a particular audience. The analyst then created a summary memo for each organization that identified the number and type of the cognitive shifts the organization was attempting to spur. (This memo only included material on cognitive shifts, distinguishing it from the "analytic memo" described earlier, which provided an overview of all the organization's activities).

We deliberately looked for evidence of attempted shifts as well as actual shifts since we are exploring the sense*giving* aspects of leadership as a part of the broader sense*making* process. Given we have only cross-sectional data, we knew documenting actual shifts would be difficult. However, we wanted to map the territory of sensegiving, which meant identifying all the different arenas in which organizations were trying to prompt shifts, as well as the legitimating strategies that they used to foster the shifts. This meant evidence of attempted shifts was still relevant.

To establish reliability, the lead author read the analytic memos (the memos written for each organization as a first-order analysis of the data). She used these memos to create her own summary memo of each organization that included the number and type of cognitive shifts. We therefore had two lists (or summary memos) of cognitive shifts, separately created, for the organizations in the database.[5] The lead author then developed a full database of cognitive shifts, by organization, including every shift listed by any of the analysts. That database was then used to identify discrepancies and establish reliability. After the first round of coding, preliminary reliability stood at 51%. The first author went through each discrepancy with the analyst. If they could not agree on any given point, that data was dropped from the analysis.[6] The final database includes a total of 86 cognitive shifts, including at least one from every organization in the sample.

4. Results

Our dataset provides ample evidence of social change organizations attempting to prompt cognitive shifts in one or more of their key audiences. Audiences can include the organization's primary constituency, that is, the population it is designed to serve or mobilize. They can also include funders, allies, public officials, the general public and others. As noted earlier, our data analysis suggested that these shifts occur in two major categories: how the audience understands the organization's issue area or focus of its work and how the audience understands the organization's constituency.

In addition to identifying the desired shifts, or outcomes, of the framing process, we also identified particular framing strategies, or ways that the organizations tried to create the desired change in perception (cf. Snow et al., 1986). While organizations may share the desire to prompt a particular cognitive shift, they often differ in the underlying strategies used to trigger the shift.

4.1. Issue-related cognitive shifts

The issue-related shifts broke down into two categories: framing of the problem and framing of the solution. Table 2 provides an overview of the desired shifts in this category as well as the framing strategies used to prompt those shifts.

[5] We actually had two lists for 16 out of the 20 organizations. The remaining four organizations were ones for which the lead author created the summary memo, so there was no second coder.

[6] We recognize that a 51% rate of initial agreement is low. We ascribe this to the fact that one list was created from the original interview transcripts for each organization, while the other list was created from the analytic memo, which did not include all the information from the transcripts. However, we referred back to the original transcripts as necessary when discussing disagreements. This usually enabled quick agreement. There were three kinds of discrepancies: 1) Both coders agreed there was a shift, but disagreed on type—24% of the discrepancies. In these cases, the two coders discussed the data until they came to agreement on type of shift. 2) Both coders agreed there was a similar type of shift but the description of the shift varied slightly—11% of the discrepancies. In these cases, the two coders discussed the data until they came to language they both agreed with. 3) One person thought there was a shift, but the other person disagreed—65% of the discrepancies. In these cases, either they agreed on a shift or agreed that there was no shift. If they could not agree on the shift, that data was dropped from the analysis.

Table 1
Types of cognitive shifts

Category	Sub-Category	Example	Number in dataset
Issue-related	How an audience views the problem	Community landfill is polluted with toxic waste and is a health hazard.	$n=21$
	How an audience views the solution	Company that illegally dumped waste should clean up landfill.	$n=12$
Constituency-related	How the constituency sees itself	As experts on their own community and health problems	$n=28$
	How one part of the constituency views another part of the constituency	As allies, not strangers	$n=5$
	How an outside audience views the constituency	As deserving of government action and attention	$n=20$

Imagine an organization opposed to a community landfill. The organization's primary constituency is the community members living around the landfill; the community includes members of several different racial and ethnic groups. An important audience is the local elected officials who must determine how to proceed. This table provides examples of the kinds of cognitive shifts this organization might be trying to prompt.
Note: We present the numbers in each category as an overview of the dataset rather than as a basis for interpretation.

4.1.1. Framing of the problem

Organizations in our dataset use three different approaches to creating cognitive shifts in audience members' understanding of the problem at stake. They try to change perceptions about the *cause* of that concern; they try to heighten the *importance* of the concern; and they attempt to broaden the *scope* of the concern.

Several organizations are trying to get audience members to focus on the root cause of a problem, rather than what the organizations would see as symptoms of the problem. For example, Justice Now uses legal advocacy to address issues facing women prisoners in California—poor medical care, sexual abuse, and the like. At the same time, it works for the abolition of prisons because it believes that the prison system itself is the fundamental cause of these issues. As one co-founder noted, the organization goes beyond "just the lack of medical care in prisons." Instead, they name prisons themselves as a health hazard:

> [P]risons are unhealthy—they're unhealthy for the people who are in them while they're there. They're unhealthy for people in the long term because they come out with compromised health as a result and sometimes die prematurely because they've been in prison… It's unhealthy for the families that those people come from. It's unhealthy for their communities.

Justice Now is trying to change the way a variety of audiences—allies, women prisoners, prison officials, the general public—understand problems related to the criminal justice system: it is not enough to reform the system because the prison system itself is at fault.

Organizations attempting to change perception of the root cause of the problem often must spur a dramatically new way of thinking. In the example here, the root cause of the problem is something previously seen as either benign or even beneficial. The prison system is seen by many as a solution to the problem of crime, not a problem in itself. In fact, creating a new understanding of the root cause of a problem involves a particular strategy of recasting institutions that are widely seen as positive or legitimate: Justice Now is arguing that the prison system is inherently corrupt. Establishing the root cause of a problem often takes the form of stripping embedded institutions of their cloak of legitimacy.

Other organizations are seeking more incremental, less dramatic cognitive shifts by simply heightening or amplifying the importance of a particular problem. For example, the Black AIDS Institute sees its role as encouraging organizations in the black community to take up the issue of HIV/AIDS, given its alarming spread among African Americans. While many black organizations are already active on the issue, others have not seen AIDS as an African American issue or have been reluctant to address the issue

Table 2
Issue-related cognitive shifts and associated framing strategies

Sub-category	Framing strategies
Problem	
Establishing root cause of a problem	Enable legitimation of the new understanding of the problem by delegitimizing existing institutions; Demonstrate that they are the root cause of a social problem.
Heightening importance of a problem or broadening scope of a problem	Argue that that this is not a new problem; it is a natural extension of the previous understanding of the problem.
Solution	
	Explain that the solution is an alternate way to reach the audience's previously articulated goal or mission.

for a variety of reasons, including class divisions and homophobia. As one journalist observed at an Institute plenary on the epidemic convened for African American reporters,

> We think, 'oh, well, yes, of course it's an issue for the community, but they're (people with HIV/AIDS) not our part of the community. You know, we're straight and upper middle class and we're fine. It's the poor people, the drug users and the black gay people who have to worry about it.'

Therefore, the Black AIDS Institute does not have to create an entirely new understanding of AIDS as a problem; rather it has to take an existing awareness and make it stronger, more urgent. They do this by encouraging black organizations to see AIDS as a legitimate black issue and include it as part of their agenda. In the words of the Institute's director, a key strategy in creating this awareness and commitment is,

> To have discussions and to figure out how the HIV work can be seamlessly integrated into what they're doing anyway. … [A] part of our motto is not [to] say to people, "Add HIV to what you're already doing." Because many of the organizations that we're working with already have a full plate. But [instead] to work with them and say, "This is already a part of what you're doing."

Other organizations are seeking cognitive shifts by broadening the scope of how their primary constituency frames its concerns so that they resonate for a larger group of constituents. The New York Immigration Coalition brings together immigrant organizations based in a wide range of ethnic communities. In its work it has tried to increase the range of issues that these groups focus on. According to the organization's director:

> One of the things that's unique about our work… is the focus on *immigrant* policy along with *immigration* policy… So many of the groups in the immigrant rights movement are much more focused on just immigration policy and visas and legalization and amnesty… The Coalition is trying to deal with more of the issues of what happens once people get here: education, housing, social services access, that sort of stuff.

Again, the Coalition is not creating a new awareness of these issues as problems among its constituency, but it is saying that these issues are immigrant concerns and, therefore, should be an important focus of the organization.

To prompt cognitive shifts that highlight or broaden existing concerns, organizations use a different strategy than when recasting the root cause of a problem. They argue that this new understanding isn't new at all, given the previous concern. The Black AIDS Institute is arguing to black organizations that concern about the African American community means being concerned about African Americans with HIV/AIDS or at risk of becoming infected. The New York Immigration Coalition is justifying to its member organizations that concern with immigrant issues is a natural extension of their concern with immigration.

4.1.2. Framing of the solution

Just as organizations attempt to change thinking about problems, they also do so with solutions. AIDS Housing of Washington (AHW) is attempting a controversial shift in how other homeless and housing organizations think about providing services to homeless and substance-abusing people with AIDS. Traditionally, service providers have required that residents in either temporary or more permanent housing remain sober in order to be housed. However, this means that significant numbers of homeless people remain without shelter because they are not able to maintain abstinence, including people with AIDS. AHW created a new residence for homeless AIDS patients, using a harm reduction model which allows residents to use drugs or alcohol as long as they follow a "code of behavior and… [are] good citizens," according to one staffmember.

AHW sees this as a dramatic shift in understanding the solution to housing homeless and substance-abusing people with AIDS. In their words, their "humble goal is to revolutionize the way people think about drug use treatment." They describe how various audiences, including some of their own board members, representatives at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and other service providers had to come to terms with a fundamentally different way of thinking about the solution. In fact, in order to spur the shift, AHW provides trainings "in which people get experiential opportunities to look inside themselves and see what their hot buttons are and what their prejudices [are] about drugs and drug use and drug users." The organization believes this kind of work is necessary for board members and other stakeholders to view substance abusers as worthy and legitimate recipients of housing assistance.

Other cognitive shifts regarding solutions, however, are more technical or incremental. Nebraska Appleseed Center for Law in the Public Interest pursues its social justice agenda by re-framing issues so that they resonate with widely held values of, in its words, fairness, common sense and "doing the right thing." For example, Nebraska Appleseed succeeded in overturning the mayor's veto of an ordinance that raised wages of Omaha's municipal workers. They persuaded the anti-poverty activists and local labor federation, who had initiated the living wage ordinance, to change their desired wage from one based on an assessment of the actual cost of living to one calculated at just above the poverty level. This was a new solution to the existing problem of low wages and ultimately proved successful when the city council overturned the mayor's veto.

Organizations prompting cognitive shifts in how solutions are understood seem to rely on a common strategy: Clarifying that the solution—whether seen as radical or moderate—is simply a new way of reaching the audience's previously articulated goal or mission. AHW is telling housing and homeless organizations that a new way of serving the people they care about so deeply is to re-think the conditions under which they are willing to provide that care. Nebraska Appleseed is arguing that accepting a lower wage than previously desired still reaches the goal of raising municipal wages and establishing basic fairness. Solutions gain acceptance by their immediate connection to an already endorsed problem.

Table 3
Constituency-related cognitive shifts and associated framing strategies

Sub-category	Framing strategies
How constituency sees itself	
We are powerful.	Promote a sense of self-confidence and self-capacity among constituents. Strengthen the constituents' identification with their cultural group because its time-honored traditions are a source of power and wisdom. Spur constituents to identify as members of a broader, and thus more powerful, group.
How one part of constituency sees another part of constituency	
They are human and worthy of respect.	Argue that everyone deserves a voice; everyone has a story
They can hold authority.	Demonstrate that, sometimes, one must contravene one tradition to preserve another.
How others see constituency	
They are powerful.	Argue that the constituents are responsible for the organization's effectiveness. Cast constituents as experts, not victims.
They are deserving.	Demonstrate that constituents are "good citizens." Show that they are targets of abuses.

4.2. Constituency-related cognitive shifts

In addition to re-framing their issues, organizations try to prompt shifts in how their constituencies are viewed. These shifts broke down into three categories: how the constituency understands itself, how one part of the constituency views another part of the constituency, and how other audiences view the constituency. Table 3 provides an overview of the desired shifts in this category as well as the framing strategies used to prompt those shifts.

4.2.1. How the constituency sees itself

Many of the organizations in this dataset are in some way trying to affect how their primary constituency—the group that the organization exists to serve or organize—sees itself. Most commonly, the groups are encouraging their members or clients to see themselves as powerful and capable, as active agents, rather than passive recipients.[7] In some cases, constituency members already have that self-perception, but this is not universally true and many organizations see creating that perception as central to their work. While sharing this goal, organizations use different strategies to reach it.

One strategy is quite simply to promote a sense of self-confidence and self-capacity. CASA of Maryland, for example, describes its low-wage, Hispanic immigrant constituency as "makers of history" and "co-authors of justice." For years, the group was a service provider; however their current leadership wants their constituents to go beyond simply getting services to demanding their rights. In order to do that, some of their constituents need to think of themselves differently. Similar language is used by other organizing groups. A leader of one labor group noted, "Some of them [the workers], at the beginning, feel so powerless. But we draw them out. They realize they are very powerful." Seeing oneself as powerful is a step towards being powerful.

Another strategy to increase constituents' sense of empowerment is to encourage them to reclaim or strengthen their cultural identity, to champion that identity rather than play it down in favor of a more assimilated identity. One activist with the Oaxacan Binational Indigenous Coalition, an organization working with Oaxacan immigrants in the U.S., noted,

> Some of us don't want to say that we are from Oaxaca. We rather say that we were born someplace else. I reached the point when I thought I even forgot my language. But when I saw this flyer [from the Coalition]—people who were proud of their origin—I decided to call him [the head of the Coalition] because I also heard that they were looking for someone interested in working with the community.

As the Coalition works to better the quality of life of Oaxacan immigrants, it believes that the Oaxacan identity is central to that community's strength and resilience. Therefore it encourages their members to reconnect with their ethnic roots: to see them as a source of power and wisdom, rather than a source of shame. The organization is saying to its constituency: We are powerful because we are members of a time-honored, traditional cultural community; we can be proud of that legacy.

The Oaxacan group is emphasizing a particular cultural heritage as a source of strength. In other cases, however, groups are trying to make non-ethnic identities more salient, also as a strategy for making their constituents feel more powerful. As part of its work, the New York Immigration Coalition encourages its members and supporters to think of themselves more broadly as immigrants, rather than thinking of themselves only as members of their particular ethnic group. The Coalition is encouraging

[7] Extensive work on empowerment (Spreitzer, 1995; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990) explores how organizations can empower their constituents; however, this work focuses largely on how organizations and managers can empower workplace employees. Because our dataset included nonprofit organizations, we have data on how such organizations empower their clients or paid members.

immigrant groups to work together given that they have many of the same interests, so that they will be more powerful. Making an immigrant identity salient facilitates this process. As one Colombian activist noted,

> It's like we are in separate ghettos in our own nationalities. So that we need this integration and it is the Coalition that gives that possibility to us…When I start to be more involved with the Coalition, I realized that maybe I am closer to the immigrants than the Hispanics… Because before being considered Latina, I am considered as an immigrant… We need to defend first our interests as immigrants…

Redefining oneself as an immigrant, rather than only as a member of an ethnic group, links one to a larger, and therefore more powerful, group.

In summary, shifts in constituents' self image are often about seeing themselves as more powerful. Organizational leaders would be the first to say that, for some, this shift is unnecessary—that some constituents already have a sense of their own power. But they also hold empowerment of their constituents as a primary goal. Organizations use several different strategies to prompt this cognitive shift, however. First, they encourage a sense of self-confidence and self-capacity. Second, they make salient a cultural identity that connects them with time-honored traditions that are sources of power and wisdom. Finally, they encourage their constituents to see themselves as members of a broader and thus more powerful group.

4.2.2. How one part of the constituency views another part of the constituency

Groups in this category are attempting to shift how one part or subset of their primary constituency sees another subset. For example, one goal is to encourage humanization, or prompting subsets of its constituency to stop de-humanizing other subsets of its constituency. The Cornerstone Theater, an arts organization dedicated to bridging across divides of race, ethnicity, class, and sexual orientation, creates productions in geographic communities that bring together different, and often opposing, subcultures in those communities. It believes that participation in these dramatic productions can change how community members view one another. For example, one troupe member described one production that involved a former gang member who had been incarcerated and released.

> He is now doing a dance on stage with a police officer, doing a kick line. [Afterwards, cast members are] sitting there and talking and … people are breaking down as they talk about one line in the play that means something to them … And it often is connected to who they are and how they have been transformed by this process … So it is really powerful to watch.

In this case, the production has allowed both gang members and police officers to see each other as human, worthy of respect and dignity.

The theater company fosters these cognitive shifts guided by the “humanist” notion (in one member's language) that everyone deserves to be heard. Members of the company recalled one production, in a community where a Bethlehem Steel factory had shut down years before, with both workers and executives involved. The theater group received some criticism from some of its supporters and audience members for including “Bethlehem Steel's point of view as well as the people who got laid off when the plant closed,” according to one troupe member. He went on, “Just because you disagree with someone's point of view does not mean that they don't deserve to have a voice in their community.” Another noted that while including the corporation's perspective went against “the liberal political agenda that I feel with every fiber in my being,” the production wasn't about politics. “It is about telling a story that these people wanted to tell.” In order to prompt constituents to see other constituents as human, the company emphasizes that everyone has a story and a right to tell it.

In several other cases, the cognitive shift is not about humanization, but about granting authority to a subset of community members who have traditionally been denied authority—women. These organizations are legitimating women as leaders in traditional communities, which means changing how men view the role of women. In the Oaxacan community, women have traditionally been expected to stay at home: “We are a very conservative culture… We the men believe that women were born to stay at home, to have children, and not to let her know about her rights or get an education,” said the General Coordinator of the Oaxacan Binational Indigenous Coalition. However, at some prompting from funders, the organization began involving women. “The idea was to get women involved in the meetings, to let them know about their labor rights…Nowadays you can find more women at meetings than men at meetings.” While this has meant a change in how many of the women see themselves, it has also meant a change in how their male colleagues see them. “We are changing our stereotype of being a culture of macho men, where there is domestic violence and oppression to women,” said one male activist.

Another example of women taking on leadership roles traditionally reserved for men developed out of the Wabanaki Youth Project's cultural preservation efforts. One of the group's leaders brought her drum along when she met with communities about the project. Some community leaders protested, as men had been the sole drummers in the past. But she pointed out to them that, “the drum was lost for a long time and the women were the ones who brought it back… It was alright to drum because the women saved it, brought it back to our communities.” Eventually, she said, “A lot of them respected me for that. I was allowed to drum in a lot of these communities.” This example suggests one framing strategy that can prompt this kind of change: sometimes it is necessary to contravene one tradition in order to preserve another, even to preserve the community as a whole. The speaker emphasizes the tribe's loss of drumming to frame her efforts in terms of cultural preservation rather than a challenge to traditional women's roles, though the challenge certainly exists.

In summary, organizations spur subpopulations of their constituency to view other subpopulations differently, in at least two ways. In one case, they encourage constituency members to see other members as human and worthy of respect, by emphasizing

everyone's right to his own voice, her own story. In the other, they encourage men constituents to change how they see their women community members and their capacity for authority and leadership, by justifying the change in tradition as a way of preserving other aspects of the tradition.

4.2.3. How others see the constituency

Just as many organizations are trying to change how their constituents see themselves, they are also working to change other audiences' perceptions of their constituency. The parallel process to encouraging constituents to believe in their own power and agency is prompting others to see the constituency as powerful and therefore deserving of respect. As one organizer with Community Voices Heard, an organization of women on welfare, recounted, observers were skeptical in the early days. They would ask,

> 'What do you think you guys can do?' First of all, some still had the attitude, 'You're women, number one.' Oh, really? Yeah, but you know we're strong women, so we had to fight that too. And we had to fight the idea that [we were] coming from a poor neighborhood. What was the basis of us thinking that we could develop anything, let alone an organization? And of course we kicked butt and showed them.

Convincing outsiders that its members were powerful actors was a common goal among the organizations in our dataset.

Organizational effectiveness was one of the key drivers of this type of shift. These groups produced results, such as legislative changes or media visibility or participants at a rally, which suggested the organization was effective. But in order for these outcomes to change the way audiences saw the organization's *constituents*—rather than the organization itself or its staff—required particular framing strategies. First of all, organizations had to make clear the key role of constituents in the organization's work. As the director of one of CVH's allied organizations put it, "It's not that CVH is inclusive of its members, it *is* its members." This audience member clearly saw CVH not as a staff-driven organization, but constituency-controlled. CVH's constituents were the force behind making the organization effective.

Another strategy used to frame constituents as powerful was to insist that constituents be seen as policy experts, not just as victims of problematic policies. When CVH members, generally women on welfare, speak to the press or public officials, they "tell their story," but do so in a way "that's very directed at" a change in policy, according to one board member. "In the telling of that story, in the development of that story, that person was also a part of figuring out, 'well, what do we want to do [about it]?'" CASA of Maryland, whose primary constituents are Latino immigrants, was trying to pass legislation related to labor trafficking in the Maryland legislature. One of their witnesses was considered an "expert witness" by the legislative committee, but she was not an academic or policy analyst. She was a live-in domestic worker, a CASA activist, who conducted outreach with other domestic workers, often victims of labor trafficking. According to the organization's lobbyist, whenever possible "community members are recognized as the actual experts."

In summary, to prompt this shift, organizations use various strategies to re-cast the image of the powerful—those with the power to create changes in social and economic policy. Traditionally, this kind of power is associated with particular groups: public officials, corporate interests, people with means and connections, who are most often white, native-born, wealthy and male. But a number of these organizations undermine this traditional image in order to encourage key audiences to see their own constituents—generally poor, often people of color, immigrants, and women—as powerful. First, they portray the constituents as responsible for the organization's success; second, they cast them as experts, not victims.

In other instances, organizations attempt to convince the broad public that their constituents are deserving of better circumstances. They use two different strategies. Some organizations argue that their constituents, contrary to popular conception, are good citizens who contribute to their communities. The New Road Community Development Group, a low-income black community fighting for home ownership and higher quality housing, became frustrated that their community members were being stereotyped as "lazy" welfare recipients even though "everybody here has a job," as one member put it. In reaction, two board members painted a sign that "laid out where people are working" and nailed it to a tree. "And we had news people come in," recounted the executive director of the group. "I guess those are the kinds of things that kind of kept us going." In this case, establishing the constituency as "deserving" of better housing came from establishing that the organization's members were employed and, thus, good citizens.

Other organizations claim that their constituents deserve better because they are being mistreated or abused. Justice Now took this tack after nine women inmates in California's prisons died in an eight-week period. "One of the ways in which we were able to get media coverage was really talking about international human rights standards and equating the conditions around the deaths to torture," noted one of the co-founders. In other words, Justice Now is suggesting that at least some women inmates are targets of torture and human rights abuses, even if they have been convicted of a crime. This framing makes the inmates more sympathetic.

To conclude, LCW awardees encouraged two different shifts in how other audiences saw the organization's primary constituency: to see members as powerful and to see them as deserving. Each was prompted by several different strategies, as summarized in Table 3 (shown earlier).

5. Combining the shifts: A case example

While identifying discrete cognitive shifts is useful for analytic clarity, it misrepresents how the shifts occur in real life. In practice, organizations prompt many different combinations of shifts in order to pursue their goals. Certainly cognitive shifts in

both how the issue and the solution are perceived are quite common. Combined shifts in how constituencies see themselves and in how others see them are also widespread. Shifts in how a problem is understood can often have significant implications for how the constituency is perceived—by itself or by others.

In order to illustrate the aggregation of shifts, we present a case example of one organization, the Gwich'in Steering Committee (incorporated as a nonprofit organization) of the Gwich'in Nation, an indigenous group that spans Canada and the United States. As we describe here, they prompt shifts in four categories of our framework, each reinforced by others, as part of a tightly woven social change strategy.

The Gwich'in Steering Committee primarily focuses on oil and gas development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR). Most commonly, this issue is framed as a problem of environmental degradation and its impact on the land and the animals that live there. But the Gwich'in remind us that people live there as well and they rely on the land, particularly a species called the Porcupine Caribou, as their primary sustenance. "It is always our way of life: we go out and hunt and fish and gather food and we subsist. That is very important to us," noted one Committee member. A tribe member noted that "60, 65, 70% of the people's diet here is from the land… the number one diet here is Caribou." These Caribou migrate every year to ANWR to breed and raise their young. If that migration doesn't take place or if the numbers are seriously reduced, that can be devastating for the Gwich'in population: "Last year, everybody here had a hard time because we did not see no Caribou all winter and all summer…" said one member. "Fifteen Gwich'in villages depend on that same Porcupine Caribou herd for food and clothing, everything. Caribou is everything to us because we are Caribou people," noted another.

For the Gwich'in, therefore, development of ANWR represents the destruction of their way of life. Earlier development of other arctic lands has already had an effect on their livelihood. So, ANWR development isn't simply an environmental issue, it is a human rights issue. As one tribal member noted,

> We have always been here and this is where the Creator put us to take care of this part of the world and we did very well… We are here to stay and that is human rights… Nobody has a right to say we don't have that right. That is human rights.

A full-page ad opposed to opening up ANWR in the *New York Times*, placed by 17 organizations including the Gwich'in Steering Committee, explicitly names the human rights issue as one reason to protect the Refuge, along with environmental issues (New York Times, 2005).

This shift from perceiving ANWR development as a human rights issue enables a second shift in how outside audiences view the Gwich'in people: framing the constituency as a target of human rights abuses. As one ally noted, "People have a right to make a living in their homeland and all, you know. That is a basic human right, and recognized, and taking away that right by eliminating the way they [the Gwich'in] traditionally made a living is an abridgement of their human rights."

The Steering Committee is not only focused on outside audiences, however. They are also trying to foster changes in how their primary constituency—the Gwich'in people—thinks about itself and the issues it faces. In particular, they are encouraging young people to reclaim their culture and see themselves as Gwich'in. "We didn't even know we were going into Western culture," said one young tribal member. "Now I know how to live off the land." An older member added that the fight against ANWR development changed how young people saw themselves and their community. "They woke up and it made them focus on the Caribou more and it made them focus on themselves more and their people more." Understanding the threat to their tribe's traditional way of life has heightened the salience of the young people's Gwich'in identity, a shift in how they see themselves.

The organization is also trying to change how tribal members see the solution to the problem of environmental degradation that they face. Tribal members agree that the primary solution is to keep ANWR pristine. But the Steering Committee has also encouraged community members to think more broadly about solutions, by urging them to consider their own role in degrading the environment. "We used to get caught up in Western culture, like throwing trash away and styrofoam and all that. Now we are buying paper cups… Where we hunt and fish it is all clean… We are more conscious of protecting what we say we are protecting," said a Committee member. The Steering Committee is also teaching community members about recycling and has been demonstrating the use of solar energy. One tribe member noted, "We need to set an example that we are not all dependent on oil… We are actually doing something to protect the … reserves by actually using solar." It has also encouraged its members to think about what kind of economic development they would support. "We don't want no dirty jobs that dirty the air," said one tribe member.

Again, while the key solution to the problem of pollution is to stop drilling in ANWR, the Steering Committee is encouraging their tribal constituency to consider another solution to the problem as well: attending to how they treat their own environment. "If we are going to go against oil and gas development in the Refuge… we have to do our part," noted a Committee member. And they are aware that this consistency will shape how outsiders see the tribe, as this member noted.

> If you are going to fight the oil company to keep the birthplace safe and healthy, you have to think about being healthy too. That is going to be in their [the oil company's] mind. They are going to try to get us for that. 'How can you trash when you say you want to save that place?'

The Steering Committee wants outsiders to see the tribe as walking its talk. "We have common sense enough to think about all that, so we can be heard."

In sum, the Steering Committee intertwines many different re-framings in order to pursue its goal of keeping its homeland free of invasive industrial development and environmental degradation. It casts oil drilling in ANWR as a human rights issue, not just an environmental one, given that it could destroy a time-honored way of life. This then enables the framing of the Gwich'in people as a

target of human rights violations. The Committee encourages its constituency members, including young people, to strengthen their connection to the Gwich'in identity, as a way of intensifying commitment to the traditional ways they want to save. The Committee suggests that Nation members also have to look inward when considering solutions to the problem of environmental degradation, facing up to their own contribution to polluting their homeland. At the same time, they are aware that this attention will shape the image of the Nation to outsiders as a group that practices what it preaches to others.

Encouraging these shifts is by no means all that the Steering Committee does. It reaches out to a broad range of audiences, from church groups to other indigenous groups, to present its case. It lobbies Congress. It cultivates connections with the media and hosts reporters from around the world. Our objective in this discussion is to highlight and illustrate one aspect of its leadership: its attempt to shape the cognitions of key audiences in ways that advance its cause.

6. Discussion

Building on previous research on cognition in leadership and social movements, this paper introduces "cognitive shifts" as a construct for analyzing sensegiving as a leadership task. Specifically, we argue that organizations try to prompt cognitive shifts—changes in sensemaking or perception—in key audiences about important elements of their work. We also identify particular legitimating strategies that organizations use to try and instill these shifts.

This work makes two primary contributions. First, previous research on leadership as meaning-making has tended to focus on how individuals enact this process, even as interest has grown in the work of leadership itself, however it is carried out. By focusing on a desired outcome of the sensegiving process, our work suggests a theoretical and methodological approach that can operationalize sensegiving, whether led by individuals, groups, or larger collectives that mutually establish shared understandings. Second, this approach has the potential to map the full territory of meaning-making, despite its intangible and slippery nature. In addition to these primary contributions, we believe this work also brings to light overlooked areas of sensegiving. We elaborate all three contributions in turn.

6.1. Exploring the work of leadership

Even as scholars call for exploration of the collective work of leadership, they acknowledge the relative dearth of empirical studies that grow from this understanding (Pearce & Conger, 2003, 13). There is even less work on how the work of sensegiving can grow out of a collective process, given the traditional emphasis, within the "new leadership" literature, on spotlighted individuals. Naming the theoretical construct of cognitive shifts as a desired outcome of the sensegiving process, and using it as the unit of analysis, provides a way to explore the collective work of leadership, however implemented or personified, which seeks to provide meaning and understanding.

Other approaches for operationalizing the work of leadership are also being explored. Gronn (2002) argues that distributed leadership itself should be the unit of analysis. Gronn proposes a taxonomy that distinguishes among two-member, three-member, four-member, and five-or-more member forms of shared leadership. Other approaches to measuring group leadership include surveys (e.g., Avolio, Sivasubramaniam, Murry, Jung, & Garger et al., 2003) and social network analysis (e.g., Mayo, Meindl & Pastor, 2003). Each of these methods makes an important contribution. However, ours complements these approaches in two key ways.

First, because it focuses on desired outcomes, rather than individual behaviors, characteristics, or perceptions, it can flexibly accommodate very different conceptions of the collective work of leadership—from the joint work of two co-leaders to self-managed teams to the shared constructions generated by the engagement of large numbers across levels and positions and types of authority. Indeed, it can apply to the work of individual leaders as well. This approach also has the elasticity to analyze leadership activities even as leader configurations may dramatically shift over time—for example, from solo to collective and back again.

Second, it specifically takes on the task of understanding collective sensegiving, a relatively unexplored arena in the distributed leadership literature. The task of sensegiving has been addressed most prominently by "new leadership" scholars, those studying charismatic or transformational leaders, who focus on sensegiving by individuals. Those that have explored leadership as collective meaning-making (e.g., Smirch & Stubbart, 1985; Pfeffer, 1981) have worked largely in the conceptual, rather than the empirical, realm, suggesting a need for analytical tools appropriate for empirical exploration.

6.2. Mapping the territory of meaning-making

Given this need, our second contribution is to provide an analytical tool that can more systematically map the territory of leadership as meaning-making, enabling integration of earlier work on the subject. Previous work tends to address various slices of the sensemaking arena without drawing them together into a comprehensive categorization. For example, several scholars have explored how influencing followers' sense of themselves as a collective galvanizes them to pursue challenging new directions (Shamir et al., 1993; Lord & Emrich, 2000). But this research tends to overlook how these new directions themselves are framed or re-framed. In contrast, leadership studies of cognition in problem solving tend to overlook shifts in how followers perceive one another (Mumford, Marks, Connelly, Zacarro, & Reiter-Palmon, 2000, Reiter-Palmon & Illies, 2004).

Using the cognitive shift as the unit of analysis provides a basic building block that underlies the many different kinds of cognitive leadership work—from re-shaping followers' identifications to changing external audiences' understandings of a critical societal problem. This approach allows us to disassemble the interwoven, intangible work of sensegiving into discrete units, which can be compared and contrasted as structural equivalents, and then re-assembled into a fuller picture.

Naming the desired outcome of framing processes as the cognitive shift also helps us differentiate the intended outcome from the strategies that are used to bring about that goal. For example, while a common goal is to encourage constituents to see themselves as powerful, organizations use different strategies to prompt this shift, from promoting constituents as confident and capable to strengthening their identification with a particular group. The "frame alignment" stream of the social movement framing literature also investigates framing strategies (Snow et al., 1986). They discuss how social movements use framing to attract potential recruits, identifying four different alignment strategies, including "frame amplification"—trying to amplify the salience of a frame already held by the potential supporter—and "frame transformation"—introducing completely new understandings in recruits. Some of our framing strategies fit into this framework. When Justice Now encourages audience members to view prisons as a terrible problem, rather than the solution to crime, it is hoping for a dramatic transformation in their understanding. In contrast, when the Black AIDS Institute encourages African American organizations to take up the AIDS issue,, it is trying to amplify an existing awareness about AIDS and an existing commitment to working in the black community.

However, by breaking up the sensemaking processes into the discrete units of cognitive shifts, and then explicitly differentiating between the shift and strategy to achieve the shift, we see how specific strategies are used to advance particular outcomes and not others. Some strategies are more useful in issue-related shifts; others more relevant for constituent-related shifts. This provides greater clarity and flexibility.

Finally, using cognitive shifts as the building block provides a consistent approach that still enables flexibility and new insights, encompassing new types of shifts as well as new framing strategies. In sum, we illustrate an approach, based on cognitive shifts, that enables a novel, systematic, yet adaptable, mapping of the framing terrain.

6.3. Illuminating overlooked areas of sensegiving

Focusing on the leadership work of nonprofit, social change organizations brought overlooked areas of sensegiving to light. We identified three ways that this understudied population of organizations (a significant exception includes Chetkovich & Kunreuther, 2006) extends our insight into leadership processes more generally. In each case, we describe the insight and then suggest applications to forprofit and public sector organizations.

First, these organizations make distinctions between framing the problem and framing the solution. This is not new to leadership research, but rarely is such a clear distinction made (an important exception includes Crosby & Bryson, 2005; see also Stone, 2001). Much of the literature refers to the importance of uniting followers behind the leaders' "vision," but this term often refers only to the suggested solution. For example, Conger & Kanungo's (1987 p. 640) conception of vision as "some idealized goal that the leader wants the organization to achieve in the future" captures the forward-looking, prognostic perspective of much of the research but glosses over the importance of problem framing. Problem construction is less studied within the transformational leadership literature; the research that exists tends to focus on the problem solving process itself more than on how redefining problems galvanizes followers to embrace new ways of thinking about a specific problem (Zaccaro, Mumford, Connelly, Marks, & Gilbert, 2000; Mumford et al., 2000; Basadur, 2004; Reiter-Palmon & Illies, 2004).

However, the work of these nonprofit leaders reminds us that problems and solutions go hand-in-hand. If leaders are engaged in framing new solutions, they may be, implicitly, re-framing the problem as well and vice versa (Carmin & Balser, 2005). We argue it is helpful for leadership scholars to also explicitly make the distinction between problem and solution. Doing so follows in the tradition of some strategy and problem solving researchers who recognize the independence of problem and solution (e.g., Nutt, 1998; Basadur, 2004; Zaccaro et al., 2000; Mumford et al., 2000) and in the tradition of "garbage can" approaches to decision-making (Cohen, March & Olsen, 1972).

Explicitly distinguishing between problem and solution lends further clarity to the important arena of how leaders engage in the substantive issues that concern organizations. While the terms "problem" and "solution" may not always be expressly appropriate, leaders of all organizations must frame the basic issue that they address. That framing must include some kind of need (or problem) and how to attend to that need (or solution). And such companies may use similar framing strategies as the organizations in our study. For example, web-based companies have been de-legitimizing brick-and-mortar outfits—as limited, inconvenient, expensive—in order to pave the way for their alternative approach. Other companies may work more incrementally, heightening an existing concern about a particular product on the market.

Second, the nature of nonprofit, social change organizations draws our attention to framing for external audiences and stakeholders, from funders to public officials to allied organizations to the general public (cf. Zaccaro & Klimoski, 2001) Previous cognitive leadership research has tended to highlight the relationship between organizational leaders and members, with less attention to outside parties (though the literature on organizational image management [e.g., Bonardi & Keim, 2005; Dutton & Dukerich, 1991] has delved deeply into this realm). Yet, the organizations in this study were quite concerned with how these outsiders viewed not only their issue, but their primary constituency as well, and took steps to shape those perceptions.

Influencing external perceptions has direct relevance for leaders of all organizations. For example, corporations undergoing scandals may have an immediate interest in influencing how the general public views not only the organization, but its members—its employees—as well. Just as nonprofits in our dataset painted an image of their constituents as "deserving," so might these companies. They may try to frame their constituents as "good citizens" who were the victims of the abuses of others—for example, the accountants who vetted its finances—just as some of our nonprofit organizations did. This aspect of sensegiving has received little attention.

Third, while some new leadership researchers have documented how leaders create a sense of collective identity among followers (e.g., Shamir et al., 1993), they have focused more on shifts in self-concept than on shifts in how sub-groups of followers

view other sub-groups of followers. But to claim or strengthen allegiance to a social identity—an identification with a larger collective—followers may have to change how they view others in that collectivity. Conceiving this collective identity is particularly valuable when the leader is trying to create a sense of solidarity across sub-groups which may be estranged or divided.

In this research, we document how leaders are often engaged in changing constituents' perceptions not only of themselves and their own capacities and identities, but about other groups as well. For example, they encouraged subsets of their constituency to view other sub-groups as human and worthy of respect and as capable of holding authority. This also has direct analogies to challenges faced by leaders in other kinds of organizations. Consider leaders of a corporate merger. The literature is replete with examples of mergers gone bad (e.g., Cartwright & Cooper, 2002, Vaara, 2002; Yu, Engeman, & Van de Ven, 2005), at least in part because of antagonism between the employees of the different firms. The leaders of the merger might very well attempt to shape how the different sub-groups view each other—as both worthy of respect and as capable of holding authority within the new organizational structure. This area also extends the range of cognitive leadership work beyond what has been documented previously.

6.4. Limitations and future areas of research

Despite these contributions, this research has limitations that suggest new arenas of research. First, we included any evidence of intended cognitive shifts, whether or not we had data that such shifts actually occurred in the target audience. We did this because we wanted to understand the breadth of meaning-making processes: What are all the arenas in which sensegivers attempt to prompt change? What framing strategies do they use to do so? We felt we might have a construct that had the potential to map the territory of cognitive leadership; casting the widest net possible was a way to test the robustness of that construct, even without evidence of shifts occurring. And, indeed, we were able to bring to light areas of sensegiving that have been largely overlooked. On the other hand, this approach is limited. For the most part, we can't establish whether a shift actually happened. We don't distinguish between successful and unsuccessful attempts or predict what might make the difference. Nor do we look at whether cognitive shifts lead to behavioral shifts. There is more work to be done in this area.

Second, empirical data from forprofit and governmental organizations would tell us whether their leaders try to prompt the same cognitive shifts that we identify here and whether they spur different ones as well. For example, we did not see instances of cognitive shifts related to how individual leaders are viewed. This is important, because leaders' actions to shape how they are viewed by followers is a major theme of the cognitive leadership literature, especially the charismatic leadership literature (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House, 1996). Yet, we did not see any examples of this in our research. While the data shows that organizational members and stakeholders often held one or more individual leaders in high esteem, we did not see explicit examples of how these individuals, or any others, actively tried to shape how others saw them. Further research would be needed to determine whether this was an artifact of our data collection or whether in fact these kinds of shifts are rarer among the kinds of organizations we studied.

Third, given the nature of the Leadership for a Changing World program, this dataset largely includes social change organizations with a progressive, “social justice” orientation. It would be useful and interesting to study a sample of conservative social change organizations to see whether the types of cognitive shifts and framing strategies hold in that population as well. Research should also investigate the cognitive shifts prompted by larger, service-oriented nonprofits such as the Red Cross or the American Cancer Society.

Fourth, this study sought only to document the various types of shifts, not their frequency or their connection to other organizational characteristics. Nor did it explore any causal relationship between shifts and organizational outcomes. While other research has tried to investigate the influence of framing on organizational success (Cress & Snow, 2000), much more work is needed in this area. Fifth, this research does not investigate why and how leaders choose the types of shifts and framing strategies they do. Leaders do not have an unlimited capacity to shape their message however they see fit. Rather, framing is enabled and constrained by both external and internal forces: prevailing norms and values, the accessibility of different kinds of discourses and understandings, the organization's financial and material resources, the frames of allied and competing organizations, and the like. These forces and others should be explored in order to understand the framing process more deeply (cf. Hardy et al., 2000).

Finally, this work doesn't investigate how framing is integrated with other kinds of activities like advocacy and lobbying, organizing, and providing services. Framing is part of a much larger toolkit which organizations must deploy to achieve their stated outcomes.

However, this research does suggest that organizations and their leaders be more deliberate in their framing processes. It could be helpful for them to surface the particular shifts they are attempting to create—across issue and constituency—and see if they fit together, or act at cross purposes. Mapping the cognitive work they are already doing could enable them to be more strategic and forward-thinking (see Fairhurst & Saar, 1996, for advice in this area).

“These are the things that the union has taught me: to defend myself, to not have to depend on anybody,” said a Latina member of the union Justice for Janitors. “Myself, I think I have made a great change, not only at work, but my way of thinking.” This research suggests that trying to prompt such changes is inherent to the process of leadership.

Acknowledgements

For comments on previous drafts of this paper, many thanks to: Angela Bies, JoAnn Carmin, Jennifer Dodge, Danna Greenberg, Amparo Hofmann, Marian Krauskopf, Tammy MacLean, Vicky Parker, Jenny Rudolph, Steve Taylor.

Appendix A. Organizations in sample, their primary issue and location

Organization	Primary issue	Location
AIDS Housing of Washington[a]	Housing/AIDS	Seattle, WA
Black AIDS Institute[a] (Formerly: African American AIDS Policy and Training Institute)	AIDS	Los Angeles, CA
CASA of Maryland	Workers' rights	Takoma Park, MD
Center for Young Women's Development	Human development	San Francisco, CA
Chinese Staff and Workers Association	Workers' rights	New York, NY
Coalition of African, Asian, European, and Latino Immigrants of Illinois	Immigrants' rights	Chicago, IL
Community Voices Heard	Workers' rights	New York, NY
Cornerstone Theater[a]	Community building	Los Angeles, CA
Gwich'in Steering Committee	Human rights and environment	Arctic Village, AK
Justice for Janitors	Workers' rights	Los Angeles, CA
Justice Now	Human rights	Oakland, CA
Nebraska Appleseed Center for Law in the Public Interest	Workers rights	Lincoln, NE
New Road Community Development Group	Community development and housing	Exmore, VA
New York Immigration Coalition[a]	Immigrants' rights	New York, NY
Oaxaca Binational Indigenous Coalition (FIOB)	Workers' rights and human rights	Fresno, CA
Ohio Valley Environmental Coalition	Environment	Huntington, WV
Silver Valley Peoples Action Coalition	Environment	Kellogg, ID
Tonatierra Community Development Corporation	Workers' rights and human rights	Phoenix, AZ
Triangle Research Options for Substance Abusers	Human development	Durham, NC
Wabanaki Youth Program of the American Friends Service Committee	Human development	Perry, ME

[a]A significant portion of the work of these organizations is national in scope.

References

Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., & May, D. R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders' impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, *15*(6), 801–823.

Avolio, B. J., Sivasubramaniam, N., Murry, W. D., Jung, D., & Garger, J. W. (2003). Assessing shared leadership: Development and preliminary validation of a team multifactor leadership questionnaire. In C. L. Pearce & J. A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership* (pp. 141–172). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Awamleh, R., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness: The effects of vision content, delivery, and organizational performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(3), 345–373.

Barry, D., & Elmes, M. (1997). Strategy retold: Towards a narrative view of strategic discourse. *Academy of Management Review*, *22*, 429–452.

Bartunek, J. M. (1984). Changing interpretive schemes and organizational restructuring: The example of a religious order. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *29*, 355–372.

Basadur, M. (2004). Leading others to think innovatively together: Leading creatively. *Leadership Quarterly*, *15*(1), 103–115.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Transformational leadership and performance beyond expectations.* New York: Free Press.

Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *26*, 611–639.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, Inc.

Berson, Y., Shamir, B., Avolio, B. J., & Popper, M. (2001). The relationship between vision strength, leadership style, and context. *Leadership Quarterly*, *12*(1), 53–73.

Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bonardi, J. -P., & Keim, G. D. (2005). Corporate political strategies for widely salient issues. *Academy of Management Review*, *30*(3), 555–594.

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Self-concordance at work: Toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders. *Academy of Management Journal*, *46*(5), 554–571.

Bruner, J. S. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bryman, A. (1993). Charismatic leadership in business organizations: Some neglected issues. *Leadership Quarterly*, *4*, 289–304.

Carmin, J., & Balser, D. B. (2005). Mobilization Routines in Professional Environmental Movement Organizations: Matching Solutions to Problems. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Philadelphia, PA.

Cartwright, S., & Cooper, C. L. (1992). *Mergers and acquisitions: The human factor.* Oxford, UK: Butterworth Heineman.

Chetkovich, C., & Kunreuther, F. (2006). *From the ground up: Grassroots organizations making social change.* Cornell University Press.

Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *17*, 1–25.

Conger, J. A. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: An insider's perspective on these developing streams of research. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(2), 145–179.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, *12*(4), 637–647.

Conger, J. A., & Pearce, C. L. (2003). A landscape of opportunities: Future research on shared leadership. In C. L. Pearce & J. A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership* (pp. 285–303). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. M. (2005). *Leadership for the common good.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Cress, D. M., & Snow, D. A. (2000). The outcomes of homeless mobilization: The influence of organization, disruption, political mediation, and framing. *American Journal of Sociology*, *105*(4), 1063–1104.

Day, D. V., Gronn, P., & Salas, E. (2004). Leadership capacity in teams. *Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 857–880.

Denis, J. L., Lamothe, L., & Langley, A. (2001). The dynamics of collective leadership and strategic change in pluralistic organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, *44*(4), 809–837.

Drath, W. (2001). *The deep blue sea: Rethinking the source of leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Dunford, R., & Jones, D. (2000). Narrative in strategic change. *Human Relations*, *53*, 1207–1226.

Dutton, J. D., & Dukerich, J. E. (1991). Keeping an eye on the mirror: Image and identity in organizational adaptation. *Academy of Management Journal*, *34*(3), 517–554.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, *14*(4), 532–550.

Engle, E. M., & Lord, R. G. (1997). Implicit theories, self-schemas, and leader–member exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, *40*(4), 988–1010.

Fairhurst, G. T., & Saar, R. A. (1996). *The art of framing: managing the language of leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fiol, C. M., Harris, D., & House, R. (1999). Charismatic leadership: Strategies for effecting social change. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(3), 449–482.

Fletcher, J. K., & Kaufer, K. (2003). Shared leadership: Paradox and possibility. In C. L. Pearce & J. A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership* (pp. 21–47). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Hardy, C., Palmer, L., & Phillips, N. (2000). Discourse as a strategic resource. *Human Relations*, *53*, 7–28.
House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo Vadis? *Journal of Management*, *23*(3), 409–420.
Gardner, W. L., & Avolio, B. J. (1998). The charismatic relationship: A dramaturgical perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*(1), 32–58.
Gioia, D. A., & Chittipeddi, K. (1991). Sensemaking and sensegiving in strategic change initiation. *Strategic Management Journal*, *12*, 433–448.
Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *Leadership Quarterly*, *13*, 423–451.
Heifetz, R. (1998). *Leadership without easy answers.* Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
House, R. J. (1996). Path–goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, *7*(3), 323–352.
Lord, R. G., & Emrich, C. G. (2000). Thinking outside the box by looking inside the box: Extending the cognitive revolution in leadership research. *Leadership Quarterly*, *11*(4), 551–579.
Lowe, K. B., & Gardner, W. L. (2000). Ten years of the Leadership Quarterly: Contributions and challenges for the future. *Leadership Quarterly*, *11*(4), 459–514.
Mayo, M., Meindl, J. R., & Pastor, J. -C. (2003). Shared leaderhsip in work teams: A social network approach. In C. L. Pearce & J. A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership* (pp. 193–214). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
Meindl, J. R. (1995). The romance of leadership as a follower-centric theory: A social constructionist approach. *Leadership Quarterly*, *6*(3), 329–341.
Morris, A. D., & Staggenborg, S. (2004). Leadership in social movements. In D. A. Snow S. A. Soule & H. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*: Blackwell Publishing.
Mumford, M. D., Marks, M. A., Connelly, M. S., Zaccaro, S. J., & Reiter-Palmon, R. (2000). Development of leadership skills: Experience and timing; problem solving. *Leadership Quarterly*, *11*(1), 87–114.
Nepstad, S., & Clifford, B. (2006). When do leaders matter? Hypotheses on leadership dynamics in social movements. *Mobilization*, *11*(1), 1–22.
New York Times. (2005). November 9. Page A15.
Nutt, P. C. (1998). Framing strategic decisions. *Organization Science*, *9*(2), 195–216.
Ospina, S., & Sorenson, G. (2006). A constructionist lens on leadership: Charting new territory. In G. Goethals & G. Sorenson (Eds.), *The quest for a general theory of leadership*: Edward Elgar Publishers.
Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (2003). *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
Pfeffer, J. (1981). Management as symbolic action: The creation and maintenance of organizational paradigms. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, *Vol. 3* (pp. 1–52). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
Podolny, J. M., Khurana, R., & Hill-Popper, M. (2005). Revisiting the meaning of leadership. In B. Staw & R. Kramer (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, *Vol. 26* (pp. 1–36). New York: Elsevier.
Reiter-Palmon, R., & Illies, J. J. (2004). Leadership and creativity: Understanding leadership from a creative problem-solving perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, *15*(1), 55–77.
Schall, E., Ospina, S., Godsoe, B., & Dodge, J. (2004). Appreciative Narratives as Leadership Research: Matching Method to Lens. In D. L. Cooperrider & M. Avital (Eds.), *Advances in appreciative inquiryConstructive discourse and human organization*, *Vol. 1* (pp. 147–170). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science.
Schon, D. A., & Rein, M. (1994). *Frame reflection: Toward the resolution of intractable policy controversies.* New York: Basic Books.
Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Doubleday.
Shamir, B. (1999). An evaluation of the conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(2), 285–306.
Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, *4*(4), 577–594.
Smircich, L., & Morgan, G. (1982). Leadership: The management of meaning. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *18*(3), 257–273.
Smirch, L., & Stubbart, C. (1985). Strategic management in an enacted world. *Academy of Management Review*, *10*, 724–736.
Snow, D. A. (2004). Framing processes, ideology, and discursive fields. In D. A. Snow S. A. Soule & H. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to social movements* (pp. 380–412). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
Snow, D. A., & Benford, R. D. (1988). Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization. *International Social Movement Research*, *1*, 197–217.
Snow, D. A., Rochford, E. B., Jr., Worden, S. K., & Benford, R. D. (1986). Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation. *American Sociological Review*, *51*(4), 464–481.
Snow, D. A., Soule, S. A., & Kriesi, H. (2004). Mapping the terrain. In D. A. Snow S. A. Soule & H. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to social movements* (pp. 3–16). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Individual empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*(5), 1442–1465.
Stone, D. (2001). *The policy paradox: The art of political decision-making.* W.W. Norton and Company.
Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, *20*(3), 571–610.
Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An interpretive model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, *15*, 666–681.
Vaara, E. (2002). On the discursive construction of success/failure in narratives of post-merger integration. *Organization Studies*, *23*(2), 211–248.
van Knippenberg, D., van Knippenberg, B., De Cremer, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2004). Leadership, self, and identity: A review and research agenda. *Leadership Quarterly*, *15*(6), 825–856.
Walsh, J. P. (1995). Managerial and organizational cognition: Notes from a trip down memory lane. *Organization Science*, *6*(3), 280–321.
Yammarino, F. J., Spangler, W. D., & Dubinsky, A. J. (1998). Transformational and contingent reward leadership: Individual, dyad, and group levels of analysis. *Leadership Quarterly*, *9*(1), 27–54.
Yu, J. S., Engleman, R. M., & Van de Ven, A. H. (2005). The integration journey: An attention-based view of the merger and acquisition integration process. *Organization Studies*, *26*(10), 1501–1528.
Zaccaro, S. J., & Klimoski, R. J. (2001). *Nature of organizational leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Zaccaro, S. J., Mumford, M. D., Connelly, M. S., Marks, M. A., & Gilbert, J. A. (2000). Assessment of leader problem-solving capabilities. *Leadership Quarterly*, *11*(1), 37–64.