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INTRODUCTION
In spite of the increase in philanthropy over the past years, nonprofits, particularly grassroots organizations, have faced a growing number of challenges. Donors and the public lost trust in the nonprofit industry as a whole due to exposés on greed and abuses of power. These scandals, along with advances in technology, have given rise to a greater demand for transparency. The government and granting organizations cut funding, especially in the arts and music sectors. Nonprofits are now expected to do more with less. What is the proper model for these nonprofits in today’s society? Is the traditional hierarchical form of nonprofit governance still relevant? Can new board structures be proposed and maintained effectively in volunteer-driven organizations?

It is critical to examine the historical hegemony of hierarchies and traditional processes as society evolves to make sure our nonprofit organizations are serving their communities transparently and effectively.

**Background of Research**

At the onset of this project, I had several initial questions:

a. How can small nonprofit organizations be sustainable?

b. Is a hierarchy an adequate model for volunteer-driven nonprofit organizations?

c. Are alternative models available?

d. If so, what are the implications of alternative models?

This question set evolved to include the following:

a. What does a heterarchical nonprofit board model look like?

b. Is this sustainable in a volunteer driven, grassroots organization?

c. If so, why is this a better fit for a nonprofit?
Through the literature review, practical application and subsequent reflection I will explore answers to these questions, outlining areas for additional research along the way.

**Thesis**

Over the course of this study I came to the conclusion that a heterarchy is an exceptional alternative model for volunteer driven nonprofit organizations in an innovation society. I will demonstrate this by first showing that hierarchies are a hegemonic standard, one that does not fully satisfy the needs of volunteer-driven nonprofit organizations. Alternative models can be introduced, and by evaluating an actual heterarchical model I will show that a heterarchical structure is possible in practice, as well as in theory.

**Overview of project**

Throughout my thesis I make a case for transitioning to a hybrid, heterarchical, practically 'leaderless' nonprofit management structure. This atypical structure dovetails well with the inherent purpose of mission-driven organizations. Empowering workers or members to engage and facilitate in a mission may prove to be a key aspect in the overall sustainability of nonprofits in today’s turbulent economic climate.

**Situating work in interdisciplinary inquiry**

This work is an interdisciplinary exploration in communications, nonprofit management, organizational theory, leadership and philosophy. In an interdisciplinary approach, one can gain understanding of the practicality of heterarchical shared-power organizational structures as well as their historical foundations and modern implications.
In communications studies, organization models are traced and analyzed. The appropriateness of different organizational structures vary from business to business and evolves throughout different eras. Contemporary scholars are starting to argue that the scientific method of management and traditional hierarchical structure are outdated and insufficient for modern businesses. I will review the past conversation, turning to a study of what organizational forms are available and which are best for a particular use.

As the structures of organizations change, so has the preferred model of leadership. In businesses that are evolving away from a top-down organizational model, the expectations of leaders are also evolving. Good managers are not simply expected to maintain accountability and efficiency, but also to reframe conflicts and demonstrate empathy. Furthermore, not only managers are expected to be leaders in modern organizations, but all participants.

Nonprofit management is a very large subsection of business. Studies on nonprofit business in academia mainly focus on large nonprofit organizations and their work within the community. As such, few resources are available on alternative models and how they specifically relate to small nonprofit organizations. The argument presented in this thesis fills a void in the current academic conversation, calling on further research that will provide small nonprofits with guidance particularly needed at a time of dwindling resources.

Philosophical inquiry underwrites this exploration. Is the traditional model of nonprofit management adequate? If not, why are we perpetuating it? Are there additional ways of operation and if so, where can they be found? A philosophical approach to this situation allows us break down the problem. It can be seen that in a traditional hierarchical business world, many
have been systematically “othered” or marginalized by the structure.\(^1\) While traditional hierarchies typically place power in the hands of a select few, innovative modern structures\(^2\) can empower the previously disempowered.

**Significance**

A study of heterarchy is imperative on both theoretical and practical levels. On a theoretical level, it furthers the academic conversation about organizational theory. What are heterarchies? When implemented in volunteer-driven nonprofit organizations, what do they look like and what are the potential pros and cons? In my literature review and subsequent argument, I dissect heterarchy and other shared-power organizational structures in order to establish a better understanding of “heterarchy.” A heterarchical organization is a model in which the structure is flat, decision-making is shared and empowerment and leadership occurs at all levels. By addressing the inadequacies of hierarchy, I also make a case for exploring alternative models.

Most of the previous discussion of heterarchies deals with theoretical models only. My thesis includes the practical application of a heterarchy to a nonprofit organization: Altered Esthetics\(^3\). This contributes to the field of communication and organizational theory by providing practical research in an actual organization using a heterarchical model. It also contributes to the nonprofit management field by showing an alternative, shared-power model, as opposed to the

---

1. *The other* as introduced by Hegel referred initially to the non-self. In later feminist studies, this term was extended by Beauvoir to females, who have been traditionally seen as a “second sex.” Over second and third waves of feminism it eventually became a term referring to groups or persons that are otherwise disadvantaged or disempowered.

2. Heterarchies can also be seen as a postmodern collage of networks and systems.

3. Altered Esthetics is a nonprofit community arts gallery and arts advocacy organization located in Northeast Minneapolis. Founded by the author of this thesis, and ready with an active and willing board, it provided a unique opportunity through which to live test a shared-power heterarchical nonprofit board structure.
hegemonic hierarchical model. By showing the possibility of a heterarchical model in an actual organization, I seek to open the door for other nonprofits to duplicate, utilize or learn from this model.

**Methodology**

Throughout this thesis I will address the above research questions and project using a number of applied methods. My direct experience in the nonprofit industry provides a practical foundation on which to apply this academic research and study. My literature-based research includes analysis of communications and organizational theory, heterarchies, nonprofit organizations, leadership and philosophy.

I will apply this knowledge base to a traditional nonprofit organization as part of an initial case study. The experimental new board structure will be implemented at Altered Esthetics in January of 2009. In addition to my initial research and practical case study, I will also conduct extensive evaluative research after implementation of the initial heterarchical structure. This research is based on the nature of heterarchical systems, heterarchical organizations, communications and innovation. I will then synthesize the research, elucidating connections to the formal review of the relevant literature. The case study will also include a working example of the proposed structure. In conclusion, I will outline the practical implications of the applied case study.

An outcome of this study, in addition to documentation of the project and a research-informed evaluation, will be a generalized heterarchical model for small nonprofit organization governance. A final presentation for the master’s program will include a reflection on the thesis
itself and the research leading up to it, insight derived from the specific case study and notes for further study.

**Overview**

The first major component of my thesis will be a review of the relevant literature in four connected disciplines: organization and communications theory, leadership, nonprofit management and philosophy. The literature traces the path away from hierarchy; and through this review of the literature, the grounds for a compelling argument against hierarchy will be presented.

Using the literature as a foundation, I will then argue for an alternative business model in contemporary times. I limit the scope of this argument to volunteer-driven nonprofit organizations, arguing that a heterarchical organization is a better model. I will argue that heterarchies can be more adaptive, innovative, creative and fulfilling than the traditional hierarchical model, noting that heterarchies call for greater individual leadership and also greater communication on the part of its participants.

As a practical measure, I will create a case study by implementing a heterarchical board system at a volunteer driven nonprofit organization and was an active participant in this process. After briefly detailing the history of the organization, I will show the methodology behind the heterarchical organization that was implemented and discuss the various reaction of the board members to the new system. I will note the strengths and weaknesses of this practical application as observed by participants thus far.

My conclusion as a result of both my research and my case study is that a heterarchical organization can be a preferable model, particularly in volunteer-driven nonprofit organizations.
In my final concluding chapter I will call for additional research, noting that academia often neglects small volunteer-driven nonprofit organizations in studies on philanthropy. I will reiterate the argument against the hegemony of hierarchy and call for more organizations to embrace alternative models as they explore paths to sustainability. Especially for volunteer-driven nonprofit organizations, a heterarchical shared power model will allow them to better engage their volunteers and board members. In doing so they will become more innovative, adaptive and flexible, better able to effectively serve their mission.
LITERATURE REVIEW
The transition of businesses into the 21st century involves new models, more effective communication, innovative leadership and better methods of managing employees. At a time of limited resources, nonprofits are buckling down, preserving funds and continuing the hegemonic hierarchical structure. Although a move away from hierarchy into shared-power models might pose a large concern for financially-driven businesses, shared-power can be considered a positive for nonprofits. Community driven movements can be detrimental to for-profit businesses, as they do not always benefit the financial bottom line.

However, as nonprofits exist to fulfill a mission, a societal shift that requires sharing power and engaging all members of an organization could simply be a manifestation of the ethic already apparent in the organization. Furthermore, nonprofits generally have an employee base demonstrating their commitment to work towards the greater good; many nonprofit employees opt for jobs that pay less on the dollar but are more intrinsically fulfilling.

A conversation on the relevancy and efficiency of nonprofit structures connects to several major academic disciplines. The following literature review will touch on the major components of organizational theory, nonprofit studies, leadership and philosophy relating to the argument at hand.

**Organizational theory: Hierarchies and traditional organizational models**

The structure of organizations and communications within them has not been without previous analysis. The historical retracing of their role and evolution sets the context for the current discussion on the adequacy of the traditional model.
Hierarchy has been the dominant model of organizational structure for the past two centuries (Fairtlough, 2005; Allee, 2002). Within any organizational structure, different management styles can be used. The traditional approach to management within organizational structures was prominent in the early 19th century, originally intended to fix the arbitrary and occasionally cruel management practices of the early 1800s (Conrad & Poole, 2005). Bureaucracy within the traditional approach placed emphasis on rational control; examples of this traditional approach included rule-based, efficient organizations with formalized communication structured to prevent abuses of power (Weber & Andreski, 1983). Scientific management within the traditional approach sought to gain further efficiency. Time and motion studies were implemented, quota systems and organizational charts were introduced and communication was further formalized (Taylor, 1985). The hierarchical organizational structure since remained a hegemonic standard (Fairtlough, 2005).

As noted by Lipman-Blumen (1992), hierarchical models once provided a ‘safe’ place for male competition in the workplace. However, increasing involvement from female workers is one factor pushing organizational models away from the hegemony of hierarchy. Lipman-Blumen (1992) argued that, for females, it is connectivity in the workplace which provides a web of safety and that this form of connectivity is more appropriate for the interconnected, global society.

Hierarchy and the traditional approach

Lipman-Blumen (1992) discussed and analyzed the psychological roots for competition and gender components in relation to the hierarchical model and traditional approach. For males,
rigid hierarchical structures establish boundaries that allow for mediated ‘safe’ competition. Lipman-Blumen (1992) argued that the male hierarchical form of leadership is one more appropriate for frontier society. Lipman-Blumen argued that traditional American leadership represents a masculine ego-ideal, something everybody can strive to be. Lipman-Blumen later showed this can be seen in the “lone-ranger” heroic ideal. Lipman-Blumen argued that this masculine ideal draws on a very limited pool of achieving styles, noting that these direct styles “emphasize individualism, self-reliance and belief in one's own abilities as well as power, competition and creativity.” (Lipman-Blumen, 1992, p. 185). Lipman-Blumen illustrated that relational management styles, seen as traditionally female, are often rejected. Throughout the text, Lipman-Blumen (1992) held that the world is a more networked place than it was in the past and argues that a connective style of leadership is needed: “leadership also integrates and creatively revitalizes individualism with a crucial female perspective, that is, seeing the world as a total system of interconnected, uniquely important parts, rather than as independent, competitive, isolated and unequal entities.” (Lipman-Blumen, 1992, p. 187).

The hegemony of hierarchy

In his study, The Three Ways of Getting Things Done, Hierarchy, Heterarchy and Responsible Autonomy in Organizations, Fairtlough (2005) looked objectively at hierarchy and what happens to societies when they begin to think that hierarchy is the best way of getting things done. Fairtlough (2005) argued that hierarchy became a hegemony, an accepted norm of society that is now self-perpetuating. He argued that some of the problems within the business world occurred because people are dependent on hierarchies without question. Because of this, the idea that the leader is the be-all-end-all valued person in an organization, the “great man myth,” has been
He noted that although the common belief is that moving away from hierarchical organization structure risks accountability within organizations, that is a dangerous assumption to make. To assume that the dissipation of the hierarchy translates to the detriment of accountability is to place all ethics and responsibility only on those with power. This sacrifices engagement and empowerment of all within the organization. Yet, the structure persists. Fairtlough (2005) also outlined some of the commonly assumed advantages of hierarchy as reasons why the structure persists:

- Hierarchies provide familiarity.
- In an ideal situation hierarchies prevent chaos by systematically avoiding conflict.
- Hierarchies can provide clarity of roles and positions.
- Workers can be more personally motivated; as members of a hierarchy attempt to rise in stature within it, they personally identify with their specific role.

Fairtlough argued that these advantages are not enough to sustain the model. He noted that if businesses really want to grow and be creative they will need to begin using alternative forms. Further, Fairtlough suggested: “if nonprofits really want to respond well to crisis, they need to consider and explore other models.” (Fairtlough, 2005, p. 18).

Psychological implications of the hierarchical model and the traditional approach

In his book *Social Intelligence* Goleman (2007) discussed the ramifications positive and negative workplace interactions can have on health. He argued that rigid hierarchical models using a traditional approach significantly and negatively effect the emotional well-being of subordinates:

---

4 Code (1940) noted that the hierarchical models of the church further perpetuate the phenomenon of the great-man myth.
In rigid hierarchies bosses tend to be authoritarian: they more freely express contempt for their subordinates, who in turn naturally feel a messy mix of hostility, fear, and insecurity (Wilkinson, 1996, as cited in Goleman, 2007, p. 227). Insults, which can be routine with such authoritarian managers, serve to reaffirm the boss’s power while leaving their subordinates feeling helpless and vulnerable (Gabriel, 1998, as cited in Goleman, 2007, p. 227). And because their salary and very security depend on the boss, workers tend to obsess over their interactions, reading even mildly negative exchanges as ominous. Indeed, across the board, just about any conversation with someone of a higher status at work elevates a person’s blood pressure more than does a similar conversation with a co-worker (Lynch, 1979, as cited in Goleman, 2007, p. 227).

Arguing for a more employee-friendly environment, Goleman (2007) suggested that a rigid traditional management approach lacks positive emotional implications for the worker.
Organizational theory: Beyond hierarchy and the traditional approach

Variations to the hierarchical organizational model and the traditional approach of management are now emerging (Allee, 2002; Fairtlough, 2005). In the systems approach to management, an organization is considered a biological organism rather than a hierarchical machine (Von Bertalanffy, 1969.) In the systems approach, all parts of the organization influence each other. These models are more adaptive, ready to resolve conflict (Conrad, Poole, 2005) According to Von Bertalanffy (1969), in order to survive organizations must work as systems and be able to adapt to changes in their environment. Open systems of management began to emerge more prominently in the early 1970’s, shifting away from hierarchical models (Britan & Cohen, 1980).

In the relational approach to management an organization is viewed as a family (Conrad & Poole, 2005). McGregor (1960) dissected the traditional approach and argued for a relational approach in The Human Side of Enterprise.5 In the relational approach leadership is prized over management, employees are intrinsically motivated, informal communication is encouraged, decision making is shared and workplace morale is valued. Those who follow the relational approach operate under the assumption that a happy employee, not a stressed employee, is a more productive one (Halepota, 2005, Sadri & Tran, 2002).

The cultural approach places an emphasis on the norms and culture of a given organization. In order to thrive within this kind organization, employees need to subscribe to and identify with

\[5\] Simplifying the traditional approach and the relational approach into Theory X and Theory Y, respectively, McGregor (1960) broke down the characteristics between the two management styles with marked preference towards a more personal approach to management, marking a fundamental shift in communications theory.
the institutional values (Jacobi, 2009). This can be seen clearly in environmentally friendly or strictly green organizations, where employees must exemplify that ethic in order to be a part of the organization.

*Introducing heterarchy*

Heterarchical organizations\(^6\) shared-power structures, are emerging as business models in current literature on organizational theory (Fairtlough, 2005; Stephenson, 2009). Within a heterarchy, interdependence and collaboration is key. As defined by DiMaggio (2005):

“heterarchy represents a new mode of organizing that is neither market nor hierarchy: whereas hierarchies involve relations of dependence and market involves relations of independence, heterarchies involve relations of interdependence.” (DiMaggio, 2005, p. 75.)

*Shifting strategies and organizational models*

In their definitive work *From a Hierarchy to a Heterarchy of Strategies: Adapting to a Changing Context*, Bala Chakravarthy and James Henderson (2007) discussed the movement away from hierarchies. Their study noted that while the hierarchy had a place in history, it is an inadequate model for modern times. They noted that a movement away from hierarchy is already occurring. Initial strategies for diversification pushed by management have already started a movement away from hierarchies into multidivisional structures (Chakravartha & Henderson, 2007). This

\(^6\) Although an increasingly hot topic, heterarchical shared-power models are not new. (Levy, 1982; Sweely, 1999; Nelson, 2006). Levy (1982), after analyzing archeological finds in Bronze-Age Denmark, argued that the social and religious organizations of the time were not hierarchical. Levy (1982) proposes that genders in Bronze-Age Denmark shared power in a more heterarchical society. She notes that the shared-power nature of the societal structure effected the power balance between the sexes, creating a more egalitarian society. Heterarchies recently re-emerged in post-feminist structures such as cooperatives and collectives that share decision making power, ownership and labor. (Oerton, 1996.)
large and unwieldy development of smaller business units is still, however, led by a corporate office. The authors illustrated that businesses, particularly NGOs and international firms are now run with a heterarchy, rather than hierarchy of strategies. They challenged the linear and top-down view of strategy and advocated further distancing from a strictly top-down model.

The structure of previously traditional organizations is changing by necessity: Verna Allee argued that “traditional business models and structures are cumbersome, costly and too slow” (Allee, 2002, p. 7). Allee summarized the current state of the business world to give her argument a clear context. Corporations are shifting to a more networked market, with boundaries between organizations becoming increasingly fuzzy\(^7\) (Allee, 2002). While traditional hierarchical organizational structures have clearly defined notions of which members reside inside versus outside the organizations, the new forms in organizations like ebay and Amazon do not. In these organizations, most transactions take place online; and the user community is relied on heavily as part of the business infrastructure. As such, the lines in which the organization begins and end are blurred. In businesses like these that rely heavily on global and ever-shifting internet-based networks of users communities and sellers, the inside/outside lines are blurred. Allee (2002) argued that as organizations become increasingly intertwined and information networks more closely related, the hierarchical model simply is inadequate. Organizations will have to learn to accommodate and plan for change and increasing uncertainty within the surrounding environment (Wheatley, 2006; Roberts & Hite, 2000). New models are needed to accommodate this change and account for the boundaries of the interconnected business community. Fairtlough

---

\(^7\) In philosophical logic: a *fuzzy boundary* refers to the boundary of an object with an indeterminate edge, “for example, the indeterminate edges of a cloud” (Keefe & Smith, 1999, p. 50).
(1994) concurred, arguing that the end of the 20th century marks a major turning point away from older organizational models.

*Argument for heterarchy*

Karen Stephenson (2009) also argued against the normative hierarchical model, offering an alternative. She made the point that it is the job of those in power today to “build meaningful, collaborative structures and performance metrics to ensure its sustainability” (Stephenson, 2009, p. 4). She argued that, as our world becomes increasingly connected, we need to form a new structure that embraces our ancestral network tendencies with the current market and hierarchical structure: the heterarchy. Stephenson (2009) argued that heterarchies exemplify the finest points of *nonsummativity*. She outlined the basic structures of networks, markets, hierarchies and heterarchies and discussed how the increased connectivity of heterarchies may require more work and greater communication but are more flexible to change.

Dawson (2009) attempted to clarify what the heterarchical model of organization is, noting, “unfortunately there appears to be no consistent definition of heterarchy available from standard dictionaries; and the term is in fact used differently in social sciences and biology” (Dawson, 2009, p. 1). He argued that Stephenson’s definition needs to be normalized and theorizes that while heterarchies are relevant and necessary, “we have far to travel in effectively working at the intersection of technology, trust and culture that is required to succeed in this transition” (Dawson, 2009, p. 2).

---

8 In organizational communication, *nonsummativity* refers to the theory that the whole is more than the sum of its parts. (Conrad, Poole, 2005, P. 29)
Frew (2009), in response to Stephenson, posed that heterarchical types of structures really can create meaningful and lasting change. He discussed the difference between heterarchy in the private and public world. Competition in the for-profit world can result in innovative products at lower prices. In the public sector, however, competition sometimes means duplication of services, redundancy and competition for resources. Though duplication of services can lead to innovation in the for-profit sector, this is not always the case with nonprofits. Frew (2009) noted that heterarchies in the nonprofit world might have to take on a slightly different structure than those in the for-profit world.

Fairtlough (2005) discussed the systematic advantages of heterarchy, the first being that rulers are more accountable and tyranny is less likely. Fairtlough (2005) noted that this is especially important in the nonprofit community. According to Fairtlough (2005), heterarchies also require more personal responsibility: “heterarchy reduces the danger of tyranny, helps cooperation and commitment to common goals, fosters coevolution, teamwork, learning, and innovation, is pluralistic and uses diversity” (Fairtlough, 2005, p. 47).

In *Heterarchies: Human Nature Transformed?* Art Kleiner (2009) reviewed some of the further repercussions of heterarchies and the issues that scale brings: “humans will adapt to them, but at some level, living in this new type of society will have to become second nature” (Kliener, 2009, p. 13). As Fairtlough (2005) noted, hierarchy became a hegemony. New types of organizational structures in society will have to become more common for them to become second nature, and the more normal state of affairs.
Inspiration within the bureaucratic model of the university

Lipman-Blumen (1998) noted that although there was a push for universities to act more businesslike, leaders in many business are being supplanted with former university leaders specifically because they have the leadership skills needed to guide organizations in rough times. She offered six ways in which universities are good business models:

• Universities have many different and diverse components and systems under one roof and are great examples of connected shared-power structures.

• Businesses should learn to value and solicit the knowledge worker, the type of person the university already nurtures.

• Knowledge begets creativity and innovation, something the business world desperately needs. Universities already nurture and promote this, individual fields bridging connections to other disciplines to generate ideas no single department could do alone.

• Businesses sometimes feel friction from creative tensions. Universities, dealing with this issue for years, can offer a wealth of information for businesses on how to overcome these issues.

• Universities offer a system that fosters creativity among knowledge workers. Academic tenure is something that gives knowledge workers the security and freedom to do what they do best. Businesses could use this model in instances where they need to entice and retain knowledge workers in their organization.

• The mission of the university provides an additional motivator for those employees who are not tenured: “the transformation of people and society through knowledge” (Lipman-Blumen, 1998, p. 9).
As Lipman-Blumen (1998) noted, other workers also identify with the larger mission of the university:

“When university leaders succeed, reality and aspirations meet. The remarkable results spark creativity, high motivation, excitement, dedication beyond measure, and a sense of mission fused in a heady and fruitful environment. Not a bad example for a business or any other organization to emulate!” (Lipman-Blumen, 1998, p. 10).

The author argued that a good mission can be an intrinsic motivator, even in a non-university setting. The shared-power model of the university can be a resource for businesses looking for ways to nurture innovation and creativity.

Placing an emphasis on continual learning and creativity in the workplace is not something intrinsic to university or educational settings. Brown and Adler (2008) argued that “in a rapidly changing world, (these) ecosystems must not only supply this workforce but also provide support for continuous learning and for the ongoing creation of new ideas and skills” (Brown & Adler, 2008, p. 17). According to the authors, a successful structure would accommodate and value information-sharing and learning.
Leadership

The traditional view of leadership and the evolution of leadership parallels the evolution of organizations themselves. The type of leadership common in a hierarchically structured organization is a male-centered, directive form of leadership (Lipman-Blumen, 1992). However, leadership theorists are beginning to note the importance of shared power in leadership, leadership at all levels (Crosby & Bryson, 1992.) The value of shared-power is a common thread in many contemporary leadership theorists (Conger & Riggio, 2007; Kouzes & Posner, 2007). These ideals reinforce the increasingly acknowledged belief that leadership is not innate; rather, good leaders and leadership itself can be refined and learned through development of specific skills and traits (Parks, 2005). Warning against the evils of toxic leadership, Lipman-Blumen (2005) also encouraged the promotion of “the leader within;” personal empowerment and accountability being a healthy prescription to corruption from the top.

In his work *Crossing the Unknown Sea: Work as a Pilgrimage of Identity*, Whyte (2001) discussed the importance of leadership. A productive team is not a symptom of one good leader, he argued, but a good crew of individual leaders as well (Whyte, 2001). Leadership is a critical component; Lipman-Blumen (1998) noted that “without effective leadership, all organizations eventually founder” (Lipman-Blumen, 1998, p. 50). In an increasingly networked world, however, the methods and functions of leadership shift from a one-person centered approach to a more egalitarian approach (Allee, 2002; Crosby & Bryson, 1992; O’Toole, 1995).

Brafman and Beckstrom (2006), in *The Starfish and the Spider*, discussed the rise in alternatively structured organizational models and their ‘leaderless’ nature. Using a metaphorical parallel, they compared hierarchical business models to spiders and networked models to starfish. In a
hierarchical model, if the head is removed an organization dies. In a starfish model, a severed leg will simply be regenerated. The authors’ theory questioned leadership in the traditional sense, making the case for organizations that rely more on the power of all the members rather than one key individual (Brafman & Beckstrom, 2006).

The structure: A symptom of the leadership

Lipman-Blumen (1992) continued her dissection of hierarchy by analyzing the organizational structure with the leadership methods used. Hierarchical models using the traditional approach have centralized power structures (Conrad & Poole, 2005). Lipman-Blumen (1992) argued against these centralized power structures, or “old boy” networks, as lesser-powered males and females have historically been excluded from them.

In stark contrast, the connective organizations observed by Lipman-Blumen (1992) are more inclusive than their hierarchical counterparts and noticeably more transparent. Lipman-Blumen (1992) argued that we will need new methods for marking leadership and achievement styles in a globally connected world. Yet, the desire to credit a leader is still a feature in today’s business world; Lipman-Blumen (1992) noted there is still a societal urge to recognize a single person, even in collaborative efforts.

Communication in leadership

William Drath (2001) argued that adaptive challenges in leadership can be faced through dialogue and communication. With regard to leadership and the importance of leadership styles, Drath (2001) argued that relational dialogue is key. He noted that the work of a new form of
leadership will involve setting direction, creating and maintaining commitment and facing
adaptive challenge (Drath, 2001).

New leaders need to be masters in networks and communication (Lipman-Blumen, 1992).
Lipman-Blumen (1992) argued that women and the otherwise disadvantaged learned to be
experts in communication and networking, going around the traditional system as a necessary
to get things done in times when power was inaccessible. Lipman-Blumen (1992) argued
“to regain their competitive edge in world markets, American organizations (should)
confront the necessity of de-emphasizing competition and developing connective leaders who
can give them the connective edge” (Lipman-Blumen, 2009, p. 20).

Feminist leadership

Feminist leadership, though evolving as a theory, historically provided an argument and
alternative in opposition to the hierarchical style. Lipman-Blumen (1992), in reviewing the
differences between male and female leadership, argued that leadership is leaning further and
further towards typically female-gendered practices. Ingram (1999) clearly summarized the
rational for the growing tendency and need for leadership theories, especially in education, to
give credit to traditionally female ideals:

Leadership education took a turn toward feminism in the 1990s. The decade's notions
about leadership embrace feminist ideals of shared power, reciprocity of influence, and
the value of relationships. Feminist pedagogies that value personal experiences enjoy a
good fit with college and university service learning and civic leadership programs.
Educators are being awakened to injuries foisted upon girls, particularly middle school
girls, highlighting a need for female-friendly practices at all levels. Furthermore, the recently recognized interdependence between institutions of higher education and their surrounding communities exemplifies the value of relationships, an idea long associated with women's perspectives (Ingram, 1999, p. 26).

Eveline (2005) reiterated the notion that traditionally leadership was associated with men, with their male gender-evoking assumptions and attributes of power. She implied that, in order for society to change, how we traditionally define genders should also change. Quindlen (2005) argued further that “by its very nature women's leadership was about redefinition, while men's leadership was about maintaining the status quo” (Quindlen, 2005, p. 86). Eveline continued:

“In effect, the customary examples, language and concepts that evoke leadership associate organizational power with men, and leadership with masculinised ways of knowing (such as tough-mindedness, emotional detachment) and doing (such as assertive self-promotion, making ‘hard’ decisions and disconnection from family responsibilities)” (Eveline, 2005, p. 656).

Kark (2003) also discussed the growing trend towards transformational leadership and the characteristic of empowering the previously disempowered. He argued that this phenomenon connects to the earlier contributions of feminists and feminist leadership theorists. The increasing number of women in the workplace, particularly in management roles, changed the way leadership is defined and the way new leaders are developed (Kark, 2003).
Oerton (1996) looked at the growing movement away from hierarchy and towards flatter, feminist organizational structures also. She reminded readers that it should not be assumed that movement away from traditionally male hierarchical structures is the only catalyst for gender diversity and equality. After looking at different cooperatives, heterarchies and other shared-power structures, she noted several of the positive implications of heterarchies, as well as the societal issues that still need to be resolved (Oerton, 1996). Contrary to the argument made by Sidanius and Pratto (2001), Oerton (1996) argued that it is not simply the structure alone that induces the symptoms of conflict and inequality, but a variety of circumstances. This includes issues such as class, society and other contextual issues that surround the workplace also contribute; societal structure at large needs to be addressed in addition to business structures.

Socially intelligent leaders

Goleman (2007) discussed social intelligence, making an argument for socially intelligent leaders. As part of a conversation with Dr. George Kohlrieser, a psychologist and professor of leadership at the International Institute for Management Development in Switzerland, Goleman argued that a leader able to create a secure work environment is a critical component to a successful workplace (Goleman, 2007). Astute, socially intelligent leaders are able to challenge workers and encourage their creativity by providing a secure work-base; socially leaders are also able to better curb stress levels and prevent overwhelming (Goleman, 2007). Goleman (2007) noted:

Excellence in people management cannot ignore these subterranean affective currents: they have real human consequences, and they matter for people’s abilities to perform at their best. And because emotions are so contagious, every boss at every level needs to remember he or she can make matters either worse or better (Goleman, 2007, p. 280).
Amy Zipkin (2000) also examined the the dynamic of management and the roles of emotional and social intelligence in the workplace. Surveying polls and studies, she noted that the attitude of management is an increasingly critical component on employee motivation and loyalty:

The American workplace has evolved to a kinder, gentler state. With unemployment at a 30-year low, bosses realize that they have to do more than pay good salaries and lavish perks on their employees if they want to keep them. They also have to be nice to them (Zipkin, 2000, pgh 4).

Leading and managing in a changing world

Leading and planning for impending change is a critical component for 21st century organizations (Conger, Spreitzer, 1998). Arts organizations in particular face a complex challenge. Clapp (2009) noted many arts organizations will undergo a crisis of leadership. He argued that current leaders are not prepared nor willing to transition to a new generation that has different cultural and or artistic values from previous, power-holding generations. The new generation wants more autonomy and creativity over a field largely dominated by older generations, serves and participates in an art audience changed by digital technology and due to economic need, operates in different models of organizational structure (Clapp 2009). Clapp (2009) noted the issues above call for a shift in the current train of thought and calls “for new ideas, new models—and new leaders” (Clapp, 2009, p. 3).

Echoing the call for leading change, Dr. Jean Lipman-Blumen’s book, Connective Leadership: Managing in a Changing World, outlined a new structure for leadership, one more suitable for organizations in the 21st century. According to Lipman-Blumen (2000), the face of leadership is
changing dynamically as society evolves. While shared-power leadership models are positive changes in the right direction, shared-power alone is not enough and not without complication. She proposed that a new, more connected leadership model is needed. She argued that a platform with internal connectedness as well as connectedness to other organizations is an appropriate structure that will adequately address the needs of many organizations in the 21st century (Lipman-Blumen, 2000.)

Embracing conflict

Traditional hierarchies are often set up to reduce and minimize conflict, something seen as a negative occurrence in the workplace. However it is now often argued that conflict can have positive effects in the workplace and can trigger innovation and creativity (Sessa, 1994; Gerzon, 2006; Luke, 1997).

In *Can Conflict Improve Team Effectiveness?* Sessa (1994) discussed the problem of conflict and how it can affect the workplace. Sessa (1994) noted that there are two different kinds of conflict - task-oriented conflict and people-oriented conflict - both of which can be present at the same time. Sessa (1994) showed that those who take place in perspective-building exercises can be more effective at resolving conflict. She argued that this should be a priority for all members of the organization. Several things organizational members can do to build perspective building are: self disclosure, role reversal and active listening. Sessa (1994) also argued team members who engage in conflict have a higher survival rate and feel more engaged with their organization. Further, development and innovation can ensue as a result of conflict (Sessa, 1994). Sessa
concluded by noting that when handled properly, conflict among teams can be a blessing rather than a burden.

Gerzon (2006) in *Leading Through Conflict* discussed further how organizations can reshape conflict, using it as a positive catalyst for innovation, change and growth. Gerzon (2006) argued that democratic principles are often based on concurrently opposing viewpoints within an organization or system. Gerzon suggested that all members of an organization need to possess mediation skills to successfully transform conflict into a benefit, saying: “we urgently need a new model of leadership, one that takes dealing with conflict and difference as a central goal” (Gerzon, 2006, p. 11). Luke (1997) agreed that new leaders can be catalysts within their organizations, networking between organizations and communities to achieve larger goals. Gerzon’s mediators are not necessarily among the leaders or managers within the organization. Likewise Luke’s catalytic leaders do not need to be those in charge. Rather, they can be a volunteer, board member or otherwise engaged member of the organization, leading from their current position (Luke, 1997).
The nonprofit sector

The nonprofit sector comprises a large section of business organizations in the United States. They employ 11 million people and engage 5.7 million volunteers annually (Cameron, 2004.) Mission-driven organizations, nonprofits serve communities and receive tax exempt status due to their public focus (Ott, 2001). “Nonprofit organizations provide unique opportunities for individuals to combine their energy, talents and values for community improvement and enrichment” (Minnesota Council of Nonprofits, 2005, pgh. 1).

Traditional nonprofit structures are innately hierarchical. In nonprofits with a paid staff the nonprofit governing board, led by a board chair, hires and supervises an executive director. This director then supervises and hires the remaining staff. Nonprofit board members are often constrained by traditional roles; they are skilled and willing to help, but situationally unable (“Invigorating,” 2004).

A new landscape for nonprofits

Ryan (1999) proposed that nonprofits are living in a new environment, one where they must often collaborate or compete with for-profits. Nonprofits responded to this situation in a variety of different ways: subcontracting, changing structures, converting to for-profit status or even shutting down. Ryan (1999) insisted that in order to survive, nonprofits need to learn how to operate in this “new landscape.” The author proposed nonprofits establish a more business-like model. However, he also noted that for some nonprofits this new model can compromise their mission. Ryan (1999) closed by saying that the societal changes offer nonprofits an opportunity
that can be positive or negative, depending on the resources available and an organization’s willingness and ability to change.

Others echo concern about the changes surrounding the nonprofit sector. Adams and Perlmutter (1995) noted that “nonprofit organizations are working in an era of heightened scrutiny, greater demands, fewer resources, and increased competition” (as cited in Hackler and Saxton, 2007, p. 474). The business environment in which nonprofits are operating is changing and as a result, nonprofits need to be increasingly strategic (Burt & Taylor, 2003).

*Effective governance for nonprofits*

Walter Gangl (1998), in *Creating and Maintaining Effective Governance for Nonprofits and Foundations*, discussed the structure of traditional nonprofit organizations. He suggested that some of the intrinsic differences between nonprofit organizations and for-profit organizations can trigger problems. Gangl (1998) argued that in a traditional nonprofit model, hierarchy is still a norm. In this model, information flows from the top-down. According to Gangl (1998) even in institutions with an active board, staff still receive most information filtered through an executive director. This funnel can prove dangerous in an instance where channels of communication are not transparent or corrupt. Gangl (1998) discussed the need for transparency across organizations and notes that even within the checks and balances of board structure, there is an innate hierarchy present in traditional nonprofit models.

Cornforth (2001) examined the traits that make boards effective, and noted that the effectiveness of a board varies with the board members’ ability, time and skills they can devote to their
respective roles. These assets, when combined with the structure of the organization itself, create a given output. In other words: if the skills of the board, the time board members have to contribute or the structure of the organization is lacking, the outcomes of the board will be weakened accordingly (Cornforth, 2001).

Orlikoff and Totten (2009) discussed the importance of board member performance evaluations as well. This dynamic, they argued, begins with the board chair. They set up the groundwork for successful board chair-ship and make suggestions for proper evaluation. They noted that the role of the board chair within the traditional nonprofit structure is critical. Evaluation is a necessary component of board membership and board sustainability and board chairs have a critical role in shaping the evaluative nature of the nonprofit board itself (Orikoff, Totten, 2009).

*The value of information technology and innovation*

There is little question that information technology affects the way modern businesses work (Saidel & Cour, 2003). Nonprofits need to utilize technology strategically and more aggressively in order to connect, compete and network with others (Gordon, 1998). Burt and Taylor (2000) suggested: “information and communication technologies have the potential to invoke deep change within voluntary organizations seeking to reconfigure relationships and to engage in effective knowledge management and organizational learning” (Burt & Taylor, 2000, p. 141).

Hackler and Saxton (2007) argued that the strategic use of information technology is a critical component in addressing and planning for changes. For the first time, technology is in the right place, a helpful tool for nonprofits with dwindling resources. “To boost information technology’s
(IT’s) mission-related impact, nonprofits must enhance their organizational capacities in long-term IT planning, budgeting, staffing and training; performance measurement; internet and website capabilities; and the vision, support and involvement of senior management” (Hackler & Saxton, 2007, p. 474). Girard & Stark (2003) argued further that “The emergence of new forms of communication will continue to destabilize established routines. Collaborative organization will continue to co-evolve with interactive technologies” (Girard & Stark, 2003, p. 102). Within all of this, the internet plays a vital role. “Never has a communications system played so many roles in our lives—or exerted such broad influence over our thoughts—as the Internet does today” (Carr, 2008, pgh 20).

**Innovation as a systemic value in nonprofit organizations**

Light (1998) argued that nonprofits need to create more ‘open’ structures that value innovation, change and communication. He suggested organizations can be structured to nurture creativity. Rather than focus on one innovative leader, innovation and creativity should be shared by all members of the organization (Light, 1998). The need for creativity from all participants within an organization is seconded by Wheatley, especially for organizations working in uncertain times (Wheatley, 2005). Light (1998) proposed that a naturally creative structure fosters innovation and incorporates the following values:

- Remaining thin, with a minimal staff
- Creating room to experiment
- Pushing authority away from the top
- Enabling internal collaboration
- Running the organization democratically
• Readying the organization to innovate
• Creating an environment of ideas
• Understanding and being ready for stress
• Nurturing diversity
• Aging gracefully

Light (1998) argued that nonprofit organizations that rely less on the creativity and innovation of
one leader in a top-down model and focus on the innovation of all members the organization will
become more innovative organizations as a whole.
Philosophical inquiry

Philosophy and the traditional Socratic method of inquiry promotes a continual learning environment, one in which what is presumed to be known can be evaluated, questioned and furthered. The argument at hand is no exception. What follows briefly reviews several major philosophic schools of thought and their impact on the understanding of structure itself, as well as the principles of deconstruction and postmodern collage that aid in the argument for alternative organizational structures.

From power and social dominance to gender theorists, the efforts of philosophers shed light on organizational theory and the human experience within organizational structures. The contributions of postmodernism and poststructuralism both enable a critique of establishments and power that provide tools for rethinking and reevaluating organizational theory and organizational structures (Hassard, 1994; Calas & Smricich 1999; Chan & Garrick, 2002; Knights, 2002).

Some philosophers argue that hierarchies persist due to a genetic predisposition to power and dominance (Fairtlough, 2005; Sidanius, & Pratto, 2001). Foucault (1979) discussed the innate struggle that comes with domains of power. Institutionalized and societal norms of power influence not only those in charge but also those subordinated. In Social Dominance : An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression, Sidanius and Pratto (2001) argued that the nature of humans to maintain hierarchy perpetuates the major forms of conflict: racism, patriarchy and classism. As these forms of power were institutionalized, facilitating change must
be driven from the intended objective of these models. In this case, change should be towards shared-power rather than power retention (Foucault, 1979).

Postmodernism

Postmodernism is characterized as a largely deconstructionist philosophy engaged with critiquing and dismantling established pillars of reason (Hassard, 1994). Hassard noted:

In its most stark sense, postmodernism stands for the 'death of reason'. It offers a frontal assault on methodological unity. Through the postmodern method of 'deconstruction' a whole range of philosophical pillars are brought down, the most notable of which are the 'unities' of meaning, theory and the self (Hassard, 1994, p. 303).

Drawing on the works of Baudrillard, Lyotard and Derrida, Hassard identified five key elements of postmodernism he believed relate to social and organizational theory: *representation*, *reflexivity*, *writing*, *difference* and *decentring the subject* (Hassard, 1994, p. 322).

- **Representation**: Attempts to discover the genuine order of things must be regarded as naive and mistaken.
- **Reflexivity**: The ability to be critical of our own intellectual assumptions.
- **Writing**: 'The logocentric image of writing (which sees language as a sign system for concepts which exist independently in the object world) must be overturned.
- **Difference**: We must develop a strategy which reflects but is not consumed by the process of deconstruction.
- **Decentring**: The grand isolation of the modern subject must be replaced with the notion of agency as a system of relations between strata (Hassard, 1994, p. 312).
Although it is touted as ideologically impractical by some, the legacy of postmodernism provided organizational theorists an invitation to deconstruct and question traditional methods of organizational structure (Hassard, 1994; Calas & Smricich 1999).

Poststructuralism

Poststructuralism furthered the postmodern critique by adding value to the deconstruction of current organizational definitions and the challenging of traditional ideals. Derrida (1970) delivered a striking critique of the structure in *Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences*, arguing for movement away from the traditional center.

Calas & Smricich (1999) noted:

> Poststructuralist analyses demonstrate how signification occurs through a constant *deferral of meaning* from one linguistic symbol to another. At its most basic, poststructuralist approaches suggest that there is no stable or original core of signification and, thus, no foundation, no grounding, and no *stable structure* on which meaning can rest. This insight affects, in particular, meanings that claim to be universal or that claim to be progressively moving toward universality, such as the Enlightenment conceptions of knowledge and science (Calas & Smricich, 1999, p. 653).

The legacy of Foucault

Foucault left a legacy of mixed result, with application of his theories being applied both for and against postmodernism and organizational theory (Chan & Garrick, 2002; Knights, 2002). Chan and Garrick (2002) argued that while the contributions of Foucault to organizational theory is dismissed by some, his case for individual freedom is poignant and relevant. Chan and Garrick
(2002) noted that his literary legacy leaves no dogmatic prescription for any one single school of thought. Knights (2002) noted that while mainstream organizational theorists write analysis into Foucault, he challenged his reader to question organizational theory as it is currently understood. Knights (2002) noted that Foucault would likewise challenge the normative structure.

The ‘other’

The introduction of the other as a concept shaped a variety of academic and social discourse from feminism to organizational theory. Hegel introduced the notion of the other as a secondary non-self, noting the perpetual and simultaneous separation and need for interactivity between the other and the self (Edwards & Inwood, 1989). The notion of the other took a stronger connotation when Simone de Beauvoir applied it to her theories on women as the second sex. Woman, when participating in a male-centric society, become others to a hegemonic patriarchal system (de Beauvoir, 1949). De Beauvoir traced the historical roots and contemporary implications of the otherness of woman, setting the groundwork for decades of feminist and gender studies. (de Beauvoir, 1949).

In her 2005 article, Women in Change Management, Melissa Tyler (2005) argued that the feminist studies of Simone de Beauvoir can be used as a lens for critical understanding of managerial studies. Tyler described how a reconsideration of de Beauvoir’s theories in relation to gender balances is appropriate to organizational theory. De Beauvoir argued that sexual differences are social and therefore organizational processes. Within the organizational and traditionally male hierarchical process, women become the other. Applying this to the organizational structure, Tyler (2005) argued that within managerial discourse men are
considered effective managers of change while women, due to their secondary otherness, are ascribed to affective support functions.
HETERARCHY AND THE NEW LEADERSHIP
The traditional hierarchical model effectively served the needs of an industrial society looking for efficiency, accountability and structure. However, society is evolving. Does the traditional model, appropriate at one point in history, best serve the needs of a modern and increasingly postmodern society? Can traditional styles of leaders effectively guide and direct organizations in a global world? Should leadership be required from only a few at the top or from everybody in an organization?

There is no one-size-fits-all model for organizations, although standards and norms are set within certain industries (Fairtlough, 2005; Allee, 2002). Variables such as organizational structure, management approach and gender dynamics all affect the organization and the culture therein (Oerton, 1996). Although there was a time and a place for the traditional machine-like hierarchy, organizations of various types are gradually moving away from that model (Chakravartha & Henderson, 2007; Allee, 2002; Fairtlough, 2005; Thayer, 1981; Hesselbein, & Johnston, 2002). To approach the globalizing nature of a networked, flat world (Friedman, 2006; Allee, 2002) organizations will need to be increasingly communicative and connective (Lipman, 1992). Especially with the advent of the internet, organizations are finding new ways to manage their employees and network with constituents, competitors, vendors and other stakeholders (Allee, 2002). The move away from hierarchy is already apparent.

As organizations change, leadership will also change. A key characteristic of new modes of leadership include sharing power within organizations rather than retaining it at the top (Crosby & Bryson, 1992). In leadership, the credibility and authenticity of both leaders and subordinates are key (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). The ability to mediate and positively transform conflict into a benefit are critical components for everyone within the organization, not just those at the top (Sessa, 1994; Gerzon, 2006). Leaders must also focus on connectivity by building
networks within the organization and across organizational lines (Lipman-Blumen, 1992). The ability to actively guide organizations through uncertainty is also going to be a necessary skill of new leaders (Terry, 2001; Wheatley, 2005). The changing dynamic of society is also a key component in the need for an adaptive organizational model.9

These issues become increasingly consequential when considering nonprofits specifically. Nonprofits exists, in part, to fill community needs left unserved by businesses and government. A traditional business may offer something to sell, refining the product and developing organizational efficiency. Publicly held corporations are committed to growth, increasing in scale over time. A nonprofit, however, serves a different bottom line: the implementation of a mission. A nonprofit’s mission should change and develop as community changes and develops. A nonprofit could also dissolve as their services become irrelevant or their mission fulfilled. Does the hierarchical model adequately serve nonprofits and more importantly, are nonprofit participants content to work in a hierarchical model? Would a nonprofit volunteer-driven organization be better served by an alternative model and if so, what would this model look like?

I propose that a heterarchical system can a successful structure to address the issues outlined in the preceding review, particularly for volunteer-driven nonprofits in an innovation society10. A shared-power heterarchical organization allows an organization the adaptability and flexibility to grow and refine its mission over time, changing as the community it serves changes. A heterarchical structure creates an opportunity for empowerment among the stakeholders of an organization, allowing them a hands on role in implementing the mission. A heterarchical

---

9 For the first time in history, four generations are present in the workplace. (Belkin, 2007). Managers and co-workers need to be able to work in a diversely aged environment.

10 Innovation Society refers to a post-industrial evolutionary stage of society, marked by rapid technological advances, collaboration, increase of global networks and heightened communication.
organization also calls for increased leadership among the members of an organization. Though a
diversion from traditional leadership might pose a concern for some, leadership at all levels can
be a powerful motivating force when put into practice. In harnessing the resources of the
employees and the volunteer base, nonprofits can better utilize a participant’s desire to be
engaged with the mission. Further, I argue that engaging nonprofit workers to lead in a
heterarchical model can trigger increased involvement, creativity and innovation.

The need for a movement away from hierarchy

Hierarchies: An irrelevant model?

Hierarchies are a hegemonic standard in most businesses. Consolidations and mergers
made many large corporations monopolies of power and information. The American patriarchal
society perpetuates and sustains this model, as does the church and many familial households. It
is not to say that the hierarchical method cannot be successful. However, there are inherent
weaknesses that make it less adequate to serve in certain situations. Organizations are becoming
increasingly intertwined and information networks more closely related. Is the traditional
hierarchy still relevant?

The heterarchical solution

Heterarchical organizations embody a shift away from the top-down hierarchical model
into a shared-power, equalized organizational model. A heterarchical organization, a collage of
networks with a fundamentally flat structure, can embrace and appropriate conflict. While
traditional nonprofit models were based on hierarchy, new nonprofit models based on
heterarchical organizations can place more emphasis on collaboration and connectivity. If
successful, workers would not be disengaged from the board or management disengaged from
volunteers. Clients would not be distanced from the bureaucracy that makes decisions about what
services they will receive. All members of an organization are involved and engaged in this
remodeled structure. Further, an organization built to shift and change could be better positioned
to take advantage of innovations, opportunities and adapt to significant events. Should society
make huge changes or shifts in value structures, heterarchies will be better equipped to
accommodate them. A heterarchy would be a complex organization, with a mission permeating
the company as an overarching culture.

What a heterarchical model would look like

Nonprofits boards are required by the federal government to have at least three members.
In traditional organizations individual roles are often needed and a nonprofit board should be no
exception. Although each member could have a specific role, there does not have to be a
hierarchy in the system. In a nonprofit heterarchical organization, I suggest that each board
member has a specific role relating to the services provided by the organization as well as the
organizational need. The leadership style in this structure is relational and shared-power, as
many people would need to work together to achieve the larger mission. Each board member has
one vote in governing processes; no single member would be any more powerful than the other.

Individual leadership is encouraged in heterarchical organizations and in it individual
workers need to take ownership of their roles. The encouragement of creativity and opportunity
for innovation at individual and organizational levels positively affects the overall innovation of
an organization (Light, 1998; Hesselbein, Goldsmith & Somerville, 2002; Wheatley, 2005). A
heterarchical organization embraces this concept, breaking down the structures that perpetuate disempowerment.

This is not to say that a nonprofit heterarchical organization would be free from problems. Features within the structure I propose help to alleviate specific issues. Regular strategic planning sessions help homeostasis and organizations can use this tool to keep the big-picture in mind. To avoid entropy, board members should have rotating terms. Training is incorporated into board terms, so that turnover would be less detrimental to the stability of the organization. Systematic turnover within the board and revolving leadership prevents burnout and encourages the features seen in motivated hot-groups (Lipman-Blumen & Leavitt, 2000; Lipman-Blumen & Leavitt, 2009). Some argue that hierarchies work well in larger organizations. While some nonprofits do grow in scale, other nonprofits remain the same size throughout the life of the organization or even shrink as they fulfill their mission and reduce the need for the services they provide. If growth in any direction would be an issue, this is something that could be identified and planned for during strategic planning sessions.

A nonprofit heterarchical organization also reduces the effect of founder’s syndrome. Founder’s syndrome is an occurrence in the nonprofit community when the originator of an organization, still in charge, is no longer qualified or able to serve the growing or changing needs. Not willing to let go of the organization they birthed, this can pose problems for further growth. In a nonprofit heterarchical organization, the founder incorporates change into their role, planning for a smooth departure and training their successor and others. This helps the long-term sustainability of the organization by focusing on the implementation of the mission, rather than the security of the founder alone.
How might organizations facilitate such a fundamental change from top-down models of leadership into heterarchical organization? Fairtlough (2005) argues, along with Somerville and Goldsmith, that in order to move forward leaders will need to relinquish power and control and employees will need to engage themselves, giving up on the “irresponsibility” prescribed in hierarchy. However, workers engaged in alternative models will need a variety of different skills. “These are interpersonal process skills, and special skills for dialogue, teamwork, mutual respect and openness” (Fairtlough, 2005, p. 63). These skills are often associated with new forms of leadership, which is critical for a heterarchical organization.

Management vs leadership: The increased needs of a heterarchical organization

A transition from hierarchy to heterarchical organization requires an exacting movement away from structural norms. While managers are considered necessary for organizational accountability and efficiency, leadership is needed for organizational guidance and individual accountability. A multiplicity of leadership skills are needed to facilitate a movement away from hierarchy. Personal leadership is needed, as individuals will need to be empowered. This personal leadership could affect an overall team and in order to perform dynamically, the team must be comprised of active and engaged persons. Excellent team leadership is also needed as the nonprofit works as a group to achieve their stated mission. In order to be globally effective, nonprofits also need to consider the impact on the outside community they have while doing their daily work. This type of leadership, leadership in context, would strengthen the impact the organization could have on the community while also strengthening the impact the community could have on the organization in return. Further, a transition to a heterarchical organization entirely would require a dynamic type of organizational leadership; to challenge the traditional
top-down notion of leadership the operating model itself would be effected. Visionary leadership
could guide and shape this process, especially when experimenting in uncharted organizational
territory.

Personal Leadership

A shift into a heterarchical structure will require personal leadership, in turn requiring
empowerment with those at all levels. Within the heterarchical organization I propose, power is
shared between those in the organization, each member having an individual role. These
individual roles exist in tandem with team leadership; although work is done independently it
affects the entire team. Because there is not a top-down hierarchical structure to demand
accountability, it becomes an issue of individual credibility and ethics. As noted by Kouzes and
Posner (1993), credibility is a key to effective leadership in an organization. This breaks down
the assumption that a traditional hierarchical structure is needed in order for accountability to
exist; a heterarchical organization emphasizes the personal integrity of each member as well as
self accountability.

This ideal can also be seen in the for-profit cooperative model. A heterarchical
organization pushes the ideal that an individual leader, through the work with their team and
company, can better attend to the greater good of their community. “Nonprofit organizations
provide unique opportunities for individuals to combine their energy, talents and values for
community improvement and enrichment” (“Principles,” 2005, pgh. 1).
**Team leadership**

Heterarchies also require team leadership. For nonprofits in particular, the mission is intended to drive the entire organization. This mission can provide common ground for relational dialogue; though employees might not always agree on a given method, the end-goal of achieving the mission remains the same. In a heterarchical organization, implementation of a mission is team-centered rather than management-centered. All stakeholders become a part of the process, rather than receiving it as a directive from management. Engagement is encouraged; hierarchies of ideas would not be a stumbling block for those at the bottom of the ladder trying to contribute.

A heterarchical board structure is in essence a dynamic ‘hot group.’ According to the Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt (2009), hot groups celebrate the individuality of their members. They are task oriented, open minded, diverse, innovative, adaptive and hard working; such is the result of individuals highly engaged with their work. Driven by the mission, a ‘hot group’ of the organization could be continually evaluating, improving and innovating. Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt (2009) argue that hot groups such as these foster change and innovation, keeping things moving. Heterarchical boards could also make use of hot groups for various committees; hot groups could be used for specific projects such as fundraisers, transition and recruitment. This would allow an organization the flexibility of tackling additional challenges without stressing the primary heterarchical structure. The heterarchical organization I propose makes effective use of committees and task forces to achieve the mission of the organization and also operates as a learning organization, continually evaluating and readdressing critical issues.
Leadership in context

Leadership in context is important when considering potential implications of a mission, particularly one that goes against the norm. In this case study, it is important to understand that heterarchies are innately more decentralized, requiring more networking than what a traditional hierarchical structure would need. In a similar vein, the phrase “think globally, act locally” was incorporated into the mission of many grassroots and community-minded nonprofits. Considering the local context or global impact of the work done is an important aspect of serving the holistic community. In addition, relationships with others in the community can then nurture the internal processes of the organizations in question.

A great example of leadership in context is the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy in Minneapolis, Minnesota, an organization that works globally to ensure sustainable farming practices. The Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy will often sublet rooms to small nonprofits at low costs, serving as an incubator for the emerging organization. They also serve as a mentoring resource, connecting the smaller nonprofit to networks and resources not easily found. As the incubated organizations grow, they move along to further impact the community. They retain the connection they made in their formative years, keeping in mind the global context of the work they do. Networking within the larger global community is something to be considered, especially in today’s increasingly connected world. A heterarchical structure also allows an organization to be more adaptive to changes within a community, a great demonstration of leadership in context. Because more stakeholders are involved in decision making, adaptation would not need to trickle down as a directive from the top managers. The
organization, more deeply rooted in its community by way of engaged workers, would already be more connected to the situational needs of the various stakeholders.

Organizational leadership

The movement to a heterarchical structure also requires organizational leadership. The mission of a nonprofit would be the common culture of an organization, along with a shared value for respect and transparency (Brown & Iverson, 2004). “Respect and integrity are values achieved only through an internalized ethical culture throughout the organization” (Strickland, R. A., & Vaughan, 2008, p. 247). This is a self-regulating aspect of a system, as it would be rare that a nonprofit volunteer would become a member of an organization for which they did not support the mission. The switch to a heterarchical structure is organizational leadership at its core. By addressing the weaknesses of hierarchical structures, a heterarchical organizations gives its stakeholders and employees a flat, shared-power structure needed to create a dynamic workplace, one that can adapt to a rapidly changing environment.

Visionary leadership

The introduction of a new board structure for nonprofit organizations is also an excellent example of visionary leadership. Issues are not always resolved by retreating to traditional norms. Creative problem solving takes innovation and vision, things both the nonprofit and for-profit industries needs. Vision is not solely forward-looking, either. Visionary leadership is holistic, taking into consideration historical context as well current needs. This is clearly seen in the case of heterarchies, which are not entirely new structures. As mentioned previously,
Stephenson (2009) argues that as our world becomes increasingly connected, we will need to form a new structure that embraces our ancestral network tendencies with the current market: the heterarchical organization.

A heterarchical organization challenges the members of an organization to take on leadership roles, which engages them with implementing the organization’s mission. Each member is responsible for leadership and accountability for themselves, their co-workers and the organization. In a heterarchical organization various leadership styles would be needed and used, and they could be implemented throughout the organization and developed further in individual roles.

**Theoretical conclusions**

A heterarchical organization, though in some ways challenging, can be a suitable alternative model for contemporary nonprofit organizations. However, this idea still exists largely in theory and not often practiced. Though shared-power models occur in cooperative organizations, heterarchical nonprofit models have not been researched in academia.

In theory, a heterarchical organization can be expected to exhibit several characteristics:

- Power and decision making will be shared
- Communication will increase
- Collaboration and informal networks will increase
- Conflict will serve as a catalyst for growth and further development
- Individual participation and engagement within the organization will increase
• Management from those traditionally in charge will decrease
• The organization will be more adaptive to changes in the external environment
• The organization will be better positioned to adapt to the changing needs of their constituency
• The need for a variety of leadership styles will increase

In her 2008 presentation on *integrative leadership*\(^{11}\) Ospina (2008) noted that academia largely neglects the work of small grassroots organizations in its research. Further, definitive guiding literature for heterarchical organizations is lacking (Anklam 2009). “If we trust our ability to approach complex systems in ways that do not shoehorn rules and measurements into a structure, but which honor adaptability and stewardship, then we may develop the tools we need to make our way across and within a new kind of sprawl” (Anklam, 2009, p. 11). Organizations experimenting with new structural models will need unique support from their leaders and members as well as academia. In the following chapters I hope to add a voice for small grassroots organizations in the growing academic dialogues on leadership, nonprofit management and organizational change.

---

\(^{11}\) The notion of *integrative leadership*, though new in term, is not new in practice. Integrative leadership values making connections and nurturing relationships across sectors, using several styles of leadership throughout.
PRACTICAL USE OF HETERARCHY
There is a critical need for leadership and innovation in contemporary community arts organizations (Clapp, 2009). As nonprofit organizations struggle with limited funds, arts organizations are often the first to be sacrificed on the chopping block of resource distribution. At a time of high unemployment, decreased volunteerism and limited funding, how will small grassroots organizations find sustainability, particularly in the arts?

This is the challenge that I faced with my own arts organization, Altered Esthetics. At a time of decreased resources, how would I make a young, offbeat arts organization sustainable? How would I engage the rest of the board members in our mission, encouraging individual leadership and empowering others? The leadership challenges faced in heterarchical organizations are connected with the challenges I faced with Altered Esthetics. To help contextualize the story, however, I will begin with the history of the organization.

In 2003 I moved to Minnesota from Southern California. In addition to finding a place with a reasonable cost of living, I wanted to become a part of the growing, vibrant arts community. Shortly after the move I opened a community arts organization, Altered Esthetics. The goal was to create a resource for the community, a non-commercial gallery where artists could safely communicate with their work. With the help of friends and volunteers, Altered Esthetics opened in April 2004 with our first group exhibit, *The Art of War*. Since that inception, Altered Esthetics introduced the work of over 1,000 artists to the public, hosting over fifty group exhibitions and engaging people in the arts through a variety of themes.

After two years of serving the community with group exhibitions and other services, I reflected on the organization as a whole. A transition to nonprofit status would resolve several issues. As a nonprofit, our existence would not be tied to one key person as it was with a sole
proprietorship. The nonprofit model would also demonstrate the transparency already valued in
the organization. Further, as a nonprofit we would be eligible for grants and fundraising
opportunities available to other community arts organizations like ourselves. Wanting to create a
continued resource for the community and valuing the transparency and mission of the nonprofit
community, I decided to apply for nonprofit status. A founding board was created and a mission
crafted: “Altered Esthetics works to sustain the historical role of artists as a true voice of society
through our exhibits, events, services, workshops and programs.” We applied for and obtained
our 501(c)3 nonprofit status, one big step closer to sustainability.

We continued to grow as an organization. We ramped up our exhibition schedule and
moved to a larger location, still in Northeast Minneapolis. However as time went on it became
clear that maintaining a small board structure was not sustainable, especially considering our
expanding program services and new nonprofit requirements. As a board, we discussed what the
next steps could be, from hiring an executive director or a part time staff person, to continuing as
a working board. We brought on additional board members and I gradually began training others
to take over the work I had previously done alone. However, the gradual delegation of random
tasks was not enough. The growing number of tasks the organization needed to complete were
very time consuming, a problem that would only become exacerbated with additional growth.
Being an organization run by volunteers was valued by those on the board, but our growth and
the stress that resulted was a catalyst for change.

In 2008 I enrolled in the Master of Liberal Studies program at the University of
Minnesota. Through this program, I began to explore alternative models and innovative
structures. I decided to use my master’s degree as an opportunity to research and explore shared-
power organizational models and began to take courses in innovation, leadership and nonprofit management. In Society 3.0, an Innovation Studies class, I learned more about leaderless models and the societal movement towards networks. There I began my research and created the initial model for a nonprofit heterarchical organization. Many of the tasks I had originally handled alone could be broken down into specific roles. Through conversation with board members, interns and volunteers, I began to break the roles of the organization into several manageable components that could each be assumed by one volunteer. Throughout this process board membership grew. A heterarchical structure was proposed, and the board voted unanimously to proceed with implementation. Fortunate to have a dedicated base of volunteers, we were able to fill all roles internally with persons already committed to the organization. Board members were trained and began assuming their new positions in early 2009, with additional board members being trained and oriented throughout the year. The overall goal of the model was to create a more sustainable infrastructure for the young organization to grow and develop according to the mission, thus becoming a more dynamic, evolving resource for the community.

The transition to heterarchical organization triggered a wide range of leadership challenges. The classes on leadership I took through the Humphrey Institute helped give me conflict resolution skills and additional strategic planning skills that were needed as I went through this process. A communications course, Communication in Human Organizations, was an excellent exploration. It gave me the background on organizational models I needed to properly understand hierarchy, the flaws in the traditional system and the challenges that come with innovative and non-normative structures. As part of an independent study I constructed a literature review in communications theory, leadership, nonprofit management and philosophy;
this literature gave me the proper academic context in which to base my study and subsequent reflections.

As founder of Altered Esthetics I spent a good deal of time in the past five years encouraging additional participation from artists, volunteers, board members and interns. Pushing for a more decentralized process, great progress was made in delegating responsibilities away from myself as the founding member and empowering others within the organization. The last transition moved us away from the traditional hierarchical structure to a heterarchical organization in a deliberate attempt to promote the increased participation and engagement from all of our stakeholders.

The role of information technology was a critical component to the transition of our organization. Altered Esthetics is an organization run entirely by volunteers, most of whom work full time in addition to their service at the gallery. Organizational information existed in heads and on various computers. Although board members and volunteers are trained as they come and go, that training needs to be repeated with each cycle. One of the primary steps in this transition was decentralization of information to all parties of the organization. A wiki, or website with easily editable pages, was started to consolidate and connect information to everyone on the board. This moved information away from brains and various computers to one organized, accessible location. The wiki could also nurture the communication of other members on the board (See wiki pageflow - Appendix 4). A wiki was chosen as the tool for online organization due to its flexibility, variety of resources and relatively easy implementation.12 The extensive use

---

12 Concurrently used by the organization are blogs, online social networking platforms and a public website. An additional resource used frequently by the organization is Google Documents. Google Documents serve the same function as Word and Excel type programs, however the documents exist online and can be constructed and edited collaboratively.
of online tools allowed volunteers and board members to work remotely, eliminating a frequent need for travel to and from the gallery for simple tasks that could otherwise be done from home.

After implementing the heterarchical organization, my next steps were to provide a reflection on the implementation process, the transition and the newly shaping structure. In order to substantiate the thesis proposed in this study and guide the reflection, a survey was given to the active board of Altered Esthetics. The survey tested the live application of the following thesis: heterarchical governance and operations models provide a well-structured, alternative model for nonprofit organizations in an innovation society, one that nurtures engagement, innovation and creativity.
Board Survey

Introduction: Relevance

The following board survey was used as a tool for reflection on the implementation of a heterarchical organization at Altered Esthetics. As argued throughout this thesis, a heterarchical organization encourages the engagement and participation of all members within an organization. If accurate, members of Altered Esthetics should have an intimate awareness of the implications of a new structure, as well as the changes it brought to the organization. If the claims made in my study hold, there would be a relative consensus across the board about the positive implications heterarchical organization can have on communication, innovation and engagement. After implementing the survey, conclusions were drawn about the relative success implementing a heterarchical organization had on the nonprofit. Though not intended to be quantitative or universally applicable to all organizations, the reflections and responses could be helpful to the organization in question and serve as a starting point for further research and additional studies on the heterarchical model.

Question construction and methodology

To test and reflect upon my thesis, the following questions were created and sent to the board for reflection and evaluation:

- Do heterarchical organizations increase opportunities for engagement?
- Do heterarchical organizations increase the opportunity or need for communication?
- Do heterarchical organizations provide more opportunities for individual and/or shared-power leadership within an organization?
- Do heterarchical organizations foster an innovative environment?
• Is a heterarchical organization more adaptive to changes within the community?

The answers, if appropriate, could then be interpreted as claims or evidence for the following:

• Communication throughout any change process or innovative structure is key

• Heterarchical organization are more adaptive to change in their environments and are more communicative structures, providing more opportunities for individual engagement and organizational innovation.

The following questions were asked at the onset of the survey to derive background and establish context for the participant. For example, if somebody joined the board at a later date, the change in organizational structure might not be as apparent as it would be if the board member was with the organization during the time of hierarchy.

• When did you join the board of Altered Esthetics.

• What is your role?

• What is your level of experience with nonprofit management in addition to your role at this organization? Please describe.

The heterarchical organization at Altered Esthetics was created to encourage engagement and personal empowerment of the board members. Questions regarding the personal engagement of board members might help show if the structure was indeed successful or not in increasing board member engagement. This lead to the formation of the first question: do heterarchical structures increase opportunities for engagement?
Although there are not many live heterarchical models to examine, the literature that exists on heterarchies theorizes that this type of organizational structure will have an increased level of inter-organizational communication. When implementing the heterarchical organization, a wiki that included a discussion forum was created to help curb communication overload. Was this a wise decision? Did communication increase? Questions about communication will serve to evaluate increased communication in heterarchical organizations. In this situation, the result could be causal; a heterarchical organization will most likely increase the need for inter-organizational communication. To explore these questions I asked the board: do heterarchical structures increase the opportunity or need for communication?

For the heterarchical structure to work fluidly, individual leadership needs to be present. Board members need to be personally accountable and responsible for what is occurring in their own roles. Did board members feel more engaged or empowered? Questions about the opportunities should help to identify if board members were more empowered. To resolve this, I asked: do heterarchical structures provide more opportunities for individual and/or shared-power leadership within an organization?

It is argued (Fairthlough, 2005; Allee, 2002) that heterarchical or networked organizations allow for greater innovation. Is this an accurate claim? This relationship is not necessarily causal; heterarchies do not cause innovation, rather they allow the innovation of the organizational members to surface and thrive. To draw a conclusion, I needed the board to respond to the following: do heterarchical structures foster an innovative environment?
Questions about the acceptance of new ideas, feedback or change might demonstrate that the organization is indeed flexible and adaptive to changes. This lead to my final question: Is a heterarchical structure more adaptive to changes within the community?

**Administration**

The nature of the board questions and the study were addressed in an October 2009 Altered Esthetics board meeting. Participation was optional but encouraged. Board questions were later sent via email to allow board members to respond electronically if they preferred. Responses were not anonymous when they were turned in, but were anonymized for use in this reflection. A copy of the questions as they were distributed can be seen in Appendix 2a.

**Reliability**

Seven of ten board members responded to the survey, not including the author. While the reflections are derived from a single organization and should not be considered universals, the challenges incurred can be helpful as other nonprofits begin to explore alternative models.

**Analysis of results**

Results were analyzed by reading through all board surveys thoroughly while also taking into consideration the context of the board member’s role and length of time on the board. The board member responses were personal reactions of the practical impact of a heterarchical organizational structure on a board model and considered valid as responsive accounts. As the study centers around individual engagement in a structure, feedback from the participants was critical in the evaluation of the model’s success.
REFLECTION
Benefits of heterarchical organizations

Increased communication

Heterarchies are likely to increase communication within an organization. As more members are networked together, communication ramps up, rather than being directed and filtered from the top-down. In an increasingly globalized world, networked communication is growing as a value in and between organizations. In a hierarchy, information flows from the top-down. Gangle (1998) discusses the need for transparency across organizations, noting that even the attempted balanced of nonprofit boards and staff is subject to error; a dangerous situation can occur if one or more channels of communication are corrupt. Even in nonprofits, business models that arguably value transparency, information is not always shared.

At Altered Esthetics our heterarchical organization opened the lines of communication between board members and volunteers that may not have otherwise worked together. This has allowed for the formation of new ideas as well as resolution to various problems. “We have spent a great deal of time brainstorming ideas and strategies to improve our organization, so board members feel very comfortable expressing opinions and new ideas” (Respondent 1, 2009).

Innovation

Heterarchies can also foster innovation from individual members. Because decision making and leadership are shared, a dialogue is key to completing any given organizational task. Through the members’ dialogue, more ideas are expressed. This can be seen clearly in the structural change at Altered Esthetics; “as each person takes over their role on the board, they are encouraged to share new ideas for best practices. Ideas are encouraged, acknowledged,
supported, and often used” (Respondent 3, 2009). When asked if innovation at the organization increased or decreased, Respondent 1 (2009) had the following to say:

Increased! Especially as we are settling into our new roles and bring in more perspectives from newer board members and new interns, we are coming up with so many new ideas for the gallery. From smaller decisions, like the organizational details for the 2009 spring fundraiser (re-working the raffle process, coming up with games and entertainment, etc.) to larger ones, like choosing to add on an entirely new program (solo exhibitions) and bringing on a new board member to oversee it – and even the number of ideas we came up with for the 2010 exhibition calendar – we seem to be overflowing with ideas these days. I would certainly contribute this to the change in board structure, since we are all much more involved in aspects of the gallery in addition to our “main” roles.

In a traditional nonprofit, this would not always be the case, as nonprofit board members are often constrained by traditional roles. Although they may be skilled or willing to help, they are situationally unable (Credit Union Directors Newsletter, 2004).

Engagement

Engagement of employees or members is a critical component of any organization, particularly a nonprofit. According to Cornforth (2001) the effectiveness of a board varies with the member’s ability, time and the skills they bring to the table. It is the successful combination of assets that create a great output for the organization. If any of these are lacking, the outcome will suffer accordingly. A heterarchical organization, interdependent in form, requires and fosters greater engagement from the members.
At Altered Esthetics, responsibility is shared and engagement increased. Board members thus feel a greater sense of accountability directly related to the responsibility of their position. “There is more individual responsibility, so the members are more engaged. They feel personally responsible for and valuable to the organization” (Respondent 3, 2009). In an organization driven entirely by volunteers, this personal engagement and accountability is a critical component. Without the extrinsic motivator of a paycheck, it is the intrinsic motivation of achieving the mission that drives the members of a heterarchical organization to work together.

Leadership

I believe guiding an organization through dynamic change takes a specific kind of leadership. For me personally, this is not something I could have done in the very first formative year or two of the gallery. Until I grew to be more confident in the work I was doing and my ability to teach, sharing leadership in this organization was a challenge. A big change occurred in my life when I began to think of the footprint I was leaving, not just on the earth itself but in my community and the organizations I participate in. Taking a “what happens when I’m gone” view and applying it to my own life, I made a series of key decisions. First and foremost, I wanted my work efforts in life to go toward something positive. Since then, I have tried to incorporate this mentality into how I earn a living by considering what company I work for as well as what tasks I do. The gallery is an interesting experiment in this regard. Most people begin a company with the end-goal of being self employed or sometimes, getting rich and not being employed at all. Although the possibility of earning a living through the gallery has been brought to the table at times, the overarching, long-term goal is to develop a sustainable organization that remains a resource for the community even when I’m gone. That is not meant to sound entirely morbid, but
any life circumstance can potentially draw one away from an organization. Life is about more than just what is a part of my day-to-day and if I planed accordingly neither I nor my organization will be entirely overwhelmed if or when I am drawn away. Creating an organization that would be sustainable with or without me would be a unique challenge, one that would benefit myself, the organization and the community.

Although the transition from hierarchy to heterarchy requires a tense movement away from structural norms, it can properly address some of the additional challenges leaders face in a modern society. In order to be successful, organizations can transform the shape of business as well as the leaders that operate within it. A multiplicity of leadership skills is needed to create this movement. Personal leadership would be needed, as individuals will need to be empowered within their organizations. This personal leadership would affect the overall organization; in order to perform dynamically, the team must be comprised of active and engaged persons. In order to be globally effective, nonprofits would also need to consider their impact on the outside community. This type of leadership in context would strengthen the impact the organization structure could have on the community while also strengthening the impact the community could have on the organization. Further, the transition in its entirety would require a dynamic type of organizational leadership; to challenge the traditional top-down notion of leadership the operating model itself would be effected.

Complications of heterarchical organization

Although heterarchies have clear benefits both in theory and practice, they are not without complication. A better understanding of the potential complications of a heterarchical organization can lead to greater success in implementation.
Increased communication

With the benefit of the heightened communication of a heterarchical organization also comes the potential for communication overload. Seshadri & Carstenson, (2007) discuss the critical need for communication in nonprofit organizations and how most executives are now using digital communication, particularly email, as the communication method of choice.13

This is a weighted issue at Altered Esthetics; our e-mail communication has increased dramatically, especially as we have many board members and volunteers working independently from home at odd hours. This, however, is not without complication. Since email is a communication tool able to be used without secondary connotations, it should be handled appropriately and with caution. At Altered Esthetics we value communication, understand the heightened need for it, but also try to be aware of the potentially negative implications. Attempts to practice good e-mail etiquette and digital communication are appreciated. Communication is a tool and is used as such. According to Respondent 5, 2009:

“I think there as been an increase in communication with the new structure. Now with the new structure board members know where to direct certain questions and problems to the appropriate director to handle the problem, without having to go through others to get to the appropriate person.”

13 Sheshadri & Carstenson (2007) argue that an understanding of the potential complications that can arise via email use, as well as appreciation of the perception of the receiver, is critical. They note that disputes are harder to attenuate via email, as email lacks the culture cues received in face to face conversation, heightening misinterpretation on the part of the receiver and occasional assumption on the part of the sender. According to the authors, conflicts are more easily generated via emails and often harder to resolve. Seshadri and Carstenson (2007) suggest that in order to combat potential negative implications of e-communication, employees should become culturally literate. They also suggest leaders should be aware of the communications styles of their constituents, and tie the communication media to the importance of the message. Negative emotions should be managed and social graces should be maintained. The authors conclude with a reminder that e-communication is not just about words but also about meanings.
Being aware of the right channels and using email as a tool is a big component of communicating effectively. As an organization we addressed this by limiting e-mail communication, developing online forums for discussion and curbing “reply-all” activity.

Reframing conflicts

A heterarchical organization, like any organization, is composed of individuals. Between individuals there can be power struggles and conflicts. In a nonprofit, sometimes a mission will be the glue that brings individuals together and helps mitigate conflicts. However, another perspective is that conflicts, when properly framed, can be a benefit. Sessa (1994) argues that team members who participate in conflict have a higher survival rate and feel more engaged with their organization. In a heterarchical organization, conflict resolution skills need to be present among all members of an organization; even in the case of a mission driven organization, it is possible that various members will have multiple ideas for how best to interpret or implement the mission. Compromise and collaboration will need to be present in order for a heterarchical organization to continually move forward, even in times of conflict.

As a group exercise, the board at Altered Esthetics participated in the Shockley-Zalabak (2009) Conflict Resolution Survey (See Appendix 3). The results for individual members were rated from high to low between the following: avoidance, accommodation, compromise, competition and collaboration. Not surprisingly, the board members were predominantly collaborative, an attribute that nurtures our collaborative organization. The board also showed willingness to compromise. The least common attribute was avoidance, seconded by competition. The board does not shy away from challenges, even difficult ones. This collaborative mindset could also help offset negative consequences power struggles may have.
The conflicts that occur as a result of increased communication or greater diversity, can be resolved a number of ways. As noted previously, conflict can be reframed by using it as a catalyst for positive change. Education and board training in empathy and conflict resolution also can increase the resilience of an organization when going through difficult times. Through board reviews and reflections, we also draw out ways to improve our contributions.

**Individuals in heterarchical non-profit organizations**

As discussed previously, a shift into heterarchical structure requires personal leadership, self-accountability and empowerment. An individual leader can better attend to the greater good of their community by working collaboratively with their team and company. However not each individual will respond to the introduction of a heterarchical organization in the same way, even if everybody is on the same page about the transition.

*Reactions to a new organizational model*

As we implemented a heterarchical organization at our nonprofit, over the course of the following year I observed a variety of reactions from our various board members through meetings, emails, board members and board member reviews. These observations are an interesting introduction to the possible reactions that can occur in implementing a non-traditional structure. At Altered Esthetics, reactions across the board ranged in the following ways:

- Excitement - Board members were excited to participate in a new challenge, having an active role in shaping an organization. Though a transition away from a well established hierarchy could be met with some resistance, at Altered Esthetics there
was an excitement to move towards a new model. This could be in part because the organization was young and board members were willing and wanting to engage.

- Empowerment - Board members were empowered to help create and refine their own roles, contributing ideas and structure about positions and the overall organization.

- Being Overwhelmed - Certain initial board members were not ready to take on additional workloads or did not fully understand them. For these board members, an initial feeling of being overwhelmed by either their role or the increased communication was seen.

- Avoidance - After accepting new roles in the system, some board members initially avoided responsibility and transfer. This was due to several factors, the largest of which was the number of obligations board members had outside the gallery. Communication from the rest of the board helped stem issues of avoidance.

- Disengagement - One or two board members, not able to support in the additional capacity needed, terminated their board service or retired from the board.

- Regression - A few board members, on several occasions, reverted back to former procedural norms. This was accounted for in transition and training and was not detrimental to the process.

- Re-creation - In a few instances, hierarchy was recreated. This happened in either team or group settings. In some cases this was a natural evolution, in other cases it was intentional. Certain instances require mentorship, in which case hierarchy is appropriate. One example could be seen in the grantsmanship committee. An informal hierarchy was established for the purpose of training committee members in the
proposal writing process. For the purposes of education, a hierarchical mentorship
model in certain instances was sustained.

- Role-sharing - In several instances, role sharing was proposed. This served as a useful
tool when implementing new services, such as a workshops program. As the
organization grew, roles responded accordingly. In limited instances where one role
became too much for one person due to medical reasons or time limitations, roles
were split or shared successfully.

The implications of heterarchies in organizations can be broad. Within organizations,
heterarchical structures could increase engagement, change the norm of internal leadership and
foster innovation. The emergence of alternatively structured organizations will also shape the
norms and traditional assumptions in society. As we try new organizational structures, we can
also learn from them.
FINAL THOUGHTS
In light of the recession, I firmly believe Altered Esthetics made a solid choice in switching to a shared-power, heterarchical model. Staying volunteer-driven allowed our organization to remain both flexible and strong, critical attributes in today’s economic climate. The quality of our services improved as result of having specialized roles for our board members and at a time when many nonprofits are consolidating, downsizing or even closing their doors, Altered Esthetics is growing.

Based on observations made from the literature as well as practical application I have shown that the heterarchical model can indeed be a suitable alternative for the traditional hierarchical model in grassroots nonprofit organizations. Heterarchical organization can also address some of the issues faced in traditional hierarchy through increased employee engagement and shared-power. The interdependent heterarchical model can also be more flexible and make effective use of conflict. Although it does require greater communication, it can harness that energy to increase innovation, engagement and creativity among its members.

Volunteer-driven nonprofit organizations may find greater benefits in flexibility, innovation and sustainability if they remove themselves from the hegemony of hierarchy and reconfigure into flatter, shared-power heterarchical organizational structures.

Over the past few years, my research and work at Altered Esthetics has been met with a mix of skepticism, excitement and confusion. Why would I not place myself as a paid director? Why would I plan for my own transition? These questions lead me to wonder: why is there a fear associated with a movement away from hierarchy? Why are more founders not planning to make the organizations truly sustainable resources for their community, with or without their presence? Are we accustomed to looking for a great leader in those at the helm of our organizations, thus placing all of our faith in that one person? Does the public simply want someone to be
accountable or does the public want someone to blame if something goes wrong? Do we simply not trust our employees - or ourselves - to be accountable to anyone other than a parental figure?

At Altered Esthetics, rather than trying to grow into a hierarchy, we flattened our operations and remained entirely volunteer driven. Rather than selfimplode, as some would have guessed, the results have been extraordinary. At a time when many nonprofits are consolidating, downsizing, or even closing their doors, Altered Esthetics is growing by leaps and bounds. We’ve also improved our transparency, communications and accountability. Further, remaining thin helped us financially as well. On an annual budget that’s the size of the average American salary, we’ve sustained ourselves as an incredible resource for the community.

This structure could have very exciting implications for nonprofit organizations. Though I have presented a case study utilizing a volunteer-driven organization, further studies can be done with cooperative models in organizations with paid staff persons. Utilizing shared-power structures could lead to decreased overhead management expenses, more active and engaged employees and collaboration where there was previously competition and ladder-climbing. Executive Directors will find themselves in the role of facilitator and co-leader, rather than Chief Executive Officers.

Nonprofits must rise to face their challenges and regain their status as trustworthy resources for the community. They need to be leaders in their field, willing partners with other nonprofits, and facilitators of community action. By communicating often with their constituents, they will be better and more dynamic resources for those they serve. For these nonprofits that are now expected to do more with less, the hierarchical model is decreasingly effective. To engage their members and serve their constituents well, to facilitate creativity and innovation, volunteer-driven nonprofits must have a flexible and organic heterarchical organizational structure.
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Appendix 1 - Ae Model

1.a Heterarchical Structure

Note. Altered Esthetics Heterarchical Board Structure: A working board made up of a combination of stakeholders in which each board member performs a specific organizational role and has one vote; the board operates under a shared powered structure. Committees operate independent of the board and can be comprised of board members and non-board member stakeholders. Direct communication lines note which board members have specific functions related to either the committee or stakeholder group noted. Communication and information sharing occurs throughout the organization.
Altered Esthetics - Heterarchical Structure

Stakeholders
- Interns
- Community
- Donors
- Artists
- Volunteers

Board Members
- Gallery Director
- Assistant Relations Director
- Exhibitions Director
- Chair
- Treasurer
- Secretary
- Development Director
- Intern & Volunteer Coordinator
- IT Director*
- Education Director*
- Communications Director
- Design Director
- Promotions Director

Committees
- Management Committee
- Exhibition Committees
- ADA Access Committee
- Grantwriting Committee
- Fundraiser Committee
- Recognition Committee
- Street Team

Single Person
- Group
- Direct Connection
Appendix 2 - Board Questionnaire

2.a Questionnaire as delivered to board

Altered Esthetics - Board Questionnaire

Over the past few years we have been shaping Altered Esthetics into a heterarchical, more shared-power board structure. As a board member of the organization and a part of this transitional process, your feedback is extremely valuable. Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability and knowledge. The feedback from these questions will be compiled and presented as part of a thesis project for the Master of Liberal Studies program at the University of Minnesota. Thank you for your participation!

- Name:
- When did you join the Altered Esthetics board of directors?
- What is your role?
- What is your level of experience with nonprofit management in addition to your role at this organization? Please describe.
- Has communication among members increased or decreased as a result of the new structure? Please detail.
- Have new ideas or innovations from other members in the organization increased or decreased as a result of this new structure? Please detail or give examples.
- Are the board members more engaged or less engaged after this transition? Please describe.
- Are the board members more empowered or less empowered after this transition? Please describe.
- Comments:
2.b Board Responses

Name:
Respondent 1

When did you join the Altered Esthetics board of directors?
January 2008

What is your role?
Board Treasurer

What is your level of experience with nonprofit management in addition to your role at this organization? Please describe.
I had limited experience with actual nonprofit management. I had managed a college-level concert band and completed an internship coordinating an educational conference, but had not worked specifically within the nonprofit sector.

Has communication among members increased or decreased as a result of the new structure? Please detail.
With the new structure, communication has increased dramatically among board members – to the point where we are looking for alternatives to try to streamline our email communications. Now that Jamie is not as closely tied to each facet of the gallery, we rely much more on each other for answers and support. Additionally, we have spent a great deal of time brainstorming ideas and strategies to improve our organization, so board members feel very comfortable expressing opinions and new ideas.

Have new ideas or innovations from other members in the organization increased or decreased as a result of this new structure? Please detail or give examples.
Increased! Especially as we are settling into our new roles and bring in more perspectives from newer board members and new interns, we are coming up with so many new ideas for the gallery. From smaller decisions, like the organizational details for the 2009 spring fundraiser (re-working the raffle process, coming up with games and entertainment, etc.) to larger ones, like choosing to add on an entirely new program (solo exhibitions) and bringing on a new board member to oversee it – and even the number of ideas we came up with for the 2010 exhibition calendar – we seem to be overflowing with ideas these days. I would certainly contribute this to the change in board structure, since we are all much more involved in aspects of the gallery in addition to our “main” roles.

Are the board members more engaged or less engaged after this transition? Please describe.
Board members are so much more engaged than before. In the last several months, we have really begun to take ownership of our roles. I came in just before the transition began, and we have steadily changed from Janie getting the ball rolling on everything to all of us taking initiative on our own. Again, to echo my previous answer, our involvement in multiple aspects of the gallery (through participation on various committees) in addition to our primary roles...
encourages us to take additional responsibilities and engage even more with the gallery and our staff.

Are the board members more empowered or less empowered after this transition? Please describe.
Much more empowered! Again, now that we have all gained ownership of our roles, we are feeling more confident to make independent decisions and come up with new ideas to continually improve our organization and further advance our mission.

Comments:
Our work to take gallery leadership and decentralize it from being board director-centered has really strengthened our organization as a whole. Our board members can work independently and interdependently, and rather than being the driving force behind most of the gallery operations, Jamie has grown to be more of a guiding force. The main goal with the new structure was to increase sustainability, and from the growth we have already experienced, I believe we are well on our way.

Name:
Respondent 2

When did you join the Altered Esthetics board of directors?
Feb. 2008

What is your role?
Exhibitions Director and Chair of Exhibitions Committee

What is your level of experience with nonprofit management in addition to your role at this organization? Please describe.
I have worked for nonprofits and was a co-chair of a nonprofit grassroots organization MPIRG. Also, a member of Amnesty International in Duluth, MN.

Has communication among members increased or decreased as a result of the new structure? Please detail.
The communication has only become stronger. With the more that we do the more we stay connected and actually we all know that in order for the organization to work at its best everyone must keep everyone else on track. This takes communication. Because we all work well together and all enjoy each other this helps the organization and each one of us stay on track.

Have new ideas or innovations from other members in the organization increased or decreased as a result of this new structure? Please detail or give examples.
They have increased. Because I have only been here less than a year on the Board I do not have much else to go on but the new structure; but I can relate it back to my job now and there is a
distinct difference between a hierarchy structure and its member to a heterarchy structure. Because we take into account each person and their ideas. Not one person makes the decisions and this allows for great ideas to foster. No one feels like their opinion does not matter because we are all given the same amount of power. All voices must be heard in order to get the most out of the Board and make the best organization we can. This takes many people not just one and that is what our Board takes in consideration. It's wonderful.

Are the board members more engaged or less engaged after this transition? Please describe.
More. Like I mentioned above, I'm new; but I think it can only make things more engaging we are open for discussion because everyone is able to express themselves and not one of us is being shot down for our ideas. This creates an understanding that everyone functions because of everyone else. Everyone matters in our organization. Again. Wonderful.

Are the board members more empowered or less empowered after this transition? Please describe.
More empowered. Because if your voice and your ideas are being validated, which I feel they are; the more empowered one becomes. I know, for myself, it is frustrating when you bring up an idea and it is shot down by the person in the power/top role. It is not like that here. Which allows me to open up more and then allows for even more creativity. The creativity allows for progression and this is what this Board structure is about; progression, creativity, and validation of everyone and their ideas.

Comments:
I can not think of how many times I'm thankful to know and be apart of an organization which really leaves me filling fulfilled and appreciated. My job right now I bring up ideas and they are not even taken into account they are not even up for question; but Altered Esthetics as an organization and a Board they do. I am very grateful to be here and know that there are places out there in the world knowing that things work better with more than one mind making the decisions. Thank you!

Name:
Respondent 3

When did you join the Altered Esthetics board of directors?
January 2009

What is your role?
Gallery Director

What is your level of experience with nonprofit management in addition to your role at this organization? Please describe.
I have not been on the board of a nonprofit before this, but volunteered for Free Arts MN for three years.

**Has communication among members increased or decreased as a result of the new structure? Please detail.**
The communication has increased. With each member in control of a certain role in the organization, and the overlap between these roles, communication has been very necessary. If anything, the board errrs on the side of too much communication, which is a wonderful problem to have.

**Have new ideas or innovations from other members in the organization increased or decreased as a result of this new structure? Please detail or give examples.**
As each person takes over their role on the board, they are encouraged to share new ideas for best practices. Ideas are encouraged, acknowledged, supported, and often used.

**Are the board members more engaged or less engaged after this transition? Please describe.**
There is more individual responsibility, so the members are more engaged. They feel personally responsible for and valuable to the organization.

**Are the board members more empowered or less empowered after this transition? Please describe.**
The high personal responsibility also results in a feeling of empowerment. Each member is responsible for many aspects of running the gallery, working with other board members to plan and execute, sharing new ideas and brainstorming effectiveness of current practices.

**Comments:**

---

**Name:**
Respondent 4

**When did you join the Altered Esthetics board of directors?**
January 2007

**What is your role?**
Multi-Media Director

**What is your level of experience with nonprofit management in addition to your role at this organization? Please describe.**
Minimal, before accepting the board position at Altered Esthetics, I had no volunteer or nonprofit experience.
Has communication among members increased or decreased as a result of the new structure? Please detail.
Increased heavily, by defining individuals roles and creating a structure of accountability, it has promoted communication and eased the openness between members by defining who's roles align with your tasks in order to educate you on who to talk to on specific issues.

Have new ideas or innovations from other members in the organization increased or decreased as a result of this new structure? Please detail or give examples.
Increased heavily once again. By creating a larger, more opinionated board we have been able to create a creative environment with structure to support each individuals voice. By assuring each member that their voice can be heard, it has actually built a respect for constructive criticism and by following a strict voting process it has lowered the chances of members feeling slighted if their idea is not used.

Are the board members more engaged or less engaged after this transition? Please describe.
More, as I said above, the new structure has defined actual roles and tasks for each member, not only does that help the member stay on track and increase their productivity, but it also holds accountability to the member and their role, so slacking off because "someone" else might do it has been eliminated.

Are the board members more empowered or less empowered after this transition? Please describe.
I feel that the board itself is more empowered, not so much each individual. By creating roles that support the board and the gallery as a whole, the team itself has become empowered and supportive of each other. And by creating a situation where there is no "do-all" member to fall back on or scapegoat, it unites the members and increases the communication, and gives each member ownership of their role and a sense of pride for themselves and respect for everyone else.

Comments:
Support, Respect and Communication have been key in this transition and I honestly feel that a "never ending story" style of productivity and change will help this board continue to be strong, creative and productive.

Name:
Respondent 5

When did you join the Altered Esthetics board of directors?
February 2008

What is your role?
Design Director

What is your level of experience with nonprofit management in addition to your role at this organization? Please describe.
Prior to joining Altered esthetics I had no other experience with nonprofit organization management. As Design Director, I have experience from a BFA in Graphic Design, as well as doing pro-bono design work for other nonprofit organizations.

Has communication among members increased or decreased as a result of the new structure? Please detail.
I think there as been an increase in communication with the new structure. Now with the new structure board members know where to direct certain questions and problems to the appropriate director to handle the problem, with out having to go through others to get to the appropriate person.

Have new ideas or innovations from other members in the organization increased or decreased as a result of this new structure? Please detail or give examples.
The structure has allowed the directors to focus more on their individual and the ideas that pertain to that role. However, fresh ideas and a different perspective from other directors is always helpful. The rest of the board of directors are always there to ask about other matters.

Are the board members more engaged or less engaged after this transition? Please describe.
I feel that the new structure are more engaged and empowered by the new structure since each director can now focus on their specific role on the board. Also, the creation of multiple new committees has allowed members to take an active role to be involved in areas other than their specific roles.

Are the board members more empowered or less empowered after this transition? Please describe.
See above.

Comments: -

Name:
Respondent 6

When did you join the Altered Esthetics board of directors?
Spring of 2009

What is your role?
Development Director
What is your level of experience with nonprofit management in addition to your role at this organization? Please describe.

I have worked in nonprofit fundraising for 3.5 years as an Associate Director of the Annual Fund at Macalester College. I have specialized in fundraising communications and teaching the value of philanthropy to students, young alumni, and parents.

Has communication among members increased or decreased as a result of the new structure? Please detail.
I believe the new board structure has created good balance and activity among board members and a healthy process of delegation and shared responsibility. Between the overall board structure and sub-committees, the members seem to be communicating well, and clearly.

Have new ideas or innovations from other members in the organization increased or decreased as a result of this new structure? Please detail or give examples.
I believe new ideas have increased. We have had extensive communications regarding a two possible procedural changes. One involved whether we want to allow featured artists to do solo shows, and the other involved the proper use of our space for event functions that are not art related. We Have also had a good discussion about our event alcohol policy.

Are the board members more engaged or less engaged after this transition? Please describe.
I believe the board members are more engaged for a number of reasons. New board members are getting better acclimated to the organization and its processes. Older board members are sharing their experiences. The collective feel of the boards and the exchanges happening seems to be appropriate, positive, and inclusive. The board definitely seems to live the Ae mission/brand.

Are the board members more empowered or less empowered after this transition? Please describe.
I believe the board is more empowered because of the education the executive director has provided and the way everyone has been educated about their role. Jamie has done a good job sharing her previous experiences and co-managing different peoples roles with them to ease the transition and provide clarity.

Comments: -

Name:
Respondent 7

When did you join the Altered Esthetics board of directors?
2007ish

What is your role?
Board Secretary

**What is your level of experience with nonprofit management in addition to your role at this organization? Please describe.**
Some experience as president of large student organizations during college, work with a variety of other nonprofits at various volunteer levels

**Has communication among members increased or decreased as a result of the new structure? Please detail.**
Increased - I am aware of many more "back-end" decisions and procedures

**Have new ideas or innovations from other members in the organization increased or decreased as a result of this new structure? Please detail or give examples.**
same or increased. I felt the board was active and open before the switch but new ideas continue to pour in and be debated and brought into the fold.

**Are the board members more engaged or less engaged after this transition? Please describe.**
More engaged - it seems like everyone has really stepped into their rolls and is giving as much positive energy to the new process as possible.

**Are the board members more empowered or less empowered after this transition? Please describe.**
similar - board seemed active and empowered before

**Comments:** -
Appendix 3 - Shockley Zalabak Survey

3.a Shockley-Zalabak Conflict Styles Orientation Survey

Write down the following key:
4 = strongly agree
3 = inclined to agree
2 = inclined to disagree
1 = strongly disagree

1. When problems arise I prefer to let others take the responsibility for solving them.
2. I believe a middle ground can be reached in most conflicts.
3. I like everyone to be able to say what they think even if they do not agree with me.
4. I can be firm in pursuing what I think is right.
5. I try to reduce tension with others, to take people’s minds off their problems.
6. Usually it is best to postpone trying to talk to someone when he or she is upset.
7. Talking about feelings and issues is important in conflict.
8. I like people to be willing to give some if I will also.
9. The goal must come first; conflict is inevitable and some people just can not take it.
10. When people are upset, I am more concerned about their feelings than any particular problem.
11. I do not like to be in unpleasant or tense situations.
12. I like to win my points.
13. Most conflicts are subject to compromise.
14. Everyone should share in the gains and bear some of the losses.
15. I will not contradict others if I believe that it will make them unhappy.
16. I offer solutions and ask others for solutions.
17. I prefer to have everyone who is affected involved in solving a conflict.
18. Believing disagreements can destroy effectiveness; I encourage others to stay with more agreeable subjects.
19. I go after what I want, even if that makes others uncomfortable.
20. Differences usually are not important enough to worry about.
21. I do not like to make other people feel bad by disagreeing.
22. I think the best solutions come when everyone participates and has concern for others.
23. I want others to know where I stand and will convince them of the rightness of my position.
24. Confrontation can be managed if we seek middle ground.
25. I try to help others be at ease, even if that means not pressing my point.
### 3.b Board Responses to Shockley Zalabak Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Board Totals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Overall Totals)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance</th>
<th>Compromise</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>Accommodation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 12 13 10</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>12 13 12 11 98</td>
<td>17 20 15 18</td>
<td>18 18 19 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 11 16 13</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>17 17 12 17 119</td>
<td>15 16 14 13</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 4 5 5</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>4 5 4 5 37</td>
<td>2 1 3 2</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 1 1</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>1 1 2 2 14</td>
<td>4 3 4 3</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 5 2 3</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>3 2 4 3 25</td>
<td>3 5 2 3</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*4.a Screenshot*
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**Agenda Items**

Committee Updates (Grantsmanship, Street-Team3, Exhibitions, Fundraiser) (2-3 mins each)
Wiki One-stop pages Intro (20 mins)
Transition discussion/planning (1 hour)
Art Vending Machine/ New program services (10 mins)

**Additional proposed items and time:**

Next Board Meeting:
4/10/2010 @ Ae
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