Group & Organization Management

Examining the Team/Leader Interface: Baseball Teams as Exemplars of Postmodern Organizations

Katherine Hawkins and Anne Tolzin

The online version of this article can be found at:

Published by:

⑤SAGE

On behalf of:

Eastern Academy of Management

Additional services and information for *Group & Organization Management* can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://gom.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://gom.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations http://gom.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/27/1/97

Examining the Team/ Leader Interface

BASEBALL TEAMS AS EXEMPLARS OF POSTMODERN ORGANIZATIONS

KATHERINE HAWKINS
ANNE TOLZIN
Wichita State University

The authors propose that baseball teams serve as exemplars of postmodern organizations, such that studying the team/leader interface on baseball teams would be analogous to studying these relationships in other postmodern organizations. Furthermore, the authors argue that traditional leadership theories (for example, contingent rewards) may not apply to postmodern organizations nor may theories that rely on the development of long-term relationships between superiors and subordinates (for example, vertical dyad linkages). Rather, the authors propose a new model of leadership that responds to the needs of postmodern organizations, wherein leaders perform leadership through ritualized behavior, engage in transformational leadership, and effectively manage the autonomy-interdependence dialectic.

The study of leadership has fascinated scholars for centuries (Hackman & Johnson, 1996). Even the great theorist Burns (1978) described leadership as both the most observed and least understood behavioral phenomenon. Barge (1996) observed that leadership has been variously described through the decades in which it has been researched. He concluded, "Despite the variety of definitions offered, most theorists agree that leadership is a type of social influence process" (pp. 303-304). Furthermore, this social influence is directed toward goal achievement. Consistent with this definition, a number of scholars agree that leaders may be distinguished from nonleaders by their ability to inspire and motivate followers toward group goal achievement (Barge, 1996; Bass, 1985; Nanus, 1992).

Demands on current organizations are such that traditional theories of leadership may no longer be adequate. Rather, more dynamic and flexible models of leadership may be required to guide postmodern organizations into the next millennium (Barge, 1994). In this article, we attempt to describe

such a model. We do so by offering baseball teams as exemplars of postmodern organizations.

Keidel (1984, 1985, 1987) argued that team sports effectively serve as a generic organizational framework. Specifically, "the world of sports mirrors the world of work . . . game or play structures parallel work structures" (1987, p. 591). At the center of the analogy, according to Keidel, are the relationships of part to part (player to player or worker to worker) and of the part to the whole (player to team or worker to organization). These relationships vary not by what kind of organization it is (i.e., sports or other business) but by the design and function of the organization. Keidel contended that the three major sports (i.e., baseball, football, and basketball) each represent a distinct organizational archetype. Baseball is characterized by autonomy of players and teams, decentralized decision making, and laissez-faire leadership.

Several have suggested that baseball is the sport that most closely simulates the American free enterprise system (Gramlich, 1994; Keidel, 1987). According to Will (1990), "baseball is big business, part of the vast entertainment industry that has grown in response to the growth of leisure time and disposable income" (p. 321). Baseball teams, then, are not merely archetypes for or analogs to "real" organizations but are "real" organizations themselves, worthy of study.

There is an added benefit of using baseball, or sports in general, as the focus of leadership research. Baseball, in sharp contrast to most formal organizations, operates in the public realm in which much of its operation is directly observable (e.g., through personal attendance or watching televised games) or accessible through the reporting of others (e.g., sports reporting via radio, television, magazines, or newspapers). In addition, traditionally, baseball players make themselves available to fans and the media more than do players in other sports. It is quite common to find baseball players signing autographs, programs, or balls before and after games in a manner not common in other sports. In addition, baseball players give numerous interviews to various media representatives as an accepted part of their occupation. Finally, Keidel (1987) argued that the use of sports, familiar and understandable to most, to explicate organizational theory makes such theory more intelligible to those unfamiliar with it. All of these factors encourage the use of baseball teams as an ideal context in which to study leadership.

The focus of this article is not baseball team management but team leadership, as distinct from management. In addition, although we acknowledge that baseball players maintain meaningful and influential relationships with myriad significant others in their personal and professional lives (e.g., team owners, team managers, sports agents, sports reporters, family members), we believe that one very significant relationship that should be examined more

closely is that of the baseball player with his teammates. That is, we feel that the role of the peer/leader should be more closely examined.

Furthermore, as we will argue, baseball teams are postmodern organizations. Therefore, by focusing on the team/leader interface on baseball teams, we are describing an instance of this relationship in postmodern organizations. Specifically, we assert that the following three behaviors characterize effective leaders in postmodern organizations: performing leadership through ritualized behavior, engaging in transformational leadership, and managing the dialectic between autonomy and interdependence.

BASEBALL TEAMS AS POSTMODERN ORGANIZATIONS

Postmodern organizations have been variously described, but a review of the literature reveals a number of common characteristics: turbulent external environment (Bergquist, 1993; Nanus, 1992;[1] Witherspoon, 1997), diverse workforce (Eisenberg & Goodall, 1993; Ettorre & Romano, 1994; Leonard, 1995; Nanus, 1992), high rates of relocations and transfers (Bergquist, 1993; Holmes, 1995; Leonard, 1995), greater worker autonomy coupled with the development of semiautonomous work groups (Blanchard, 1994; Eisenberg & Goodall, 1993; Krau, 1995; Pollar, 1996; Reich, 1994; *Worklife Report*, 1994), preference for highly skilled generalists (Ettorre & Romano, 1994; Manville & Foote, 1996; Reich, 1994; *Worklife Report*, 1994), fewer managers and a flatter and more flexible organizational structure (Bergquist, 1993; Eisenberg & Goodall, 1993; Ettorre & Romano, 1994; Krau, 1995), an emphasis on personal gain (Pollar, 1996), and the need for a clear organizational vision or mission (Bergquist, 1993; Nanus, 1992).

The American sport of baseball shares all of these common characteristics. First, the sport of baseball operates in a dynamic economic and political environment. Teams abandon their traditional homes for new locations; new teams are formed whereas others are reassigned to new divisions; free agents change teams at a dizzying pace. Perhaps as a result of environmental turbulence, the historical baseball team dynasties (e.g., New York Yankees, 1926 to 1964) are gone. In recent decades, although there have been dominant players, there have been no dominant teams in either league (Will, 1990). As a consequence, Will concluded, "Today, when there are no dominating teams, everyone is riding the roller coaster" (p. 313).

Clearly, the external environment for baseball teams is turbulent and uncertain. In a related vein, Weick (1995) investigated organizational members' response to internal turbulence. Weick listed 12 characteristics of ambiguous, changing situations. Although a complete discussion of Weick's model of social organizing is beyond the scope of this article, there are

several characteristics from Weick's list that are particularly applicable to baseball teams. In ambiguous, changing situations, the nature of the problem itself may be in question. In addition, what information exists may not be reliable and is open to multiple interpretations. For example, Will (1990) noted that most batters can expect to encounter as many as three slumps in a season, so slumping is common. Although a batter may recognize that his hitting is "off" in some way, he may not be able to identify the problem nor know how to correct it. Advice from coaches may be conflicting or, if adopted, may not immediately improve batting performance. In this sense, both the internal and external environments of baseball teams are highly uncertain.

Another characteristic of postmodern organizations is workplace diversity. According to Keidel (1987), the cultural bias in baseball is toward diversity. For example, many present-day baseball teams have African American, Hispanic American, Asian American, and Caucasian players (of various nationalities) playing side by side. In addition, it is not unusual for veteran players (some in their 40s) to play alongside rookie players half their age.

Baseball teams' highly permeable boundaries illustrate another characteristic of postmodern organizations identified by organizational scholars. Player relocations (e.g., trades) are common in baseball, as are moves from the minor leagues to the major leagues and back again. Deterioration of veteran players' skills, maturation of young players' skills, and demands for replacement players from the "parent" teams give rise to a constant shifting among team members in the minor leagues, even more so than in the major leagues. In addition, according to Will (1990), a significant part of the manager's preparing his team to play is to identify role players (sometimes drawn from the minor leagues) to take the place of regular players unavailable due to injury.

As a consequence of workplace diversity and permeable organizational boundaries, baseball players share an experience in common with members of other postmodern organizations—working with strangers. According to Bergquist (1993), "more and more people we work with are in some sense strangers to us, either because we have had no previous contact with them or because they come from a different cultural background" (p. 130). Extant communication theories offer few suggestions for coping with such an environment. Eisenberg (1990) argued that currently, communication theory overemphasizes openness, self-disclosure, and shared values. Furthermore, in some cases, attempts to increase disclosure and empathy may be counterproductive. Clearly, managing workplace diversity is a challenge for postmodern leaders.

Baseball players, though members of a team, work autonomously, another characteristic common to postmodern organizations. Keidel (1987) submitted

that this is one of the greatest advantages for a baseball player, given the opportunity for increased visibility. According to Will (1990), even the spatial separation between players "underscores the individualism" of the game (p. 240). In baseball, players perform their individual functions independently of one another (e.g., catching a fly ball, hitting a home run, stealing a base), yet work in serial fashion in some cases (e.g., the double play, the pick-off). In addition, the typical leadership style in baseball is laissez-faire (Keidel, 1987). Baseball teams are groups of relatively autonomous individual players, not heavily influenced by team management.

As a consequence of diversity, permeable boundaries, and worker autonomy, postmodern organizations (including baseball teams) must confront, and somehow manage, the dialectic of autonomy and interdependence. According to Will (1990), the autonomy-interdependence dialectic is characteristic of baseball: "Baseball exemplifies a tension in the American mind, the constant pull between our atomistic individualism and our yearning for community" (p. 240). Eisenberg (1990) addressed this issue in his discussion of "jamming." According to Eisenberg, "jamming experiences are highly rule-governed, structured activities in which little or no personal information is exchanged, yet important goals may be accomplished, and a strong, ecstatic bond is formed among participants" (p. 146). Given the diversity and permeable boundaries of many organizations, members are obliged to identify means to work effectively together without the benefit of established working relationships. In attempting to strike an effective balance between the competing needs for autonomy and interdependence, common ground may sometimes be found through coordination provided by the work experience itself: "Jamming experiences provide an opportunity to transcend the autonomy-interdependence dialectic, simultaneously allowing for the possibility of both" (p. 146). This is consistent with Giddens's (1981) position that shared beliefs are often revealed through shared daily activities.

Not surprisingly, Eisenberg (1990) suggested that jamming often occurs in sporting contexts. As one example, he offered basketball great Bill Russell, who described experiencing the rare "magical" moment on the court, when "the game would just take off and there'd be a natural ebb and flow that reminded you of how rhythmic and musical basketball is supposed to be" (Russell & Branch, 1979, p. 156-157, cited in Eisenberg, 1990, p. 148). Jamming is not limited to sporting venues, however. Those who spend their careers in more traditional work environments may savor the same transcendent experience in a brainstorming or problem-solving session.

Eisenberg (1990) identified four conditions necessary for jamming: a high level of skill, a significant degree of structure, a contained setting, and a

surrendering to the game. In baseball, structure is supplied by the intricate rules of the game. In addition, the nature of the game itself (e.g., games are usually only nine innings, or about 3 hours long; players and officials must wear uniforms during the games; games are played inside stadiums) is such that it is self-containing. Therefore, in baseball, only skill and personal surrender are affected by the actions of players. Eisenberg (1990) cautioned that jamming cannot be forced: "It is precisely the fact that you cannot jam at will—that it depends on others and cannot be harnessed—that gives the experience its special mystery," but adds that "much can be gained by preparation, sharpening skills, developing the right attitude, and seeking out partners with compatible skills and dispositions" (p. 156). Eisenberg described the leader's role in this process as creating a context for jamming.

As we argued earlier, in postmodern organizations, skill emphasis is for the generalist. Keidel (1987) noted that the most prized baseball players are those who can play a number of allied positions. Will (1990) described baseball as a game "where you have to do more than one thing very well" (p. 324). Players often change position out of necessity (e.g., to take the place of an injured player). Consistent with other postmodern organizations, decentralized decision making and a flat organizational structure characterize baseball management (Gramlich, 1994; Keidel 1987).

Escalating player salaries and intense competition for "money" or franchise players clearly demonstrates the opportunity for personal gain in baseball. Keidel (1987) asserted that the reward system in baseball is keyed to individual performance. Will (1990) pointed out that increasing revenues will lead to increasing demand for available talent. However, baseball demands a level of skill that takes years to develop. These factors will combine to keep supply low and demand high, further increasing the autonomy and mobility of star players.

Finally, Bergquist (1993) and Nanus (1992) argued that for a postmodern organization to be successful, it must articulate a clear mission statement or vision for the organization. Otherwise, workforce, workplace, and task diversity would tear it apart. An organizational vision describes a "realistic, credible, attractive future" for the organization (Nanus, 1992, p. 8). Although the goal of some members of baseball team management may be limited to generating revenue, even at the expense of winning games, the mission or vision of the majority of teams can be expressed clearly and succinctly in two words—win games.

In our estimation, baseball teams evidence all of the characteristics of postmodern organizations articulated by organizational theorists. For this reason, we feel justified in treating baseball teams as postmodern organizations.

Given that, the team/leader interface on baseball teams should mirror that in other postmodern organizations.

LEADERSHIP IN POSTMODERN ORGANIZATIONS

Leadership theories that rely on leader/follower exchange and contingent rewards may not be appropriate theoretical frameworks to apply to leadership in postmodern organizations such as baseball teams. Bass (1985) summarized the situation well in his claim that "Contingent reward and management-by-exception are favored in well-structured, stable and orderly environments, and mechanistic organizations with pragmatic norms" (p. 166). Baseball teams fit none of the criteria mentioned by Bass. In addition, baseball team peer/leaders have no position power, so have no formal authority to direct players' actions nor to reward or sanction player behavior. Rather, they must rely on more personal forms of power, such as referent or expert power (see French and Raven, 1959, for a discussion of social bases of power). From this perspective, leadership theories based on contingent rewards, such as Leader-Member Exchange Theory, Path-Goal Theory, or Transactional Leadership Theory may not apply.

In postmodern organizational environments, communication defines members' various perceptions of reality (Bergquist, 1993; Eisenberg, 1990). Reliance on communication to define reality obliges the researcher to adopt an interpretive framework (Daniels, Spiker, & Papa, 1997; Putnam, 1983). According to Bantz (1983), neither trait, nor style, nor contingency, nor situational theories are consistent with the interpretive approach. Therefore, none of these leadership theories may help to inform us about leadership in postmodern organizations.

Arguably, we need a different approach to follower motivation in postmodern organizations than that provided by traditional leadership theories. There is a dearth of empirical research specifically addressing leadership in postmodern organizations, although some scholars have commented on the issue. Bergquist (1993) stated that conversation is the glue that binds members of postmodern organizations together. Given that, the most important role played by leaders in postmodern organizations is to influence the conversations that take place among members. Witherspoon (1997) argued that a successful postmodern organizational leader will accept chaos and uncertainty as natural and not to be feared.[2] She or he will be adaptive, follower-focused, and will concentrate on the creation of community through communication within the organization. Nanus (1992) held that effective leaders must play

four roles simultaneously: those of direction setter, change agent, spokesperson, and coach. He stressed the need for leaders to be visionaries, to communicate a common sense of direction for disparate work units in the organization, as well as to "supply a meaningful job context and a challenge worthy of commitment and exceptional effort" (p. 179). As noted above, Eisenberg (1990) suggested that the role of a leader in a postmodern organization may be to create a contextual frame conducive to jamming. Weick (1995) proposed that the role of a leader in a turbulent and ambiguous information environment is to be a sense-giver, to help others see information from different perspectives that might allow them to construct efficacious meaning from the information available to them.

Returning to the baseball diamond, consider the role of veteran player as sense-giver to the rookie. The rookie player and the seasoned player watch a pitcher pitching or a first baseman covering first base and receive similar visual input. However, the more knowledgeable and experienced player attends to the stimuli in a more sophisticated way and is able to deduce pitching patterns and base-stealing opportunities that the neophyte player does not. Playing the teaching role of a team leader, the experienced player translates what he has seen in a way that helps the rookie make sense of what he has observed. For example, Will (1990) reported that Yogi Berra claimed to be able to predict a pitcher's pick-off move from a telltale tightening of his buttocks just before the pick-off attempt.

Bass (1985) contended that the conditions we associate with the postmodern organization may necessitate new leadership forms that go beyond traditional models. Regarding the need to qualify theories of motivation to work, Bass (1985) argued, "Expanded views of motivation and leadership must be added on to the basic postulate that effort is a function of the value for us of outcomes and our confidence . . . that we will obtain them" (p. 9). Bass offered transformational leadership theory as such an expanded view. He argued that transformational leadership is most often seen in cases in which a group's external environment is troubled or turbulent or during times of change and discontinuity. The unstable, competitive world of professional baseball (and postmodern organizations in general) seems to fit Bass's description. In fact, Bass suggested that team sport is a setting in which transformational leadership could be a prerequisite for team success.

Bass's (1985) theory builds on earlier work by Burns (1978), who posited a theory of transforming leadership based on his observation of political leaders. Burns argued that transforming leaders inspire followers, through appeals to higher ideals and moral values, to become their "better selves." In addition, Burns sharply contrasted transforming leadership with transactional leadership,

which he saw as based on the exchange of favors or rewards for desired follower behavior.

Bass (1985) summarized his theory by suggesting that transformational leaders are able to motivate followers to achieve more than they would otherwise achieve. Transformational leaders motivate followers by (a) raising followers' level of awareness of the importance and value of designated outcomes, along with ways to achieve them; (b) convincing followers of the need to transcend their own self-interest for the good of the team or organization; and (c) altering followers' perceptions of their own needs and levels of aspiration. There are four components of transformational leadership: charisma (the emotional component), inspirational leadership (originally conceived by Bass as a "subfactor" within charismatic leadership), individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation. If transformational leadership theory is an appropriate theoretical framework to apply to postmodern organizations, then we should expect to see these behaviors evidenced by baseball team leaders.

LEADERSHIP AS COMMUNICATION PERFORMANCE

As noted earlier, research in postmodern organizational contexts requires the adoption of a communication perspective. A number of scholars have recognized the significance of communication in postmodern organizing. Speaking of postmodern organizing in general, Bergquist (1993) stated, "postmodern emphasis on verbal communication and conversation requires us to examine the dimensions of relationship and communication in greater depth" (p. 122). Eisenberg (1990) argued that in the absence of shared meaning, organized action is made possible only through shared communication. To understand organizational actors, we must understand their communication. Weick (1979, 1995) argued that only through communication can workers make sense of uncertain information environments in the workplace. Conger (1992) observed that leaders often use narratives to motivate followers. According to Hackman and Johnson (1996), "communication *is* the organization" (p. 200). In their comments on postmodern organizational leadership, Bergquist (1993), Nanus (1992), and Witherspoon (1997) all cited the centrality of verbal communication to the exercise of leadership.

Relatedly, Trujillo (1983) discussed managerial communication from a performance perspective. That is, consistent with an interpretive framework, managerial behavior is a performance that reveals social and cultural reality to those who participate in the performance. According to Trujillo, managerial

performances are interactive (enacted by multiple participants), contextual (both situationally and historically embedded), improvisational (loosely scripted), and episodic (distinguishable as discrete events).

Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo (1983) expanded on this idea in their presentation of a heuristic list of organizational performances. The list includes personal rituals ("'trademark' performances that not only solidify the actor's organizational identity, but inform and orient others to those identities") (p. 135); task rituals ("the day to day routines members perform to call themselves 'workers' ") (p. 136); social rituals (social gatherings and other patterned group behaviors that identify in-group status); and organizational rituals (organized ceremonies, such as rites of organizational leadership succession). Relatedly, Conger (1992) suggested that leaders use personification, or enacting exemplary task behaviors, to motivate followers. The provision of meaning through action makes the performance perspective seem particularly appropriate for studying leadership in postmodern organizations, in which the creation of shared meaning through communication is crucial.

Consider the implications for leaders in postmodern organizations characterized by high levels of worker autonomy and rapidly shifting group membership. Workers' lack of trust in one another due to unfamiliarity and reluctance to sacrifice individual benefits for the good of the group present real challenges for leaders in postmodern organizations. It is not always in the interests of nor possible for members of postmodern organizations to invest energy in forging close relationships characterized by mutual trust and self-sacrifice (Eisenberg, 1990). Rather, leaders of postmodern organizations might be better served by modeling or personifying, and thereby cultivating in others attributes that contribute to success in their turbulent and uncertain work environments.

For example, Will (1990) argued that the confidence with which a pitcher takes the mound can be contagious and can influence the whole team's performance.

> When they take the mound confident they can handle the other team, their own team relaxes. Their teammates are apt to score more than they would if they were pressing because they were worried about needing to get runs in bunches. (p. 90)

We would extend Trujillo's (1983), Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo's (1983), and Conger's (1992) concept of performance to include leadership, in general, and baseball team leadership, specifically. Just as are managerial performances, performances of baseball team leadership are interactional (baseball players enact their roles as members of teams), contextual (interactions

occur primarily within the ballpark, during practice and games), improvisational (highly variable, depending on occurrences during games and practice), and episodic (any game is discrete from any other game).

Baseball is replete with examples of personal, task, social, and organizational ritual. For example, "Ozzie," a now-retired major league shortstop, was famous for his personal ritual of performing handsprings on his way out to the infield to assume his defensive position. The Pirates's Willie Stargell would stand in the batter's box, quickly ratcheting his bat in circles over the plate until the pitcher began his motion. Tony Gwynn, one of the greatest batters in baseball history, was renowned for his task ritual of "taking BP," or batting practice, every day (Will, 1990).

> By the time he left the room he had taken more than 200 swings, for the fifth time in as many days. Those 1000 swings were taken before and after full workdays. When he left the room it was 2:45 p.m., 4 hours and 15 minutes before game time. (p. 164)

The pregame team dinner and postgame locker-room party are social rituals that reinforce team identification. Finally, highly ritualized organizational functions, such as the induction ceremonies in Cooperstown, home of the internationally recognized Baseball Hall of Fame, serve as reminders of the values shared by all those whose lives have been devoted to America's pastime. For example, the exclusion (to date) of Pete Rose from eligibility for the Hall of Fame underscores the severity of his transgression, gambling, against the code of baseball.

Adoption of the performance perspective underscores the significance of both verbal and nonverbal behavior, especially in the case of baseball, a context with a tremendous physical component. Both verbal and nonverbal communication provide the agency for leadership in postmodern organizations, so both must be examined.

IMPLICATIONS FOR STUDYING LEADERSHIP IN POSTMODERN ORGANIZATIONS

In summary, our review of postmodern organizational communication theory and research persuades us to suggest that leadership scholars search for verbal and nonverbal communication demonstrating some or all of the following: influencing interpersonal conversations that take place within the organization (Bergquist, 1993); creating community through communication (Witherspoon, 1997); communicating new ways of interpreting ambiguous

information (Weick, 1995); communicating an organizational vision (Nanus, 1992); managing the dialectic between autonomy and interdependence through jamming (Eisenberg, 1990, p. 139); performing leadership through ritualized behavior (Conger, 1992; Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1983; Trujillo, 1983); and engaging in transformational leadership (Bass, 1985).

In our estimation, neither Bergquist (1993) nor Witherspoon (1997) described their concepts of postmodern leadership behavior in sufficient detail to conduct a reliable search for instances of the behavior. Only in the remaining instances do we feel that there is sufficient construct definition to conduct any sort of reliable search for evidence of the identified behaviors. Therefore, the following three behaviors should characterize effective leadership on baseball teams, specifically, and in postmodern organizations, in general.

First, by performing leadership through ritualized behavior. Team leadership should be most directly observable at the level of personal ritual. These are defined by Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo (1983) as "trademark performances that not only solidify organizational identity, but inform and orient others to those identities" (p. 135). In this case, the organizational identity of interest is the team peer/leader.

Specifically, Eisenberg (1990) and others have argued that leaders should model behaviors as personal and task rituals that others may emulate. Leaders can organize social functions to reinforce work group boundaries and establish organizational rituals that champion corporate values.

Second, by engaging in transformational leadership behavior. As defined by Bass (1985), such leadership includes displaying charisma, inspiring teammates, showing individualized consideration to teammates, and intellectually stimulating teammates. We include communicating vision here, as some (House, 1977; Yukl, 1994) have argued that vision is an integral part of transformational leadership. We offer Nanus's (1992) definition for vision: verbally articulating "a realistic, credible, attractive future" (p. 8). Finally, Weick's (1995) work suggested that one function of leaders in postmodern organizations is to make sense of equivocal information for followers. According to Bass, transformational leaders incorporate this function in their role as teachers, examples of which were described earlier.

Third, by managing the dialectic between autonomy and interdependence. Eisenberg (1990) argued that one effective means to accomplish this goal is through jamming. The literature on jamming suggests that team leaders should actively encourage conditions necessary for jamming. Specifically, according to Eisenberg, leaders can facilitate jamming in four ways.

First, leaders must create a work environment in which risk is rewarded, not punished. Second, work groups must be kept sufficiently autonomous to protect and nurture novel ideas. Third, work group members must be carefully screened in terms of skill level so that mediocre performance by one does not cripple the efforts of others. This has sometimes been referred to as working or playing within oneself (Eisenberg, 1990; Will, 1990). Doing so inspires confidence and emboldens risk taking. Playing outside of oneself, or beyond one's abilities, leads to failure and subsequent caution and timidity. Finally, jamming is discouraged in the absence of a minimal level of resources (Eisenberg, 1990):

> The anxieties of limited capital, equipment, or support can frustrate jamming in the organizational context. As a result, building the requisite structure for surrender also means providing a structure of safeguards. Enough of the basics must be in place to allow participants the latitude to take risks. (p. 159)

We hypothesized three characteristics of effective postmodern leadership. Specifically, we focused on the role of peer/leaders in postmodern organizations. The next logical step is to observe peer leadership as it functions in selected postmodern organizations to determine if these three communication behaviors actually do characterize the behavior of effective postmodern peer/leaders. Interested scholars could approach this task from a variety of different perspectives. For example, case studies of peer/leaders in team settings, interviews with those recognized as effective peer/leaders, or ethnographic investigations of team leadership could all generate the data necessary to test for the presence of the hypothesized behaviors identified above.

In addition, "jamming" is a construct that requires clearer explication. Eisenberg's (1990) definition of jamming helps to orient attention to behaviors designed to address the autonomy-interdependence dialect but is not adequately precise to serve as an operational definition allowing for reliable replication. One intriguing issue is the intersubjectivity of jamming. Must all participants jam for jamming to have occurred? Does jamming progress through the group in serial fashion; that is, is jamming contagious? Although the operational definition of jamming is somewhat unclear, we feel its intriguing nature makes it worthy of investigation. Additional specificity regarding the definition of jamming is clearly indicated.

We began this essay by suggesting that baseball teams serve as exemplars of postmodern organizations, such that studying the team/leader interface on baseball teams would be analogous to studying these relationships in other postmodern organizations. Furthermore, we argued that traditional leadership theories (e.g., contingent rewards) may not apply to postmodern organi-

zations nor may theories that rely on the development of long-term relationships between superiors and subordinates (e.g., vertical dyad linkages). Rather, we proposed that a new model of leadership may be required that responds to the needs of postmodern organizations. We posited such a model wherein leaders perform leadership through ritualized behavior, engage in transformational leadership, and effectively manage the autonomy-interdependence dialectic. We found our focus on "America's pastime" instructive in the ways of leadership, not only for baseball teams but, arguably, for all postmodern organizations.

NOTES

1. Nanus's (1992) discussion of 21st century organizations mentions a number of characteristics in common with our description of postmodern organizations, so we felt it was defensible to include his work here.

2. Alternately, Frank and Brownell (1989) reviewed Pareek's (1983) work that stress can be a positive influence in an organization. In fact, Van de Vliert (1985, as cited in Frank & Brownell, 1989) argued that conflict can be deliberately escalated to increase creativity and innovation.

REFERENCES

Bantz, C. R. (1983). Naturalistic research traditions. In L. L. Putnam & M. E. Pacanowsky (Eds.), *Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach* (pp. 55-72). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Barge, J. K. (1994). *Leadership: Communication skills for organizations and groups*. New York: St. Martin's.

Barge, J. K. (1996). Leadership skills and the dialectics of leadership in group decision making. In R. Y. Hirokawa & M. S. Poole (Eds.), *Communication and group decision making* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Bergquist, W. (1993). *The postmodern organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Blanchard, K. (1994). The Blanchard management report. *Manage*, *45*, 12-13.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Conger, J. A. (1992). *Learning to lead*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Daniels, T. D., Spiker, B. K., & Papa, M. J. (1997). *Perspectives on organizational communication* (4th ed.). Madison, WI: Brown and Benchmark.

Eisenberg, E. M. (1990). Jamming: Transcendence through organizing. *Communication Research*, *17*, 139-164.

Eisenberg, E. M., & Goodall, H. L., Jr. (1993). *Organizational communication*. New York: St. Martin's.

Ettorre, B., & Romano, C. (1994). AMA's HR conference report: Reengineering: The HR perspective. *HR Focus*, *71*, 1, 4+.

Frank, A. D., & Brownell, J. L. (1989). *Organizational communication and behavior: Communicating to improve performance*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

French, J.R.P., Jr., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies of social power* (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Giddens, A. (1981). *A contemporary critique of historical materialism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gramlich, E. M. (1994). A natural experiment in styles of capitalism: Professional sports. *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, *34*, 121-130.

Hackman, M. Z., & Johnson, C. E. (1996). *Leadership: A communication perspective* (2nd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Holmes, A. (1995). Reform trickles in. *Government Executive*, *27*, 46-49.

House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189-207). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Keidel, R. W. (1984). Baseball, football, and basketball: Models for business. *Organizational Dynamics*, *4*, 5-18.

Keidel, R. W. (1985). *Game plans: Sports strategies for business*. New York: Dutton.

Keidel, R. W. (1987). Team sports models as a generic organizational framework. *Human Relations*, *40*, 591-612.

Krau, E. (1995). Disempowering and downsizing middle management? *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, *15*, 91-119.

Leonard, B. (1995). Companies form partnerships for relocation. *HR Magazine*, *40*, 53-55.

Manville, B., & Foote, N. (1996). Harvest your workers' knowledge. *Datamation*, *42*, 78-82.

Nanus, B. (1992). *Visionary leadership: Creating a compelling sense of direction for your organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pacanowsky, M. E., & O'Donnell-Trujillo, N. (1983). Organizational communication as cultural performance. *Communication Monographs*, *50*, 126-147.

Pareek, U. (1983). Organizational role stress. In J. W. Pfeiffer and L. D. Goodstein (Eds.), *The 1983 annual for facilitators, trainers, and consultants* (pp. 115-117). San Diego, CA: University Associates, Inc.

Pollar, O. (1996). Managing the MTV generation. *Incentive*, *170*, 57-58.

Putnam, L. L. (1983). The interpretive perspective: An alternative to functionalism. In L. L. Putnam & M. E. Pacanowsky (Eds.), *Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach* (pp. 31-54). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Reich, R. (1994). Leadership and the high performance organization. *Journal for Quality and Participation*, *17*, 6-11.

Russell, B., & Branch, T. (1979). *Second wind: The memoirs of an opinionated man*. New York: Random House.

Trujillo, N. (1983). "Performing" Mintzberg's roles: The nature of managerial communication. In L. L. Putnam & M. E. Pacanowsky (Eds.), *Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach* (pp. 73-98). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Van de Vliert, E. (1985). Escalative intervention in small group conflicts. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *21*, 19-36.

Weick, K. E. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Will, G. F. (1990). *Men at work: The craft of baseball*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Witherspoon, P. D. (1997). *Communicating leadership: An organizational perspective*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Worklife Report. (1994). Employee responses to EI initiatives. *Worklife Report*, *9*, 4.

Yukl, G. (1994). *Leadership in organizations* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Katherine Hawkins, Ph.D., is a professor of communication and coordinator of the Master of Arts in Communication program with the Elliott School of Communication at Wichita State University. She received her doctoral degree in speech communication in 1986 from the University of Texas at Austin.

Anne Tolzin is a broadcast news producer in the professional communication industry. She received her Master of Arts in Communication degree from Wichita State University in 1995.