

**A conceptology of
Learning and Leading at Work.
Humanology, Humanability,
Learningship and Leadingship.**

By
Rune Kvist Olsen

A lecture of lessons
2013

**The material in this publication is subject to the rules of the Copyright Act.
Unless otherwise specifically agreed with the author, any reproduction or
commercialization of this material is not permitted.**

1. A conceptology of Learning and Leading – an overview of process and system.

1. Ideology:

Humanology; A system of belief in the ability and capability of the human being in taking responsibility for one self and others:

- Individuality
- Personality
- Trustability
- Reliability

2. Methodology:

Humanability; A system of humanized synergy by integrating, coordinating and complementing the human flow of energy through an organizational form of organizing, leading and managing work and people:

- Learnability
- Leadability
- Learningship
- Leadingship

2.Introduction.

This paper is a conceptology introducing a language and a linguistic approach in defining and describing a terminology in organizing, managing and leading work and people in an organizational setting. This conceptualization is based on an ideological part and a methodological part. The ideological part is designated as *Humanology at Work* which describes the system of belief in abiliting and capabiliting the consciousness and conscience of the human being by the creation of a new and alternative order in organizing work and people.

Humanology is a way to initiate trustability and reliability in the human being by releasing and optimizing the true and genuine human potentials through the free will and freedom of choice emanated by the individual person. The methodological part is designated as *Humanability at Work* in characterizing the system and structure of responsibilizing the human state of mind at work. The organizing of learning and leading as organizational forms, is designated as respectively *Learningship* and *Leadingship* in describing the initiation and implementation of individual independency and personal responsibility for everyone in the workplace.

3. Definitions and descriptions of the ideology by design.

Humanology is the knowledge, understanding and conception of humanized awareness and consciousness as the basic, essential and substantial factor in the creation of intelligent life forms in organizing and uniting individual human beings. Humanology is the acknowledgement and understatement of the individual human being as an autonomous, independent and responsible living entity able and capable of ruling and leading one self in togetherness with other individuals. Humanology is the ideological platform and foundation in shaping and forming the consequential methodology in creating and erecting consistent structures of power and organizational forms in the workplace. The consequential methodology in implementing the belief system of Humanology is Humanability as the structural and systematic form of organizing, leading and managing work and people. Humanability is the enabling mechanism in transforming and converting the power grid in the organization to an organizational structure where personal independence and individual responsibility are operating as the core drivers in releasing human resources.

Learningship is the methodological approach where everyone are learning by themselves through processes alone or together with others, while Leadingship is the methodological approach where everyone is leading themselves together with others. Humanology is a holistic system of belief in our self and in our fellow human beings as reliable, credible, accountable, trustworthy and competent individual entities, while Humanability is the holistic method in powering the values of trustability and reliability for everyone demonstrated by our practice at work. Humanability is based on 4 foundation pillars:

1. Learnability – our ability to learn by processing our gained knowledge and experiences into awareness and consciousness about performances, accomplishments and achievements. Our learnability is tested and enhanced by challenging our self and others through critical questions and inquiries regarding our future adaptability and compatibility towards change.
2. Leadability – our ability to lead processes by utilizing our potentials and resources in operating and functioning as individual and responsible human beings.
3. Learningship – organizing our learning by converting the learning to competence through application and adaption of knowledge and experiences in practical and sustainable actions.
4. Leadingship – organizing our leading of processes by making individual judgements and decisions within a distinctive field of work, and by taking responsibility for our actions and the consequences of our actions.

These 4 pillars in the construction of Humanability are interconnected and interactive through their integration, coordination and unification by the effort of individual human beings in collaboration and cooperation with each other as a unified force of collective actions. The matrix is as follows:

Personal	<i>through</i>	Learnability	<i>through</i>	Leadability
Organizational	<i>through</i>	Learningship	<i>through</i>	Leadingship

4. Definitions and descriptions of the methodology by design.

Leadingship is the organizational and functional form of leading processes. The term is referring to the function of “*Leading*” which can be operated by everyone involved. The individual human being is personal responsible for the performance and effectuation of the working processes within a distinctive field and area of work based on individual competence. By other words, the individual human being has the force of power and the assigned authority in making and taking autonomous decisions within a specific field of workshop. Subsequently the individual person is leading the corresponding processes allocated in performing and achieving results and accomplishing estimated goals and outcomes for the benefit of one self and the common good.

The opposite pole of Leadingship is Leadership. This is because the concept of Leadership is founded on an opposite and contrary belief system compared to the belief system behind Leadingship. The belief system behind Leadership is designated as Scientific Management where individuals must be led, managed, controlled, commanded, subjugated and subordinated by the power of a supreme and superior force in charge of the individuals.

Leadership is the organizational and functional form of leading persons (in contrast to leading processes). The term is based on the term “*Leader*” referring to the person appointed the function in leading other persons. The belief system behind Leadership states that someone must lead and others must be led, someone must rule and others must be ruled by an external force of power in control. Leadership as an organizational form, is structured by positions and ranks and organized hierarchically from above to below. People ranked in superior leadership positions above are assigned the decision authority over the people ranked in subordinate positions below. The decision power and authority is subsequently based on position and rank (in contrast to personal competence).

The consequence of adopting the ideology of Humanology in releasing the spirit of the human mind, and of adapting the methodology of Humanability in the shaping of Learningship and Leadingship, is that people is enabled with individual authority and powered by the sense of responsibility in being responsible for one owns actions at work through individual learning and personal leading. The clue and key in becoming and being a responsible human being, is the power and the enabling force coded through learning by one owns actions, by taking personal responsibility according to the learning experience and by making responsible decisions based on the gained knowledge. By getting or being given responsibility from someone above, the human mind will be revolting contra productive in the sense of disrupting the self-evaluation in the

energetic field of the mindset - as it is deprived of the option in taking responsibility of one's actions and the adherent consequences of these actions. Deprivation in the freedom of personal choice, is a maleficent interference in sensing personal responsibility and in that way might become a damaging, destroying and devastating impact on the process of learning itself. By the power in taking responsibility autonomously, the individual person is developing self-esteem, self-respect, pride and commitment towards one self and others from the asset of personal responsabilizing.

The consequence of applying Scientific Management and the corresponding Leadership approach, is as stated the deprivation of the power in taking responsibility independently and autonomously. The leadership role is based on the supreme authority of the leader in taking responsibility on behalf of the subordinates. The superior leader will be giving or delegating actions down to the subordinates, while keeping the control of the responsibility in order to execute the leadership function autonomously and responsibly. In case the superior leader should think of sharing some of the responsibility by letting the control waver and crumble, the leader would surely undermine the supreme authority vested in the leadership position. The effect of not being in control and not having the power in taking responsibility autonomously and independently as a free person, is the absence and lack of options in effectuating free will and freedom of choice. And that consequence is an inhumane aberrance according to the belief system of Humanology, but consistent with the intentions embedded in the belief system of Scientific Management powered by Leadership.

The relationship between Leadership and Leadingship is the story of an interconnection between opposite poles and counterparts in organizing, managing and leading work and people. The first important aspect of this relationship is the contradiction between two contrasting systems of beliefs. Humanology based on the unconditional belief in our fellow human beings regarding their personal ability and capability in taking care of themselves and others, contrary to Scientific Management stating that people must be controlled and enforced in compliance with the ruling hierarchical order as followers. Here we find the contradiction between subjugation, subordination, obedience and conformity on the one side, and freedom of choice, mutual trust, individuality and equal dignity on the other side. The next significant aspect in this relationship is how the structure of power is organized in leading work and people.

The power of Leadership is based on the vertical power structure with someone above in superior positions and ranks to lead, and others in subordinate positions below to be led. The consequence of a vertical power structure is the organizing of vertical relationships between human beings ranked above or below each

other based on the organizational structuring of positions and ranks. This organizational structure is decisive for the status of What you are in the organization and closely aligned with your privileges according to your placement in the organizational order of hierarchy. The vertical relationship is synonymous to the character of domination - in the sense that the few superior persons above dominates the many subordinated persons below – and that the inferior persons below are dominated by the superior persons above. The vertical relationship is a competitive pursuit with the intention and purpose of climbing the hierarchical ladder on the expense of others. The vertical relationship is bonded by a fear-based interaction between a superior and inferior party powered by Leadership.

The power of Leadership is based on the horizontal power structure with everyone as leaders within their respective area of work and granted responsibility by their personal competence. The consequence of a horizontal power structure is the organizing of horizontal relationships between human beings working alongside each other as co-operators, based on equalized and equivalent functions and roles. This organizational structure is decisive for Who you are in the organization and closely linked to personal and individual characteristics. The horizontal relationship is synonymous to the character of complementation – in the sense that persons alongside each other are exchanging, communicating and cooperating mutually and reciprocally on an equivalent level of operations. The horizontal relationship is a joint venture between equals and peers where the people involved must support, assist and complement each other in gaining personal and collective advantages and assets. The horizontal relationship is bonded by a trust-based interaction where independence and interdependence is mutually interconnected powered by Leadership.

- What sort of relationship do you prefer and appreciate in the relations with your colleagues? Vertical shaped by superiors and subordinates with leaders of persons and followers? Horizontal shaped by equals and peers with leaders of processes and fellows? Domination in the quest for personal power or complementation in releasing both individual and collective potentials? Your answer will probably be depending proportionally on your authoritative status as either superior in charge, subordinate in submission or equal in dignity.

The relationship between Leadership and Leadingship is subsequently summarized by the terms; Leadership for Someone or Leadingship for Everyone.

On this reflective and analytical background we can state that Leadership and Leadingship are irreconcilable and incompatible components in a state of dualistic dependency in manifesting alternative options of choice. By this acknowledgement we will be able to grasp, understand and comprehend the true nature and logic of respectively Leadership and Leadingship as equalized counterparts. And not at least give us the option of choice in organizing, leading and managing work and people into the future.

5. Potential force of changeability from pretended or real challenges.

The domination of the Leadership mantra in leading, managing and organizing work and people, have led to a perception of change as an alteration of the lines in the organizational chart without changing the terrain where the shaping and structuring of power is taking place. Restructuring, reorganizing, regenerating and re-engineering are samples of action based terms that have evolved during the last decades. This perception of change has led people to believe that change can be achieved and attained by remaking the organizational structure with superiors and subordinates through replacements and relocation of resources, without changing the power structure with positions and ranks in the order of ruling.

The organizational structure is the reflector while the power structure is the shaper. This significant constellation of connectedness is signifying the logic in a chain of successive actions. In changing and modification a phenomenological reflection as a perceived image of a specific context, the character of the creation source as the shaper must first be changed in attaining essential, substantial and sustainable alterations. This challenging approach will be the ultimate and significant proof and evidence of the changeability in the specific matter. When the shaper is remodelled, the reflector will inevitably be adjusted according to the denominator in the successive chain of actions. By other words the organizational structure can only be changed if the power structure as the premise of organizational activities is changed, and not visa versa. In changing an organizational structure as a reflector, the power structure as a shaper must therefore first be remodelled in creating a real and sustainable change of both the human mindset and the modus of successive actions.

A reflection is only an imagination and a picturing of the original source, and it is only mirroring manifested effects and not underlying causes. In order to make fundamental and sustainable changes in the way practice is functioning, the cause of the action must be treated and resolved. Make up will only superficially improve and modernize the out look of a facade, while the embodiment is still the same with the same inhabited features producing the same patterns of actions. The source of creation as the structuring of power in an organization, shapes the reflection of its own image as the structuring of the way work and people is led, managed and organized. In developing new structures of organization, we must subsequently change the present enabling factors by providing new models of power flow in the organization, and in that way create a new reality in leading, managing and organizing work and people.

6. Why the necessity of corporate activists in challenging the existing corporate organization?

- Do you know the difference between a conservative corporate activist and a radical corporate activist?
- The conservative corporate activist is staying behind in the past by conserving established, known and accepted conventional theories and practises, as for instance Leadership for Someone. The person can nonetheless be talking and speaking of the necessity of change, but through a vocabulary and terminology that is reflecting existing models, systems, structures and concepts. The conservative corporate activist will be safeguarding one owns career within the existing establishment and community by not advocating or promoting provocative, unconventional and contradictive believes, theories and concepts.
- The radical corporate activist moves beyond existing borders of conventions in pursuing new knowledge, theories and practises, as for instance Leadership for Everyone. The purpose is finding new and alternative ways that can challenge the existing believes by providing progressive options that will change the way work and people are organized, managed and led. The radical activist will be advocating new models, systems and structures that will be part of the future solution and not solutions that are contaminated by the

versions of the past. The radical corporate activist will by conviction and action be risking one owns career in pursuing new agendas for corporate actions adapted to future settings.

Crossing the border between behind in the present and beyond into the future, requires and demands courage, integrity, dedication, commitment and compassion in order of fulfilling essential and substantial purposes. Holding on to and articulating concepts adapted to the present state of organization (f.ex. Leadership), is consistent with staying within and behind existing borders of ideology and methodology. Letting go of the concepts that are dominating the present stage of corporate organization, would be an opener to sensibility, receptivity and susceptibility for real change. Adopting and adapting new concepts in challenging and changing the old and fixed agendas, will be consistent with moving beyond into the future with a transformed compatibility and adaptability of a prospective corporate organization at disposal.

Here are some reflective questions in dealing with the options of change:

1. Do you think you can create new ways of organizing work and people based on old platforms of operations and conventional systems of belief?
2. Do you think you should develop or adopt new and radical ways of organization, independent of the known, predictable and safe organizational arrangement people always have been used to?
3. Why do you still continue talking and speaking about the need of changing the old ways of organizing work and people, whilst still talking about using the old frameworks through modification and modernizing of the old solutions (f.ex. Leadership)?
4. Do you really think you can build on the old platforms in building new foundations and knowledge for a new corporate reality, without adapting new models based on alternative belief systems?

In studying the aspects of corporate change more thoroughly, you can look into my paper “The Story of a Corporate Heresy” from December 2012 and get a closer picture of the relation between “*speaking/talking about change*” and “*moving/acting for change*”.

7. Leadingship as a methodology in the transition of control.

1. Powering and charging the inclined disposition embedded in the mind of the human being, in becoming and being the learnable, leadable, independent and responsible creator and shaper on the corporate stage.
2. Converting and transmitting the external control outside the individual person to internal control inside the person.
3. Re-make external control persons and control systems redundant and superfluous, and make everyone at the corporate stage leaders by their own Self.
4. Emanating the Law of the Human Nature by releasing and optimizing the infinitive potentials of the individual human being.

8. Sources.

Olsen, Rune Kvist: "*A conceptology of Learning and Leading at Work*", long version, 2013

Olsen, Rune Kvist: "*The Story of a Corporate Heresy*", 2012,
<http://petervan.files.wordpress.com/2012/12/the-story-of-a-corporate-heresy1.pdf>

Olsen, Rune Kvist: "*The Leadingship Fieldbook*", 2012
<http://www.psmwascend.org/Content.aspx?SitePageContentID=475&SitePageID=462>
http://www.psmwascend.org/uploads/attachments/aa018cf0e4f0e1e6_d3ASIm9bi.ppt
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NCiVO4fGbl8>

Olsen, Rune Kvist: The Conceptual Articulate Exhibition, "*Vertical Relationships versus Horizontal Relationships*", 2012

Olsen, Rune Kvist: "*Responsibility in the workplace*", 2012
<http://www.nliah.com/PSMWKnowledgeManagement/uploads/attachments/5wKMlfd8j.pdf>

Olsen, Rune Kvist: "*Humanistic Management - Balanced Relationships in the workplace*", 2012

Olsen, Rune Kvist: "*Leadingship; reshaping relationships at work*", 2010
<http://newunionism.wordpress.com/2010/01/30/olsen/>

Olsen, Rune Kvist: "*The DemoCratic Workplace*", 2009
ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/workplace/.../183505
<http://isarc10internetforum.wikispaces.com/file/view/RuneThe+DemoCratic+Workplace.+Completed+Version..pdf>

Olsen, Rune Kvist: "*The Equal Dignity Organizational Concept*", 2008
<http://issuu.com/ottar/docs/equaldignity/1>

Olsen, Rune Kvist: "*A change from leadership (vertical power structure) to leadingship (horizontal power structure) at work*", 2006
<http://www.humiliationstudies.org/documents/OlsenLeadershipLeadingship.pdf>

Olsen, Rune Kvist: "*From a vertical and hierarchical order to a horizontal and Horizontal order in structuring and shaping power in the organization.*", 2006
<http://www.uncharted.ca/content/view/149/35/1/1/>

Olsen, Rune Kvist; "*None to Command and Control. A New Paradigm for a New Workplace Reality*", 2005 http://issuu.com/ottar/docs/none_to_command/1

Olsen, Rune Kvist: Collection of papers published on Democratus 2005-2010
<http://democratus.yolasite.com/avis.php>