Expanding Perspectives, Expanding Actions and Generativity Two

Gary Quehl and William Bergquist

So far in our exploration, we have been presenting a new narrative about the nature and dynamics of generativity. We have relied on a script that has already been written by the original playwright, Erik Erikson (1963) —and by subsequent authors and researchers in the field of adult development. In this essay, we will expand on that text by investigating the various ways in which Generativity Two is played out in several different relationships; in this essay we turn to our own research findings about Generativity Two, relying primarily on the 100 interviews conducted with Emerging and Senior Sage leaders in Nevada County, California. We also rely on our own experiences as coaches and consultants to client who are now mentoring or considering taking on a mentoring role in their organization.

At the heart of Generativity Two is an expanding perspective about deep care and the engagement of actions that are aligned with it. We consider this expanding perspective and set of actions to be a result of our formulation of Generativity One; we are generative when we raise our children, and when we initiate a project that is important to us. Both clearly are primary examples of deep care. It is when we move into Generativity Two (and later into Generativity Three and Four), that we reach out through deep caring even further in both time and space.

What's in a Name: "Generativity"

The term "generativity" was first used by Erik Erikson to identify an ongoing concern for people besides oneself and one's family. This concern typically develops during mid-life and, according to Erikson, involves a need to nurture and guide younger people in a supervisory, sponsoring, or mentoring role. Erikson's generativity is about contributing to the next generation, as well as leaving a legacy in the organizations with which we work as successful mid-life leaders.

Erikson's basic idea about generativity has been expanded and probed in great depth by other adult development theorists and researcher—most notably Dan McAdams and Ed de St. Aubin (McAdams and de St. Aubin, 1998). We will review his work shortly but must first note that the term "generativity" is used in many other ways—at least three of which are indirectly relevant to Erikson's use of the term. All three of these alternatives seem to enhance our understanding of Erik's generativity by providing a focus on innovation and creativity, sources of energy, and foundational processes in a specific system.

Generativity as Innovation/Creativity

On an everyday basis we make use of the term "generate" when speaking of the creation of new ideas, slogans, logos and many other types of thought and image being created. We conduct "thought experiments" and do "brainstorming" to generate many new and "off-the-wall" suggestions for an advertising campaign, new use for a wrench, or ways to get that young kid living on the street into a safe environment. Sometimes, we even label someone a "generative" thinker.

There is an essay from the *Sloan Management Review* that makes use of this first definition of generativity. Jeanne Liedrka and her colleague (Liedrka, et al., 1997) are interested in the "generative cycle" used by

knowledge-based organizations, which are often professional firms. The authors identify this cycle as consisting of collaborative learning among employees in an agency and the clients that they serve. They see business development and individual professional development as being intimately linked. For this collaborative work to be successful, an agency must hire and retain people who have *analytic talent* to do technical work, *relationship skills* to build and sustain the collaboration through a combination of interpersonal skills and personal qualities of integrity and respect, and *entrepreneurial instincts* to drive the business development and organization-building work.

We believe the ingredients which are required to create a generativity cycle are also perquisites for a person to be successful in the role of Generativity Two. In building the competencies and confidence of those with whom a leader is working, it is essential that many things be known in-depth about the system in which the leader and his or her colleagues operate. That requires experience in this system and a deep understanding of how it actually operates.

Leaders also must be able to build a strong collaborative relationship with their co-workers. This requires the relational skills identified by Liedrka—a combination of interpersonal skills (emotional IQ), personal integrity, and respect (appreciation) for these colleagues. Finally, the leader needs to be driven to achieve success for the organization, and not just for themselves. The entrepreneurial instinct identified by Lierka seems to be right on target.

All of this suggests that the ingredients which are to be found in the creation and maintenance of an organization's generative cycle parallel and overlap with the ingredients needed for success in Generativity Two. That is, creativity and innovation exist side-by-side with Eriksonian generativity. Or as Everett Rogers (1962) once observed, the process of innovation diffusion starts with creativity and innovation and then disperses to various constituencies in an organization. This diffusion requires analytic skills, relationship skills, and an entrepreneurial instinct —as we will see later in this essay. All of this is important to keep in mind when serving as an organizational consultant. We are encouraging creativity and innovation when we help an organization foster Generativity Two through its mentoring program--or a related program involving one of the other M's that we identify later in this essay.

Generativity as Source of Energy

The second use of the term "generativity" is an off-shoot of the more commonly used word, "generator" – a device that produces energy by converting it from one form (such as natural gas, propane or water) to another form (often electricity). Used in this way, "generative" refers to the capacity of any device to perform this function and is directly aligned with Eriksonian generativity.

Just as a generative leader can produce, enhance or at least encourage creativity and innovation, so the generative leader can transform organizational energy from conception to action and from dream to reality. This is another important insight for all organizational consultant to keep in mind and for an organizational coach to share with their executive client: coaching can help move ideas to action.

This transformation is likely to occur because the generative leader is interested in the welfare and advancement of other people and the long-term welfare of the organization. There is an additional point to be made about energy and generativity. The legacy that a generative leader wishes to leave behind is based on the capacity of the organization to sustain its energy long after the leader has left the organization. This is the essence of Generativity Two: leaving a legacy of energy-conversion based in commitment, encouragement, and vision (and not just the legacy of a specific product or procedure). This is also the

essence of a legacy-oriented strategy for leadership development and executive coaching (Sandstrom and Smith, 2017; Bergquist, 2020)

Generativity as a Foundational Process

The third use of the term "generativity" ties in many ways to both the first and second uses, though it comes from a different region of contemporary thought. This use is esoteric and a bit hard to exemplify. It has to do with the formation of a specific foundation for some powerful ongoing process. We see this third use of the term in the phrase, "generative grammar." This refers to the deeply embedded rules that govern our use of language—the foundation for our capacity to speak, write, hear and read a set of words that immediately make sense to our self and other people.

We also find the use of "generativity" in descriptions of complex global communication networks that undergird our Internet services, come with code, and have the capacity for rapid change and flexibility that is truly remarkable. Quoting work by Jonathan Zittrain regarding the Generative Internet, David Post (nd, p. 2) suggests that generativity:

> . . . denotes a technology's overall capacity to produce unprompted change driven by large, varied, and uncoordinated audiences. The grid of PCs connected by the Internet has developed in such a way that it is consummately generative. From the beginning, the PC has been designed to run almost any program created by the manufacturer, the user, or a remote third party and to make the creation of such programs a relatively easy task. When these highly adaptable machines are connected to a network with little centralized control, the result is a grid that is nearly completely open to the creation and rapid distribution of the innovations of technology-savvy users to a mass audience that can enjoy those innovations without having to know how they work. (Quoted by Post, nd).

It is not our intention to move fully into Post's rather technical analysis of generative networks; we simply wish to note how his analysis parallels and perhaps points to the inherent value found in Eriksonian generativity. Post is describing a dynamic process that is often labeled a "self-organizing system." This type of system is the focal point for many studies about complexity and chaos, areas of scientific investigation that are now popular and widespread. On a global level, this type of system has also become familiar through the work of Thomas Friedman and his portrait of the "flat earth."

With regard to Generativity Two, we can point to the loss of personal ego and control among men and women in networked organizations who are truly generative. They encourage the generation of new innovative ideas (first use of the generativity term) and the generation of sustained energy (second use of the generativity term) by identifying (analytic skills), supporting (relationship skills) and promoting (entrepreneurial instinct) the natural, self-organizing processes of their organization. It is these generative processes and cycles that enable an organization and its members to "come alive" and flourish.

Organizations die when their leaders seek to tightly control its operations. Generative leaders influence but do not control; they seek to understand, not predict, and they encourage self-monitoring by their colleagues rather than their own ongoing inspection. This is what Generativity Two is all about, and we are thankful for the insights provided by those who make alternative uses of the word "generativity."

Generativity Two: The Existing Concepts

We now turn to the analyses of Generativity that have been provided by theorists and researchers who begin with Erikson's description of mid-life Generativity—and what we are calling Generativity Two.

The concept of generativity is about birthing -- the birthing of children, of projects, of leaders, of heritage, of community. In keeping with this emphasis on birthing, we now turn briefly to a history of the birth of the generativity concept itself. It began with the work of Erik Erikson and his initial identification of eight life stages -- the seventh stage (mid-adulthood) being positioned as the point in life when we choose between generativity and stagnation.

Process of Deep Caring

At the heart of the concept of generativity resides the process of caring, and the transformation that occurs in this caring process during one's lifetime:

> In youth you find out what you *care to do* and who you *care to be*--even in changing roles. In young adulthood you learn whom you *care to be with*--at work and in private life, not only exchanging intimacies, but sharing intimacy. In adulthood, however, you learn to know what and whom you can *take care of.* (Erikson, 1974, p.124)

This a very important distinction that is often lost on us as we consider the act of caring. We have used the term "deep caring" as a way to differentiate between our internal concern as a young person to care about our own personal life and interpersonal relationships, on the one hand, and a caring about the welfare of other people (including our children), about the past and future of our community and society, and about a sustained commitment to that about which we care most deeply.

As a professional coach, some of our most important (and potentially rewarding) work with a client is focused on these deep caring issues. Our understanding of Generativity in all of its manifestations is critical to this engagement of Deep Caring coaching. As professional coaches, we also will want to examine our own generativity and that about which we care most deeply both inside and outside our work as a coach.

Outliving One's Self

While Erikson began writing about generativity during the 1960s, he primarily focused on the other seven stages--as did most developmental theorists and researchers who were building on Erikson's work. It was only during the 1980s and 1990s that generativity began to receive much attention, but this seems to have dropped off during the first two decades of the 21st Century.

The two key developmental theorists to devote considerable attention during the late 20th Century to generativity were John Kotre and Dan McAdams. It was Kotre (1984) who first expanded on Erikson's concept of generativity and the motivational base for this developmental stage. Specifically, Kotre suggested that generativity is "a desire to invest one's substance on forms of life and work that will outlive the self." (Kotre, 1984, p. 10)

It is quite understandable and appropriate that Kotre identifies this wish for some form of immortality as a key motivator for generative action. It is also quite understandable that some developmental theorists have identified other sources of motivation and have referred to the inherently narcissistic orientation to be found in Kotre's challenging proposition. We will return frequently in this set of essays to the issue of desired immortality and the role it plays in motivating generative actions.

Don McAdams has played an even larger role than Kotre in bringing the concept of generativity to the fore. McAdams seems to have been a very active and successful convener of psychologists and other behavioral science researchers from around the world. They have written about generativity from cross-cultural, philosophical, historical and social-political perspectives. McAdams and his associates (McAdams, Hart and Maruna,1998, p. 9) summarize their own expansive definition of generativity in a seven-element model:

> [G]enerativity consists of a constellation of inner desire, cultural demand, conscious concern, belief, commitment, action, and narration revolving around and ultimately justified in terms of the overall psychosocial goal of providing for the survival, well-being, and development of human life in succeeding generations.

We rely on two of McAdams edited books (*Generativity and Adult Development* and *The Generative Society*) in linking our own research and theorizing with that of previous researchers and theorists. Sponsored by the American Psychological Association, these books offer many different ideas about generativity and certainly expand on Erikson's original definition and description.

With this brief overview of the field, we turn to several of the core concepts that are offered by Kotre. McAdams and their colleagues as related to what we are identifying as generativity two -- the caring for other people and institutions through the process of mentoring and other related roles. We will exemplify these core concepts by turning once again to our *Featured Players* -- and more specifically to two of these generative actors: Sally and Dan.

The Next Generation

First, it should be noted that most theories of generativity focus on the interactions between a senior person (usually in their 40s and 50s) and someone who is younger (member of the next generation): "It requires only a passing familiarity with the popular writings of Erik Erikson to have an inkling of what the concept of generativity is all about. It is about the next generation." (McAdams, Hart and Maruna, 1998, p. 7). Furthermore, while the next generation certainly includes our own children, most theorists and researchers distinguish between the care we devote to our children (what we call Generativity One) and the care we devote to someone who is not a family member but is related to us as a fellow member of the organization in which we work.

One of our *Featured Players*, Sally, offers a poignant example of what it means to care for the next generation, even though the person being cared for does not come from her own family. Sally frames this generative act as being similar to the role she has played as both a caring mother and daughter:

> Perhaps my most authentic and meaningful grand parenting has been in a mentoring role with someone outside our family. Shortly after we moved here, I became a board member of a local nonprofit organization that works with at-risk, under-served girls. Each girl has a mentor, called "an Angel." I met my mentee, Janet, when she was twelve years old; her mother was killed in an automobile accident. I have had a major parenting relationship with Janet from that time right through her recent 20th birthday. My husband and I have become so close with her that she calls us "Grandma and Grandpa."

Sally takes great pride in recounting the achievements of Janet and their own intervention with Janet's partner:

> She will finish college in 2016 and is living with a wonderful young man who is going on to law school; they plan to extend this relationship long term, and they both turn a lot to us for advice and

emotional support. For example, the young man hadn't told his parents that he was living with Janet, and we counseled that he tell them. To his surprise, they surmised that he and Janet had been living together. This experience and grand parenting relationship have been very satisfying to my husband and me. We have helped Janet along the way to be honest with herself, to be true to herself, and to have compassion in dealing with the sad part of herself. Indeed, we have developed an emotional attachment with her that we were unable to have with our own grandchildren due to the distance while our granddaughters were growing up. We regard Janet as our "adopted granddaughter."

Repeated and Diversified Experiences

Many of the generativity researchers have noted that mentoring is often not a onetime experience, that sometimes it involves increased diversity of mentoring experience. Frequently, a generative adult will describe multiple experiences as a mentor and often identify mentoring experiences that extend over many years (suggesting that Generativity Two is not limited to our mid-life years). This persistence is often identified as long-term commitment: "Experiencing the world as a place where people need to care for others, the protagonist commits the self to living in accord with a set of clear and enduring values and personal beliefs that continue to guide behavior, throughout the life span (moral steadfastness." (McAdams, Hart and Maruna, 1998, p. 34)

We turn again to Sally's narrative, beginning with her experience as a mentor while in her 30s:

> I also had a wonderful mentoring experience in my 30s during the Creative Initiative Foundation years. My husband and I served as "house parents" to a group of young high school women whose parents (also members of the Creative Initiative project) decided it would be a valuable experience for their daughters to live together under a single roof and develop life skills that would help them to move through their formative years and then on to college. Each girl got a stipend from their parents for a whole year, and they did all of the cooking and planning. Part of their stipend was spending money, and they did a variety of projects (e.g., working at the Levi factory putting fabric on carts, picking garlic in Fresno with migrant workers, various internships, etc.). My husband and I were volunteers, and our role was to develop a mature adult relationship with the girls by helping to support their decision making. My husband and I were adults who they could come and talk to, but we avoided telling them "what to do"; rather, we guided them on the "how to do" when they identified personal problems and issues. The girls are now in their 50s, have careers, and most are married with children of their own.

Years later, Sally served as a mentor to a young woman who came from a different cultural background. We see Sally not only repeatedly offering mentoring to young people, but crossing a cultural boundary:

> After my husband and I had moved to Nevada City, I mentored a young Hispanic girl from the time she was 11 until she was 17. I still keep in touch with her. She comes and sees us once in a while, and she is now in college. She spoke very little English when I first met her. So, I helped her transition from being Mexican with parents who worked in strawberry fields to becoming a young professional American woman.

We can consider the diverse challenges that Sally chooses to address in her mentoring as a manifestation of what generativity theorists identify as the rich interplay between caring and creativity. While creativity (as we mentioned earlier in this essay) often is identified with creating a new idea or product, it can also (in alignment with caring and generativity) be identified with the passing on of an existing idea or product. We

create by expanding the space in which the idea is shared, or the product is used: "creativity [in its isolated form] ends once the [idea or] product is made, but generativity implies caring for the [idea or] product as it grows and develops." (Kotre, 1984, p. 11)

Mentoring Inside and Outside an Organization

As the reader might note, these first three narratives offered by Sally do not take place within a specific organization; rather, they concern work with younger people who reside in the same community but not the same organization. While many of the generativity researchers focus on mentoring inside organizations, we find examples of work being done outside a specific organization as well. As a generative woman in mid-life, Sally was eager to take on many new challenges both inside and outside organizations: "Having formed a sense of identity and developed relationships, the middle-aged adult at the generative stage is thought to be ready to become involved in the larger sphere of society and to work to continue it and perhaps improve it for the next generation." (Snyder and Clary, 2004, p. 223)

In many ways, the mentoring done by Sally is this expansion into the larger sphere of society--a blending of Generativity Two and Generativity Four (civic engagement). It also may represent a blending of Generativity One (parenting) and Generativity Two. As McAdams and his associates (McAdams, Hart and Maruna, 1998, p.13) have noted: "Forms of generativity that go beyond one's kin may represent expansions or generalizations of the instinctive patterns associated with reproduction and care of offspring, and they may also tap more generally into other, related evolutionary tasks and mandates."

In expanding her sphere of influence (and caring) in her community, Sally also provides mentoring inside organizations.

> I became involved about a decade ago when my husband and I moved here with an organization serving at-risk girls. I played a role in mentoring the young executive director (who is still the ED) to become skilled in meeting the various challenges of the organization. Given my professional background, she first tapped me to head the organization's marketing committee. Then, after I became board president, we obtained critical help from a six-month leadership seminar that the umbrella nonprofit organization sponsored for non-profit ED's and Board Presidents; this was the beginning of my really helping our ED to develop the leadership skills that she needed, and she helped me understand how to work with ED's in the nonprofit world.

We see generativity also exemplified in the willingness (even eagerness) of Sally to expand her mentoring experience -- in this instance by working with a different kind of non-profit organization:

> The non-profit arts organization [I serve] has been an entirely different experience. This organization had been in operation for a number of years, but it wasn't until we hired a new ED that it really took off in terms of the quality of performances and audience growth. I have been board president for three years now and have had the continuing challenge of encouraging and helping this extraordinarily creative and productive executive director understand that she needs to learn how to listen to her board members and benefit from their counsel. This trying experience has been like taking a brilliant diamond in the rough and trying to polish it.

What a wonderful enterprise—polishing a diamond!

Involved But Not Embedded

There is one other important insight to be gained from the narrative offered by Sally, which is reinforced in many of the articles about generativity. The mentor is not expected to take over the work of the person she is mentoring. Nor is she to be the formal supervisor of this person. Mentoring works best when there is no formal power relationship between the mentor and mentee and when the work and responsibility remain in the mentee's hands (the "monkey" of responsibility does not leap onto the mentor's shoulder from the mentee's):

> The main thing that I conclude about my mentoring is that I am done with wanting to lead nonprofit organizations. To be part of important projects, yes. But I no longer care to be in a . . . leadership role. What I most care about are my personal relationships and the value that they add to my life. These relationships are my lifeline.

This level of involvement that skirts direct leadership and supervision is not always easy to attain. It also represents the important distinction to be drawn in the generativity literature between generative caring and narcissism. While the narcissist does care deeply about his continuing presence in an organization or community, even after he has left the organization, the generative mentor has moved beyond the inevitable need for control of the mentee's current and future behavior or the environment in which the mentee is working.

One of our colleagues, Don Jochens (1998) , has effectively framed the difference between narcissism and generativity. At one level, we want our innovations and accomplishments to be sustained after we have left an organization. We want to leave a mark and know that our influence will linger, and our style of leadership will be replicated by the next generation. This is an understandable (but often counter-productive) mode of narcissism. At another level, we hope to come back to the organization and observe that our mentees and the organization have continued to innovate and be successful.

For this latter state to exist, our mentee and our organization will no longer be sustaining our specific innovation; instead, they will be able to take pride in their own unique accomplishments. To have emulated and sustained our spirit of caring and creativity, the mentee will be exhibiting their own style of leadership and probably will themselves now be mentoring someone else. To be truly innovative, the organization will have moved on past our own ideas. It is the latter state that exemplifies generativity.

Another of our *Featured Players*, Dan, expresses this sense of thoughtful, generative engagement by suggesting that the role he plays might not even be best described as mentoring. It is more like a friendship that is initiated by the other person:

> In the context of its meaning for me, mentoring is too strong a word. I think of a mentor as someone who fully engages with a person and really helps them. It's like walking beside them during a part of a journey over time. I have not mentored in that fashion. I'm more of a resource, advisor, or a counselor. Maybe I am more of a nurturer than a mentor. I am sought out by friends and other people that I know—mostly in the nonprofit world where I have these contacts. And generally, with younger people (e.g., executive directors of nonprofit organizations). A number of these friends are women and are raising families, and they just call me. I'm actually quite surprised when they call. These friendships have often led to conversations over coffee, and they are most often initiated by them and not me. It's quite like my role as parent. I can give advice and insight when asked, without them having to follow it. It's much like giving time to my children and grandchildren. So, I am not initiating mentoring, which requires a much more proactive role, and I

don't have any skin in the game—other than helping others as a friend. What I do comes entirely from my heart.

Dan offers a specific example of the way he works in this "non-mentoring" fashion:

I have a dear friend who is with Habit for Humanity. He is an incredible man who gives of his time and energy. His name is Ed. He will just call me, and I almost always think he's getting on me to come out and pound some nails. But he isn't calling about that. He just wants to have a shoulder to vent on, and it's obviously helpful to him for me to listen in complete confidence. He often expresses his frustration at having to herd cats for Habitat and run all over the place. We have had a number of times when we talked through some very difficult organizational issues, where friendships were fractured and actually became irreparable. So again, this is more of an advisor role rather than mentoring.

We close with yet more pondering by Dan about his role in working with other people. These last two excerpts from his narrative serve also as examples of how mentoring can move far beyond the confines of a specific organization. As in the case of Sally's work, it seems that Dan is generative in a manner that defies the traditional definition of mentoring and also moves generativity beyond its usual boundaries:

I had a beautiful experience when I was 53 and a similar one just recently here at age 75; each had to do with a dear friend who was dying of cancer. My first experience was with a friend named Harry. I went into this just wanting to be present and give his wife a much-needed break. It was a fascinating, beautiful, and sad time. Harry had pancreatic cancer and was not expected to live beyond three months. My wife asked what I was going to do, and I said that I had no idea other than just listening. Actually, Harry lived almost two additional years, and early on he didn't have the strength to do much. But we did go to lunch periodically and sometimes went to a park. And sometimes we ate as his home. I found out that as a young man he loved to fly fish. He was of Japanese heritage and said that he hadn't touched a fly rod in 40 years. I said, "Well, I used to fly fish, too." So, we started tying flies together, and he actually got really good at it. This was an interesting experience for me because Don gave us a model for how to live through a terrible, irreconcilable tragedy. Being with him was actually uplifting for me, and this outcome was unexpected. I don't know if this experience is an example of mentoring, but it certainly was a profound learning experience for me. I found that I could help give Harry back memories.

Is this mentoring? Is it even a form of generativity? Perhaps we will be able to answer both of these questions after exploring various forms of Generativity Two, and after exploring the other forms of generativity as well. At the very least, we can certainly identify Dan's relationship with Harry as deeply caring. Can we ask for anything more from the life-affirming relationships with which we are blessed?

The Enactment of Generativity Two: Legacy and Leadership

In preparing this essay we have turned once again to our own research findings about Generativity Two, relying primarily on the 100 interviews that we conducted with Emerging and Senior Sage leaders in Western Nevada County California. In this section, we will review some of the analyses that have already been done on Generativity Two—including a few excerpts from several Eriksonian researchers about this second generative role.

Generativity: The Alternative Definitions

We begin by turning not to the Eriksonian notion of Generativity Two, but rather to some of the insights offered by our Sage leaders about the broader notions of generativity we have identified. Our Sage leaders seem, at some level, to fully appreciate this broader definition. For instance, the following observation is made by one of our Senior Sage leaders when asked to indicate what he most values in other leaders:

> I most admire leaders who pay attention to the key facts of a situation, who don't rush to judgment. I also admire people who are intellectually strong and know their subject, who can speak with accuracy at various levels, who make themselves relevant to others, and who lead others to a consensus decision and help others own it. I believe and hope these qualities characterize my leadership style, which have been augmented by the gifts given to me.

Another Sage leader identifies similar factors that have enabled leaders with whom she has worked to be successful:

> My experience is that leaders of most organizations think they know their organization's full potential, but actually have no idea. Just like we as individuals think we know ourselves. So, there usually is so much more that we can accomplish as an individual or as a group. Our possibilities are limitless, and all it takes is visualization, actualization, and execution.

The above two observations seem to capture all three of the alternative definitions of generativity we have identified. These Sage leaders certainly admire the analytic and relational skills that are needed to generate creativity and innovation. They also seem to have captured the essence of entrepreneurship--especially as entrepreneurial energy and dedication are directed by a compelling vision.

Some of our other Emerging and Senior Sage leaders have provided even more detailed perspectives on these alternative modes of generativity. We turn first to analytic skills.

Analytic Skills: One of our Sage leaders focuses in particular on leaders who offer an open-minded and visionary perspective when analyzing the situation in which they find themselves as leaders:

> I admire humility in effective leaders. Everyone must be treated as having equal importance. I also admire open-mindedness in leaders. To be effective, the leader must be able to see things from a different perspective—call it a vision—to keep followers from spinning their wheels. They are able to say, "Have you thought about this direction? Let's stand back and have a look at it." I do think there are times when I see things that other people aren't seeing and that I can bring a different perspective to a situation.

For this Sage leader it is not just a matter of leaders being bright and filled with insights; they must also possess the relational skills that can lead other people to insightful conclusions.

Another Sage leader reflects on her own leadership competencies and turns specifically to the formulation of analytically sounding questions:

> Regarding my own leadership qualities, a number come to mind: asking big questions, listening carefully to others, trying to glean the truth from a situation, and if truth is elusive to ask more questions. Once again, it is the quality of verifying the thinking of others. Even though I had been in leadership roles all of my life, I had not thought of myself as a leader until I began to observe other leaders very carefully and discover that I am much like them. This took a long time. A lot of this came from my dad, who was a highly successful business leader. I watched him as an executive and saw he was a good role model.

Yet another Sage leader focuses on collaborative problem-solving skills when reflecting on the nature of effective leadership. She noted that problem-solving is actually a multi-skilled endeavor:

> Being a good problem-solver is the one thing I have respected most in leaders I have worked with. Someone who says, "I'll handle that. I'll figure a way to solve that problem." I try to do that and get volunteers and others on my committee to do that. It requires being very objective about what needs to get done. It involves a whole bunch of qualities—skills, ability to deal with people, intellectual capability.

We conclude this brief venture into the analytic skills needed to be an effective leader (and effective agent of Generativity Two care) by turning to a lengthier analysis made by one of our Sage leaders regarding what doesn't work:

> There are two mistakes that leaders make. One is over-control. I have lots of examples where people may not understand how to do a job, and a supervisor explains it to them and then takes over the task while the volunteers stand around with their hands in their pockets. People aren't going to stand around very long because they didn't volunteer for that. Yelling and criticizing is also what I mean by over-control. Some leaders also make the mistake of looking too closely over someone's shoulder. Instead, let them make mistakes, let them try, and then show them what's wrong and they won't make the mistake again. The second mistake I see is people making assumptions and generalizations that lead to problems, like assuming someone knows what they're supposed to be doing and they're told "Go over there and do that." And the next thing you know they are making errors that could have been avoided. In some ways these two issues, over-control and assumptions and generalizations, are two sides of the same coin.

We suggest that "sides of the same coin" refers explicitly to the coin of analytic reasoning and, as our other Sage leaders have noted, to several other sides of the same coin-- the complex and interrelated coins of vision, effective questioning, and collaborative problem-solving.

Relational Skills: We turn now to a second element. It has been identified by Liedrka (1997) as critical to the generativity cycle. This element has to do with the skills needed to build a collaborative relationship. With regard to the role of Generativity Two, this means building relationships that are truly respectful and caring. Let's first consider the reflection offered by a Sage leader about her own leadership strengths:

> In thinking about my principal leadership strengths, I believe I have a good balance among personal style, ability to build relationships, and political capability. And all of this is rooted in action. Of these, building personal relationships is most important to me and probably best defines my leadership style. I also have the ability to be a quick study of people and decide whether to connect with them or not. I can immediately determine whether I'd like to get to know the person, or if the person possesses something important that I'd like to learn. I guess this came from all of the hiring I did in one of my early Bay Area jobs. I got to be very good at assessing people's strengths and weaknesses and at making "yes" or "no" decisions on whether to hire.

For this Generativity Two leader, it is a matter of first assessing the other person, then building a relationship that is compatible with this assessment. We also see in this Sage leader's statement a translation of skills learned while in a corporate setting to the civic leadership (Generativity Four) that she provides in her community.

One of our Emerging Sage leaders identifies his move to a more collaborative leadership style as a product of the corporate culture in which he worked (management in *The Gap,* a large clothing store corporation). His culture was a facilitator of collaboration rather than being a barrier:

> As I grew, I figured out how to delegate properly. This has taken a long time, but I think I get it now. *The Gap* really helped me in this way. My leadership style has changed from doing it myself to relying on a team of qualified people to do the same level or even better-quality work than I would do myself. Having an awareness of this is probably the biggest change in my leadership style.

Another Sage leader describes a process whereby she temporarily sets aside her analytic skills on behalf of relationship building:

> I have learned to reserve judgment and not be quick in making decisions based on the first thing that comes to my mind. I now take time to gather adequate information. I don't like people who come in and waste my time, but sometimes it is necessary to allow certain staff members to do that because it is valuable for the other person to express their concerns or views. There is value in the process, even if I know where the conversation is heading. This helps build a relationship with the person, whether I agree with that person or not.

One of the other leaders we interviewed for our Sage project offers a candid assessment of his own maturation with regard to relationship-building. He reminds us that relational skills are not always easy to either learn or apply:

> It took a long time, but I am learning to listen and develop patience. I also believe I am pretty good at building relationships among diverse individuals and groups. The most important may well be that my staff used to say I was a visionary. Developing patience and listening skills, building relationships, and being a visionary seem to be my main strengths.

It is interesting to note that this Sage leader not only emphasizes vision; he also points to patience and listening skills, which often seem in short supply when observing our contemporary society in operation.

Finally, one of our Sage leaders offers a wonderful interweaving of analytic and relational skills. He would be a perfect role model for Liedrka's generativity cycle:

> My major strength is an ability to bring together groups of people, help them to find common ground, and to share motivation and vision. I do this through building personal relationships. I like ideas and am good at getting groups of people to accomplish things. I like to find people who are better than me at implementing ideas, and then empowering and helping them do the job.

Entrepreneurial Skill: Liedrka's generativity cycle seems to require not just analytic and relational skills, but also the capacity to get something done. This is the heart of the entrepreneurial spirit and requires its own set of generative skills. The following observation reveals something about this skill set:

> I don't consider myself a leader, but others do. They give me a job, and I do it. When people want to help with a goal, I always find a way to get them involved. And I never turn them down. The job of a leader is to have vision, which I think I have. But I also know who to ask when I don't. I can always find someone with a different perspective that can help plan. I am not cocky and also treat everyone as an equal. When you treat people as an equal, they do things you would never think that they would do. I get people who find themselves doing amazing things, and I believe they feel they can do them because they are respected.

We particularly like the label given by one of our Sage leaders about entrepreneurship: "Two words come to mind when I think of effective leadership: *gentle fierceness*. You have to have compassion and be a good listener. You also have to be grounded and be able to cut through like an arrow to the truth of the matter. And understand what is being asked and what is being required."

We conclude this brief journey into entrepreneurship as a generative act by noting that many of our Sage leaders have come to recognize that entrepreneurship requires patience and a recognition that change does not happen overnight. It seems from all of our sources, that generativity of all kinds requires patience – whether we are relating to our own children, guiding a cherished project, mentoring a younger colleague, or advocating for an important cause. It also seems that our job as a professional coach is often to support our client in being patient in their own leadership. From an appreciative perspective we are there to help our client "lean into the future" and look for the long-term desired outcomes rather than the short-term fixes and quarterly returns. We can reference Jim Collins (2001) own research-baaed conclusion that patience is one of the key virtues to be found among "great" leaders.

Appreciation as Source of Energy and a Foundational Process

We now turn to the second and third alternative definitions of generativity by suggesting that both forms, when applying in an interpersonal setting where caring takes place, are fulfilled in the act of appreciation. Appreciation, in turn, is about identifying the strengths and potentials in other people and the possibilities to be found in challenges we confront. It is about "catching people when they are doing it right!" and "seeing each challenge as a door opening to a new possibility." One of our Sage leaders hits on this point directly:

> I like collaborative leaders. Some people advocate or lead from a sense of outrage. This approach may have a role, but I don't respect it. What I do admire is a leader who looks at possibilities and holds them by opening doors and asking questions. I want to be like that and am to some extent. I emulate people who I see as effective. It's more "appreciative" in nature, and I didn't even know that term until I met a colleague in our county's health and human service agency as a great example of a leader I admire tremendously. He allows and encourages the people under him to be good at what they do—and that's certainly an emerging part for me. He's also so thoughtful and kind and has a broad perspective. I just love working with him. His boundaries are not so tight that you can't move inside them.

Appreciation is also to be found in the recognition of one's own strengths and enduring values. This is where an appreciative approach to professional coaching is of particular values (Bergquist and Mura, 2011) We are catching our own coaching clients "when they are doing it right." 'Integrity and authenticity come with this recognition of strength and accomplishment. With repeated acknowledge of distinctive strengths comes the capacity to act consistently with integrity and authenticity. As coaches we help clients appreciate themselves while appreciating other people. This seems to be critical in engaging all forms of generativity.

We conclude this return to alternative definitions of generativity by offering a particularly astute set of observations made by one of our Sage leaders about the power of appreciation as a leverage point for the generation of energy and strategies for collaboration.

> I have seen leaders make several serious mistakes. One is confusing the organization with its mission. It's very easy for the organization to take on a "will to survive," similar to "the guardian" within us as individuals. This can blind those in the organization from exploring collaborations or even mergers that could better achieve the mission. It can also cause organizations to develop competitive rather than resource-sharing strategies. It can get all mixed-up with protecting one's job

and personal survival needs. And it takes courage to keep focused on the mission, especially in times of shifting paradigms and challenging economic issues.

Generativity seems to reside, finally, in a commitment to vision and the movement beyond one's personal interests (setting aside ego). This commitment and this movement are not easily engaged. A professional coach might lend a hand by asking questions that help to clarify commitment and offering support for actions being taken that display this commitment. A skillful and knowledgeable coach can also offer a broadening perspective regarding the important intertwining of personal and collective interests and welfare. It is from this systemic perspective that a coach can best help their client find the courage and persistence needed to foster collaboration and take the blindfold off a push toward competition and self-protection.

Mentoring Individuals and Organizations

The rest of this essay is devoted to insights offered by our Sage leaders about Generativity Two, as represented in the processes of mentoring both individuals and organizations. We begin with our leaders' reflections on their role as mentors. We then expand this perspective by talking about four related roles played by generative leaders: mediator, monitor, motivator, and mobilizer. Along with mentoring, these become the "Five M's" of Generative Two leadership. (Quehl and Bergquist, 2012).

We start this review by emphasizing the complex nature of Generative Two mentoring. Our Sage leaders describe a variety of ways in which they provide mentoring as organizational leaders. At this starting point, one of our Sage leaders said:

> I have a management role that I play. I supervise a number of programs, and my style is a mentoring role. I support staff in their leadership and help to move our department into new areas, like chronic disease prevention. I also create partnerships for the department by providing community service in ways that further the mission of public health.

In her brief description, this leader defines mentoring as not only support for other members of her organization, but also mentoring ideas and partnerships with other organizations. We will see additional ways that mentoring takes place as we tune into other Sage leaders in the following paragraphs-and as we then turn to the related roles of mediator, monitor, motivator, and mobilizer.

Learning about Mentorship

Why and how do Sage leaders become mentors? One ingredient of the role that mentoring plays in Generativity Two concerns the nature of rewards one receives from seeing other people be successful and acknowledged for their work. It is about expanding our perspective beyond self-based achievement. As one of our generative leaders noted, she is "motivated by the fun of seeing things happen as the result of the efforts of others and myself."

It is also, for her, about finding new sources of gratification:

> I see myself primarily as a mentor and enjoy promoting the professional growth of others. I encouraged someone to apply for a countywide coordinator position, and she brought me a bottle of champagne when she got the job. When I asked why, she told me she never thought to apply before I mentioned it. I got a huge charge out of that. That's why teaching, in all of its forms, has been so satisfying for me. I enjoy seeing people succeed and grow.

Mentoring the Mentors: In many cases, they themselves were mentored and found powerful role models among the men and women they worked with when young:

I admire the qualities of calmness and a willingness to listen in a leader. One leader stands out to me. There was an old business partner who was very successful, and he always took the time to listen and be involved. He knew so much more than I did about everything, but he always encouraged my decisions and supported them. And he did this in such a calm manner that it was empowering for me. The biggest thing of value I took from my relationship from him is that I have now developed similar abilities. I discuss a direction with people rather than dictate to them.

Another Sage leader offered a similar, heart-felt reflection on how she learned about mentoring and how she, in turn, "passes forward" this mentoring role:

I have been fortunate to have been mentored by some great individuals throughout my life. They have helped me to grow over the years and have allowed me to become an effective mentor myself. I mentor junior analysts at work, providing them with advice and help with personal training. I also provide role modeling in leading by example. I have extended my mentoring role in my involvement with the Business and Professional Women group of Nevada County, where I am on the mentoring committee. We target young women in their late teens, especially those from underserved populations, and provide mentorships. This includes meeting with the girls, having lunch with them, and helping them learn about opportunities. It also involves helping them determine what they want to do with their lives and identifying steps they need to achieve their goals.

A notable example of mentors teaching and mentoring other mentors is to be found in the work done by the SCORE organization in preparing their own new mentors to be effective in their work (Strojny, 2020). Set up as a volunteer organization to assist those starting a new business to be effective in preparing business plans and engaging in "start up," SCORE ensures that its new mentors not only receive training in mentoring but also sit alongside and are mentored by one of the experienced SCORE mentors. Regular sessions are also held where SCORE mentors at all stages of experience share their most challenging cases with one another. Learning occurs at all levels of SCORE. The ultimate beneficiaries are not just those who are receiving these invaluable pro bono services. Major benefits are also derived by those who are learning about a diversity of business operations by mentoring those starting these operations. If they are not retired, these SCORE mentors can take what they have learned about mentoring back to their own organization.

Coaching the Mentors: Leaders can also learn about mentoring from a coach. Taking an appreciative perspective, the coach can invite their client to look back in time while also looking forward. The backward look is an invitation to identify moments when the leader was already doing some mentoring—perhaps with their own children, with members of a sports team that they are coaching, or simply in their daily interaction with a new hire or someone they supervise who just took on a new assignment. This is a expansion on "catching them when they're doing it right."

By looking back in time for moments of skillful enactment, the coach is showing their client that they already "know how to do it right." They just need to determine how best to replicate their skillful behavior in specific settings. The coach asks: "so what did you say to that kid playing third base when they hit their first home run; they seem to have been energized by what you told them; and what about the kid who threw out the other kid trying steal second base; once again, you seem to have had a positive impact." Or the coach might offer the following inquiry: "you took that new hire around to meet the people with whom they would be working; it seems to have gone well; what did you ask their new colleagues to say about the workplace in which they are both about to spend eight hours a day/"

Then there is the matter of "leaning" and "learning" forward regarding mentoring, The coach can do a bit of teaching that builds on what their client already knows (identified when look backward to "catch them doing it right"). As a coach, it is often appropriate to share some of what we know about effective mentoring—including some of the insights we offer in this essay (based on the insights offered by our Sage leaders). The past is integrated with the future—that is how we "lean" and "learn" into the future. As we are about to note, these insights from other people are particularly valuable in helping one to make the challenging transition from doer to mentor and from being the champion to being the cheerleader.

Transition to Mentoring

Many of our Sage leaders, whether emerging or senior, reflect on the transition between being "take charge" and "doing it myself" leaders to a more collaborative and mentor-based role. One of our Emerging Sage leaders offers the following reflection:

> When I was younger, I was very driven and results oriented. I had to lead by example, and perfection was the goal. Now I view my leadership role more as mentor and coach, giving others the skills to move-up and move on and better themselves and not so much focus on myself. Helping others grow into those roles, not having it be only myself.

Another of our Sage leaders identified the transition primarily in terms of not taking ownership for everything herself (keeping the "monkey" off her back):

> I've gotten better at not over-committing by learning when to say "no." I also balance my time better than I did in the past and have more self-acceptance about wherever I'm at in my learning process. And I'm finding more ways to let go of responsibilities and create the opportunity for other people to step forward. When just I take the lead, it doesn't create much space for other people to step-up. I also now recognize the ego trip I get from being the one person who does it all. I'm trying to give more from my heart, rather than from a place of wanting recognition.

Mentoring with All Levels and at All Levels in the Organization

We wish to convey a particularly important insight offered our sage leaders that is directly relevant to our work as a professional coach. We found in reviewing the interviews conducted with our Sage leaders that mentorship occurs at many levels in an organization and can be engaged with the young, the middle-aged, and even those men and women who are older than ourselves. This where the *Scope of Appreciation* can be expanded by a coach. The coach can help their client discover ways in which they have already been mentoring someone who is older than themselves or consider future ways in which they might assist an older employee or someone much younger themselves.

  Here is a Sage leader who enjoys mentoring the young:

> My principal civic role here is in mentoring young people. There is one young woman in particular whose mother had been killed in an automobile crash. I helped to mentor her through her grieving process and our relationship continues to this day. I have also been involved in two other civic roles: as a mobilizer to bring about social change and as motivator to urge people toward public good and away from self-interest.

Another Sage leader identifies his role as a mentor to those in his organization who are new in the job and need to gain a perspective about how the whole organization works. These new employees need not be

young (especially in a work environment in which older people are seeking new career opportunities). We need to get "a lay of the land" at any age when joining a new organization:

> Within the probation department, I've had the opportunity to be in all of the units and become fluent in all the aspects of the organization. That's helped me become a leader in the department, and it has served me well. I tell [new] department members that they should go after assignments in different areas of the organization, because it gives them such valuable perspective to know that each unit has its own style and culture. Each can benefit from the other.

The mentoring of new or less experienced employees seems to be most effective if the person doing the mentoring is neither judgmental nor intimidating:

> My strongest role is mentor. In my school district position, I often have site administrators who are new or transitioning into a new position. I am the person they contact because I'm not intimidating, and they feel safe in calling me. One of my gifts is being able to put people into the right positions. This is one of the reasons I enjoy the district personnel position. Being able to get the right teacher in the right place is important, because then I know I am impacting many kids. I am a good mentor and really enjoy it.

Generativity Two often involves not just having gained considerable experience in one's working life in an organization, but also having achieved some well-deserved status and position-power in the organization.

In mentoring from the top of the organization, one can often provide protection for the younger or less experienced person being mentored:

> I admire leaders who protect their staff and take hits for them. The guy I worked for in Santa Cruz always looked so beat-up, and what he took on was just amazing. Whatever got filtered down to us, he would fight the battle. And when he couldn't fight the whole battle, he would somehow find a way. That's hard to do sometimes-- because the easiest thing to do is avoid fighting the battle.

This role of protector and shield as a mentor enables one to serve fellow employees regardless of age or experience. It is when our clients are "taking the hits" on behalf of others in their organization that a supportive and encouraging coach can be of particular value.

Generativity Two and the Four Other M's

Through our interviewing of both Emerging and Senior Sage leaders we encouraged a reflection on not only their generative role as mentors, but also the ways in which Generativity Two shows up as mediating, monitoring, motivating, and mobilizing. Coaches can be of great value if they engage yet another expanded Scope of Appreciation. In this case, they assist their client identify ways they are already being "helpful" to other people by serving in one of these roles. They might be serving in one of these roles at work or in their life outside of work. A coaching client is motivating members of their church to join one of the church's committees. One's client is mobilizing a task force in their community that will study the impact of a new zoning law.

An informal book club that was formed in a client's organization is being monitored by a coaching client to see if it might be formally sponsored--by giving participants some time off from work to participate in the club (provided the book being considered is relevant to the organization's ongoing operations). Insights gained from reflecting on these past or ongoing roles with one of the M's can be of great value in identifying

and preparing for new, expanded roles as someone being supportive of other people. Servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1970) can be alive and well when Scope of Appreciation is expanded.

Appreciative coaching can also enable a client to lean and learn into the future by gaining insights regarding the four Ms from those who are already engaged in one of these generative roles. Having learned about each of the four Ms from their coach, a coaching client might take on the assignment of discovering ways in which these roles are now being played by others in their organization, or might look to insights regarding their roles offered by generative people outside their organization—such as those in the Sage project.

Those who engage in one of the Ms can share stories and offer advice regarding the nature, costs and benefits of mediating, monitoring, motivating, and mobilizing. They can also provide some insights regarding how these other M's complement the generative role of mentoring--and create the conditions for Generativity Two to flourish. To gain some sense regarding what insights these generative folks might offer we provide some comments about the four M's made by our Sage leaders and turn first to the role of mediator.

Mediator

This first of the four M's has much to do with conflict. In a complex civic environment, there is room for diverse and passionately held opinions about many issues. We begin with a story provided by one of our Sage leaders about a direct role he played as mediator in a conflict-filled situation:

> We had a board member who was abusing the office staff. I met with him and asked that he stop. He thought about it and decided to resign from the board, although he is still supporting the organization. That was a success. He was a major contributor, and I was very much afraid he would stop, but he hasn't. There are also financial issues and the selection of a new Artistic Director. Another role I have played is driving home the fact that we are in a serious recession, that donations and ticket sales are going to be down, and that we must stop spending more each year than the year before. And now we are facing the need to search for a new Executive Director, and it is probable that I will serve on the search committee.

Through our study of Sage leaders, we concluded that the Generativity Two Sage leader who can mediate conflict and help mentor other people to become more effective and collaborative problem-solvers provides an invaluable service to her community (Quehl and Bergquist, 2012).

One of our Sage leaders frames the role of mediator in a broad, historical context:

> I always felt this country was founded on people becoming involved in their community. Back then we didn't have professional politicians because business and other leaders would come together to run their community, then leave and someone else would come and do the job. Well, we've screwed that up. I've always felt an obligation to pay back the community, because the people before me established an excellent school system and form of government. I've always felt the need to be involved, and I've always enjoyed it, working with right-thinking people who appreciate the community.

Ultimately, it seems that effective mediation involves many of the analytic and relational skills we identified earlier with regard to alternative definitions of generativity. Mediation (and perhaps all forms of generativity) also seems to require a strong dose of patience:

I have a lot more patience for stupidity than I used to have. In many cases, it's naiveté. Early on, that would irritate me no end. I'd have a hard time being patient with people who didn't get it or didn't want to get it. I came to accept that sometimes it's just like that.

Monitor

The second of the four M's complements mentoring (the fifth M) by providing an oversight function that is observant rather than judgmental. This is a tricky balance for any Generativity Two leader who wishes to be supportive, but also provide insights and expertise regarding the organization where she is serving as mentor. This monitoring leader is particularly concerned about uninformed and unreflective decision-making:

The biggest problem with some leaders? In brief terms: *Ready, Fire, Aim*. There's a lot wrapped up in that old saw, including anger, impulsiveness, and over-confidence. It is so easy when you have been in charge to see some idiotic thing happen that you don't know the background of but let fire any way. And that is more often than not the wrong thing to do.

Another Sage leader was faced with an even greater challenge--the continuing existence of his organization. How does one serve as mentor and observant monitor while facing a stressful crisis that is likely to precipitate the kind of *Ready, Fire, Aim* decision making described above?

Two years ago, when I would wake up some mornings, I was not sure we were going to keep our doors open. We were short on providers and our bills had mounted due to some mismanagement by one employee. So, we had to make some changes in personnel. We really bit the bullet and tightened our finances. We had to hope for about six months that our one medical provider could survive the increased patient caseload until we were able to successfully recruit, hire and train new people. We weathered those problems and made a successful turnaround, which has been very satisfying.

It seems that successful monitoring requires a balanced ego when helping to engage and resolve a conflict-filled issue. The Generativity Two monitor is doing hard work that often is not acknowledged or even appreciated by many people in an organization or community. The monitor is likely to be less visible—unlike the mediator who is often recognized for the role she is playing. The monitor usually doesn't get a plaque in the city park.

Mobilizer

Like the activist/monitor, the mobilizer is involved in providing active generativity in a collaborative, mentoring manner. This exemplifies yet again the delicate balancing act in which effective Generativity Two leaders must engage:

I think my strength is as a mobilizer. In all of the day-to-day things that I go through, it's really not me who's *doing* anything. It's more me knowing the people and having the knowledge to mobilize them in the direction we want to go. It's asking. "Why can't we do that?" or "How can we make that happen?" "Who do we need at the table?" The most important function is getting the train going down the tracks.

At the heart of the matter, mobilizers who are generative in their role find themselves finding and activating the energy of people with whom they work; in this way they are acting like the mechanical "generators" we identified in the previous essay. They are translating desire and vision into action:

Motivator

The last of the four M's often seems to involve leading by example, as well as providing a compelling vision that excites other people and leads them to collaboration:

> I'm good at motivating and helping others to have passion in what they are doing. If you lose motivation and passion, everything gets lost in details and turns into one big frustrating mess. So, I never lose sight of what I am doing. Everything is tied together in my personality.

This motivationally oriented Sage leader speaks about being a "cheerleader," especially when the "going gets tough":

> My strongest role is as a motivator—whether getting volunteers working with the girls, understanding why this work is so important, or empathizing when the work gets tough. I play this role with the board as well, walking a fine line between leader and cheerleader. Board members need to have a good grasp of the issues, but also not panic when those issues seem overwhelming.

A final insight we offer from our Sage interviews brings us back to the fundamental role played by appreciation in all aspects of generativity, including Generativity Two motivation. We motivate by helping our colleagues to focus on their own strengths and appreciate them:

> Motivator is an important piece, and probably the strongest tool I use in my advocacy work. There's a reason that people choose to work touching the lives of children. In engaging them, I help them to examine their core beliefs and mental models as a way to increase their effectiveness. The important part is doing this without destroying their sense of self-worth. It is all a work in progress, everything from education to child welfare to how we feed our kids. It's unfolding, and we're learning all of the time. Being positive is one of my strengths. I'm always reframing and don't even know that I'm doing it, and I think that helps people to look at possibilities.

Blending the Five M's

We add back in mentoring as the fifth M. Up to this point, we have treated the five M's as distinct roles that are all related to the broader process of Generativity Two. We have suggested that all interweave in some manner with the foundational process of mentoring (our fifth M). The actual enactment of Generativity Two, however, often involves interplay among the five Ms.

At the very least, our Sage leaders often acknowledge that they play all five generative roles:

> As a mentor, I have helped my staff and other community members learn how to engage people and deal with different situations. I also try to set a good example and help people to engage in advocacy, empowerment, and self-directing their lives. As a mediator I work to resolve community conflict, especially in situations where people have strong feelings or may not understand the whole picture. As a monitor, I am also very engaged in working with people who contact us because they feel they have been discriminated against. We know their rights, and we work with businesses and organizations to help ensure that these people are heard. Being a mobilizer is my favorite role, and where I have been most involved. My work has focused on systems change and making social change in our community, our politics, and our policies to support fairness and equality for people with disabilities. This has been the most challenging and the most rewarding role. We advocate on each individual's own behalf but do not tell the community what it needs to do. Instead, we

mobilize the community to see what is best for each individual, and what each wants to do to make that change on his or her own behalf. This approach has had excellent success.

Thus, it would seem that the tapestry of Generativity Two is made up of many distinct, though tightly interwoven ways of being helpful to other people. We assist by energizing, defending, provoking and at times defending on behalf of Generativity Two. We are helping to provide safety, learning and creativity when engaged in one or more of the five M's. As a professional coach, we can be truly helpful to a leader and their organization when assisting them in the effective engagement of Generativity Two services.

Conclusions

What does all of this mean? What have we learned about the complex processes of Generativity Two from our own coaching and consulting experiences and from the 100 interviews we conducted with Emerging and Senior Sage leaders?

Patience

We conclude, first, that Generativity Two doesn't occur overnight. It is a gradual, transforming process that is a central ingredient, as Erik Erikson noted, in the developmental process of any maturing adult. We must be patient, in particular, about the emergence of Generativity Two as a leadership style or perspective. We don't learn about Generativity Two from a textbook on leadership. Rather, we learn about it by observing and personally experiencing the generative role played by other leaders. And we learn how to be generative through our own accumulated positive and negative experiences in our work within organizations and communities:

> My leadership style has greatly changed over the years. When you're working for a living and have people working for you, it's a whole different approach to getting things done. If you were getting paid to do a job, I expected you to do it. That's the way we were brought up, and that's the way we learned to manage things. There's more control involved, and more downside. What I've taken away—what's been good for me—is that I don't need to be a controlling person anymore. I don't need to say, "Why didn't you get that done?" I'm a lot more appreciative of people. We're all volunteers, and I'm very appreciative of what these people do. And I've found it much easier to be personable with people that I don't even know, like a walk-on volunteer. I feel very comfortable with that person because I know they want to get involved in doing something for Habitat. I don't need to be controlling or measuring. I like to just lay it out there and say, "How are we going to get from here to here by this time?" It works.

Furthermore, it is more than being patient about our own emerging generative style of leadership. It is also about patience in observing and supporting the growth and maturation of other people with whom we interact as mentor, mediator, monitor, motivator, and mobilizer. It means thoughtfully awaiting the achievements we hope to gain in collaboration with other people and in our five generative M roles:

Quiet

We have concluded from the wisdom offered by our Sage leaders that effective Generative Two engagement is aligned with a particularly challenging stance: being quiet:

> I have tended to do things quietly. I live quietly and when I act, I act quietly. I like being in the background, working behind the scenes, rather than being up front. I am not a joiner and don't

> belong to a lot of organizations. So I do things without other people knowing. People don't have to know the good things one does. The Good Lord knows, and that's all that is important.

To be quiet is not to be mute, nor to stand by idly as bad decisions are being made. Our Sage leaders repeatedly talk about stepping in and providing both direction and energy when a problem emerges in their organization. To be quiet is to step away from taking credit for everything. It is about letting other people speak. It concerns the acknowledgement that you might not be the custodian of all truth. It is not always about being in the formal leadership role. Perhaps in the end, we should turn to the wisdom offered by one of the Sage leaders we quoted earlier. Generativity Two is about *Gentle Fierceness*.

_____

References

Bergquist, William (Ed.) (2020) Curated: Leadership. Library of Professional Coaching. Link: Curated 2020: Leadership | Library of Professional Coaching

Bergquist, William and Agnes Mura (2011) Coachbook: A Guide to Organizational Coaching Strategies and Practices. Sacramento, CA: Pacific Soundings Press.

Collins, Jim (2001) Good to Great. New York: Harper.

Erikson, Erik (1963) Childhood and Society. (2nd Ed.) New York: Norton.

Erikson, Erik (1974) *Dimensions of a New Identity*. New York: Norton.

Greenleaf, Robert (1970) *The Servant as Leader*. Peterborough, N.H.: Windy Row Press.

Jochens, Donald (1998) A Study of a Sociotechnical Systems Intervention on Productivity in the Production Operations of a Daily Newspaper Group. Dissertation. The Professional Psychology of Psychology.

Kotre, John (1984) *Outliving the Self*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Liedtka, Jeanne, Mark E. Haskins, John W. Rosenblum and Jack Weber (1997) The Generative Cycle: Linking Knowledge and Relationships, MIT Sloan Management Review, October 15, 1997. Link: The Generative Cycle: Linking Knowledge and Relationships (mit.edu)

McAdams, Dan and Ed de St. Aubin (Ed.) (1998) *Generativity and Adult Development*. Washington D. C.: American Psychological Association.

McAdams, Dan, Holly Hart and Shadd Maruna (1998), "The Anatomy of Generativity" in McAdams, Dan and Ed de St. Aubin (Ed.) (1998) *Generativity and Adult Development*. Washington D. C.: American Psychological Association, pp.7-43.

Post, Davis (nd) *The Theory of Generativity*. DavidPost@temple.edu. http://www.davidpost.com.

Quehl, Gary and William Bergquist (2012) *The Sages among Us: Harnessing the Power of Civic Engagement*. Grass Valley, CA: The Center for Nonprofit Leadership.

Rogers, Everett. (1962) Diffusion of Innovations. 5th Edition. New York: Free Press.

Sandstrom, Jeannine and Lee Smith (2017) Legacy Leadership: The Leaders Guide to Lasting Greatness (2nd Ed.) Dallas Tx: CoachWorks.

Snyder, Mark and E. Gil Clary (2004) "Volunteerism and the Generative Society" in de St. Aubin, Ed, Dan McAdams and Tae-Chang Kim (Ed.) *The Generative Society*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, pp. 221-237.

Strojny, Nancy (2020) Mentoring for the Greater Good. Library of Professional Coaching. Link: https://libraryofprofessionalcoaching.com/concepts/ethics/nancy-strojny-mentoring-for-the-greater-good/