

*Erol Sundelowitz,
Carol Macdonald,
Karel Stanz*
Republic of South Africa

Trapped in Perpetual Peripheral Participation: Unseen and Undiscovered Leadership Potential

Abstract

The present study is focussing on the leadership potential at schools that goes unnoticed, unacknowledged and un-nurtured. Traditionally, schools focus on children/learners whose leadership traits are encouraged and developed through conventional structures such as the prefect system and the leadership schools/camps that selected candidates are sent on. By developing the concept of Leadership Cocoons, this study is drawing attention to individuals whose potential for leadership lies hidden in a chrysalis form that is masked for leadership selection by pervasive, generic, norm-generated criteria. Such individuals are trapped in a situation of Perpetual Peripheral Participation around communities of leaders. As a means to explore the above issues, the paradigm of Cultural Psychology has been selected.

Keywords: Self-concept, Multiple Intelligences, Leadership Cocoons, Perpetual Peripheral Participation, Cultural Psychology, methodology, Early Childhood Education.

INTRODUCTION

The study – in process – on which this article is based, is a doctoral study that is being conducted through the University of Johannesburg, South Africa. A central purpose of the study is to develop theory around the concept of *Leadership Cocoons* for two main practical reasons. The first is to develop a view of leadership assessment that will encourage the incorporation of selection strategies that are more broadly encompassing and give credence to individual differences. In other words, the developing theory hopes to encourage the inclusion of strategies that are not as narrowly focussed as present strategies are described as being.

The second reason is to draw attention to individuals who fall prey to a system where those who do well in school stand out and are rewarded for excellence. However, not every individual manages to assemble all the elements necessary to succeed in traditional educational terms. Not everyone is ready for leadership at an early stage of their lives, though standard international education systems start preparing future leaders early on in their training to become productive adults. Traditional educational systems – with their norm-based criteria – only cater for individuals who fall within the range for meritorious behaviour, being strongly informed by the axiom of ‘Nothing succeeds like success’.

Researching the issues

Guiding Paradigm

The research and theoretical paradigm that has been chosen to guide the present study is that of Cultural Psychology. The main proponents of Cultural Psychology are taken to be Shweder (1991), Bruner (1996), Cole (1996), and Wertsch (1998). As a point of departure for this section, a preliminary description is offered of a unit of analysis for this paradigm. Cultural Psychology looks at cognitive activity both within individual subjects as well as the social activity systems that have historically engendered this cognitive activity. Furthermore, the social systems that maintain and further develop such activity need to be included in a conceptualisation of a unit of analysis (Cole, 1985). The emphasis for ‘analysis’ for Cultural Psychology is therefore on cultural units as they are expressed through and embedded in socially constructed interactive activity contexts.

An important facet of research within this paradigm is that it does not seek to formulate definitions of generic individuals that operate only within a very restricted realm of social behaviour. This precept also falls within the domain of MI (Multiple Intelligence) theory as described below. “Behavioural science ... has, for the most part, dealt with generic individuals, admitting into the system only those features of human nature that all men have in common,” (Harré & Secord, 1972, p.81). The pursuit of a generic individual definition is very limiting in that it reduces individuals down to a set of criteria that have been imported from scientifically generated norms. Such criteria do not give enough credence to the differences which create individuals. Wertsch (1998, p. 21) points out that, “One of the tasks of sociocultural analysis . . . is to find a way to avoid the pitfalls of such individualistic reductionism”. Differences between individuals are to be celebrated and should be seen as “an inherent part of the human condition” and should be

valued for their ability to enrich research endeavours (Graue, 1998, p. 16). Differences between individuals are therefore to be celebrated and not controlled for.

The concept of context is central to Cultural Psychology and the concepts of context that have informed this study are Cole's (1996) concept of "*Contexts as That Which Surrounds*" (p. 132) and his concept of "*Contexts as That Which Weaves Together*" (p. 135) (italics as in original). Under the *Contexts as That Which Surrounds* metaphor, any cognitive event, behavioural event or intersubjectively constructed activity system that might be identified as being worthy of being researched should be viewed as being subsumed by, and embedded in, surrounding layers of context that are interrelated and interpenetrating. Neither of Cole's two views of context sees "boundaries" as "clear-cut and static"; boundaries are rather seen as being "ambiguous and dynamic" (*ibid*, p. 135). "When using the surrounds interpretation of context, the psychologist seeks to understand how this task is shaped by the broader levels of context" (*ibid*, p. 133).

Cole's *Contexts as That Which Weaves Together* metaphor sees the relationship between task and its context as "a qualitative relation between a minimum of two analytical entities (threads) which are two moments in a single process" (*ibid*, p.135). The constituent aspects of the context are said to be woven together through the thread of activity, and it is in "following the thread of activity" that the researcher is said to find his work (*ibid*, p.139). This view sees context as providing the thread that weaves together the various constituting elements of an activity system. Whatever the elements are that are identified, they are all dynamically interrelated and woven together through the thread of activity. "The various components of the activity system do not exist in isolation from one another; rather, they are constantly being constructed, renewed, and transformed as outcome and cause of human life" (*ibid*, p. 141).

Why Cultural Psychology and not one of the other Psychologies?

The focus on *culture* in Cultural Psychology is on culture as a non-generic and variable concept, and the emphasis for research is on variety within historical/cultural contexts. The objective of exposing a variety of variables rather than on 'controlling for' variables serves to direct research attention away from *generic individuals* studied *in vitro*, to the *in vivo* context textured by the enmeshed threads that are the legacy of the present South African milieu. *In vitro* research refers to a "grotto" type of controlled laboratory experimental setting created under other paradigms in psychology. *In vivo* refers to "the market place of semiotic transactions" (Miller, 1987, p. 195) of human activity systems where the focus is on real life situations rather than on a test-tube view of context.

General psychology is said to have a test-tube view of human functioning in its search for a central processing mechanism that drives generic individuals. Cross-cultural psychology exports the instruments developed by general psychology and applies them to other cultures where they seek out reinforcing evidence for a broadly applicable central processing mechanism. The 'other psychologies' – unlike Cultural Psychology – control for any individuating factors or extraneous variables as might be found in local manifestations and levels of context. Psychological Anthropology will look at the above variables and variations but they will try to identify the way in which they fit into and are influenced by the template of the central processing mechanism. Here, "the central processing mechanism gives structure to a sociocultural environment, either by mediating the relationship between its stuff or by impressing its abstract form upon it" (*ibid*, p. 89). According to Schweder (1991, p. 100), Cultural Psychology makes none of the presumptions of fixedness as do the 'other psychologies'. The aim of Cultural Psychology, he says, "is to develop an interpretive framework in which nothing is by fundamental nature fixed, universal, transcendent . . . and abstract; and in which local things can be embedded, but only for a while".

Methodology

For research under Cultural Psychology, allowance needs to be made for an organic aspect in the development of a research project. The following is therefore a current list of some of the research strategies that have been adopted in the present study:

Autobiographical Case Study

I was a non-achiever throughout my school career. I was one of the "Invisible Children" that Pye (1988) writes about. I was an invisible non-achiever to the extent that I failed high school outright and only began my academic career in my thirties with a mature age university entrance exemption. I had begun researching the literature on biographical case studies when I came across the term/research strategy of 'autobiographical case study' and 'autoethography'. With the knowledge and support of precedent, a decision was made to adopt this strategy for the present study. My entry into this field was Chenail (1996)'s *Questionnaire for an Autobiographical Portrait of a Practicing Therapist and Researcher*. In adopting this approach, it became incumbent on me to demonstrate academic rigour and to "provide reasons why others should trust [my] findings" (Feldman, 2003, p. 27; cf. also Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001).

Questionnaire-based surveys

Burgess (2001, p.1) points out that, "The strength of the analysis depends on good quality data that in turn stems from good design of the data collection instru-

ment, i.e. the questionnaire, and of the collection procedures.” Using – among others – Schonlau, Fricker Jr., and Elliott (2005) to inform the process, a questionnaire was designed for distribution to individuals. In addition to an adult survey, surveys have also been conducted at primary and high schools, using the same basic set of questions, (Sundelowitz, 2006a, b & e). The same basic set of questions was used for all three levels to enable a correlation of themes for data analysis.

Expert Input

In terms of monitoring and maintaining academic rigour, the academic supervisor for the study is Dr Carol Macdonald (University of Witwatersrand) and the co-supervisor is Dr Karel Stanz (University of Johannesburg). Leadership specific experts have and will be consulted for their input on the research topic. For example, at a recent conference attended by the author, the presenter of a WIP (Work in Progress) paper entitled *Leadership values across gender and culture* (Cox, Amos and Baxter, 2006) was approached with a view to interpolating data and results. The strategy of seeking out expert input will be used to add a further element in contributing to a “thick description” of context (Geertz, 1975) for the concept of *Leadership Cocoons* and as part of the possibilities of utilising interdisciplinary contributions (Cole, 1996) within Cultural Psychology.

Two established concepts

Self-concept

A healthy self-concept could be said to be necessary for a child to emerge from their Leadership Cocoon and to own a leadership position. A concept of the self-as-leader starts developing early on in a child’s life and is especially affected by his/her engagement with the formal education system. To own the silk of their leadership, children need to have a healthy self-concept, after all, “Healthy self-esteem is a child’s armor against the challenges of the world,” (Sheslow, and Lukens, 2005, p.1). If the child (or an individual of any age) does not have a ‘healthy’ self-concept, owning the silk of their leadership talent is a challenge. “Children who think poorly of themselves have a hard time finding solutions to problems. If they are plagued by self-critical thoughts, such as ‘I’m no good’ or ‘I can’t do anything right,’ they may become passive, withdrawn, or depressed,” (*ibid*). The negativity becomes generalised beyond the self. Under such circumstances the individual starts insulating him/herself against the challenges of the world in a manner not too dissimilar to the way in which a silkworm spins an insulating cocoon that blocks out the outside world.

Self-concept can be said to be a major contributing factor to the creation of Leadership Cocoons. There is evidence of the phenomenon of *Leadership Cocoons* occurring at an elementary (primary) and high (secondary) school level, even if it is indirect or recognised by peers (Sundelowitz: 2006a; 2006e). There is also retrospective evidence for the issue in our adult survey (Sundelowitz, 2006b). “. . . students who are performing well at the elementary level may be able to draw on those experiences in ways that leave them less susceptible to negative changes in academic self-perceptions during the transition,” (Silverthorn, Dubois and Crombie, 2005, p.197). Dissonant self-concepts seldom allow children who might be classed as Leadership Cocoons the luxury of smooth transition from primary to secondary school, and thence into the challenging and turbulent real world of work.

“. . . self-concept is not innate, but is developed or constructed by the individual through interaction with the environment and reflecting on that interaction,” (Huiitt, 2004, p.1). The dynamic aspect of self-concept – and the fact that it often takes constant work to maintain the ‘self-as-leader’ once out of the cocoon (if that occurs at all) – is a life-long task as has been described above. The maintenance of personal growth and acceptance of their leadership silk can be an ongoing task for a child as well as for those in charge of selecting leaders. Citing Gardner (1990) as source, Kleon (1998, p.1) points out that, “All talent develops through interplay - sometimes over many years - between native gifts on the one hand and opportunities and challenges on the other.” How an individual’s all talents develop – especially for *Leadership Cocoons* – has direct bearing on their self-concept. If circumstances conspire to create the right conditions for a transition in concept of the self-as-leader, then cocooned leaders might be induced into metamorphosis and thereby enable their legitimate engagement at the periphery of leadership contexts.

Multiple Intelligences and Leadership

Gardner (1999, p.91) says that he regards Multiple Intelligence theory as, “a ringing endorsement of three key positions: We are not all the same; we do not have the same kinds of minds (that is, we are not all distinct points on a single bell curve); and education works most effectively if these differences are taken into account rather than denied or ignored.” The concept that “We are not all the same” (*ibid*) is in accordance with the non-generic view of the individual as espoused by Cultural Psychology. “People have a wide range of capacities. A person’s strength in one area of performance simply does not predict any comparable strengths in other areas,” (*ibid*, p.31). Martin (2001) points to the fact that the selection of leadership candidates in organisations is not fair if it does not allow for leadership identification from within a broader non-generic spectrum of talents. The same

concept can be applied to single process leadership selection criteria at school level which is the period when future leaders' track records are being mapped out.

Gardner (1999, p.139) says that, "If I were asked to assess someone's intelligences, I would not be satisfied until I had observed him solving problems and fashioning products in a number of settings". This speaks to a recommendation that a more broadly encompassing strategy for identifying leadership talent/potential be adopted by leader selectors at all levels. Jolly and Kettler (2004, p.1) point out that, "no one assessment adequately [assesses] the construct of leadership in youth". Assessments of leadership in youth – children in school – generally focus on a limited number of the multiple intelligences as outlined by Gardner (1999). The effectiveness of any assessment is exacerbated by their narrow focus on what counts as valid intelligence – in this case, what counts as a valid predictor of leadership talent. After all, "intelligences are . . . potentials . . . that will or will not be activated, depending on the values of a particular culture, the opportunities available in that culture, and the personal decisions made by the individuals and/or their families, schoolteachers and others," (*ibid*, p. 34). The fact that common assessment strategies focus on what would be acceptable norms for predictors of future leadership performance, does not do service to those individuals who could be described as *Cocooned Leaders*.

A results observatory

The results from this section are based on a current analysis of feedback from four strategies/sources: An autobiographical case study (in process); a survey conducted with children in their final year of Primary School (ages 11-12); a survey conducted with High School students between the ages of 16-17; and an adult survey where there are historical traces for the central issues of the study. The aim of these data gathering strategies was to provide a snapshot longitudinal overview by examining a variety of lifespan stages that would offer support for the developing theory of *Leadership Cocoons*. It was not considered adequate to examine data purely focussed on early childhood, but it was rather considered of relevance to examine the consequences of early childhood educational practices and contexts on leadership identification, selection and development – the consequences here being specifically either the emergence of the child as leader from his/her cocooned position or entrenchment in *Perpetual Peripheral Participation*. The direct implications for early childhood education are discussed below in the last section of this article.

Engaging with the process of writing an *Autobiographical Case Study* has provided an interesting challenge for me as principal author of this article (the use of

the first person is purposefully used here). I am a leader and recognised by many as such, but it took me till fairly recently to be able to make such a statement. I started spinning my cocoon in my preschool years. My mother has said, "I first knew you had a problem when I drove past your kindergarten and saw you sitting on your own, separated from the group," (personal communication). Sitting down to answer Chenail (1996)'s autobiographical questionnaire showed me the extent to which I had insulated myself from positive feedback because of my entrenched self-fulfilling prophecy of not being good enough. "A comment of my father's when I was a youngster playing cricket with him and my brother [this could have been around the age of eight]. I missed a ball and was told, 'You are no good at anything.' I adopted this as a credo," (Sundelowitz, 2006d, p. 2). My resultant life strategy became to add further gum to my cocoon. I was so hell-bent on maintaining my insulation that, "what I used to do was run away, run into hiding, wait a while and try to find something new to fail at," (*ibid*, p. 8). I resisted metamorphosis into a leader, despite experiences that occurred in my life which demonstrated my leadership potential. This resistance had its roots deep in my early years and was reinforced by my non-mould personality.

The second source of findings can be seen in Sundelowitz (2006a). This was the first survey conducted at the school. In response to the question, "Can you identify with the concept of a Leadership Cocoon (as described above) and if so, how and why?"; a limited depth of understanding on the part of the respondents was apparent. However, there is evidence elsewhere in the survey of relating to the concept. If at this age children are unable to formally identify their *own* leadership reticence, they do, however, relate to seeing it in *others*. There is also evidence of withholding of leadership action in themselves. A sample of a response from the report in support of the above are as follows (spelling as in original): "I dont remember myself as a leader I dont see my self as one crose people that are leader's see they slef as one but I dont if I wanted to be one I would be but don't want it's not my thing." (*ibid*, p. 3)

By the time they reach the end of secondary or high school (Sundelowitz, 2006e), children may have improved talent in expressing themselves, but many of the core issues remain the same: non-recognition of their own potential, poor self-concept, lack of experience and issues from the home environment that prompt individuals to opt out of actualising their leadership potential (Sundelowitz, 2006c). Some responses from Sundelowitz (2006e) are cited below:

- "No, as I did not feel that people looked up to me. And I was not chosen as a potential leader;" (p.1)
- "No as I was never given the chance to prove myself as a leader;" (p. 1)

There is a degree of follow through from the school level responses to adult

responses to the survey (Sundelowitz, 2006b). One response is cited here for the purpose of demonstrating how a concept of the self-as-leader can remain with a person in perpetuity:

“I not only never led (in anything, except scholastically) but was also looked at unenthusiastically by those who were selecting groups or teams for any activity. (Perhaps it has some bearing that I am very short in stature. Was shocked to find that when I was in std.1 I was the shortest child in the whole school – and have no “ball sense” – can’t catch almost anything - ball games were and are a penance.)” (p. 4).

The interesting thing about this response is that it came from a woman of 75 years old who actually has achieved great success in her life. She says that, “Firstly, it took me many years to lose the embarrassment, the feeling of inferiority and lack of ability, and to stop blushing and wanting to hide. Even today I can hardly credit the amount of confidence I generate,” (*ibid*, p.10). Despite her feelings of negative self-worth in terms of leadership abilities, she is obviously a person who has achieved great things and is often “relied on” by others. Others trust her but she does not seem to trust herself. This is rooted in her childhood experiences and her concept of self that she so assiduously hangs onto.

Two new concepts

Leadership Cocoons

Through developing the concept of *Leadership Cocoons*, the present study is focusing on the leadership potential at schools that goes unnoticed, unacknowledged and un-nurtured. Traditionally, schools encourage and develop children’s/learners’ leadership traits through conventional structures such as the prefect system and the leadership schools/camps that selected candidates are sent on. The potential for leadership of individuals who fall prey to the system – the so-called non-, poor and under- achievers – lies hidden in a chrysalis form that is masked against leadership selection by generic, norm-generated criteria that are applied widely in western contexts. Children who fall short of such criteria begin insulating themselves from a very young age against the challenges of the world, especially those of leadership.

This process can be likened to the process whereby silkworms cocoon themselves. The process is conducted through the production of, “a protein material that coats the filaments of raw silk as it is extruded from the silkworm’s body. This gum bonds the filaments of silk together and aids in the formation of the cocoon,” (Selk, 2005, p.1). For a child who might be viewed as in the process of weaving him/herself into leadership obscurity, the fixedness of this gum presents a challenge for him/her to

undo. Evidence for this can be seen in Sundelowitz (2006b, p. 5). One of the respondents in this survey commented that, “it took [him] many years to lose the embarrassment, the feeling of inferiority and lack of ability, and to stop blushing and wanting to hide”. The fixedness manifests in children in them being, “too afraid to step into any kind of roll,” (*ibid*, p. 3).

Individuals often resist emerging from their cocoon and owning their leadership potential (Sundelowitz, 2006b) because they have a reputation and track record as a non-leader – this is where the weaving of the cocoon becomes inevitable. On the other hand, those in charge of selecting leadership candidates cannot see the silk of leadership potential here due to the opaque insulation of the cocoons. Neither initiative nor participation in leadership contexts is demonstrated or seen. Leadership Cocoons thereby stand in contrast to the type of future leader where an achievement trajectory has been identified, owned and pursued. On course candidates can be said to have been consistent achievers throughout their school history. The biggest challenge for such children is often to maintain their ‘top achiever’ position. The same cannot be said for non-achievers who have fallen through the meritocratically orientated future leader net. These are cocooned children who are, more often than not, *Invisible Children*, children who strive to remain unnoticed (Pye, 1988). In the process of insulating themselves in *Leadership Cocoons*, such children land up living in “Nomansland”. “Nomansland “offers protection from attention and activity” (*ibid*, p. 38), especially if it were to involve participation in leadership roles.

Today, much as it pains me to say it, I still find myself waging this invisible battle. I am leader, both in practice and by some form of innate design, and yet I still need the approval to know that I am leading. I still need the nod from the group to know that I can do the job. I still struggle with the lack of confidence, despite repeated, repeated, repeated reminders that I am more than capable. (A respondent in Sundelowitz, 2006b, p. 7)

Perpetual Peripheral Participation

Leadership Cocoons find themselves in a fixed orbit in terms of their engagement with communities of leadership practice. Such children find themselves in a state of marginality, “a form of non-participation [that] prevents full participation. Here, it is the non-participation aspect that dominates and comes to define a restricted form of participation,” (Wenger, 1999, p.166). They exist on a perpetual periphery. Peripherality as described by Lave and Wenger (1991)’s theory of *Legitimate Peripheral Participation* (LPP) implies at least a certain degree of participation and would include newcomers who stand at the periphery of engagement with a community of practice. This does not apply to *Leadership Cocoons*. They never cross the border into even peripheral participation in leadership.

Such children are not apprentices in the craft of leadership and have no chance or opportunity of being coached to the central point of mastery. They do not experience the gift of apprenticeship and are thereby denied the “journey within the community [where] newcomers learn skills, acquire knowledge, and understand the artifacts and identities of the community, eventually becoming what are known as old timers,” (Altalib, 2002, p. 5). Theirs is not the type of Peripherality described in LPP theory where,

The partial participation of newcomers is by no means “disconnected” from the practice of interest. Furthermore, it is also a dynamic concept. In this sense. Peripherality, when it is enabled, suggests an opening, a way of gaining access to sources of understanding through growing involvement. (Lave and Wenger, 1991, p. 37).

Their peripherality is more a type of marginalisation not unlike that described by UNICEF (2005, p. 7) where the children being described “are excluded, marginalized and often invisible”. They are not “on an inbound trajectory that is construed by everyone to include full participation in the future,” (Wenger, 1999, p. 7). No future leadership trajectory is identifiable by those looking for incipient signs of leadership ability. Their only connection with the community of leaders is the gravitational force that maintains their orbit around communities of leadership practice. *Leadership Cocoons* exist in a state of what we choose to call *Perpetual Peripheral Participation*.

Implications for early childhood education

Dodds (2006, p.1) – an Early Childhood Education specialist – has made the following comment:

I think you could substitute reader for leader. All children are potential readers/leaders. When a teacher teaches to a model, or even teaches the subject rather than the children, many children don’t get it. Young children – 3 to 4 years don’t really care but when they emerge as having reading difficulties they certainly form a cocoon around themselves.

If those involved in enculturating the child and preparing his future education trajectory are too fixed on the sort of model referred to by Dodds (above), then much about the child is missed. “Primary school teachers didn’t recognise [or have the ability to recognise] where your strengths lay. [You were non-mould]. They didn’t bother to see other qualities. High school was an extension of primary school,” (Sundelowitz, 2006c, p. 1). What happens in Early Childhood Education has consequences for the child in all future stages of his schooling experience.

Dodds (*op cit*) points out that, “When children are unable to meet the demands/requirements of the environment, they are never ‘wiped out’. They certainly do cocoon themselves and their talents and gifts are lost to the group/environment and ultimately society”. Generic, norm-based selection criteria are prepared for when the child first engages with the formal education system. The consequence of this type of lack of fairness to individuality for those who do not fit the mean standards list, is a type of self-judgment that initiates the process of spinning of insulating capsules such as *Leadership Cocoons*. “I think the ‘trouble’ begins when we as adults somehow convey to a perfect child that he/she is not part of the pack, team or environment anymore because he/she is not meeting requirements or standards,” (Dodds, *op cit*).

In his comments on Sundelowitz (2001) Michael Cole pointed to the unfairness of norm based school readiness assessments tools and strategies (personal communication), and how this study conducted with a group of 5–6 year old children supported this fact. Sundelowitz (2001, p. 145), points out the following:

. . . not all children are at the same stage or state of readiness at the same point in time - although what Grade One entrance assessment tests test is extremely norm-related. What one child might be able to produce in an entrance test might be what another still has to achieve or what yet another child achieved a long time ago. There are different possible levels of accomplishment, at various points in time, for different reasons and “whenever we define readiness in terms of a specific level of accomplishment, we are omitting children from this definition who have not had similar life experiences or opportunities for learning” (Meisels, 1998:7).

The above extract could easily be applied to the issue of leadership in early childhood. Dodds (2006, p.1, as cited above) supports this when she points out that the perception in a child that he is not perfect is the result of environmental influences and the adults who people that environment. This emergence of perceptions of mismatch between performance and expectation contributes to the formation of *Leadership Cocoons*.

This article has presented new theory based on a doctoral study which is currently still in process. A principle focus of what has been presented is to demonstrate how norm-based assessment criteria fall short of serving all children equitably. What has been presented has been made possible through the paradigm of Cultural Psychology, where the view of the development of children is teleonomical and thereby open-ended and non-generically orientated. This is the best way to honour each individual child.

Each individual is as different as their fingerprints and leadership reveals itself in many forms. The child who is fresh to the environment can teach us more about

what we have forgotten because they have no concept of leadership. Leaders will emerge in power, in vulnerability, in shyness. I have witnessed three year old children lead in silence with focus and intent. As they concentrate on the perfection of the task others are drawn to the situation like magnets. (Dodds, 2006, p. 1)

Bibliography

- Altalib, H. (2002): *Situated Cognition: Describing the Theory*. Fifteen page document as retrieved from the ERIC database on 25 November 2005.
- Bruner, J. S. (1996): *Culture of Education*. Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press.
- Bullough, R.V. & Pinnegar, J. (2001). Guidelines for Quality in Autobiographical Forms of Self-Study Research. *Educational Researcher*, 30:3. 13–21.
- Burgess, T.F. (2001): *A General Introduction to the Design of Questionnaires for Survey Research*. Edition 1.1 from Information Systems Services, University of Leeds. As downloaded on 30 Jan 2006 from <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/iss/documentation/top/top2.pdf>.
- Chenail, R.J. (1996): Questionnaire for an Autobiographical Portrait of a Practicing Therapist and Researcher. *The Qualitative Report*, Vol.2:4. One web page as downloaded on 5 Nov 2005 from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR2-4/autobio.html>.
- Cole, M. (1985): The zone of proximal development: where culture and cognition create each other. In, Wertsch, J.V. (Ed.). *Culture, Communication and Cognition: Vygotskian Perspectives*. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Cole, M. (1996): *Cultural Psychology*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Cox, A., Amos, T. & Baxter, J. (2006). Leadership values across gender and culture. Work-in-Progress presentation, Conference Proceedings, SAIMS, 18th Annual Conference of the Southern Africa Institute for Management Scientists: *Demystifying the Art of Management ... through Research*. Pretoria, South Africa: SAIMS.
- Dodds, H. (2006): *Email Response to the Concept of Leadership Cocoons and its Applicability of the Issues to Early Childhood Education*. Received 9 October 2006.
- Feldman, A. (2003): Validity and Quality in Self-Study. *Educational Researcher*, 32:3. 26–28.
- Gardner, H. (1999): *Intelligence Reframed: Multiple Intelligences for the 21st Century*. New York: Basic Books.
- Geertz, C. (1975): *The Interpretation of Cultures*. London: Hutchinson.

- Harcourt, D. & Conroy, H. (2005): Informed assent: ethics and processes when researching with young children. In: *Early Child Development and Care*, 175:6, August 2005. 567–577.
- Harré, R. & Secord, P.F. (1972): *The Explanation of Social Behaviour*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Huitt, W. (2004): Self-concept and self-esteem. *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. As downloaded on 28 Oct 2005 from <http://chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/col/regsys/self.html>.
- Jolly, J. & Kettler, T. (2004): Authentic Assessment of Leadership in Problem-Solving Groups. *Gifted Child Today*, Waco, Winter 2004, Vol. 27:1. 32–39 (1 web page). As downloaded on 6 Oct 2005 from the ProQuest Research Database.
- Kleon, S. (1998): Leadership Skill Development of Teen Leaders. *Journal of Extension*, June 1998, 36:3. As downloaded on 25 Oct 2005 from <http://www.joe.org/joe/1998june/rb1.html>.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991): *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, J.J. (2005): “*Maya Angelou Quotes*.” About Women’s History. As downloaded from http://womenshistory.about.com/cs/quotes/qu_maya_angelou.htm on 18 Feb 2006.
- Martin, J. (2001): *Profiting from Multiple Intelligences in the Workplace*. Wales, U.K.: Crown House Publishing Limited.
- Miller, R. (1987): Methodology: a focus for change. In, Mauer, K.F. & Retief, A.I. (eds). *Psychology in Context*. Pretoria: HSRC.
- Pye, J. (1988): *Invisible Children: Who are the real losers at school?* Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Rosnow, R. & Rosenthal, R. (1996): *Beginning Behavioral Research*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Schonlau, M., Fricker Jr., R.D. & Elliott, M.N. (2005): *Conducting Research Surveys via E-mail and the Web*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Books and Publications. Downloaded on 06 Feb 2006 in separate PDF files from http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR1480/index.html.
- Selk, K. (2005): Secrets of Silk by Selk. One web page as downloaded on 12 June 2006 from http://www.treenwaysilks.com/secrets_silk.html.
- Sheslow, D.T. & Lukens, C.T. (2005): *Developing your Child’s Self-Esteem*. As downloaded on 28 Oct 2005 from http://www.kidshealth.org/parent/emotions/feelings/self_esteem.html.
- Shweder, R.A. (1991): *Thinking Through Cultures: Expeditions in Cultural Psychology*. Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press.

- Silverthorn, N., Dubois, D.L & Crombie, G. (2005): Self-Perceptions of Ability and Achievement Across the High School Transition: Investigation of a State-Trait Model. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 73:3. 191–218.
- Sundelowitz, E. (2001): “Coming Ready or Not”: *The Hide and Seek of School Readiness in a Historically “Model C” School*. Research report submitted in partial fulfilment of the degree of Master of Education in the Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education, University of the Witwatersrand.
- Sundelowitz, E. (2006a): *Evaluation Report: Hazelglen Primary School Survey One*. Unpublished evaluation report submitted to Hazelglen Primary School on 3 April 2006.
- Sundelowitz, E. (2006b): Response Collation Table: Adult Survey One. Unpublished collation of responses to the first adult survey for the study: “Leadership Cocoons”: *The Hidden Leadership Potential of School Non-achievers*.
- Sundelowitz, E. (2006c): *Interview with J.A.*. Unpublished interview write-up.
- Sundelowitz, E. (2006d): *Autobiographical Case Study Working Document*. Unpublished notes, responses to Chenail (1996), Autobiography/autoethnography reading summaries and other notes made in pursuance of the doctoral study, “Leadership Cocoons”: *The Undiscovered Leadership Potential of School Non-achievers*.
- Sundelowitz, E. (2006e): *Response Collation Table: Valeden Survey One*. Unpublished collation of responses to the first Grade 12 survey at Valeden High School for the study: “Leadership Cocoons”: *The Hidden Leadership Potential of School Non-achievers*.
- UNICEF (2005): *The State of the World’s Children 2006*. As downloaded from [http://www.unicef.org/publications/files/SOWC_2006_English_Report_rev\(1\).pdf](http://www.unicef.org/publications/files/SOWC_2006_English_Report_rev(1).pdf) on 27 August 2006.
- Wenger, E. (1999): *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wertsch, J.V. (1998): *Mind as Action*. New York: Oxford University Press.