

The Polarities of Democracy as a Framework for Leadership and Social Change

Marjorie Calixte-Hallworth, PhD*

Author, Independent Researcher, Speaker, Tennessee, United States.

Corresponding Author (Marjorie Calixte-Hallworth, PhD) Email: Marjorie.Hallworth@waldenu.edu*



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38177/ajast.2025.9411>

Copyright © 2025 Marjorie Calixte-Hallworth, PhD. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Article Received: 15 October 2025

Article Accepted: 26 December 2025

Article Published: 29 December 2025

ABSTRACT

Democratic systems are characterized by enduring tensions among core values such as freedom, justice, equality, and participation. While democratic theory has long acknowledged these tensions, they are often approached through either/or decision-making frameworks that contribute to polarization, institutional instability, and declining public trust (Dahl, 2001; Rawls, 2001). Drawing on polarity theory and the work of William J. Benet, this article examines the Polarities of Democracy framework as a conceptual approach to leadership and social change. The framework conceptualizes democracy as a dynamic system of interdependent values organized into five polarity pairs that must be managed rather than solved. Using a conceptual and theoretical methodology, the article situates the framework within democratic theory and systems thinking and analyzes its implications for leadership, governance, and public policy. The analysis suggests that unmanaged democratic polarities undermine democratic legitimacy, while intentional polarity management supports resilience, equity, and sustainability. The article concludes with leadership and policy recommendations for applying the framework in governance, civic engagement, and social change initiatives.

Keywords: Polarities of Democracy; Polarity Management; Polarity Thinking; Democratic Leadership; Public Policy; Governance; Social Change; Systems Theory; Civic Engagement; Democracy Theory; Equity; Sustainable Democracy.

1. Introduction

Democratic governance is increasingly challenged by polarization, institutional fragility, and declining public trust. These challenges are often addressed through reforms that prioritize one democratic value over another—such as security over liberty, efficiency over participation, or equality over diversity, reflecting an underlying tendency toward either/or decision-making in democratic practice. While such approaches may offer short-term clarity, they frequently generate unintended consequences that undermine democratic legitimacy and sustainability.

Democratic theory has long recognized tensions among core values, yet it has struggled to offer frameworks that address these tensions as enduring and interdependent rather than resolvable. Competing democratic approaches have emphasized different priorities, often reinforcing value trade-offs rather than providing guidance for managing them simultaneously. As a result, democratic leaders and policymakers are often left navigating complex value conflicts without conceptual tools designed for sustained balance.

Polarity theory offers an alternative lens by distinguishing between problems that can be solved and polarities that must be managed over time (Johnson, 1992). Building on this distinction, William J. Benet developed the Polarities of Democracy framework, which conceptualizes democracy as a system of interdependent values organized into polarity pairs. This framework shifts the focus from resolving democratic tensions to managing them intentionally in support of long-term democratic health.

This article examines the Polarities of Democracy framework as a leadership-oriented approach to democratic governance and social change. It argues that many contemporary democratic challenges stem not from value conflict itself, but from the mismanagement of democratic polarities. By reframing democracy as a dynamic system

of interdependent values, the framework offers a theoretical foundation for more resilient, equitable, and sustainable democratic leadership.

1.1. Study Objectives

The objectives of this study are to:

1. Conceptualize democracy as a system of interdependent values rather than a set of solvable institutional problems.
2. Examine the Polarities of Democracy framework as a unifying theoretical lens for leadership and social change.
3. Situate the framework within classical and contemporary democratic theory and systems thinking.
4. Analyze how mismanagement of democratic polarities contributes to polarization, institutional fragility, and declining trust.
5. Explore leadership implications for managing democratic tensions in governance and public policy contexts.
6. Identify future directions for research and practice using polarity management in democratic systems.

2. Literature Review and Historical Context

Democracy has long been understood as both an ideal and a practice grounded in values such as freedom, justice, equality, and participation. Classical democratic theorists emphasized liberty and civic engagement as foundational to democratic life (Tocqueville, 1835/2003; Mill, 1861/2001), while later scholars focused on pluralism, representation, and institutional legitimacy as essential to democratic stability (Dahl, 1971, 2003). Despite these contributions, democratic theory has struggled to reconcile the persistent tensions among its core values—tensions that frequently surface in contemporary debates around governance reform, social justice, and civic trust.

Much of the democratic literature has framed these tensions as trade-offs requiring resolution through policy choice or institutional design. Liberal democratic theory has often privileged individual rights and procedural fairness (Rawls, 2001), while participatory and communitarian traditions have emphasized collective engagement and shared responsibility (Pateman, 1970; Barber, 2004). While each tradition offers valuable insights, the tendency to elevate one set of values over others has reinforced polarization and limited democracy's capacity to adapt to complex social challenges.

Systems-based perspectives challenge this binary framing by conceptualizing democracy as a complex, adaptive system (Meadows, 2008). Within this tradition, polarity theory provides a critical analytical lens by distinguishing solvable problems from polarities—enduring tensions between interdependent values that cannot be resolved permanently but must be managed over time (Johnson, 1992, 2020, 2021). Efforts to maximize one pole of a polarity inevitably generate negative consequences that undermine long-term effectiveness.

Building on polarity theory, William J. Benet developed the Polarities of Democracy framework as a unifying theory of democracy explicitly designed to guide social change (Benet, 2006, 2012, 2013). Drawing from civic

education scholarship (Butts, 1980), democratic theory, and systems thinking, Benet identified ten core democratic values organized into five polarity pairs: Freedom and Authority, Justice and Due Process, Diversity and Equality, Human Rights and Communal Obligations, and Participation and Representation.

According to this framework, democratic failure most often results not from the absence of democratic values but from the mismanagement of these interdependent tensions (Benet, 2013). The framework has also been applied in empirical research examining public secondary education governance in rural Haiti, where mismanagement of democratic polarities contributed to patterns of dominance and abuse of power within public institutions (Calixte-Hallworth, 2024).

The Polarities of Democracy Institute has further advanced this framework through leadership development, research, and applied initiatives addressing governance reform, equity, and community change. However, scholarly work explicitly connecting the framework to leadership theory and social change remains limited. This article contributes to that space by positioning the Polarities of Democracy as a leadership-oriented framework for navigating democratic complexity.

3. Methodology

This study employs a conceptual and theoretical methodology appropriate for advancing frameworks within democratic studies, leadership research, and public administration (Johnson, 2020; Benet, 2013). Rather than testing hypotheses empirically, the analysis synthesizes established theory to clarify the structure, assumptions, and implications of the Polarities of Democracy framework.

Primary sources include Benet's peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, and doctoral research on the Polarities of Democracy (Benet, 2006, 2012, 2013), along with foundational polarity theory literature (Johnson, 1992, 2020, 2021). Secondary sources include classical and contemporary democratic theory, civic education scholarship, and leadership theory focused on complexity and adaptive governance. Through systematic analysis of these sources, the study examines how the five polarity pairs function as interdependent democratic values and how their management informs leadership practice and policy development.

4. Findings and Analysis

4.1. The Polarities of Democracy as a Unifying Framework

Analysis confirms that the Polarities of Democracy framework functions as a unifying analytical lens rather than a prescriptive democratic model (Benet, 2013). Unlike approaches that privilege a single democratic value or institutional arrangement, the framework integrates multiple democratic traditions into a dynamic system. Each polarity pair contains both positive and negative aspects, and democratic health depends on maximizing positive outcomes while minimizing negative consequences over time (Johnson, 2020).

Across all five polarity pairs, democratic breakdown is most evident when one pole is treated as an endpoint rather than as part of an ongoing dynamic (Benet, 2013). This reinforces the framework's central premise: democracy is sustained not through resolution of tensions, but through their continuous and intentional management.

4.2. Leadership Implications of the Polarities of Democracy Framework

Within the Polarities of Democracy framework, leadership is understood as the capacity to recognize, interpret, and intentionally manage enduring democratic tensions over time (Benet, 2013). Rather than resolving conflicts by privileging one democratic value over another, democratic leadership involves sustaining balance among interdependent values while responding adaptively to changing social, political, and institutional conditions. This conception aligns closely with adaptive and systems-oriented leadership theories that emphasize complexity, learning, and long-term stewardship rather than linear problem-solving (Heifetz, 1994; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007).

From this perspective, leaders are not positioned as controllers of democratic outcomes but as stewards of democratic health, responsible for maintaining legitimacy, trust, and ethical balance within democratic systems (Benet, 2013; Denhardt & Denhardt, 2015). The Polarities of Democracy framework equips leaders to anticipate the negative consequences that arise when one pole of a democratic polarity is overemphasized and to design policies, institutional practices, and governance processes that leverage the positive potential of both poles (Benet, 2013).

For example, leaders managing the Freedom and Authority polarity must safeguard civil liberties while ensuring effective governance and public safety. This requires adaptive leadership capable of navigating competing demands without defaulting to coercion or deregulation (Heifetz et al., 2009). Similarly, leadership within the Justice and Due Process polarity demands ethical judgment that balances moral accountability with procedural fairness, particularly in policy areas such as criminal justice, administrative decision-making, and regulatory governance (Burns, 1978; Van Wart, 2013).

Across all five polarity pairs, the framework positions leadership as an ongoing practice of tension management rather than episodic decision-making. Leaders are required to engage stakeholders, monitor feedback loops, and recalibrate strategies as democratic conditions evolve. This approach reflects complexity of leadership theory, which conceptualizes leadership as an emergent process distributed across individuals and institutions rather than vested solely in formal authority (Benet, 2013; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007).

4.3. Analysis of the Five Polarity Pairs

The following analysis draws explicitly on the Polarities of Democracy framework (Benet, 2012, 2013).

Freedom and Authority

Freedom enables individual agency and civic expression, while authority provides structure and collective order. Overemphasizing freedom without authority risks instability, while authority without freedom undermines democratic legitimacy (Mill, 1861/2001; Benet, 2013).

Justice and Due Process

Justice emphasizes fairness and moral accountability, while due process ensures transparency and legal protection. Justice without due process risks arbitrariness, while due process without justice may perpetuate systemic inequities (Rawls, 2001; Benet, 2013).

Diversity and Equality

Diversity recognizes difference and lived experience, while equality ensures fairness and access. Diversity without equality leads to symbolic inclusion, whereas equality without diversity ignores historical and cultural context (Pateman, 1970; Benet, 2012).

Human Rights and Communal Obligations

Human rights protect individual dignity, while communal obligations emphasize responsibility to the collective good. Sustainable democracies integrate both to balance autonomy and social cohesion (Benet, 2013; Ober, 2017).

Participation and Representation

Participation fosters civic engagement and legitimacy, while representation provides continuity and institutional governance. Participation without representation lacks sustainability, while representation without participation leads to alienation and distrust (Barber, 1984; Dahl, 2001; Benet, 2012).

5. Conclusion and Policy Recommendations

The Polarities of Democracy framework offers a robust theoretical lens for understanding democratic complexity and guiding leadership and policy decisions (Benet, 2013). By reframing democratic tensions as interdependent polarities rather than problems to be solved, the framework supports democratic resilience, equity, and legitimacy.

Policy and practice recommendations include integrating polarity thinking into leadership development and public administration education (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2015), evaluating policies for their impact on both poles of democratic values, and using polarity frameworks as diagnostic tools to address polarization and institutional distrust. Future research should empirically examine the application of the framework across cultural, political, and institutional contexts.

As democracies confront increasing polarization, inequality, and declining trust, managing the interdependent values of Freedom and Authority, Justice and Due Process, Diversity and Equality, Human Rights and Communal Obligations, and Participation and Representation remains essential for building healthy, sustainable, and just democratic systems (Benet, 2013).

6. Future Research and Practice Directions

- 1) Empirical testing of the Polarities of Democracy framework across different governance systems.
- 2) Longitudinal research examining polarity management and institutional trust.
- 3) Application of the framework within specific policy areas such as education, criminal justice, and healthcare.
- 4) Integration of polarity thinking into leadership development and public administration curricula.
- 5) Comparative analysis between polarity-based approaches and traditional conflict-resolution models.
- 6) Examination of the framework's role in reducing polarization and strengthening civic engagement.

Declarations

Source of Funding

This study received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Competing Interests Statement

The author declares that she has no competing interests related to this work.

Consent for publication

The author declares that she consented to the publication of this study.

Authors' contributions

Author's independent contribution.

Availability of data and materials

Supplementary information is available from the author upon reasonable request.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable for this study.

Informed Consent

Not applicable for this study.

References

- Barber, B.R. (2004). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. University of California Press.
- Benet, W.J. (2006). *The polarity management model of workplace democracy*. Doctoral Dissertation, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Benet, W.J. (2012). *The polarities of democracy: A theoretical framework for building a healthy, sustainable, and just world*. In B. Johnson (Eds.), *Polarity management: Leveraging polarities to create alignment and results*, Chapter 7, *Polarity Partnerships*.
- Benet, W.J. (2013). *Managing the polarities of democracy: A theoretical framework for positive social change*. *Journal of Social Change*, 5: 26–39. <https://doi.org/10.5590/josc.2013.05.1.03>.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
- Butts, R.F. (1980). *The revival of civic learning: A rationale for citizenship education in American schools*. Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Calixte-Hallworth, M. (2024). *Public secondary education in rural areas in Haiti: Dominance and abuse of power through the lens of polarities of democracy theory*. <https://agpegondwanajournal.co.in/index.php/agpe/article/view/340>.

- Dahl, R.A. (1971). *Polyarchy: Participation and opposition*. Yale University Press.
- Dahl, R.A. (2001). *How democratic is the American Constitution?* Yale University Press.
- Denhardt, J.V., & Denhardt, R.B. (2015). *The new public service: Serving, not steering*, 4th Edition. Routledge.
- Heifetz, R.A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Harvard University Press.
- Heifetz, R.A., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world*. Harvard Business Press.
- Johnson, B. (1992). *Polarity management: Identifying and managing unsolvable problems*. HRD Press.
- Johnson, B. (2020). *And: Making a difference by leveraging polarities, paradox, or dilemma*. Polarities Partnerships.
- Johnson, B. (2021). *And: Making a difference by leveraging polarities, paradox, or dilemma, volume two: Applications*. Polarity Partnerships.
- Meadows, D.H. (2008). *Thinking in systems: A primer*. Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Mill, J.S. (2001). *On liberty*. Batoche Books. Original work published 1861.
- Ober, J. (2017). *Demopolis: Democracy before liberalism in theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pateman, C. (1970). *Participation and democratic theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Polarities of Democracy Institute (n.d.). *Polarities of democracy*. <https://www.polaritiesofdemocracy.institute>.
- Polarity Partnerships (n.d.). <https://www.polaritypartnerships.com/>.
- Rawls, J. (2001). *Justice as fairness: A restatement*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Tocqueville, A.D. (2003). *Democracy in America and two essays on America*. Penguin Classics. Original work published 1835.
- Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18: 298–318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.04.002>.
- Van Wart, M. (2013). Lessons from leadership theory and the contemporary challenges of leaders. *Public Administration Review*, 73: 553–565. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12069>.