

# **Servant Leadership and Creative Destruction**

**Larry Chamberlain, Doctor of Strategic Leadership**  
[larry.chamberlain@indwes.edu](mailto:larry.chamberlain@indwes.edu)

**Gary Wilkinson, PhD**  
[gary.wilkinson@indwes.edu](mailto:gary.wilkinson@indwes.edu)  
**Indiana Wesleyan University**

Annual Conference of  
**The Christian Business Faculty Association**  
October, 2006

# Servant Leadership and Creative Destruction

## Introduction

Servant Leadership is the model of leadership taught and exemplified by Christ. It calls upon leaders to be the servant of those they lead, and stresses the attributes of listening, trust, empathy, and the ethical use of power. However, in many college courses which use the servant leadership model, only the internal attributes of servant leadership are stressed, and the strategic task of understanding the external environment with its attending opportunities and threats is often left for other courses within the business curriculum.

This paper is intended to stress the need to integrate the process of looking externally as a fundamental attribute of servant leaders. Within business, we have seen that leaders of high ethical standards still may not possess the qualities needed for their organizations to be successful in today's rapidly changing, competitive environment. Although there are never guarantees of business success, it is vital that as business educators we stress not only the internal characteristics required of Christian leaders (being trustworthy, demonstrating empathy, etc.), but also the need to understand the external environment affecting the business and offer these concepts as an integrated whole. Our leadership courses must stress the totality of the leadership challenge, which requires integrating both an internal and external focus within our leadership education.

This paper discusses servant leadership in the context of rapid business change and shows through examples that if servant leaders are primarily internally focused, they will miss the opportunities for growth. In many cases, this lack of external focus results in the failure of the business. The overall intent of this paper is to help business faculty emphasize the importance of external analysis as an integral component of servant leadership.

As Mayo and Nohria (2005) observed, "The best business leaders have an almost uncanny ability to understand the context they live in-and to seize the opportunities their times present" (p. 34). Our current business environment may be best described (using Schumpeter's term) as a period of rapid "Creative Destruction." We are constantly seeing new business opportunities arise, but also the destruction of many organizations which did not adapt to the changing environment. The literature on leadership and change within the economy and business environment is extensive and growing rapidly. Many approaches are possible to make the point that servant leadership must integrate both Christ-like internal leadership characteristics and the keen awareness of the external conditions affecting the firm. This paper integrates the servant leadership model and selected concepts developed in the Burke-Litwin leadership model. The Burke-Litwin model focuses on how the changes in the external environment must be a key driver for

effective leadership. This model builds upon standard tools of business analysis such as SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) and Porter's Five Force Model.

## **Servant Leadership**

The concept of servant leadership goes back to the teachings of Christ (Matthew 20:26-27) and the writings of Paul the Apostle (Philippians 2:1-11). This was a revolutionary concept at the time, which stood on its head the Roman view of the servant-leader relationship. Christ's words, "Many who are first will be last, and many who are last will be first," was an idea foreign to the Roman mind. The view of servant leadership as a modern management concept, however, was popularized through the writings of Robert Greenleaf, who wrote a treatise, *The Servant as Leader*, in 1970 and later founded The Robert Greenleaf Center, which today continues to publish articles and present seminars on the subject of servant leadership.

Greenleaf's 1970 treatise provided the philosophical underpinnings for the servant-leader management model, while subsequent writers provided the more pragmatic, applied concepts that are commonly associated with servant leadership. Larry Spears, the current CEO of the Greenleaf Center, writes, "Servant-leadership seeks to involve others in decision-making, is strongly based in ethical and caring behavior, and it enhances the personal growth of workers while improving the caring and quality of organizational life". He identifies ten characteristics of servant leadership, which are:

- Listening – "The servant leader seeks to identify the will of a group and helps to clarify that will."
- Empathy – "People need to be accepted and recognized for their special and unique spirits."
- Healing – "The healing of relationships is a powerful force for transformation and integration."
- Awareness – "Awareness helps one in understanding issues involving ethics, power, and values."
- Persuasion – "The servant-leader seeks to convince others, rather than coerce compliance . . . [and] is effective at building consensus within groups."
- Conceptualization – "Servant leaders seek to nurture their abilities to dream great dreams . . . [and] seek a delicate balance between conceptual thinking and a day-to-day operational approach."
- Foresight – "Foresight is a characteristic that enables the servant-leader to understand the lessons from the past, the realities of the present, and the likely consequence of a decision in the future."
- Stewardship – "Servant leadership assumes first and foremost a commitment to serving the needs of others."
- Commitment to the Growth of People – "The servant-leader recognizes the tremendous responsibility . . . to nurture the personal and professional growth of employees and colleagues."
- Building Community – "The servant-leader [should] seek to identify some means for building community among those who work within a given institution." Are there pages for these?

Paterson and Stone (2003), based on their research of Christians in top management “who are longtime practitioners of servant leadership,” and summarized seven observed habits of servant leaders:

- Altruism – selflessly helping others.
- Empowerment – enriching jobs and relinquishing some of one’s authority to employees.
- Humility – shunning public adulation and building up employees.
- Love – a disposition that people are not just hired hands, but hired hearts.
- Service – actively meeting the needs of others.
- Trust – increasing personal security, reducing inhibitions, encouraging risk-taking, greasing the wheels of change.
- Vision – with regard to the organization and with regard to helping people achieve their potential.

McGee-Cooper and Looper (2001), based on their research and consulting on the subject of servant-leadership, and offer an informative comparative analysis between the traditional, hierarchy/heroic leader and the servant-leader model (see their Appendix). Citing a few of their comparisons, the traditional leader controls information and the servant-leader shares information. The traditional leader speaks first, the servant-leader listens first. The traditional leader views accountability as assigning blame, the servant leader as creating a safe environment for learning.

The literature on servant-leadership is expanding greatly as this model gains acceptance and takes root in academia and is applied to organizational settings. The general emphasis in the literature is on internal relationships and the manner in which leaders treat the people entrusted to their care. While this emphasis on the internal is critical in helping to shape the character and values of current and future leaders, it is strategic that leaders also be trained and equipped to focus on the external, being aware of opportunities and threats in the external environment and seeking what lies at and beyond the horizon. This is a more holistic view of servant-leadership; that leaders can best serve their organizations by looking within *and* looking without. As Mayo and Nohria (2005) emphasize, “A leader’s long-term success isn’t derived from sheer force of personality or breadth and depth of skill. Without an ability to read and adapt to changing business conditions, personality and skill are but temporal strengths” (p. 34).

It is desirable that in our academic instruction of future leaders that we emphasize not only the relational aspects of servant leadership, but hearken back, in fact, to the early writings of Greenleaf (1970), who proposed in his original treatise that leaders must develop the skill of foresight. “Foresight,” he writes, “is the ‘lead’ that the leader has. Once he loses this lead and events start to force his hand, he is leader in name only. He is not leading; he is reacting to immediate events and he probably will not long be a leader. There are abundant examples of loss of leadership which stems from a failure to foresee what reasonably could have been foreseen, and from failure to act on that knowledge while the leader had freedom to act. Framing all of this,” he continues, “is awareness, opening wide the doors of perception so as to enable one to get more of what is available of sensory experience and other signals *from the environment* [emphasis added] than people usually take in.”

It is strategic to note that the core concepts of servant leadership that emphasize participative decision-making, safe learning environments, openness in communication, acceptance of change, professional development, etc. all provide for an enriching work culture that allows the creative and innovative mind, searching for opportunities in the external environment, to flourish. It is also interesting to note that Greenleaf, again in his original treatise, employed the phrase, “create dangerously” in his summary remarks to emphasize the need for leaders to be open to change and to be aware of the opportunities ever present in the environment. This is eerily close to Schumpeter’s phrase, “creative destruction.” Indeed, both visionaries offer important lessons for leaders to employ a more holistic view of leadership, looking within as well as without, in order to best serve the people and organizations entrusted to their care.

## **Creative Destruction and Environmental Change**

It has become a cliché, but one that is obviously true, that change in the business environment is becoming more rapid and more pervasive. The process of change has been extensively studied, but, perhaps, the best description was coined by Joseph Schumpeter, when he referred to the process of change as “creative destruction.”

Schumpeter was an Austrian economist who taught in the US and published a number of papers on change and entrepreneurship. In his description of the process of creative destruction, Schumpeter (1934) said the economy “incessantly revolutionizes the economic structure *from within*, incessantly destroying the old one, incessantly creating a new one.” Schumpeter observed that it is the entrepreneur who constantly innovates and changes the economy. Firms are constantly subject to “gales of creative destruction” (Schumpeter, 1934) and the leadership of these firms must understand and act upon these changes to survive and to take advantage of the opportunities the changes afford.

Examples are numerous of the process of creative destruction in business. The largest firm in the country only 30 years ago (AT&T) has been purchased by one of its spin-offs. Telecommunications has changed from land-line to wireless and the internet has risen from a small network connecting a few computers, to becoming almost a necessity of modern life. Great American industries such as automotive and steel manufacturing are in serious financial difficulty, out-paced and out-engineered by foreign competition. A number of airlines are in bankruptcy. However, the bad economic news, which often is the major story in press reports, is only part of the picture. New, dynamic companies such as Google, Microsoft, and Starbucks have been formed and flourish in today’s changing economy.

There are many modern business writers who have thoughtfully discussed the challenge of the external environment and leadership. Christensen’s book *The Innovators Dilemma* (1997), further defines the process of change in the business environment. Christensen breaks change into two general categories: sustaining technologies and disruptive technologies. In general, Christensen found that sustaining technological change, which improves products and services, rarely results in the failure of a firm. The leadership of firms generally recognizes the value and uses of the improved technology, and this type of change is usually rapidly incorporated into the firm. In fact, many firms are the developers of these sustaining technological changes. Examples of sustaining

technologies would include things like improvement in battery life for laptop computers, greater amounts of memory for disk drives, more fuel efficient engines, etc.

The second type of change, however, often results in the failure of the leadership of existing firms to recognize the importance of a change and often results in failure of the firm. The classic example is the fact that most firms who manufactured vacuum tubes failed to change rapidly enough when the transistor replaced vacuum tubes in most electronic devices. Christensen (1997) cites a number of examples including the emergence of the steel minimills, which have proven to be far more efficient for many types of steel production compared with the traditional integrated steel mill. Even though it is rare for a firm to recognize the impact of disruptive technologies and successfully lead a firm through a transition, it is, by no means, impossible.

Intel is a prime example of successful leadership in the face of technological change. In its earlier years, Intel was primarily a maker of memory chips for computers. However, the leadership of Intel recognized that memory chips were becoming a commoditized product, and Intel had neither competitive advantage nor core competency in this type of market. Thus, Intel's leadership moved the company into the development and production of microprocessors (Grove, 1996, p. 93-94). Although in retrospect, this seemed like a logical move for Intel, at the time it was a radical departure from the major source for most of their revenue to a product that was unknown and still required significant amounts of capital for research and development before being commercially viable. We now know that the leadership decisions were correct for Intel, but this is one of only a few examples of leadership successfully understanding and acting upon a change of this magnitude.

Kotter, in his book *Leading Change*, (1996) describes four forces which are precipitating the rapid change in the external environment: technological change, international economic integration, maturation of markets in developed countries, and the fall of communist and socialist regimes. Kotter comes to the same conclusion as Schumpeter, namely, that the implications for leadership are more hazards and more opportunities. Drucker, in his book *Managing in a Time of Change* (1995), makes the argument that our business environment (society, markets, customers, technology) "is in constant flux." "And so, built into the theory of business must be the ability to change itself." (p.31).

There are obviously many other studies and data. It is not clear that leadership education has fully integrated the needs of leaders possessing both internal servant leadership qualities, while also possessing a keen understanding of external change. Leadership education which leaves the understanding of the external environment to some brief references or "getting that information in other classes" misses the important point that the understanding and acting upon threats and opportunities in the external environmental are of equal importance to the internal servant leadership characteristics we seek to build and reinforce.

## **Integrating Change into the Leadership Models**

One of the models of leadership that focuses on external influences and its importance in decision-making and leadership was developed by Burke and Litwin. According to Burke and Litwin (1992), organizational change is chaotic: "The number of variables changing at the same time, the magnitude of environmental change, and the frequent

resistance of human systems create a whole confluence of processes that are extremely difficult to predict and almost impossible to control” . Offering a *Model of Organizational Performance and Change*, the authors propose a holistic, interconnected view of leadership that is responsive to the external environment, with equal emphasis between developing mission and strategy on the one hand and enhancing organizational culture on the other. Commenting on mission and strategy, the authors write, “Astute leaders are people who scan their organization’s external environment, choose the forces they wish to deal with, and take action accordingly.” In a summary remark, the authors comment further on the need for leadership to give equal weight to organizational strategy (responding to changes in the environment), and culture (responding to needs in the workforce): “We should be concerned with *both* [authors’ emphasis], and with a more effective integration of purpose and practice”

### **Biblical Case Study**

Perhaps no one was more successful in spreading Christ’s message and establishing churches than Paul. Following his conversion, Paul exemplified the heart of a servant leader. He possessed the attributes described in the above section on servant leadership, but he also had a keen awareness and cultural knowledge of the external environment and the opportunities for establishing churches throughout the known world. When servant leadership integrates the awareness of the external environment, several key leadership characteristics are vital for success: commitment to the mission, a vision for the organization’s growth, the formation of a decentralized organizational structure and the development of local leaders through mentoring, clear communication within the organization, and finally, a welcoming of diversity within the organization.

First and foremost for any organization, the leadership must be truly committed to the vision of the organization. Clearly, Paul’s conversion (Acts 26:12-13) and service to God (three major missionary journeys) and his unwavering diligence in spite of imprisonment, shipwrecks, and many other hardships demonstrate this commitment. Second, the vision for the organization must go well beyond its modest beginnings. For Paul, this meant traveling and establishing churches around the Mediterranean. Paul truly thought globally in his vision of church growth. Third, Paul established self-governing churches. Paul understood that he had to develop and mentor the leaders (Titus, Timothy, Barnabas, and others,) but he was not going to be there to provide the leadership himself. Acts 19: 8-10 describes the teaching and training for new church leaders in Ephesus. This approach also meant that these churches and their leadership would be more adaptive to local conditions and change. Fourth, Paul’s letters to churches and leaders are wonderful examples of clear communication and persuasion. He constantly teaches that we should look to Christ’s example for how we should live and how to settle the inevitable disagreements. However, Paul uses patient persuasion, and not command and control leadership. He taught by example, he mentored to develop new leadership, and practiced servant leadership, which is the leadership model necessary for successful decentralized organizations. Fifth, Paul understood the diversities in culture and the opportunities these differences afforded the early church. An example is the way he connected with the Greek society in Acts 17. Not everyone followed, but Paul effectively reached many in this diverse audience. And finally, Paul traveled extensively among diversified people groups, and his example was always that he would use diversity

as an asset to his mission, not a liability. Paul also showed that he was not coming simply to preach, but to work among those he was called to minister to and to support himself. Paul was a tentmaker, and showed the calloused hands as an example that he was willing to do his share of the work and was not there to be supported by the churches he helped to establish.

## **Business Case Studies**

The following examples in this section are intended to show some industries which have experienced significant challenges or opportunities in their leadership due to external influences. All businesses face challenges and none can be said to fully exemplify all of the attributes of servant leadership. The intent here is to point out some discussion starters for understanding the totality of servant leadership. It is the contention of the authors that the principles of servant leadership and the ability to adapt to a changing environment are critical components to a holistic understanding of leadership roles and responsibilities. Where one or the other is absent or weak, the results can be detrimental to an organization's success.

Perhaps no industries in the US have been more visible in their decline in employment than the automotive and steel industries. Both of these sectors are still important parts of the economy. However, with a major firm like General Motors having over fifty per cent of the market share for domestic automobiles in the 1960's to one with less than half that market share today (and is continuing to decline), demonstrates the dramatic change in the competitive landscape. Foreign competition was a small factor forty years ago, and is now continuing to gain market share, while GM and Ford continue to reduce employment and automotive capacity in North America. Clearly, the problems faced by the domestic automotive producers have many facets, but one important aspect of the leadership of these firms has been a failure to see the changing consumer tastes and preferences and the need to improve the quality of automobiles. Foreign producers really established the foothold in the domestic market during the period of high gasoline prices during the 1970's (although there has always been some importing of automobiles into the US) and then leveraged this foothold by generally being quicker to meet consumer needs and leveraging into other car and truck models. The problem of not understanding the market changes and adjusting rapidly to competitive environmental forces is a serious leadership weakness that continues to plague our domestic automotive firms.

Another case in point would be the disastrous decline of a once prosperous steel industry in the United States. Hoerr (1988), writing in a classic book of journalism covering this era, *And the Wolf Finally Came*, comments, "The steel companies [referring to the traditional, large, integrated steel manufacturing firms] had engaged in little innovation, social or technological, for most of the postwar period. Led by a management that ranged from mediocre to poor, the American steel industry simply failed to make the right business decisions at the right time. Most important, it failed to change its authoritarian style of managing people in order to gain cooperation in a common endeavor" (pp. 14-15). ". . . It became clear that the union and industry hadn't advanced beyond primitive stages in their relationship. Each side sought only to advance its own interests and did not recognize changes in the market, such as the growth of foreign competition, or the need to invest and improve productivity. The decline of the steel

industry—its poor profit showing, decreasing productivity, and lack of investors—should have galvanized both sides to focus on their mutual interests. Instead, each side blamed the other and stood aside as jobs dwindled” (p. 23). Commenting on the dual leadership issues of managing a workforce and responding to environmental change, Hoerr writes, “It is management that sets the tone of a relationship between supervisors and employees in a workplace. It is management that constantly looks to the future and plans ahead for shifting patterns of consumption, the growth of competition, and the development and use of new technologies” (p. 31). It is interesting that Hoerr links the two strategic dimensions of effective leadership in these remarks: looking within and looking without.

One of the success stories of American businesses in recognizing external threats and opportunities has been General Electric. As Mayo and Nohria (2005) point out, the leadership for GE has been well attuned to the changing economic environment. In the 1970’s, the CEO was Reginald Jones, an accountant by training and one who was focused on internal controls and cost containment. This was a period of high inflation and economic conditions which alternated between slow national economic growth and recession. However, during the period of the eighties and nineties, GE rapidly expanded internationally, but also made significant changes in their business portfolio and focused on achieving dominant market share. Jack Welch was the CEO during this time and had a completely different leadership agenda than his predecessor, but both seemed to be attuned to external conditions (Mayo, 2005.) The current CEO of GE, Jeff Immelt, seems to be altering the course of GE, with greater emphasis on the environmental impact of GE’s products (Fonda, 2005) and lessening the hard approach to managing people and expanding their global presence for GE’s products (“Immelt Revolution,” 2005.)

A more holistic servant leadership approach is as important (or perhaps, more so) for small businesses. A company which originated in Spokane, Washington, is featured on a series of case studies for small businesses in video tapes published to accompany the Robbins and Coulter textbook (*Small Business Management*, 1999). The company was founded in 1983 by Jill Smith and was called Buckeye Beans and Herbs. The firm produced bean and pasta products for about fifteen years under the leadership of Jill and her husband, Doug, and the firm was very successful. It was noted in *Inc. Magazine* in 1997 as being one of the 500 fastest-growing businesses in the country. The video contains a number of short clips about company meetings and their overall philosophy of business. All indications were that the leadership of the firm cared deeply about the employees and their welfare. Clearly the firm was in a market which was very competitive, with few barriers to entry. To be successful in this type of market requires constant innovation and differentiation and operating as efficiently as possible to keep costs low. Jill and Doug Smith sold the firm in 1998, and it seems the new management did not understand or act upon the external threats and opportunities in the market place. Innovation slowed and the firm went into a spiral of cutting costs to survive, which further reduced their opportunity to differentiate and finally the firm closed (Crompton, 1999.) Responding to external threats and opportunities are, perhaps, more important for the leadership of small firms. These firms seldom have deep reservoirs of resources to draw upon in the event of external shocks to their product lines and cash flows.

There are clearly many examples of firms being successful in evaluating the opportunities in the external environment. Starbucks and Southwest Airlines give evidence of

operating their businesses with both superior internal leadership attributes as well as a keen understanding of the external environment. Interestingly, both of these businesses were in markets which many thought provided little profit opportunity, but which proved to be excellent business opportunities.

## Conclusions

The objective of this paper is to advocate a holistic approach to servant leadership, for both teaching and in practice within businesses. Servant leadership is not simply a model per se of leadership among many competing leadership models. It is the Christ-like behavior that we are called to emulate. Often, however, servant leadership is thought of as focusing on the internal characteristics of the leader. We should never forget that we are not serving effectively unless we also develop and utilize a keen awareness of the external environment to lead our businesses into the future. This holistic approach, going back to Greenleaf's original servant leadership writings, needs to be reinforced within our business education of the next generation of Christian leadership.

## References

- Burke, W. and Litwin, G. (1992). A causal model of organizational performance and change. *Journal of Management* 18, 523-545.
- Christensen, Clayton. (1997). *The innovator's dilemma*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Crompton, K. (1999, March). Buckeye beans slashes staff, changes direction. *Journal of Business*. Retrieved from <http://www.spokanejournal.com/index.php?id=article&sub=257&keyword=>
- Drucker, Peter. (1995). *Managing in a time of great change*. NY; Penguin.
- Fonda, D. (2005, July 7) GE's green awakening. Retrieved from <http://www.time.com/time/insidebiz/printout/0,8816,1079496,00.html>
- Greenleaf, R. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Westfield, IN: The Robert Greenleaf Center.
- Grove, Andrew. (1996). *Only the paranoid survive*. NY: Doubleday.
- Greenleaf, R. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Westfield, IN: The Robert Greenleaf Center.
- Hoerr, J. P. (1988). *And the wolf finally came*. Pittsburgh: The University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Kotter, John. (1996) *Leading change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Maxwell, J.C. (Ed.). (2002). *The Maxwell leadership Bible*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson
- Mayo, A. & Nohria, N. (2005). Zeitgeist leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, (83)10, 45-60.
- McGee-Cooper, A. & Looper, G. (2001). *The essentials of servant-leadership: Principles in practice*. Waltham, MA: Pegasus Communications.

Paterson, K., & Stone, A. (2003). The seven habits of servant leaders. *Regent Business Review*. Retrieved at [www.regent.edu/review/issue4/sevenhabits.html](http://www.regent.edu/review/issue4/sevenhabits.html)

Robbins, S.P. & Coulter, M. (2004). *Management* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Robbins, S.P., & Coulter, M. (1999). *Small business management* [video recording]. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Schumpeter, J. (1934) *The theory of economic development*. Cambridge, Harvard Univ. Press

Schumpeter, J. (1975). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. New York: Harper.

Spears, L. *On character and servant-leadership: Ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders*. The Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership. Retrieved from <http://www.greenleaf.org/leadership>

Steward, D.L. (2004). *Doing business by the good book*. New York: Hyperion.

Trahant, B., Burke, W., & Koonce, R. (1997). 12 principles of organizational change. *Management Review*, September.

The Immelt revolution. (2005, March 28). *BusinessWeek Online*. Retrieved from [http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/05\\_13/b3926088\\_mz056.htm](http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/05_13/b3926088_mz056.htm)

## Appendix

# THE HEROIC LEADER VERSUS THE SERVANT-LEADER

### Traditional Boss or Hierarchy-Based Leader

1. Begins with a personal drive to achieve top position of power.
2. Operates in a highly competitive manner. Possesses an independent mindset. Finds it important to receive personal credit for achievement.
3. Uses personal power, fear, and intimidation to get what s/he wants.
4. Focuses on fast action.
5. Relies on facts, logic, and proof.
6. Controls information to maintain power.
7. Spends more time telling and giving orders than listening.
8. Derives a sense of confidence and personal worth from building his or her own talents and abilities.
9. Sees supporters as a power base. Uses perks and titles to signal to others who has power.
10. Speaks first and believes that his or her ideas are the most important.
11. Understands internal politics and uses them for personal gain.
12. Views accountability as assigning blame for mistakes.
13. Uses exclusive humor (often put-downs and sarcasm) to control others.

### Servant as Leader

1. Begins with a desire to serve others from any place in the organization.
2. Operates in a highly collaborative and inter-dependent manner. Knows that all can gain by working together to create win/win/win solutions.
3. Uses personal trust, respect, and unconditional love to build bridges.
4. Focuses on gaining understanding, input.
5. Balances with intuition and foresight.
6. Coaches others by providing context.
7. Listens deeply and respectfully to others, especially to those with dissenting views.
8. Derives a sense of fulfillment from mentoring, coaching, and growing collaboratively with others.
9. Develops trust across constituencies and sees the ability to facilitate interdependent solutions as a core value.
10. Listens first. Values others' input and is able to build strength through differences.
11. Balances what is best for the individual with what is best for the group.
12. Views accountability as creating a safe environment for learning.
13. Uses inclusive humor to lift up others and make it safe to learn from mistakes. Is the first to let themselves become vulnerable.

Source: McGee-Cooper & Loper (2001).