

# Chapter 8 - Leadership

## *Introduction*

In order to build a model of leadership based on Huna principles and practices, it is first necessary to review some of the modern thinking on what makes a good organisational leader and what best practice looks like. As **Jim Collins**, author of ‘**Good to Great**’ and ‘**Built to Last**’ has said: “(the leader’s) style will set the tone of (the) entire company. It is a multiplier effect for better or worse. The tone...set at the top affects the behaviour patterns of the people throughout (the) company.”<sup>i</sup> An extended discussion of the subject is, however, outside the scope of this paper.

Prof. Roger Lehman of INSEAD pointed out at the 2008 international European Mentoring and Coaching Council (EMCC) conference that interest in leadership in business has grown exponentially over the last 10-15 years. When this writer was an MBA student in 1980, the word leadership was rarely mentioned in a business context. The term ‘management’ included leadership. People went on management development courses, not leadership development courses. This has now changed. Junior managers go on management development courses. Senior managers are developed as leaders. As a business trainer, the experience of this writer is that it is possible to charge as much as 100% more for a ‘leadership’ course than a ‘management’ course, for the same amount of effort. There is profit to be had from leadership.

## *The literature on leadership*

The growth in books and articles on leadership means that there are many different definitions of leadership and ideas about what constitutes a good leader. There is not always agreement between the so-called authorities on the subject. What is generally agreed is as

follows. Firstly, leadership has interested writers since Plato and even before him: it is not a new subject. Much of the earlier writing on leadership focused on politics, the military and, at least in the West, the Church. It was not until the development of an industrial society that authors such as Weber opened up consideration of leadership in other contexts.<sup>ii</sup> Secondly, the older model of command-and-control, or authoritarian leadership, is generally not seen to be the most effective approach in modern business organisations. Thirdly, there have been trends or fashions in ideas about what constitutes a great leader.

For example, **trait theory** holds that there are various traits, or personal qualities which make a great leader. Examples of this include qualities such as trustworthiness or decisiveness. True trait theory assumes that these qualities are innate. Many writers, particularly those who are not from a psychology background, talk about ‘traits’ as something which can be developed. **Behavioural theories** hold that leadership is a matter of particular behaviours. **McGregor’s 1960 Theory X/Theory Y model** is an example of a behavioural approach<sup>iii</sup>. The Theory X approach holds that workers are inherently lazy. Managers with this view typically demonstrate authoritarian, even coercive behaviours. Theory Y, on the other hand, holds that employees may be self-motivated, and that Maslowian self-actualisation is possible through work. Managers with this view should create an environment where subordinates can use their skills, and develop, and where subordinate-superior relationships are more egalitarian. People are regarded as an asset.

Although such a hard dichotomy now seems a little out of date, McGregor was one of the first writers on motivation in the workplace to identify employees as potential assets. Subsequent behavioural theories have developed theory Y. Few writers would now dare to suggest that a coercive approach is acceptable, although plenty of leaders can still be

identified, both from court cases and from anecdote, who adopt coercive behaviour. Modern writers on leadership, such as Warren Bennis, may combine trait and behavioural characteristics when developing their theories of what makes a good leader.

One of the more modern concepts is that of **transactional** versus **transformational** leadership, although **Weber's** bureaucratic and charismatic leaders could be seen as examples of transactional and transformational leadership. Transactional leaders are said to treat the leader-follower relationship as an exchange such as "I give you my effort, you give me money". Transactional leadership has, arguably, developed from the Theory X view of life: transactional leadership does not necessarily assume that employees are inherently lazy, but does assume that they need structure and discipline, and that a system of punishment and reward is most effective for motivation. People need telling what to do, and are rewarded (or punished) according to how well they do this. Transactional leadership is sometimes described as a management, rather than a leadership approach, although there are plenty of CEOs and other organisational leaders who still adopt a transactional approach. As a coach, this writer has found that this often occurs when leaders or managers do not know how to behave differently.

Transformational leaders are, in theory, more visionary, appealing to the higher nature of their people and moving them towards a more universal good. The transformational leader is a change agent, both for individuals and the organisation. Transformational leaders may have charismatic attributes, but they generally lack the narcissism of the truly charismatic leader. There are risks associated with transformational leaders. These include the possibility that their passion and confidence may be mistaken for truth and reality, that their energy wears

out their followers, and that the organisation does not need transforming.<sup>iv</sup> Recent literature on the subject tends to espouse some form of transformational leadership model.

One of the earlier writers to distinguish between managers and leaders was **Abraham Zalaznik** who, in a 1977 **Harvard Business Review** article, challenged traditional views of management on the basis that they omitted essential leadership elements of inspiration, vision and human passion.<sup>v</sup> He felt these were the qualities which drive corporate success. He made some key distinctions between leaders and manager. Leaders, in his view tolerate chaos and lack of structure and prevent premature closure on important issues. Managers, on the other hand, seek order, control and rapid resolution of problems. Zalaznik's approach is primarily behavioural. His concept of leader broadly fits the transformational model, while his concept of managers is a more transactional one.

**Marcus Buckingham**, in a 2005 Harvard Business Review article, remarks that, 'lately much has been made of the notion that there is no one best way to lead and that instead, the most effective leadership style depends on the circumstance.'<sup>vi</sup> This is often referred to as 'situational' or 'contingent' leadership', an approach which was perhaps best popularised by **Hersey and Blanchard** in the 1960s.<sup>vii</sup> As Buckingham points out, Situational Leadership has enjoyed a renewed popularity. One of the challenges, however, is that it offers no single answer to the would-be leader seeking to identify useful ways of working. For individuals, particularly junior managers aspiring to be or become leaders, it is not enough to say that ones leadership style should be determined by circumstance.

Unsurprisingly, **Daniel Goleman**, the author of 'Emotional Intelligence' says that it is emotional intelligence that makes a good leader. That is to say, a successful leader should

display self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy and social skill or, put more simply, knowing your emotions, managing your own emotions, motivating yourself, recognising and understanding other people's emotions and managing relationships, i.e. managing the emotions of others.<sup>viii</sup> The growth of interest in Emotional Intelligence as part of leadership development programmes indicates that many people accept this view, or, at least, the people designing such courses accept it. Emotional Intelligence of itself is unlikely to be sufficient for effective leadership which achieves results. In an increasingly complex world, IQ is also relevant. At the same time, Emotional Intelligence is necessary, as the UK military has long understood.<sup>ix</sup>

**Jim Collins** talks about 'level 5 leadership', which sits at the top of a hierarchy of capabilities.<sup>x</sup> The hierarchy is as follows:

- **Level 1 (lowest level) High Capable Individual** - someone who contributes productively through talent, knowledge, and effective work habits
- **Level 2 Contributing Team Member** - someone who works effectively with others in a group and contributes to the achievement of the group's objectives.
- **Level 3 - Competent Manager** - someone who is good at organizing people and resources towards the 'effective and efficient pursuit of predetermined objectives'.<sup>xi</sup>
- **Level 4 - Effective Leader** - someone who acts as a catalyst for commitment to a clear and compelling vision and its pursuit, and stimulates the group to high performance standards.
- **Level 5 - Executive** - someone who 'builds enduring greatness through a paradoxical combination of personal humility plus professional will.'<sup>xii</sup>

The Level 5 leader combines all the attributes of the lower levels with those of level 5. While a Level 4 leader can be perfectly effective, it is the level 5 leader who is capable of taking a good organisation and turning it into a great one. As Collins puts it, Level 5 leadership is humility + will. It is learnable, although Collins believes there is no easy 10-step path to achieving it. In particular, it involves putting people first and strategy second. It also requires an ability to hold two apparently contradictory beliefs in mind at the same time, namely the brutal facts of the current reality combined with a total faith that they, as leader, will prevail. The ability to hold two apparently contradictory beliefs in mind is said by Papa Bray to be one of the fundamentals skills of a *kahuna*, as discussed in Chapter 3.

The companies that Collins researched experienced neither a single leap into greatness, nor a sustained upward progression. They rather lurched backwards and forwards, like a giant flywheel.<sup>xiii</sup> They focused on what would make them the best, and eliminated anything that did not fit with the model of excellence, used technology wisely, and maintained a culture of discipline: disciplined thought, disciplined people and disciplined action

Collins' work is interesting because, contrary to popular belief, he found that the outgoing, charismatic personality does not make the best leader. In fact, he argues, it is modesty, and a willingness to shun public admiration and act with quiet, calm determination, relying on 'inspiring standards, not inspiring charisma, to motivate' which often makes the best leader.<sup>xiv</sup> The truly great leader channels ambition into the company, not his or her self, looks to develop the next generation of leaders, and takes responsibility for poor results. This does not betoken weakness. While the leader practices humility, their belief is strong. They are completely committed to doing whatever must be done to produce the best long-term results, no matter how difficult, they settle for nothing less than excellence, and they credit

success to others. Collins remarks that there is a tendency among the more classically charismatic leaders to effect great results in the short term, but not in the long term. They excel in a crisis, but not in maintaining success, partly because they become too focussed on their own success and their own image, and neglect to pay attention to the long-term success of the organisation. Humility (*ha'a*) is one of the spiritual values espoused by Daddy Bray, as discussed in Chapter 5.

The research of **Goffee and Jones** on leadership shows some overlap with both the ideas of Goleman and those of Collins.<sup>xv</sup> Researching the qualities that cause leaders to inspire as others, as opposed to necessarily producing great results, they identified four main characteristics of a truly inspirational leader:

- Reveal your weaknesses (albeit selectively)
- Rely heavily on intuition (coupled with an ability to collect 'soft' data)
- Empathise passionately yet realistically with employees, and care about their work
- Reveal and capitalise on what makes you unique.

Goffee and Jones' work is not as well known as that of some of the authors discussed here.

This is possibly because most organisations, particularly commercial organisations are predominantly interested in success. There is little point in having an inspirational leader if the organisation then fails, even if profit is not the overriding driver of the organisation.

One of the best known modern writer on leadership is **Warren Bennis**. His 1985 book, **Leaders**, which he wrote with his colleague **Burt Nanus** represents a milestone in thinking about leadership. Bennis and Nanus researched 90 leaders in America.<sup>xvi</sup> 66% were from the corporate world, and 33% were from non-profit organisations of different kinds. All the

leaders of these organisations were different in style, traits and behaviours, but Bennis and Nanus were able to identify 4 types of leadership competency, all expressed in management terms. These were:

- **Management of Attention** (through vision).
- **Management of Meaning** (through communication).
- **Management of Trust** (through positioning).
- **Management of self** through (1) positive self regard, and (2) the 'Wallenda factor'" - named after Karl Wallenda, the tight-rope walker who would not, or could not, consider the possibility of failure.

**Management of attention** is the need to find a compelling cause or vision that will focus the minds and the energies of everyone involved. The leader needs a dream and the determination to live that dream. **Management of meaning** is the ability to communicate that dream so it has meaning for others. The **management of trust** means that a leader should be consistent and honest in all that he or she says or does, while the **management of self** means that leaders must be aware of their weaknesses as well as their strengths. Leaders also need to be able to accept valid criticism, and know when to change course and when to 'plough on regardless'.<sup>xvii</sup> In his more recent work, Bennis has come to the conclusion that leadership involves a partnership between the leaders and the led, that the role of the leader is to generate an environment where intellectual capital can flourish, and constantly to remind people of the importance of their work. In particular, the leader must create and encourage an atmosphere of trust, where risk-taking is encouraged, and -perhaps most importantly to create hope.<sup>xviii</sup> Thankfully leadership is something that can be learned. A Bennis leader

clearly shows high levels of emotional intelligence. He or she also has the capacity to generate respect on the basis of abilities, experience and knowledge.

No discussion of modern approach to corporate leadership would be complete without considering the ideas of **Servant Leadership** and **Authentic Leadership**. The idea of Servant Leadership was first popularised by Robert **Greenleaf**, in 1970,<sup>xix</sup> although it was familiar to the British Army in the 1940s. It has been argued the approach dates back to the writings of **Lao Tzu** in approximately 600 BC.<sup>xx</sup> It is worth quoting what Greenleaf had to say, because of the impact he has had on a number of influential writers, such as **Steven R. Covey**, **Larry Spears**, **Peter Senge** and **Ken Blanchard**, to name but a few.

*"The servant-leader is servant first... It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. That person is sharply different from one who is leader first, perhaps because of the need to assuage an unusual power drive or to acquire material possessions...The leader-first and the servant-first are two extreme types. Between them there are shadings and blends that are part of the infinite variety of human nature."*

*"The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant-first to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served. The best test, and difficult to administer, is: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society? Will they benefit or at least not be further deprived?"<sup>xxxi</sup>*

The emphasis here is on the leader as a self-less individual who puts the interests of others before his or her own. Greenleaf put these beliefs into practice during his time as Director of Management Research at AT&T, and in leadership organisations (such as the Center for Creative Leadership) that he subsequently founded. While the idea of Servant Leadership is espoused by many writers, true Servant Leadership still seems to be a fairly rare commodity in modern business.

Interest in Authentic Leadership has mushroomed in recent years. A brief search on **Google** identifies a number of organisations with ‘Authentic Leaders’ or ‘Authentic Leadership’ in the title. The fundamental tenet is that the best leader is one who is true to him or her self, and does not try to be something or someone they are not. **Bill George**, former CEO of **Medtronic**, referred to in Chapter 2, identifies five main tenets of authentic leadership in his book of that name.<sup>xxii</sup> These are

- **Understanding your purpose** and staying true to it
- **Practising solid values** on a daily basis
- **Leading with heart**, so demonstrating compassion, empathy, passion and courage
- **Establishing connecting relationships**
- **Demonstrating self-discipline.**

George lays out this list after declaring that authenticity is about being yourself, and that the lists of common leadership **traits** produced by writers on the subject are the antithesis of authenticity. Implicit in this list is the idea that an authentic leader accepts that they are in a position of responsibility and stewardship. They need to capture hearts and minds, and have a clear vision and set of values. George’s thinking is based on his experience at Medtronic, and he freely admits to embracing the views of Greenleaf and **Du Pree**<sup>xxiii</sup> in developing his perspective on leadership.

Taking the ideas of Authentic Leadership and Servant Leadership together, a logical conclusion is that Servant Leadership will only work if the individual is **genuinely** inclined to put the interests of others, and of the organisation, before himself or herself. As we know

from **MBTI**, **NLP** and other psychologically based thinking, some people are more naturally people-oriented, and more inclined to put the interests of others first, or at least to consider them carefully. The '**Feelers**' (Fs) in MBTI terms are interested in the emotions of others. '**Thinkers**' (Ts) have a preference for dealing with data first and may come across as being disinterested in others. NLP distinguishes between those who have a preference for paying attention to self first, then others, and those who pay attention to others first. The latter group are more likely to deliver good customer service, as they pay attention to the needs of the customer. An individual whose preference is to direct their attention to self first, coupled with a preferred interest in information, places or things, as opposed to people, may find it difficult to be an authentic servant leader.

Many of the key writers mentioned here see trust as an outcome of good leadership practice, rather than something which a leader should deliberately strive to create. Bennis is an exception, in that he specifically writes about the need to manage trust. **Stephen M.R. Covey**, son of the more famous Stephen R. Covey, believes that trust is the absolute key to effective leadership.<sup>xxiv</sup> He cites many sources in support of this argument, including his own experiences. Covey suggests that most people believe that trust is all about character. He proposes that this is a myth. Trust is a function of character together with competence. Character includes integrity, motives and intent. Competence includes capabilities, skills, results and track record. Covey's core message is a simple one which intuitively sounds 'right'. If we do not trust someone, we will only follow them up to a point, if at all. Therefore a leader who is not regarded as fundamentally trustworthy may not consistently deliver excellent results over an extended period of time.

Most of the writers referred to above are generally talking about models drawn from the observation of large corporations and organisations in the USA. **Rich Schefren**, a comparatively new thinker who is making a name for himself as an internet-based teacher and coach looks specifically at the qualities required to lead business start ups and small businesses. Schefren identifies the number one reason for small business failure as being an inability on the part of the owner/leader to distinguish between family and team. He claims that most people mistakenly believe that business is a family, that their business is their family and their family is their business. As a consequence, businesses often continue doing things they should have stopped long ago, fail to deal with people who underperform, and hire people for who they are or whether they like them, as opposed to whether they have the relevant skills set. When the company is viewed as a team, rather than as a family, it is easier to take hard decisions, according to Schefren. Schefren's thinking on this is somewhat at odds with that of writers such as Rosa Say, as we will show.

With the growth of so much output on the subject of leadership, authors consistently strive to find new angles on the subject. **Laurie Beth Jones**, whose bestseller, '**Jesus, CEO**', examines the leadership of Jesus, and attempts to put it into a corporate context has a particular relevance for this paper, because she takes a leader known for his spirituality, and creates a model based on what she perceives as his traits and behaviours. Jones distinguishes between what she terms '*Alpha*' management, based on 'the masculine, authoritative use of power' and '*Beta*' management, based on the 'feminine, cooperative use of power'.<sup>xxv</sup> She claims to have identified a third style, which she terms '*Omega*', which 'incorporates and enhances them both'.<sup>xxvi</sup> She identifies three categories of strengths:

- self-mastery

- action
- relationships

For each of these strengths she identifies 20-30 specific behaviours, all of which, she believes, are recounted in the **New Testament**. Jones was writing in 1995: before the publication of ‘Authentic Leadership’ or ‘Emotional Intelligence’, and only a year after the publication of Bennis’ authoritative work ‘On Becoming a Leader’. Much of what she proposes is reflected in both Emotional Intelligence and Authentic Leadership. In particular, in her discussion of the strength of **self-mastery**, she emphasises self-belief, guarding ones energy, passionate commitment and sticking to ones mission. Under **strength of action**, she talks about taking action, having a plan, taking the long view and training successors. All of these would be familiar to a reader of the 1994 **Collins and Porras** book, ‘**Built to last**’.<sup>xxvii</sup> **Strength of relationships** includes behaviours such as treating others as equals, serving them, loving them, spending plenty of time with them, giving people a sense of something larger than themselves and regarding his successors as his greatest accomplishment. Again, many of these behaviours are reflected in Level 5 Leadership, the findings of Bennis, and the concepts of Authentic and, most particularly, Servant Leadership. The latter is unsurprising, as Greenleaf was committed to putting his Christian beliefs into action, and ‘Servant Leadership’ reflects this.

From the brief review above, a number of common themes emerge. Firstly, there is the importance of having a core purpose, or vision, and deeply held values, together with the ability to communicate all this and the discipline and determination to pursue it. There is also common agreement on the need to develop relationships, and to have a high level of self-awareness. Opinions vary on how far an apparent failure should be pursued, and how dogged

a leader should be. Some writers cite well-known perennial ‘failures’ such as Edison, who finally did produce the first commercially practicable incandescent light, as an example of focus and dedication. Others, such as Zalaznik, claim that the leader’s role is to keep options open, and support chaos and lack of structure. Opinion also varies as to the value of charismatic leadership. Collins espouses humility and suggests that the leader who is seen as a personality potentially disadvantages their organisation, while for Covey, the leader can be charismatic or not, providing he or she is trusted. Authentic Leadership proposes that the leader must be true to themselves: if the leader is naturally charismatic, so be it. If they are not, then they should not try to assume these qualities.<sup>xxviii</sup> As discussed above, Servant Leadership is espoused by a number of authors, but is, as yet, rarely demonstrated in modern corporations.

Most writers emphasise the need for leaders to create meaning. As discussed in Chapter 2, humans seek meaning in their life, and for many people the workplace is their only source. Bennis specifically refers to the creation of meaning in his discussion of the management of meaning, while Bill George implies it with his principle of leading with heart, or passion. In ‘Built to Last’ Collins and Porras talk of the value of developing a ‘cult-like’ organisational culture, with a total focus on living the core values of the organisation.<sup>xxix</sup> In such organisations, the organisation becomes like family, and the commitment to the ideology sustains passion and dedication. Those who stay with the organisation do so because they love both what they do and the *esprit de corps*. The organisation gives them a sense of meaning. At the same time, the organisation trusts its people and encourages them to take responsibility and act with authority. In these organisations it is not only the leader who embodies the organisational values. Every process and structure in the organisation is attuned to honouring the values.

Previously this writer worked as a management consultant working with organisational change. It was noticeable that the mediocre organisations in which we consulted were willing to compromise their values if they thought it would save them money. They found it difficult to understand that this would lead to incongruence, which customers and employees quickly identify. This incongruence then becomes a source of dissatisfaction. Organisations which understood the importance of embodying the core values in everything they did, tended, ultimately, to thrive. An example of this was given by Sonia Stojanovic at the 2004 Be The Change Conference.<sup>xxx</sup> One of the values espoused by ANZ bank was honesty and integrity. When a senior manager sent out a letter to retail customers that effectively reneged on existing agreements, and did so in a way that was clearly underhand yet promised to make the bank considerable amounts of money, he was told to write a letter of apology to those customers and was promptly dismissed because his actions undermined the values to which the bank was committed.

### ***Managing with Aloha***

There is one further writer whose work is of relevance to this paper, namely Rosa Say. Say is concerned with ‘bringing Hawaii’s universal values to the art of business’ and that is the subtitle of her book, **Managing with Aloha**, mentioned in Chapter 5.<sup>xxxi</sup> Say was brought up in Hawaii, and her aim is to build a model of business based on Hawaiian values. Her approach is not overtly spiritual, but it is overtly Hawaiian, and as such assumes a certain spirituality. As she puts it: ‘I do believe that we should acknowledge our own spirituality and get comfortable with it. One’s spiritual power is assumed in the Hawaiian culture, and it is celebrated’<sup>xxxii</sup>. She distinguishes between leadership and management, and emphasises that

her book is about management, not leadership. For her, the modern tendency to aspire to leadership, as opposed to mere management, is condescending. She sees management as a noble task, one that needs to be mastered before someone can become a leader. She remarks that, '*it will often require a charismatic leader to create excitement, and lead the way with new and innovative thinking. However, it will require a great manager of people to actually inspire employees to get the job done*'.<sup>xxxiii</sup>

This writer has some sympathy with this view. Leaders gain credibility if they have a track record, and a track record implies competence, as Covey proposes. The dotcom boom and bust highlights this. A number of new, young fresh companies were started by new, young fresh individuals, many of whom did not have the necessary business experience to see the process through, even where they did have qualities such as empathy, vision, integrity and exciting ideas.

Say regards leadership (*Alaka'i* in Say's terms) as a value that anyone who is in a position of guiding others needs to adopt. Although the dictionary meaning of *alaka'i* is to lead or guide, in a Hula *halau* (group or school) the *alaka'i* is the deputy, and many of their functions are managerial. A *halau* may have more than one *alakai'i*. They run classes if the *kumu* (teacher or master) is away, help those who are less familiar with the chants and dances and organise matters to do with the *halau*. They may or may not be in training to become a *kumu* (teacher) in their own right someday, but they serve the *kumu* and the *halau*. Thus the sort of leadership Say is talking about resonates with the idea of Servant Leadership, although Say does not describe it as such. She presents *alaka'i* as a set of values. Someone who is *alaka'i*, according to Say, is 'the one who leads with initiative, and with ...good example....willing to

shoulder the greater responsibility that comes with leading others'.<sup>xxxiv</sup> They 'possess a strong belief in their own capacity and in the power of possibility. They are confident optimists, filled with hope.'<sup>xxxv</sup>

The values Say proposes can be summarised as follows. The overarching value is that of *aloha*. As previously discussed in Chapter 5, *aloha* for Say is unconditional love, similar in spirit to the Greek concept of *agape*. It is spiritual in nature, because it involves the outpouring and receiving of spirit. It also embraces the qualities of respect, kindness, co-operation, humility, unity, graciousness and hospitality. For Say, *aloha* is about giving and receiving spirit. It also includes the concept of being of service. Managing with *aloha* could be seen as equivalent to 'servant management'. The rest of the values set is derived from this concept.

Most of the values which Say espouses resonate, at least to some extent, with Servant Leadership. Many, if not most, also resonate with one or more of the writers on leadership previously mentioned in this chapter. She talks about *ho'ohana*, finding passion in your work and supporting others in finding meaning through their work. These themes are reflected in the findings of Goffee and Jones, and in the work of Bennis and Collins and Porras. Although the term she uses for perseverance (*ho'omau*) is different from that used by Daddy Bray (*ahonui*), both espouse the need for diligence and determination, which is also in line with the thinking of Collins. The pursuit and desire for personal excellence (*Kulia i ka nu'u*), identified by **Ken Shelton** as a quality of great leaders, is also important.<sup>xxxvi</sup>

*Lokahi*, collaboration and co-operation was said by Daddy Bray to be a core value of Huna. It is equally important in Say's model, and is captured in the work of **Stephen R. Covey** as the habit of 'creative co-operation'.<sup>xxxvii</sup> *Ha'a ha'a*, humility, is a part of Say's model of *aloha*, just as it is part of Daddy Bray's. The value of *nana i ke kumu*, look to your source or find your truth, lies at the heart of Authentic Leadership. Say's final value is *pono*, rightness and balance. The concept of *pono* is fundamental to Daddy Bray's notions of how an individual should lead their life. Being *pono* implies being authentic, and thus is one way of expressing the concept of authentic leadership.

One of the values which Say embraces is that of *Ohana*, family, and those who we choose to call family. It is also the spirit of community. It is the 'complete circle of human *aloha*'.<sup>xxxviii</sup> It is more than a team or a department, and has a sacred quality. Being part of an *ohana* demands of the individuals in it that they give and receive *aloha*, support, understanding and forgiveness freely and unconditionally<sup>xxxix</sup>. While this has something in common with the 'cult culture' of 'Built to Last', it is in many ways more demanding of the individual than membership of a 'cult culture'. An example is that of the hula *halau*. A good *halau* operates in true *ohana* style. Support is freely given, and the members treat one another as brothers or sisters. At the same time there is a price to be paid: that of dedication, commitment and sacrifice (*amama*). This does not necessarily sit well with modern Western thinking, although it may resonate with cultures, such as those of Singapore, Japan or even France, which are more communitarian and less individualistic than the mainstream cultures in the USA, Canada and UK. As Rich Schefren points out, in business you sometimes have to dismiss those who underperform. In an *ohana*, underperformers are nurtured and cherished, although in a competition *halau* they will not dance at public performances.

## *Comments and conclusions*

As the discussion in this chapter suggests, many of the leadership models developed in the last 20 years or so share common themes, although different models have different emphases. If we compare the leadership models with models of workplace spirituality discussed in Chapter 2, we find that some models have very little in common with the workplace spirituality models, whereas others share many themes with models such as the Findhorn model. Say's model is particularly strong in this respect, as is that of Laurie Beth Jones. Both promote working towards the realisation of the highest potential in each individual, seeking to embody spiritual values such as love, acceptance, compassion, forgiveness, integrity, honesty in the workplace and acting in ways that embrace a higher truth. Even Greenleaf and the secular proponents of Servant Leadership do not actively promote the acceptance of a higher truth, although this is embraced by the many non-secular, primarily Christian, organisations which espouse various forms of Servant Leadership.

Connection, particularly with the land (*aina*), is a fundamental Hawaiian value, although it is not one which Say promotes explicitly. John Ka'imikaua, a Hawaiian Hula master and expert in the Hawaiian culture, used to say that there are three aspects to our existence: the self, the higher self and the *aina* (by which he meant everything else including living things, the environment and the land itself). **All** are inter-connected, and we need to care for and respect those connections. This concept is partially covered by Say. The notion of connection with the planet is becoming a part of ethical or sustainable leadership. None of the writers mentioned above subscribe, as yet, to the holographic principle put forward by the Findhorn consultancy.

Subsequent chapters are concerned with developing a new model of corporate leadership based on the principles and practices of Huna. In order for the model to be practicable, it will refer to and take account of ideas presented in this Chapter, and on Chapter 2 (Spirituality in the Workplace).

---

<sup>i</sup> Jim Collins quoted by Rich Scheffren in his Business Growth System programme.

[http://www.strategicprofitsystem.com/bgs\\_mod\\_0010/resources/module\\_01\\_transcript.pdf](http://www.strategicprofitsystem.com/bgs_mod_0010/resources/module_01_transcript.pdf)

<sup>ii</sup> Weber is probably best known for his concept of the charismatic hero, a leader who leads by sheer force of personality. Modern examples include Hitler and Nasser. The charismatic leader is similar to the transformational leader. Weber's version of the transactional leader is the Bureaucratic leader. Weber's best known work, *Die Protestantische ethik und der geist des kapitalismus* (The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism) originated from a series of articles published in 1904-1905.

<sup>iii</sup> McGregor, D. (1960) *The Human Side of Enterprise*. McGraw Hill Higher Education

<sup>iv</sup> See for example Bass, B.M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, Winter: 19-31 or Burns, J.M (1978) *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row  
[http://changingminds.org/disciplines/leadership/styles/transformational\\_leadership.htm](http://changingminds.org/disciplines/leadership/styles/transformational_leadership.htm)

<sup>v</sup> Zalaznik, A. (1977/1992) 'Managers and Leaders - Are They Different'. *Harvard Business Review*. March-April 1992

<sup>vi</sup> Buckingham, M. (2005) 'What Great Managers Do' *Harvard Business Review* March 2005

<sup>vii</sup> Hersey and Blanchard's book has been reprinted many times. For the latest edition see Hersey, P., Blanchard, K., John, D. (2008) *Management of Organizational Behavior: Leading Human Resources (9th ed.)* Pearson Education, Upper Saddle River, N.J.

<sup>viii</sup> Goleman, G. (1998/2004) 'What makes a leader'. *Harvard Business Review*, January 2004

<sup>ix</sup> Some of the early work on leadership with a human face came out of the UK military. See for example, the work of Greenleaf or John Adair.

<sup>x</sup> Collins, J. (2001/2005) 'Level 5 Leadership: The Triumph of Humility and Fierce Resolve'. *Harvard Business Review*. 'The High-Performing Organization'. July-August 2005

<sup>xi</sup> Collins, *op. cit.*

<sup>xii</sup> Collins, *op. cit.*

<sup>xiii</sup> Collins *op. cit.*

<sup>xiv</sup> Collins, *op. cit.*

<sup>xv</sup> Goffee, R. & Jones, G. (2000) Why Should Anyone be Led by You? *Harvard Business Review*, September 1, 2000.

<sup>xvi</sup> Bennis, W & Nanus, B. (1986) *Leaders* Harper and Row

<sup>xvii</sup> Bennis' thinking was superbly summarised by Charles Handy in The Handy Guide to the Gurus of Management. BBC English, programme 5.

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/worldservice/learningenglish/work/handy/bennis/html>

<sup>xviii</sup> Bennis, W. and Ward Biederman, P. (1998) *Organizing Genius*. Perseus Books Group.

<sup>xix</sup> Greenleaf, R. (1977) *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press, New York.

<sup>xx</sup> The Wikipedia article on Servant Leadership gives a short quote from Lao Tzu, whose writings on strategic leadership are being rediscovered in a business context. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Servant\\_Leadership](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Servant_Leadership)

<sup>xxi</sup> <http://www.greenleaf.org/whatissl/index.html> accessed 7 March 2009

<sup>xxii</sup> George, B. (2003) *Authentic Leadership: creating lasting value*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco

<sup>xxiii</sup> Du Pree is best known for his work as CEO of Herman Miller Inc., an innovative furniture company.

Through his work he earned a place in Fortune Magazine's National Business Hall of Fame. He intentionally allowed his beliefs as a committed Christian to shape his approach to life, management and business practice, and has written a number of books on Leadership emphasising the notion that beliefs shape practice.

<sup>xxiv</sup> Covey, Stephen M.R. with Merrill, R. (2006) *The Speed of Trust: the one thing that changes everything*. Free Press/Simon & Schuster. New York

- 
- <sup>xxv</sup> Jones, Laurie Beth (1995) *Jesus, CEO: using ancient wisdom for visionary leadership*. Hyperion. New York.
- <sup>xxvi</sup> Jones, *op. cit* p.X111
- <sup>xxvii</sup> Collins, J. & Porras, J. I. (1994/2002) *Built to last: successful habit of visionary companies*. Harper Collins, New York.
- <sup>xxviii</sup> Bill George became something of a *persona* while still at Medtronic. Subsequently he is frequently featured in interviews and articles, and teaches at a leading US business school.
- <sup>xxix</sup> Collins & Porras, *op cit*
- <sup>xxx</sup> Be The Change - London Conference, May 2005.
- <sup>xxxi</sup> Say, R. (2004) *Managing with Aloha: Bringing Hawaii's Universal Values to the Art of Business*. Ho'ohana Publishing, Waikoloa, Hawaii
- <sup>xxxii</sup> Say, *op. cit.* p.21
- <sup>xxxiii</sup> Say, *op cit.*, pp 9-10.
- <sup>xxxiv</sup> Say, *op. cit.* p106
- <sup>xxxv</sup> Say, *op. cit.* p.180
- <sup>xxxvi</sup> Shelton, K. (2009) 'Seven Traits of Great Leaders'. *Utah Pulse*, 19 February 2009.  
<http://www.utahpulse.com/featuere/article/seven-traits-great-leaders>, accessed 13 March 2009
- <sup>xxxvii</sup> Covey, Stephen R. (1990) *The 7 habits of highly effective people*. Fireside, New York.
- <sup>xxxviii</sup> Say, *op. cit.* p99
- <sup>xxxix</sup> Say, *op. cit.* p.94