Love and Servant-Leadership

—Tom Buck

Parker Palmer (2000) described the world as a mixture of both shadow and light. On a grand scale, the interplay of shadow and light can be witnessed both in wars and the giving of humanitarian aid across the globe. This exchange of shadow and light can also be experienced in local communities through the existence of poverty and depression, as well as volunteerism and charitable giving. While there are examples of famous leaders who inspired large movements towards great change, these leaders are famous and notable precisely because they are the exception, rather than the rule. Most leaders will not bring an end to global wars or other large-scale atrocities, but they can make a difference in their local communities. "A leader is someone with the power to project either shadow or light onto some part of the world and into the lives of the people who dwell there" (p. 78).

As if in response to the challenge to project light into the world, Robert Greenleaf (1991) wrote *The Servant as Leader*, beginning the modern era of servant-leadership (Heskett, 2013). In the article, and in his corresponding works, "Greenleaf discusses the need for a better approach to

leadership, one that puts serving others—including employees, customers, and community—as the number one priority" (Spears, 2005, p. 32). Since then, servant-leadership has increased in popularity and study by leadership scholars worldwide. As of the writing of this paper, a search for articles about servant-leadership on Google Scholar yields more than 480,000 results.

In his essay, Greenleaf (1991) suggested "human service that requires love cannot be satisfactorily dispensed by specialized institutions that exist apart from community" (p. 21). Through this statement, Greenleaf expressed a connection between love, service, and community, all of which are foundational aspects of servant-leadership. Of these, I argue that it is love that rises as the critical aspect on which servant-leadership hinges. Thus, the purpose of this paper is to suggest that the characteristics and practice of servant-leadership can be viewed as the natural result of a leader who loves those whom she or he leads.

In regards to this idea, the paper will begin by examining the response of servant-leadership to the shadow in the world before contrasting its properties with love, showing that the results of love are consistent with the desired outcomes of servant-leadership. Since an exhaustive review of all shadow in the world is impractical, I will focus solely on examining the shadow of dehumanization due to materialism. I chose to focus specifically on materialism for two reasons. First, materialism, and the use of individuals, is a shadow in the world common to the understanding of most leaders. Secondly, in materialism

can be seen perhaps one of the most direct affronts to love itself. St. John Paul II, in his book *Love and Responsibility* (1981), posits that, rather than hate, it is 'using' that can be considered the opposite of love. John Paul argues that "Anyone who treats a person as the means to an end does violence to the very essence of the other" (p. 27). In response, however, "love will gradually eliminate the purely utilitarian or consumer attitude to the person" (p. 29).

After examining the shadow of materialism, a discussion of the nature of love will be considered to provide a response and a background for connecting love and servant-leadership. To expose this relationship, I will argue Spears' (2005) 10 characteristics of servant-leadership are the natural result of a leader who loves by examining how each of these characteristics fits with the given definition of love.

SHADOW AND LIGHT

To better understand the way servant-leadership projects light into the world, an examination of shadow must first take place. "Before we come to that center, full of light, we must travel in the dark" (Palmer, 2000, p. 18). One such shadow in the world that might be examined is materialism. The shadow of materialism is appropriate for leaders to examine in that it can be considered a shadow side of leadership, for it often leads to dehumanization. "Our own individual and collective shadow often reveals a much darker reality—the reality that we tend to use people, see others as inferior, view people as commodities, and demonize our enemies" (Ferch, 2012, p. 20).

Philosophers and religious figures from all walks of life continue warning about the dangers of materialism. Pope Francis, for example, recently pointed out, “Whenever material things, money, worldliness, become the center of our lives, they take hold of us, they possess us; we lose our very identity as human beings” (as cited in Lenartowick, 2013). Likewise, his predecessor, Pope Emeritus Benedict XVI (2009) stated, “If the market is governed solely by the principle of the equivalence in value of exchanged goods, it cannot produce the social cohesion that it requires in order to function well” (p. 35). Another example of a religious figure warning against materialism can be found in the Dalai Lama (1999), who argued, “a culture of materialism . . . becomes the context for all kinds of societal ills which bring suffering to all members of [the] community” (p. 165). This shadow is still present in the world. The American philosopher, bell hooks (2000), observed, “suddenly, it was no longer important to bring an ethical dimension to the work life, making money was the goal, and by whatever means” (pp. 108-109). Psychologist Viktor Frankl (1988) also lamented that materialism has advanced to the point that people have begun to be viewed simply as machines.

SERVANT-LEADERSHIP AS A RESPONSE

Servant-leadership theory stands in opposition to this form of dehumanization. Rather than viewing people solely as a means to achieve a focused goal, Greenleaf suggested reorienting leaders toward the people themselves, and stated, the “servant-leader is servant first” (Greenleaf, 1991, p. 6). “In

his works, Greenleaf discusses the need for a better approach to leadership, one that puts serving others—including employees, customers, and community—as the number one priority" (Spears, 2005, p. 32). Greenleaf's focus on the individual can be summed up this way:

> When the business manager who is fully committed to this ethic is asked, "What are you in business for?" the answer may be: "I am in the business of growing people—people who are stronger, healthier, more autonomous, more self-reliant, more competent. Incidentally, we also make and sell at a profit, things that people want to buy so we can pay for all this. (Greenleaf, 2002, p. 159)

Greenleaf further contrasted a leader who is servant first with one who is leader first. Greenleaf wrote:

> That person [the servant-leader] 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. For such it will be a later choice to serve—after leadership is established. (Greenleaf, 1991, p. 6)

In this particular passage contrasting a leader who is servant first with one who is leader first, Greenleaf framed materialism as the antithesis to servant-leadership.

While servant-leadership can reorient the leader toward the individual and help prevent the leader from wounding those who are led, it can and must also work toward healing wounds left by other sources. All people have experienced suffering at one time or another, and a great many continue to experience

the feeling of woundedness from suffering (hooks, 2000). Additionally, Spears (2010) posited:

> Many people have broken spirits and have suffered from a variety of emotional hurts. Although this is a part of being human, servant leaders recognize that they have an opportunity to help make whole those with whom they come in contact. (p. 27)

Rather than dismiss this woundedness, "servant leadership enters the crucible of human understanding and seeks to affirm the deep losses and suffering that attend every human life" (Ferch, 2012, p. 71).

It is difficult to discuss the topic of woundedness and suffering without speaking of love. The connection between the two has not been lost on philosophers. St. John Paul II (1984), for example, wrote in his encyclical on suffering, *Salvifici Doloris*, that suffering exists "to unleash love in the human person*"* (VII. 29*)*. Additionally, the Dalai Lama (1999) wrote, "When we enhance our sensitivity toward others' suffering . . . we can gradually extend out compassion" (p. 124). While the connection between love and suffering has already been explored, it should also be mentioned there also exists a connection between love and servant-leadership. Greenleaf (2002) suggested, "caring for persons, the more able and the less able serving each other, is the rock upon which a good society is built" (p. 62).

A significant amount of research and discussion exists regarding the effect of love on leadership. Recently, an article in Forbes magazine stated, "leading with love is a winning

leadership and employee engagement strategy on many levels" (Biro, 2014, para. 2). The article cited studies done by the Boston Consulting Group concluding, "companies that embrace 'whole person' employee engagement have consistently outpaced growth in S&P average cumulative share price by margins of up to 99 percent" (para. 5). According to a study by Gallup (2017), employees who are "involved in and enthusiastic about their work and workplace" (p. 63) are considered engaged. However, according to the same study, these workers consist of only 33% of the workforce. In contrast, 51% of American workers claim to be unengaged, or simply "putting time—but not energy or passion—into their work" (p. 63). Worse, 16% of workers consider themselves actively disengaged, claiming to be "resentful . . . and acting out of their unhappiness" (p. 63). This lack of engagement, Gallup predicted, costs the U.S. between $483 and $605 billion each year (p. 19). This lack of engagement can come from lack of love. According to the findings of the study, "Employees need to know . . . that someone is concerned about them as people first and as employees second" (p. 108). Caring about someone as a person, and encouraging the development of another is arguably at the heart of love itself. The Gallup study further concluded that having engaged employees reduced absenteeism, safety incidents, theft, and turnover, while increasing profitability, productivity, and quality.

Harvard Business Review undertook another study regarding leadership and love involving employees, patients,

and families at a nonprofit healthcare center. The study concluded:

> Employees who felt they worked in a loving, caring culture reported higher levels of satisfaction and teamwork. They showed up to work more often. Our research also demonstrated that this type of culture related directly to client outcomes, including improved patient mood, quality of life, satisfaction, and fewer trips to the ER. (Barsade, 2014, para. 3)

These results should not be surprising to anyone. “Humans want to love. They want to be loved . . . so, love becomes an obvious act of choice for a leader” (Khandelwal & Mehta, 2018, p. 41).

A DEFINITION OF LOVE

These studies appear to show that love has an effect on leadership. To discuss love further and show its connection to servant-leadership, a working definition is necessary. While Greenleaf (2002) himself declared, “Love is an undefinable term” (p. 52); in order to use the term, a shared definition is important. bell hooks (2000) expressed the importance of a definition of love when she stated, “had I been given a clear definition of love earlier in my life it would not have taken me so long to become a more loving person” (p. 11). She further suggested many are uncomfortable with defining love because, once defined, they are faced with their own sense of falling short. While my purpose is not to create a universal definition of love that will be accepted by all scholars, a working

definition for the sake of discussion itself is required. Therefore, to explore the connection between love and servant-leadership, the nature of love itself will be considered.

Some of the earliest known attempts to define love go back to Plato. In his work, *The Symposium*, Plato (1993) expressed the power of love on personal behavior, stating, "Love will make men dare to die for their beloved; and women as well as men" (p. 7). Plato also observed, "the love of the noblest and highest, even if their persons are less beautiful than others, is especially honourable" (p. 10). Finally, Plato contended:

> Love, especially, which is concerned with the good, and which is perfected in company with temperance and justice, whether among gods or men, has the greatest power, and is the source of all our happiness and harmony and friendship with the gods which are above us, and with one another. (pp. 14-15)

The sense of fulfillment in loving others expressed by Plato was mirrored by hooks' when she wrote, "I know of no one who has embraced a love ethic whose life has not become joyous and more fulfilling" (hooks, 2000, p. 88).

At the time of Plato's writing, it should be noted the Greek language had more than one word for love. In his book, *The Four Loves*, C.S. Lewis (1960) examined the nature of love from these varying perspectives. Among the different words the Greeks used, there were: στοργή (storge), which denoted a familial love, φιλία (phila), which expressed the love shared between friends, ἔρως (eros), which for the Greeks was an erotic or romantic love, and ἀγάπη (agape), which denoted a selfless

love focused on the beloved (Lewis, 1960). It is this form of love that Lewis considered the greatest. Agape can also be defined as "care for another motivated solely by an awareness of the intrinsic dignity of that other" (Spitzer, 2000, p. 228). In this perspective, it is directly opposed to materialism, which views the other as merely a means to an end. In fact, it is the word agape that is used in the Greek text which contains one of the most well-known descriptions of love: St. Paul's letter to the Corinthians. The famous passage states,

> Love is patient and kind; love is not jealous or boastful; it is not arrogant or rude. Love does not insist on its own way; it is not irritable or resentful; it does not rejoice at wrong, but rejoices in the right. Love bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things. (1 Cor 13: 4-8, Revised Standard Version)

One common thread that may be seen through these differing perspectives on love is that each of them is directed toward that which is good.

The great philosopher, St. Thomas Aquinas (1941), echoed Aristotle by defining love as, "to wish good to someone" (*Summa Theologica I-II*, Q26 A4). In defining what is good, the thought of Aquinas is similar to that of Aristotle in determining that an act is good or bad depending on whether it brings people closer or further away from their proper end (Floyd, 2014). In other words, good can be seen as willing the development of a person to become more fully who they are meant to be.

Aquinas' (1941) definition of love seems to encompass the

sentiments of multiple perspectives. Because of its clarity and at least some degree of consensus from the above figures, it is Aquinas' definition that will be the operative one for this paper, from the perspective of agape.

ATTRIBUTES OF SERVANT-LEADERSHIP

Larry Spears, former CEO of the Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership, is well known for his scholarly work in the field of servant-leadership. Spears is considered an authority on servant-leadership even by skeptics of the discipline (Eicher-Catt, 2005). In his work, Spears (2010) laid out 10 attributes of a servant-leader that he viewed as "being of critical importance—central to the development of servant-leaders" (p. 27). These attributes are: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community (p. 25). These attributes ought to be present, therefore, wherever there is authentic servant-leadership. Further, if servant-leadership flows naturally from love, then these attributes must be a byproduct of love as well. In order to demonstrate this, the attributes will be grouped together and connected to love.

Listening, Empathy, and Awareness

In listening, empathy, and awareness, perhaps the strongest grouping between characteristics can been seen. Listening, the first attribute of servant-leadership on Spears' (2010) list, can be considered a foundational characteristic. Both empathy and awareness rely on listening.

Spears (2010) linked empathy directly to listening by arguing, “the most skilled servant leaders are those who have become skilled empathetic listeners” (p. 27). Northouse (2016) connected empathy and listening together through respect:

> Respect means that a leader listens closely to followers, is empathetic, and is tolerant of opposing points of view. It means treating followers in ways that confirm their beliefs, attitudes, and values . . . In short, leaders who show respect treat others as worthy human beings. (p. 342)

Awareness, though not tied directly to listening by Spears, is nonetheless connected to it. Spears (2010) wrote, “General awareness, and especially self-awareness, strengthens the servant-leader” (p. 27). Greenleaf (2002) defined awareness as “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 than people usually take in” (p. 40). Opening wide the doors to perception requires the characteristic of listening. Certainly, it becomes difficult to imagine becoming aware without listening. Given that communication often involves a large nonverbal component, increased awareness certainly is connected to listening.

Given the dependence on listening to at least two other attributes, its importance becomes apparent. Servant-leadership scholars concur with the importance of listening, arguing that “from listening, the world can be transformed” (Ferch, 2012, p. 134), and “true listening builds strength in other people” (Greenleaf, 2002, p. 31). Listening itself is an act of perception,

not just of the ears, but of all the senses. “Listening . . . is not just keeping still, or even remembering what is said. Listening is an attitude, an attitude toward other people and what they are trying to express” (Greenleaf, 2002, p. 313).

For Spears (2010), listening includes not just listening to others, but also one’s inner voice (p. 27). This requires quiet for “periods of reflection” (p. 27). Even in dialogue, some silence is desired. Greenleaf (2002) argued, “One must not be afraid of a little silence. Some find silence awkward or oppressive, but a relaxed approach to dialogue will include the welcoming of some silence” (p. 31).

Listening, then, involves opening up the senses with the desire to allow the world to reveal itself. This opening up becomes a requirement for empathy and awareness, and viewed in the light of Aquinas’ (1941) definition of love, in particular agape, has a clear connection with it. When people love, in particular with agape, the natural inclination is toward the loved. This stands in opposition to materialism, where the inclination is towards the goal, rather than the individual. Being inclined towards followers develops listening as a natural result, and creates a bond with the person listened to. “In listening we create the kind of lasting and informed relationships capable of meeting the great difficulties of the age” (Ferch, 2012, p. 130).

While listening is a natural outgrowth of love itself toward the good of the person loved, it could also be argued that it works to the good of the listener as well, contributing to his or her process of becoming. The Jesuit philosopher Fr. Bernard

Lonergan (1997) contended that the process of becoming requires tension and dialogue, and that, in the absence of these factors, beings do not grow. “Unless one is encouraged out of shyness, timidity, pretended indifference . . . one will not develop” (p. 255). Love, or the willing of a thing to become that which it intended, then, produces listening.

Persuasion

Put simply, persuasion is a style of leadership that seeks to accomplish tasks through proposing, rather than imposing. “The servant leader seeks to convince others, rather than coerce compliance” (Spears, 2010, p. 29). In contrast to coercion, persuasion requires listening, which has been shown already to be an outgrowth of love. Coercion stands in opposition to agape. “Leaders who use coercion are interested in their own goals and seldom are interested in the wants and needs of followers” (Northouse, 2016, p. 13). Aside from opposing agape, it can also be argued that coercion is also a counter-productive leadership strategy. “With respect to morale: fear, force, and bribe create long term passive-aggression” (Spitzer, 2000, p. 282).

Coercion is contrary to the ethos of servant-leaders, who seek to liberate rather than oppress (Palmer, 2000). Studies of coercion and control have been particularly prevalent in research regarding domestic partner violence. Such relationships, it can be argued, are based not on love, but on control. Regardless of what is argued, agape certainly is not present in the abuser in such relationships – even in those cases where an abuser might struggle toward it. As part of this research, the Domestic Abuse

Intervention Project in Duluth, Minnesota developed a visual aid that has become known as the Power and Control Wheel and is used widely in many intervention programs (McClennen, 2010). The wheel, divided into sections, with each section highlighting a particular type of abuse, draws attention to the center, on which is written Power and Control. The point of the wheel is to indicate, "that all tactics of abuse are used to maintain power and control in the relationship" (Cory, 2016, p. 44).

Conversely, the Domestic Abuse Intervention project created the Equality Wheel in an attempt to model a healthy relationship. It represents a relationship were both partners "feel . . . free to communicate and express their thoughts and feelings to one another" (McClennen, 2010, p. 147). This type of relationship is "characterized by. . .respect. . . trust. . . honesty. . .shared responsibility. . . and fairness" (p. 147).

In the contrast between the Control Wheel and the Equality Wheel, the differences between persuasion and coercion become apparent. While domestic violence may seem an extreme example to compare with coercive leadership, it should be recognized that the spectrum between coercion and persuasion is not binary, and various personalities can fit in various places in that spectrum. Nonetheless, the inhuman working conditions present in parts of the world, often an outgrowth of materialism, seem to argue that an adequate comparison can be made. In this, a bias toward persuasion may be witnessed in loving relationships, rather than coercion, which is the antithesis of agape.

Conceptualization, Foresight, and Stewardship

Conceptualization, foresight, and stewardship connect in that they are all outcomes of persuasion and listening. If persuasion and listening are the natural outcome of a leader who loves those whom are led, then conceptualization, foresight, and stewardship naturally follow from persuasion and listening.

Conceptualization is "The ability to look at a problem . . . [and] think beyond day-to-day realities" (Spears, 2010, p. 28). Leaders who practice conceptualization, then, are oriented toward longer-term goals. This attribute is distinct from materialism which is tied more closely to coercive power and short-term self-indulgence (Ahuvia, 1992). Conceptualization, however, focuses on longer-term goals as great dreams, rather than the status quo.

> Servant leaders seek to nurture their abilities to dream great dreams . . . The traditional leader is consumed by the need to achieve short-term operational goals. The leader who wishes to also be a servant leader must stretch his or her thinking to encompass broader-based conceptual thinking. (Spears 2010, p. 28)

Because of this tendency toward large goals, conceptualization can bring hope. Snyder (2000), who is well known for his work on hope, defined hope as "the sum of perceived capabilities to produce routes to desired goals, along with the perceived motivation to use those routes" (p. 8). In other words, when followers can see the path to a shared goal, they experience hope. Greenleaf (2002) viewed hope as integral to

development: “Hope . . . is absolutely essential to both sanity and wholeness of life” (p. 17). Hope stands in contrast to coercion since “using coercion runs counter to working with followers to achieve a common goal” (Northouse, 2016, p. 13). Conceptualization is tied to love in that it generates hope by creating a shared vision through listening and persuasion, rather than coercion.

Along with conceptualization as an outcome of persuasion and listening is 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 for the future” (Spears, 2010, p. 28). In this quote, a connection between foresight and conceptualization can already be drawn. A relationship with listening can also be seen, as it would be difficult to know the lessons from the past or realities of the present without listening. Greenleaf (2002) highlighted the importance of foresight by tying it to ethics:

> The failure (or refusal) of a leader to foresee may be viewed as an ethical failure, because a serious ethical compromise today (when the usual judgment on ethical inadequacy is made) is sometimes a result of a failure to make the effort an earlier date to foresee today’s events and take the right actions when there was freedom for initiative to act. (p. 39)

With the complexities of the world, the suggestion that failure to foresee is unethical might seem absurd. Complexity theory teaches, “No system can be known completely and therefore there is an implication of unpredictability” (Uhl-Bien, 2008, p.

23). If this is so, then it becomes reasonable to believe that foresight is impossible. However, in arguing the future is unknowable, there is an admission that one thing is in fact known about the future: Its unpredictability. Being aware of this, a reasonable application of foresight should involve persuasion and listening, rather than control. Building an environment of collaboration, rather than one that is autocratic, can create an organization flexible enough to adjust to the unknowns of tomorrow. “The purpose of dialogue is to go beyond any one individual’s understanding . . . In dialogue, individuals gain insights that simply could not be achieved individually” (Senge, 2006, pp. 223-224).

Along with foresight, stewardship “emphasizes the use of openness and persuasion, rather than control” (Spears, 2010, p. 29). Stewardship, which can be defined as “to hold something in trust for another” (Block, 1996, p. xx), is recognition that there are other stakeholders that should be considered. This recognition cannot be realized in an autocratic, coercive environment if followers are considered to be stakeholders themselves. Further, this recognition requires both listening and awareness.

Conceptualization, foresight, and stewardship, then, all flow naturally persuasion and listening. Each of these attributes requires respect for followers through the creation of a shared goal, autonomy, and collaboration. Just agape is expressed through persuasion and listening, rather than coercion, then these three attributes naturally flow from persuasion and listening.

Building Community and Commitment to the Growth of People

If agape is directed toward the good of the other, then commitment to the growth of people is a natural outcome of leaders who love. In particular, this is almost precisely the definition given to love earlier. Conversely, building community flows naturally from commitment to people. Both building community and commitment to people—like conceptualization, foresight, and stewardship—connect naturally with persuasion. Spears (2010) emphasized the loving aspect of commitment to the growth of people in opposition to the dehumanization of materialism. "Servant leaders believe that people have an intrinsic value beyond their tangible contributions as workers. As such, the servant leader is deeply committed to the growth of each and every individual within his or her organization" (p. 29). Spears further contended servant-leaders have a responsibility to foster both the personal and professional growth of both colleagues and followers (p. 29). This responsibility becomes a natural focus of one who leads with agape.

Commitment to the growth of people requires building community because it is in community that people grow. Greenleaf (1991) suggested leaders who are committed to others naturally build community:

> All that is needed to rebuild community as a viable life form for large numbers of people is for enough servant-leaders to show the way, not by mass movements, but by each servant-leader demonstrating his or her unlimited liability for a quite specific community-related group. (p. 53)

Soliciting ideas and feedback from other individuals, openly sharing information with those around us, and listening proactively are all behaviors that arise from commitment to the growth of people. Through these behaviors, a culture of co-participation may be built (Spitzer, 2000). This culture is only one example of community building that can and does occur when leaders are oriented toward people in agape.

Healing

While the other characteristics express behaviors that arise from leading through love, healing stands not as a behavior, but as a natural consequence nonetheless. “Servant leaders recognize that they have an opportunity to help make whole those with whom they come in contact” (Spears, 2010, p. 27). More than simply an opportunity, it seems to follow that servant-leaders have an obligation to do so if they are to call themselves servant-leaders. “The servant leader, familiar with the servanthood that develops life and mercy in others, is a person who seeks forgiveness for harming others and grants forgiveness to those who have done harm” (Ferch, 2012, pp. 71-72).

Much research has been done on the healing effect of love. In 1887, the French sociologist, Emilie Durkheim, studied suicide rates in connection with social integration. In the study, Durkheim found suicide rates were lower among those integrated into social groups, including those who were married (Ornish, 1998). This study shows not only the healing effect love for an individual through acceptance can have, but

also a clear correlation between building community and healing.

Aside from the emotionally healing effects of love, studies have been performed on the biologically healing effect of love as well. Parental love, which contains properties similar to agape, has been shown to have healing effects. In the 1950s a study took place involving Harvard students who were randomly chosen and asked how they felt about their parents. Those who felt more distant from their parents were twice as likely to experience diseases in midlife, such as heart disease, ulcers, and high blood pressure (Ornish, 1998).

While healing is listed as an attribute of the servant-leader, it can just as readily be considered an outcome of agape. It seems to follow love can heal a broken relationship, yet research has shown that the effect of love goes much deeper. From healing emotional wounds to preventing disease in the body, there is undoubtedly a relationship between love and healing.

CONCLUSION

Shadows in the world are ever-present. One such shadow is that of materialism, which threatens to dehumanize people by seeing them as a means to an end, rather than an end in themselves. Servant-leadership, as a response, acts as a reorientation of a leader toward those being led, rather than solely toward a task to be accomplished. While few leaders may be afforded the opportunity to confront shadows on a large scale, through love, leaders can work in their communities to

better the world. As St. Theresa of Calcutta once said, “Don’t look for big things, just do small things with great love . . . the smaller the thing, the greater must be our love” (as cited in Kolodiejchuk, 2007, p. 34).

While servant-leadership can help to heal our world against forms of dehumanization, such as materialism, it does so simply as an outgrowth of love. This is because those who love their followers naturally practice the attributes of servant-leadership. For example, because of their focus on followers, those who lead through love express themselves through listening and awareness which leads to empathy. Additionally, they seek to accomplish tasks through persuasion, rather than coercion which focuses on the task at the expense of the freedom of the follower. Because of the broader focus required for persuasion, leaders who love are better able to conceptualize, orienting them towards longer term goals rather than the expedient. This provides them with better foresight and stewardship. Finally, because they are oriented towards individuals rather than the task alone, those who lead with love wind up building communities through their commitment to the growth of those whom they lead.

Ultimately, the attributes of servant-leadership naturally flow from leading with love, which has the power to respond to the shadow with light in a healing way (Ferch, 2012). Studies have shown the effects of love in healing a person may be more powerful than we originally thought, healing both emotionally and physically. Perhaps when used in leadership, love can do so for the shadows in society as well.

References

Ahuvia, A. C. (1992). For the Love of Money: Materialism and Product Love. In F. W. Rudmin (Ed.), *Meaning, measure, and morality of materialism* (pp. 188-198). Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.

Aquinas, T. (1941). *Summa theologica*. London, UK: Burns Oates & Washboard LTD.

Barsade, S. (2014) *Employees who feel love perform better.* Retrieved from: http://blogs.hbr.org/2014/01/employees-who-feel-love-perform-better/

Benedict XVI (2009). *Encyclical letter caritas in veritate.* Retrieved from: http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20090629_caritas-in-veritate_en.html

Biro, M. (2014). *Let love inspire your leadership*. Retrieved from: http://www.forbes.com/sites/meghanbiro/2014/02/09/let-love-inspire-your-leadership/.

Block, P. (1996). *Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishing.

Cory, J. (2016). *A woman's guide to understanding abuse in relationships*. New Westminster, BC: WomanKind Press.

Dalai Lama. (1999). *Ethics for the new millennium*. New York, NY: Riverhead Books.

Eicher-Catt, D. (2005). *The myth of servant-leadership: A feminist perspective*. Retrieved from: http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-133864711.html

Floyd, S. (2014). *Thomas Aquinas: Moral philosophy*. Retrieved from: http://www.iep.utm.edu/aq-moral/

Ferch, S. R. (2012). *Forgiveness and power in the age of atrocity: Servant leadership as a way of life.* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Frankl, V. E. (1988). *The will to meaning: Foundations and applications of logotherapy*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Gallup. (2017). State of the American workplace report. Retrieved from: http://www.gallup.com/strategicconsulting/163007/state-

american-workplace.aspx.
Greenleaf, R. K. (1991). *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis, IN: The Robert K. Greenleaf Center. [Originally published in 1970, by Robert K. Greenleaf].
Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
Heskett, J. (2013). *Why isn't servant leadership more prevalent?* Retrieved from http://www.forbes.com/sites/hbsworkingknowledge/2013/05/01/why-isnt-servant-leadership-more-prevalent/hooks, b. (2000). *All about love*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
John Paul II (1984). *Encyclical letter salvifici doloris.* Retrieved from: http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_letters/1984/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_11021984_salvifici-doloris.html
John Paul II (1981). *Love and responsibility*. London, UK: William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd.
Khandelwal, N. & Mehta, A. (2018). Leadership by 'love': A divine paradigm. *Annual Research Journal of SCMS, Pune, 6*, 38-56.
Kolodiejchuk, B. (2007). *Mother Theresa: Come be my light – the private writings of the saint of Calcutta*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
Lenartowick, K. (2013). *Materialism robs us of our humanity, warns Pope Francis*. Retrieved from http://www.catholicnewsagency.com/news/materialism-robs-us-of-our-humanity-warns-pope-francis/
Lewis, C. (1960). *The four loves*. New York, NY: Harcourt.
Lonergan, B. J. F., Morelli, M. D., & Morelli, E. A. (1997). *The Lonergan reader*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
McClennen, J. (2010). *Social work and family violence: Theories, assessment, and intervention*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing.
Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Ornish, D. (1998). *Love and survival: 8 pathways to intimacy and health*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
Palmer, P. J. (2000). *Let your life speak: Listening for the voice of*

vocation. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Plato. (1993). *Symposium and Phaedrus*. (B. Jowett, Trans.). New York, NY: Dover Publications, Inc.
Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art & practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
Snyder, C. (2000). *Handbook of hope: Theory, measures, and applications*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
Spears, L. C. (2005). The understanding and practice of servant-leadership. *International Journal of Servant Leadership, 1*(1), 29-45.
Spears, L. C. (2010). Character and servant leadership: Ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders. *The Journal of Virtues & Leadership, 1*(1), 25-30.
Spitzer, R. J. (2000). *The spirit of leadership: Optimizing creativity and change in organizations*. Seattle, WA: Pacific Institute Publishing.
Uhl-Bien, M. (2008). *Complexity leadership: Part I: Conceptual foundations*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Tom currently lives in Spokane, Washington with his wife Maria. Together they have eight children who test his leadership skills on a daily basis. His educational experience involves degrees in technology, business, and leadership, giving him exposure to both the analytical and the not so predictable behavior of people and organizations. With this background, he has a passion for examining the intersection and tensions between technology and human behavior, such as the risk of dehumanization modern trends such as technology can create, and the benefits that good leadership can bring to mitigate these risks. In his current role as Infrastructure Architect at Gonzaga University, he mixes his love for technology with his background in business to plan and design

technological solutions to improve the organization. He currently holds a Ph.D. in Leadership Studies from Gonzaga University, in Spokane, WA. email: buck@gonzaga.edu.