A Case Study: The Mindsets of a Leader

Chelsea Church, Elizabeth Donovan, Brianna Hamblin, Caleb Parson and Carolyn Perkins

James Madison University

Abstract

According to Modesto A. Maidique and Nathan Hiller, there are six mindsets that a leader can possess. One leader can possess one or more of these mindsets. They even have the ability to change their mindsets, depending on the situation they are placed in. The six mindsets are as follows: the sociopath, the egoist, the chameleon, the dynamo, the builder and the transcender. In this paper we break down each mindset and explore how other approaches, namely trait leadership and servant leadership, can compare and be applied. We will look at different examples presented in the case to further explain our applications. While it is concluded there is no perfect blend of mindsets, we have determined that knowledge of how to use certain traits one is born with and taking the time to understand one's followers will ultimately yield effective leadership.

Key words: mindsets, trait leadership, servant leadership, sociopath, egoist, chameleon, dynamo, builder, transcender

A Case Study: Mindsets of a Leader

Every leader has his/her own way of leading. The mindset, or mindsets, they posses in their position can have a very powerful impact on their environment and team, whether that be a positive or negative thing. We will be exploring six different mindsets of leaders, as explained by Modesto A. Maidique and Nathan Hiller, and how those mindsets can affect a leader's success. We will also determine whether or not there is a perfect mix of mindsets that can create the most effective leader. Additionally, we will use servant leadership and trait leadership to further explain, break down and apply this case in other contexts.

Case Review

This case revolves around the question: "whom do I serve?" Maidique and Hiller explore how a leader's answer to this question influences their decisions and the environment they work in, ultimately impacting the organization as a whole. It is rare for one person to possess a single mindset. Each leader has their own mix of mindsets. In fact, different personality traits are linked to successful leadership. There are six main leadership mindsets identified as: the sociopath, the egoist, the chameleon, the dynamo, the builder and the transcender.

The Sociopath

The sociopath serves no one and utilizes fear as a motivator. People with this mindset are not necessarily sociopaths, but they possess similar characteristics as someone with antisocial personality disorder. Leaders with a mindset of recklessly disregarding anyone but themself can be dangerous because they are able to manipulate subordinates in a charming manner. Their lack of empathy could lead to decisions that produce negative consequences. For example, Martin Shkreli was the CEO of Turing Pharmaceuticals and was temporarily successful, but he

ultimately destroyed his career due to his sociopath mindset. Shkreli turned a profit by deciding to raise the price of the prescription drug Daraprim by more than 5000 percent. Due to this choice, his patients' health suffered. People with this thought process can exist at all levels of an organization, which can lead to the downfall of teams and a company's reputation. While leaders with this mindset can produce short-term success, their coercion and transient ethics make it so there is no practical way to work effectively with them. Unlike mindsets that will be discussed below, people with the sociopath mindset are less likely to change.

The Egoist

The Egoist is self-absorbed and motivated by "their own accumulation of wealth, power and status" (Maidique and Hiller, 2018). When presented with tasks, people with this mindset constantly ask themselves, "what's in it for me?" It is common for many people to be concerned with these things, but it becomes a problem for an organization's culture if a leader is disproportionately egoist. An organization can only thrive under a leader with this mindset if its objectives align with the leaders; Otherwise factors necessary for long-term success, like collective action and helping behaviors, begin to deteriorate. For example, a director of a high-tech components manufacturer was promoted to a leadership role within his organization. He began to reveal his greedy behavior rather than investing his efforts in benefitting his entire team. The sales staff became chaotic and mirrored their leader's behavior, which ultimately led to business dying out. People can often get ahead with self-focus and an egoist ambition, but they later struggle to build a team. Team members mirror the leader's behavior, like in the example, and are less inclined to do what is best for the organization because they know the leader will take credit.

The Chameleon

Serving anyone, the chameleon mindset is versatile. Unlike the someone with the sociopath mindset who is manipulative, a person with a chameleon mindset is easily manipulated. Although a leader with this mindset is able to adapt, their low self-esteem and lack of courage leads to a need for approval from others. By pleasing others, a leader with a chameleon mindset may move up in rank. However, they will not reach CEO level due to their inability to make tough decisions as well as the lack of respect they receive from subordinates. Persons with this mindset are able to produce ideas but typically do not follow through because they cannot take criticism. An example being a senior manager within a construction firm. This individual possessed promising qualities. He was asked to lead a new project plan due to his superiors admiration of his innovative thinking. The project never got off the ground because the senior manager was discouraged after receiving pushback. He rather please his superiors than fight for his ideas. In the end, the senior manager lost respect as a leader as well as his credibility. As a leader, it is important to stand up for what you believe in and be your own person. Leaders are presented with many decisions each day, and they need to be able to make those calls for the betterment of the company despite others' possible disagreement. Having a chameleon mindset makes a person unreliable within a team and can potentially set up personal roadblocks to success.

The Dynamo

The dynamo solely operates to serve the goals of the group. Leaders who exemplify the dynamo mindset place emphasis on the flawless execution of strategy and on consistency. People with this mindset tend to be labeled as "superstars," meaning they excel in the field they are

working in. They possess a dominant mindset, proving they are reliable due to a strong work ethic. This is shown through their desire to exceed quotas and over deliver when it comes to their products. These qualities allow for productivity, but unfortunately, it is combined with acting as their "Achilles' heel." This means that it results in the tendency to lose sight of the broader mission. Further, it is possible for them to fail to consider the long-term perspectives, and they frequently lack wisdom. Within organizations, leaders with the dynamo mindset are often found at the junior and senior level of organizations.

A real-life example of the dynamo mindset is the CEO of Hewlett-Packard Co., Mark Hurd. Hurd developed HP's technological product strength. He achieved this through increasing HP's stock price during his tenure. He was able to increase the stock price by cutting spending on research and development infrastructure.

The relevance of the dynamo within the workforce is that if leaders are not concerned with long-term goals, the organization could be at risk of failing. Leaders like Hurd may be devoted and work hard, but they oftentimes lose sight of the broader, long-term goals. Dynamos may be so focused on a particular goal that achievement of the goal leads to failure in other domains. They also may not recognize that a situation has changed and requires adjustment of goals. They also have the tendency to struggle with delegating.

The Builder

The builder's main focus is to serve the institution. People with this mindset serve their institution by doing what is best for the organization but also by considering what is best for the team as a whole. Leaders with this mindset are normally seen as great assets to their organization, due to their selflessness and drive to improve the institution. Some of the greatest

leaders throughout history have the builder mindset. CEOs like General Motors Alfred P. Sloan, IBM's Tom Watson Jr., and Apple's Steve Jobs all fall into having this thought process. These leaders are always trying to achieve goals for their institutions, which normally are long-term goals instead of short-term goals. People who have a builder mindsets do not always have to be in a CEO position; They often can be found in a variety of positions. Ultimately, people with the builder mindset help build their organization by having a broad vision of how to reach long-term goals.

The Transcender

Leaders with the transcender mindset serve society. Their focus is solely on the mission and course of action taken to complete tasks. Due to this, in business situations, stakeholders' values are maximized. Leaders with the transcender mindset choose to disregard the work being done and take note the process of which things are achieved. For example, Nelson Mandela, the first black President of South Africa, directed his separated country into a positive direction despite hatred. Another example is Alvah H. Chapman Jr., who was a late chairman and CEO of a large media company. He reached out to community leaders to join him in assisting with the clean-up following Hurricane Andrew in 1992. Everyone that was asked replied yes and aided the victims. Often, short-term goals are put at risk as a result of the transcender's broad mindset. To combat these risks, it is important as a person with the transcender mindset to be surrounded with leaders with builder, dynamo, and egoist mindsets.

This case identifies different types of mindsets and who each of them serve. Each mindset brings its own positives and negatives. In this paper, we will be introducing traits and

servant leadership, analyzing the case using those approaches, and offering our recommendations.

Leadership Literature Review

Trait Leadership Approach

A trait is an innate personality that remains stable over time. There have been an abundant amount of trait studies conducted throughout the years. “Trait leadership theory explores the link of leader personality traits to motivation to lead” (Lu Chen, 2016, pg. 11). This theory questions if people are more likely to lead depending on their personality or if other factors contribute to leadership styles. The theory derives from an early assumption that leaders are born with these traits, which essentially makes them suited for leadership. It also highlights that a certain set of traits “is crucial to having effective leadership” (Northouse, 2015, pg.10).

Trait leadership theory started “with the emphasis on identifying the qualities of great persons, shifted to include the impact of situations on leadership, and currently, shifted back to re-emphasize the critical role of traits in effective leadership” (Northouse, 2015, pg. 2). Trait leadership allows for the use of personal awareness and development. If you do not display the attributes of leaders who influence you, you can work to demonstrate those core characteristics. “Traits must be relevant to situations in which the leader is functioning” (Northouse, 2015, pg.16).

There are several traits that are considered to go along with those who possess an inherent leadership drive. One of the main traits associated with leadership is intelligence. Intelligence is positively related to leadership, and leaders are said to have higher intelligence than their subordinates (Northouse, 2015, pg.20). Intelligence is linked with having strong

communication skills, perceptual ability, and the ability to reason. Another relevant trait is self-confidence, meaning self-confidence goes along with having a secure sense of self-esteem and self-assurance. Leaders believe they can make a difference, and their ability to influence others allows them to feel assured that their decision making is appropriate and right. Determination is seen as "the desire to get the job done," which comes along with characteristics like initiative, persistence, dominance and drive. Leaders often exemplify determination because they assert themselves, take charge, and can persevere in the face of obstacles (Northouse, 2015, pg. 20). Integrity is the quality of honesty and moral uprightness. People who have integrity possess a strong set of principles and are considered to be trustworthy. Integrity is a trait that not all leaders may exemplify, but honorable leaders do because is speaks to them being "Loyal, dependable, and not deceptive" (Northouse, 2015, pg. 21).

Other traits that Dawood, A. & Bach C., 2014 saw as key to leadership are drive, leadership motivation, cognitive ability and knowledge of business. Drive in a leader can be seen through their achievement, motivation, ambition, energy, and initiative. Leadership motivation is a leader's desire to lead, rather than seeking power within a hierarchy. A leader's self-confidence pertains to their emotional stability. However, possessing all of these traits "does not guarantee leadership success" (Dawood, A. & Bach C., 2014). To become an effective leader you must not only possess a variety of traits, but an effective leader should also: inspire action, be optimistic, have integrity, be decisive, have confidence, communicate, and support your team (Economy Peter, 2013). Not every leader is the same, and possessing certain traits does not guarantee an individual to become a leader (Northouse, 2015, pg.16). With the continuous progression of

studying trait combinations and leadership characteristics connected to those traits, leadership efficiency can increase.

Another major component of trait leadership is the five factor model, this model is essential in explaining the big five personality factors and the differences they investigate. These dimensions are used to categorize people to provide a better understanding of individual personality traits. The first factor is neuroticism, and it involves "emotional stability and reaction when faced with something positive or negative" (Chen, 2017). This goes along with the tendency to be anxious and insecure. The next factor is extraversion, meaning this term "refers to people who prefer to be sociable and work positively towards achieving high performance"(Chen, 2017). These people tend to have positive energy. Those whose personality displays openness are "informed, creative, insightful, and curious" (Chen, 2017). This term refers to people who display an active imagination. Next is agreeableness, those who are agreeable display a tendency of "trust, altruism, reputation, or modesty" (Chen, 2017). They act as accepting and conforming individuals. Lastly, those who display conscientiousness are very dependable and decisive, they are "fair, proceeding, regular, systematic, or dutiful" (Chen, 2017). All of these traits come together to display different qualities of individuals.

Servant Leadership

Robert Greenleaf coined servant leadership in 1980. He describes it as a way of being, which emphasizes service toward others. The servant leader is a servant first, whose core focus is to help develop people to build a better tomorrow. Greenleaf founded seven dimensions of

servant leadership, and many other scholars include similar variables when discussing servant leadership.

Two of the dimensions, emotional healing and putting followers first, demonstrates that servant leaders value their followers and their wellbeing. These values are portrayed through characteristics the leader possess, such as empathy and good listening. “A good servant-leader strives to understand and empathize with others. But this understanding should be supportive as opposed to patronizing; ―It is a misuse of our power (as leaders) to take responsibility for solving problems that belong to others” (Block, 1993/1996). A big part of being empathetic is being a good listener. This is how a true servant leader responds to any problem (Crippen, 2010). Good listening not only means being engaged and hearing what someone is saying, but how they are saying it and noticing what they are not saying. Leaders who take the time and effort to do these things will begin to foster a culture that is trusting, fair, collaborative and helping, which will not only result in individual effectiveness but also organizational effectiveness (Parris and Peachey, 2012).

Another dimension of servant leadership that Greenleaf mentions is creating value for community. This means that servant leaders not only focus their efforts on their team, but they hope those efforts go beyond their organization and make positive change throughout the community. “Greenleaf believed all members of an institution or organization play significant roles in caring for the well-being of the institution and serving the needs of others in the institution, for the greater good of society” (Crippen, 2010). The best outcomes result from quality engagement with the community, where people are able to learn from each person’s unique experiences. Stewardship plays a major role in contributing to how this happens.

Stewardship serves as reminder to take a step back to look at the bigger picture and pay attention to "supporting the common good for our communities, the earth, and people outside the usual cast of stakeholders" (Block, 2013). Servant leaders strive to leave behind legacies that have meaning, and they do that by including the broader community in their vision.

Empowering followers is such an important dimension of servant leadership because without it, servant leaders would not be able to make their vision a reality. This is the key to long-term growth within an organization (Winston, 2003). Winston describes how giving followers responsibility and making them feel able to accomplish those tasks can influence their actions leading them to putting forth more effort, take different courses of actions, have resilience, and so forth (Winston, 2003). This influence is illustrated in his extension of Patterson's one-directional servant leadership model. Winston believed that the influence was more circular in nature. A leader's service ends up influencing a follower's agapo, which in turn, leads to followers feeling empowered through self-efficacy and becoming intrinsically motivated. When followers feel empowered, they yield higher levels of service to leader by helping bring their vision to life (Winston, 2003).

Another dimension involves helping followers grow and succeed. Servant leaders are known to teach and nurture their followers while encouraging creativity and wellbeing, which in turn produces positive outcomes (Parris & Peachey, 2012). To encourage growth and success servant leaders distribute rewards equally to compensate the hard work of their followers (Block, 2013). Since servant leaders choose service over self interest, they commit to sacrificing things to better others and focus on the success of their followers (Block, 2013).

Demonstrating conceptual skills is a vital dimension because it promotes trust between the servant leader and followers (Abu Bakar & McCann, 2018). Servant leaders affirm the potential that followers posses and provide developmental support (Abu Bakar & McCann, 2018). Abu Baker and McCann explain that group members reciprocate the sacrifices made by leaders by putting forth effort and showing commitment. Some of the characteristics of servant leaders are modeling and empowerment, which show when demonstrating conceptual skills to others (Parris & Peachey, 2012).

Behaving ethically is the final dimension of servant leadership. Ethics, virtue, and morality are three of the most important links. The leaders ethically serve their followers and model ways to serve (Abu Bakar & McCann, 2018). Servant leaders look forward to the future seeking the greatest outcome for the organization (Parris & Peachey, 2012). Leaders focus on a vision and the best and most ethical ways to achieve that.

Case Analysis Using Trait Leadership

The case revolves around and explains in depth the six different mindsets of a leader. While everyone is not limited to one of these mindsets, each one of them comes with a different set of traits that can distinguish your personality and work ethic. Studying and understanding these mindsets allows for us to incorporate them and decide the best approach when working with other individuals.

Trait theory allows us to apply people's inherent traits to leadership, we can then compare which distinguishing traits align with each mindset to identify the type of leader one is.

This is essential when working with others because knowing the mindsets of your teammates allows for stronger relationships and better overall team cohesion.

In order to be an effective leader, it is essential to know the personality traits of one's followers. Applying traits to mindsets can allow for more effective leadership management and can predict which skills and values should be improved upon. Trait theory focuses on predisposed traits affecting the ability to be an active leader, emphasizing that leaders are born, not created (Northouse, 2015). This relates to the six different mindsets because one can apply his/her separate traits to know which type of mindset one has. The mindsets can be a combination of predisposed personality traits as well as act as a product of the environment one grew up in. Traits within the six different mindsets can be overlapping, which relates back to what the case describes as a "blend" of mindsets (Maidique & Hiller, 2018). It also states that there is not a perfect blend of mindsets.

The mindsets: the sociopath, the egoist, the chameleon, the dynamo, the builder, the transcender all have different traits that fall under each category. More specifically, The egoist serves themself meaning the egoist exemplifies the traits of self-centeredness and lack of empathy. An egoist looks to maximize their own benefits. A leader with this mindset can blindly rid an organization of collective action. Rather than looking to develop others, an egoist pursues wealth, power, and status. When comparing an egoist mindset to the Big Five Factor Model, this mindset lacks heavily in conscientiousness and agreeableness (Chen, 2017). Egoists spend very little time looking to detail and rarely assess the damage they have caused, unlike someone who is characterized as highly conscientious. Agreeableness is revolved around prosocial behaviors.

An egoist is concerned with themselves and does not take interest in others. Someone who is high in agreeableness enjoys helping others while also feeling concern for those around them.

The chameleon will serve anyone, exemplifying the traits of flexibility and being easy to work with but also lacking initiative. Individuals with this mindset have a need to be liked by others and demonstrate low self-esteem. A chameleon mindset can be characterized as high in neuroticism. They are anxious to be liked and experience a great deal of stress when placed in strong positions of power or decision making situations. A chameleon mindset could also be described as high in openness because they can be very creative; however, they do not possess a strong set of values that allow them to follow through on ideas.

The individual with a dynamo mindset looks to serve the group's goals. The traits that align with this mindset include being task oriented, productive, and a rule follower. Individuals who have this mindset are seen as overachievers, who often lose sight of the bigger picture. A leader with the dynamo mindset can be characterized as high in conscientiousness because of their tendencies to be thorough, organized, and dependable. People with the dynamo mindset can also be seen as dominant, holding a tunnel vision which negatively affects their long-term perspective as a leader.

The builder "makes decisions and leads in ways aimed at building a lasting institution" (Maidique & Hiller, 2018). The traits that identify with the builder mindset are decisiveness and helping others. These traits are what make the builder high in extraversion, regarding the "Big Five Personality Factors." A builder's traits also allow them to strive and achieve long-term goals for the institution. Some of the greatest leaders are made because of the selfless builder mindset.

Individuals with the transcender mindset "target institutional success," (Maidique & Hiller, 2018) which exemplifies the trait of consideration for the entire group. Those with the transcender mindset also deal with supporting the system outside the organization by socially benefiting it. Similar to the other types of leader mindsets, traits that coincide with leaders with the transcender mindset do have some pitfalls. For example, the leaders with this mindset can sometimes focus too much on spearheading change.

The sociopath is a selfish mindset to have because it "perceives self as superior" (Maidique & Hiller, 2018). The people who fall into having this mindset can have multiple characteristics. For example, they can be seen as charming, manipulative, and dangerous. The main reason why the sociopath is dangerous is because its lack of empathy. A way that people are manipulative with this mindset is through the use of fear. Also, individuals with this mindset are the least likely to change when compared to the other mindsets. In regard to the "Big Five Personality Factors," the sociopath has the hostile characteristic of neuroticism and the assertive characteristic of extraversion, which is why it is a mixture of both.

Each of these mindsets represents a set of assumptions or beliefs and how best to use them. Applying varying traits to the six mindsets allows for a broad idea of the best method to utilize when working out a strategy as a leader. Trait leadership is focused on what motivates a leader as does each mindset, whether their motivation be self-serving or for others such as the company or simply a higher authority figure. Further, traits nor mindsets are set in stone, individuals adapt their way of thinking in given situations. Trait theory allows for a stronger idea of what traits and characteristics an effective leader must maintain. Individuals seeking self-improvement can also develop new traits in order to change to a more effective blend of

mindsets. In addition, we can also identify the overlapping traits within each mindset and make a comparison to traits that effective leaders are said to possess.

Trait leadership theorizes that individuals are born leaders rather than created, and there is a certain set of traits that makes an effective leader. This goes along with the varying mindsets because the combination of each mindset can aid to being an effective leader.

Recommendation

An effective leader can only be successful in an environment if they know the best strategy to work with their team. Working with your team in a strategic manner can only occur when the leader knows which mindsets and traits apply to the situation. The case states that there is no perfect mindset that works across the board. Trait leadership also suggests that although a leader may possess a powerful set of traits, effective leadership is dependent on which traits are appropriate for the given situation. It is all about application. We believe that there can be a ideal "portfolio of mindsets" as long as a leader is knowledgeable on how to use each trait within (Maidique & Hiller, 2018). Taking into account the different mindsets everyone has can allow for a better overall team development and create a stronger community when working with people. These mindsets can teach us which traits make for a stronger work ethic and gives us a better understanding of trait leadership theory.

Case Analysis Using Servant Leadership

"The Mindsets of a Leader" explores many different mindsets on the basis of who a particular leader aims to serve. This is a practical way to look at leaders and determine why their

leadership may or may not be effective. However, serving means something different to servant leaders. We will now be analyzing this case using servant leadership and the way it defines service to see how it can be applied to each mindset.

As mentioned above, the main question of the case is “whom do I serve?” This opens the exploration of who and how each particular leader described serves. Servant leaders place their focus on the wellbeing of their followers and focus on the future and a main vision for the organization.

The sociopath serves no one. They are only focused on themselves. They do not consider anyone else’s feelings besides their own. With the manipulation tactics used, they easily get their way in the organization. A person with the sociopath mindset ignores others’ suffering and continues to trick and coerce their peers. Sociopath mindsets do not have the same amount of morals that servant leaders do. This form of serving is the exact opposite of the servant leader who serves everyone and is extremely selfless.

The egoist mindset serves themself. They are motivated by their own wealth, power, and status and want to increase those even more. Peers are ignored, and if one is hurt, it is simply ignored, which is dissimilar to the servant leader. Often, the egoist mindset is ambitious, which does assist the organization and themselves in getting ahead. However, people get hurt along the way, and the egoist mindset will take all of the credit. Servant leaders do well in any level of an organization, but the egoist mindset, if put at the top, can ruin an organization and its culture. The servant leader empowers others to be ambitious and assists them in succeeding without taking credit.

The chameleon mindset serves anyone. They will serve whoever is the most important that day. Pleasing people in power is main goal of this mindset, due to their low self-esteem. They are easily manipulated by peers, such as people with the sociopath mindset. This mindset only serves important people, not everyone, like servant leaders. To grow, the chameleon mindset would need someone like a servant leader to encourage them to believe in themselves and make their own decisions.

The dynamo mindset serves goals. This includes serving their colleagues and helping them achieve their goals. Any goal that is set, the dynamo mindset wants to complete. A flaw is that they do not contain the same amount of wisdom and courage that servant leaders have, making it difficult to make important decisions. Similar to servant leaders, countless people depend on dynamo mindsets for their assistance.

The builder mindset serves the institution. Similar to servant leaders, people with the builder mindset focus on what is good for the organization. At times they do act out of self-interest, but mostly they promote the best actions for the organization. Like servant leaders, they focus on long-term actions and a broad vision. The builder is very similar to servant leaders because of their goals and focus on the greater good for the organization.

The transcender mindset serves society. Similar to the builder mindset and servant leaders, they think about the broad picture. They focus on how things are achieved, not the profits being made. People with transcender mindsets will rethink organizations goals to ensure they benefit society. They want to ensure customers are getting maximum value for what they wanted from the organization. Similar to the servant leader, the transcender mindset finds goals important and strives to get out the best product.

A servant leader would most likely possess the mindset of the transcender. This way of being and way of thinking have many things in common in their approaches to leadership. First, both servant leaders and those with the transcender mindset are interested in providing outcomes that benefit not only their team and organization, but that also benefits a broader range of people extending out to the community. With their main focus on people, leaders with a transcender mindset are easily able to bridge disconnected parties and see how "seemingly unrelated parts of the whole fit together" (Maidique & Hiller, 2018). Servant leaders are also typically relationship-oriented and are able to build strong teams through empathy and understanding. They devote themselves to helping their followers grow on personal and organizational levels.

This type of service is referred to as stewardship, which is a common thread of the two approaches. Block describes stewardship as an idea that promises achieving fundamental change by doing authentic service. This occurs when power is balanced, the primary commitment is to the larger community, each person is a part of the process of determining the culture of an organization and rewards are balanced and equitable (Block, 2013).

An example of someone who possesses the transcender mindset mentioned in the case was Alvah Chapman Jr. He also exemplifies stewardship in action and what it means to be a servant leader. After a hurricane hit South Florida, he was able to round up people in the community to help clean up the area and help people in need. Since then, those efforts have even extending to helping other regions. This illustrates how far people with this mindset or who value service are willing to go to put others before themselves. "To commit to something outside of [them]selves. To be part of creating something we care about so that we can endure the sacrifice,

risk, and adventure that commitment entails. This is the deeper meaning of service" (Block, 2013).

Chapman also exhibited agapo love and altruism, which are variables of the servant-follower relationship. Agapo love includes focusing one's purpose on the wellbeing of others and treating them morally and respectfully. Altruism means seeking benefits for one's followers by going to lengths to improve their welfare. This is shown by how fast Chapman reacted to help his community and his drive to keep helping by branching out into other communities.

The transcender mindset is also similar to servant leadership because of the goal of creating change. Servant leaders are devoted to moving in positive directions toward their vision. "The vision provides the hope, the vision provides the motivation, the vision provides the engagement, and the vision provides the excitement" (Warner & Evans, 2006). It is important for servant leaders to invite their team to be a part of crafting that vision. The key here is to foster collaboration with one's team, so they want to own it and be committed to working hard toward the vision. This also allows team members to take ownership and responsibility in the workplace.

The transcender mindset is also devoted to spearheading change in the workplace. Leaders with this mindset are always interested in how they can better their organization. Nelson Mandela, was mentioned in the case as someone who has a transcender mindset. That is because "he rose above racial, tribal, and class hatred to steer his divided country in a new direction" (Maidique & Hiller, 2018). He was devoted to creating positive change despite the trials he faced in his life. It is important to include followers on this journey so that everyone can move

forward together. Teams work better when they feel like they are taking part in something innovative and larger than themselves.

While it is important to always be thinking about improvement, it is also important to know when to take action to make that change happen. One of the critiques provided in the case was that leaders with the transcender mindset may be too eager to do this, and in turn may fall short of short-term goals. One way to mitigate that is for these leaders to surround themselves with people possessing other mindsets to keep them in track. This is also true of servant leaders. They have humility and know when they should take a step back to allow someone else to take charge (Winston, 2003).

The main difference between people with the transcender mindset and servant leadership is where their focus lies. Both approaches want to create positive change and maximize values for all, but servant leaders do this by focusing on follower development. That is clear through Greenleaf's seven dimensions that were mentioned above. Leaders with the transcender mindset are concerned with the wellbeing of their followers, but their main focus is how they creating networks that can work together to provide outcomes extending out into society. In addition, while it may be implied that trust is an important aspect of the transcender mindset, it is not emphasized as a key to its effectiveness, like servant leadership does (Winston, 2003). This is also because of the emphasis servant leaders place on follower development. One cannot foster relationships without first developing a solid foundation of trust.

Recommendation

Effective leaders are those who put others before themselves. They take time to listen first and help their team to reach their goals. Our case concludes that there is no perfect blend of mindsets that are effective across the board because there are multiple factors that determine that. However, we believe that leaders who take time to listen first and help their team reach their goals are the ones who will ultimately be successful and leave a lasting legacy within the organization and beyond.

Conclusion

Leadership is a highly debated topic in social sciences and knowing the six different mindsets can help to add some clarity when acting as a leader. Knowing who each mindset serves, which traits apply to each mindset, and how each mindsets thinks can create a stronger team and working environment. The effectiveness of a leader is dependent upon the ability to know the followers, and the differing mindsets provides stronger insight to how people operate. While we all may not fall into the category of these mindsets, or relate to one ourselves, it is helpful to have a background knowledge on how they perform and how to handle working with them in case you find yourself in a situation working with a select mindset.

References

Abu Baker, H., & McCann, R. M. (2015). An Examination of Leader-Member Dyadic Politeness of Exchange and Servant Leadership on Group Member Performance. *International Journal of Business Communication,55*(4). Retrieved April 3, 2019.

Al Dawood Ahmed and Christian Bach, "Major Traits/Qualities of Leadership," *International Journal of Innovation and Scientific Research,* vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 47–53, June 2014.

Block, P. (1993/1996). Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Block, P. (2013). *Stewardship Choosing Service Over Self-Interest*(2nd ed.). San Fransico, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Chen, K.-D., & Chen, P.-K. (2017). Research on the relation the characteristics of the faculty and the commitment to continuous improvement of motivations and student study processes. *Asia Pacific Education Review,* 18(4), 439. Retrieved from https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=cookie,ip,cpid,athens,shib&custid=s8863137&db=edb&AN=126529319&site=eds-live&scope=site

Crippen, C. (2010). Serve, Teach, and Lead: It's All about Relationships. *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching,5*, 27-36. Retrieved April 19, 2019

Economy, P. (2018, May 23). It Is Never Too Late to Learn These Top 7 Powerful Leadership Habits. Retrieved April 21, 2019, from

https://www.inc.com/peter-economy/it-is-never-too-late-to-learn-these-top-7-powerful-leadership-habits.html

Ljungholm, D. P. (2016). EFFECTIVE SERVANT LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR IN ORGANIZATIONS. *Linguistic and Philosophical Investigations*. Retrieved April 3, 2019.

Lu Chen. (2016). Linking Leader Personality Traits to Motivation to Lead: A Self-Concept Approach. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, *44*(11), 1913–1926. Retrieved from https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=cookie,ip,cpid,athens,shib&custid=s8863137&db=s3h&AN=120165519&site=eds-live&scope=site

Maidique, M. A., & Hiller, N. J. (2018). The Mindsets of a Leader. *MIT Sloan Management Review,59*(4), 75-81. Retrieved April 19, 2019, from https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/the-mindsets-of-a-leader/.

Northouse, P. G. (2015). *Introduction to Leadership. Concepts and Practice.* Los Angeles: Sage.

Parris, D. L., & Peachey, J. W. (2012). A Systematic Literature Review of Servant Leadership Theory in Organizational Contexts. *Springer Science Business Media*. Retrieved April 2, 2019.

Warner, M. J., & Evans, W. F. (2006). *Inspiring Leadership It's Not About the Power*. Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Winston, B. (2003, August). *Extending Patterson's Servant Leadership Model: Explaining how Leaders and Followers Interact in a Circular Model*[Scholarly project]. In *School of Leadership Studies Regent University*. Retrieved April 21, 2019, from

http://www.regent.edu/acad/sls/publications/conference_proceedings/servant_leadership_roundtable/2003pdf/winston_extending_patterson.pdf