Leadership As Genuine Giving

Ken Hultman, RODP

Ken Hultman, RODP, is an organization development consultant and coach. He is the author of four books on OD: The Path of Least Resistance: Preparing Employees for Change; Making Change Irresistible: Overcoming Resistance to Change in Your Organization; Balancing Individual and Organizational Values: Walking the Tightrope to Success; and Values-Driven Change: Strategies and Tools for Long-Term Success (in press).

Contact Information

Email - ken@kenhultman.com

Abstract

An ancient proverb says, "All that is not given is lost." Leadership, like all other aspects of life, involves both give and take. There are different types of taking and giving, however, and some are much more effective than others in supporting visionary leadership. This article defines nine types of taking and giving, and argues that leaders possessing the qualities of Genuine Giver offer the best hope for the future. A coaching process designed to help leaders increase their effectiveness in relationships is offered.

● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●

Introduction

> *This article argues that genuine giving is not only good for building healthy relationships, but also good for business.*

Good leadership is an act of giving; bad leadership is an act of taking. Put in personal terms: what kind of a leader would you follow willingly, a giver or a taker? People are drawn to givers and suspicious of takers. Reports about corporate scandals, which have become almost commonplace, reveal that our leadership paradigm is suspect. Over the past decade, a plethora of books have appeared on concepts as servant leadership, emotional intelligence, stewardship, ethical management, and principle-centered leadership. There is even an impressive body of research showing the relationship between values such as these, on the one hand, and bottom-line results, on the other (see, for example, Collins & Porras, 1994; De Geus, 1997; Fitz Enz, 1997; Kotter & Heskett,

1992). Nevertheless, many leaders find such results counter-intuitive, arguing that they must be hard-nosed and aggressive--sometimes even ruthless--to survive, let alone succeed. Stated succinctly, they believe leaders have to be takers to win in the marketplace. This article argues that genuine giving is not only good for building healthy relationships, but also good for business.

OD practitioners are very interested in organizational values. In spite of this, many of us find little of our consulting focused on values (see Piotrowski & Armstrong, 2004); most of it has to do with immediate pressures in organizations to improve performance or put out fires. Those of us determined to work with values within organizations had to seek methods that would meet with less resistance. Some background on self-awareness, motivation, and interpersonal relationships will provide a framework for understanding and applying the "Genuine Giving" model.

Toward a Theory of Interpersonal Motivation

Daniel Goleman (1995) asserts that self-awareness is the core emotional competence upon which all the others are built. But, how do you develop a leader's self-awareness? Obviously it can't be done in a weekend workshop or by reading an executive brief, although these methods are very popular in our quick-fix society. True self-awareness involves facing one's issues honestly and non-defensively, which requires deep personal work over a period of time to identify and resolve barriers to effectiveness.

A primary output of increased self-awareness is a deeper understanding of human motivation and improved interpersonal relationships,

---

A primary output of increased self-awareness is a deeper understanding of human motivation and improved interpersonal relationships, which Goleman and many believe are keys to successful leadership (see, for example, Block, 1996; Covey, 1989). One can turn to the developmental and interpersonal psychology literature in a search for greater understanding. Of particular interest are the structural-developmental models of human growth, which contend that under favorable conditions, (i.e., those that are conducive to a positive sense of self-worth, competence, and moral character) people progress naturally through a series of invariant stages toward fuller personal and interpersonal functioning. A key factor appears to be how people deal with adversity. Those who reconcile themselves to negative experiences are freer psychologically to move toward higher levels of effectiveness in relationships.

... with favorable conditions present, people move away from self-centered ways of functioning toward more inclusive, mutual ways of being;

Major theorists look at different aspects of development, but they all come to a similar conclusion: with favorable conditions present, people move away from self-centered ways of functioning toward more inclusive, mutual ways of being; they leave behind narrowly-defined egocentric and cultural biases, embracing views that encompass a wider range of humanity. Descriptions of the second highest and highest stages of development offered by selected authors are presented in Table 1. Notice the distinctive shift from a self-centered to a more other-centered, mutual perspective across these descriptions.

Table 1
Highest Stages in Selected Structural-Develpmental Theories

Theorist	Focus	Second Highest Stage	Highest Stage
Lawrence Kohlberg	Moral development	**Social Contract or Utility and Individual Rights:** The individual integrates perspectives by formal mechanisms of agreement, contract, objective impartiality, and due process, recognizing that these sometimes conflict and integrating them can be difficult.	**Universal Ethical Principles:** The individual embraces universal principles of justice, i.e. equality of human rights and respect for the dignity of human beings as individual persons. Social perspective is that persons are ends in themselves and must be treated in this manner.
James Fowler	Faith Development	**Conjunctive Faith:** The individual sees that religious beliefs are limited by a particular people's experience of God, and is open to other traditions, expecting that truth has been revealed and will be revealed in those traditions in ways that may compliment or correct one's own.	**Universalizing Faith:** The individual envisions an ultimate environment that is inclusive of all beings. Social perspective includes a radical commitment to justice, love, and a selfless passion for creating an inclusive and fulfilled human community.
Robert Kegan	Self development	**Institutional Stage:** The individual acknowledges and cultures capacity for independence, focusing on the assumption of authority, personal enhancement, ambition or achievement. Emphasis is on group involvement in career and the public arena.	**Interindividual Self:** The individual embraces and cultures capacities for interdependence, self-surrender, intimacy, and interdependent self-definition. Emphasis is on genuine intimacy in personal and work relationships.
Robert Selman	Development of social perspective taking	**Mutual Perspective Taking:** The individual is capable of a third-person perspective that simultaneously includes and coordinates the perspectives of self and other(s); the system or situation and all parties are seen from the third-person or generalized other perspective.	**Societal-Symbolic Perspective Taking:** The individual is capable of multiple mutual perspectives (generalized other) to societal, conventional, legal, or moral orientations within which everyone can participate and share.
Jane Loevinger	Ego development	**Autonomous Stage:** The individual moves beyond thinking in terms of polar opposites, and sees reality as complex and multifaceted. The person also recognizes other's need for autonomy, freeing them from the oppressive demands characteristic of lower stages. Self-fulfillment becomes a frequent goal, partly supplanting achievement.	**Integrated Stage:** The individual consolidates a sense of identity and moves toward self-actualization, recognizing the limitations of autonomy and that emotional interdependence is inevitable. Personal ties are cherished among the person's highest values. The person takes a broad view of life, holding to such abstract social ideals as justice.

All these theorists espouse that people can "get stuck" at lower stages of development and that very few people actually achieve the highest stage. In other words, a person can be at one stage chronologically but at a less advanced stage developmentally. Erik Erikson's well-known model of psychosocial development is not based on a structural-developmental view (Erikson, 1963). He contends instead that people progress through all his stages across a lifespan; however, if the developmental task associated with a given stage fails to be completed, the person takes this unfinished work into the next stage. We often refer to this as "baggage."

Considering these theories from an interpersonal perspective, broadly , the developmental progression can be described as transcending from selfishness (taking) to unselfishness (giving), i.e., with personal growth, giving becomes freer from the limits imposed by parenting, personal experience, religious training, and culture. Interpersonal exchange consists of taking, receiving, and giving. There are various types of taking and giving, some healthier than others, and each with different underlying intentions or motivations. Over time this led to the development of a model of interpersonal motivation that addresses the question, "What do I really want from this person?" The model identifies nine types of interpersonal motivation, representing various types of taking and giving. It is important to note that this is a practical model based on qualitative analysis of past research in combination with the results of experiential application over three years. There is no claim that the nine types in the model are the only

types, but rather the ones that have been found to be most instructive at this point in the author's research. The model is offered as a tool to be tried, discussed, and explored. Table 2 lists the nine types, along with the primary motive for each one, and brief descriptions.

The Complexity of Interpersonal Motivation

Similar to the developmental theories discussed earlier, this model is based on the view that people have a natural desire to move toward unselfishness as they mature, but that negative or traumatic experiences often block progress, particularly if these experiences leave them with unresolved feelings of fear, shame, guilt, and/or anger--the emotional cripplers to genuine giving. Generally speaking, developmental models describe the first three tasks of life as gaining a sense of self-worth, competence, and moral character. Self-worth has to do with our sense of value as a person. Competence and character are the two major building blocks of self-worth. To have a positive sense of self-worth, people must be able to view themselves as both capable and ethical. Acceptance from others is the most powerful affirmation of our self-worth. Acceptance can be operationally defined as listening and offering encouragement, support, nonjudgmental feedback, and forgiveness for personal mistakes. Sullivan (1953) asserted that even very young infants experience anxiety when they perceive rejection from their caregivers, because it's a reflection of their basic unworthiness. Many theorists

Table 2

Types of Interpersonal Motivation

Type	Intention	Description
Pure Taker	Satiation	The Pure Taker's modus operandi is, "I want what I want, when I want it." This is a natural stage for children during the first two years of life. This behavior is "pure" in infants because they take what they need and are content. When children's basic needs aren't met or are met sporadically, they often perceive themselves as lacking in basic worth. Similarly when caregivers dote on children the latter often develop a sense of entitlement, expecting others to defer to their wants and needs. We commonly refer to such people as "spoiled." In either case they always want more of something, and are viewed as self-centered and greedy.
Insecure Taker	Reassurance	Starting at about age 2, children need reassurance when attempting something new, which builds self-confidence. If they're constantly criticized, however, they experience feelings of shame and grow up believing they're inadequate. Adult insecure takers lack self-confidence and tend to place more confidence in other people's judgment and abilities than in their own. The striving for reassurance makes it difficult for them to build and maintain healthy relationships. They're so preoccupied with their own issues that they have trouble focusing on the issues of others.
Guilty Taker	Approval	Approval starts becoming important to children around the age of 3, when the socialization process begins in earnest. This is when they start being taught the difference between right and wrong, good and bad, which leads to conflict between the desire to have or do things and the fear of disapproval from parents, caregivers, and other authority figures. Adults who were subjected to extensive criticism as children become discouraged and struggle with feelings of false guilt and morbid introspection. Such feelings are barriers to giving in relationships. Viewing themselves as "bad" and undeserving, they feel guilty receiving from others and are reluctant to take what's rightfully theirs. The combination of guilt, approval-seeking behavior, and lack of assertiveness prevents them from enjoying what they have, and leads to conflict and imbalance in relationships.
Rationalized Taker	Revenge	When young children fail to receive security, love, and encouragement, some of them respond with anger and begin lashing out at others. We refer to this as "having a chip on your shoulder." Everyone has feelings of unfairness from time to time, but the Rationalized Taker has a pervasive sense of being treated unfairly, and they use this to justify their mistreatment of others. They tend to blame other people for their problems and take secret delight when bad things happen to them ("He got what he deserves"). As adults, some end up on the fringe of society or in the criminal justice system, alienated and bitter. Their deep feelings of resentment and explosive bouts of anger pose major challenges to building and maintaining healthy relationships.

Table 2 *(Continued)*

Type	Intention	Description
Detached Taker/Giver	Self-reliance/ Withdrawal	As children begin developing peer relationships it's normal for them to become more self-reliant, but many children with unresolved trust issues prefer to meet their own needs rather than accepting help from others. As adults fear of losing control causes them to avoid commitments, prizing freedom and self-sufficiency instead. They don't want to feel obligated to others. It's possible for them to be in relationships, as long as no unwanted expectations or demands are placed on them. When others put pressure on them to make a commitment they back away, severely limiting their ability to establish deep relationships based on interdependence.
Manipulative Giver	Control	When children are praised for sharing with others, they learn the connection between giving and receiving positive feedback. With additional experiences, they also discover that they can give in order to get something they want. In other words, they learn that giving can be a way to control others, getting them to think or act in a certain way. In common parlance, we refer to this as having an ulterior motive or hidden agenda. Adult Manipulative Givers usually have unresolved feelings of bitterness and contempt for others. Whereas the Rationalized Taker gets even by acting out, the Manipulative Giver gets even by being a con artist. While the latter are often successful in various types of work, many of them have difficulty establishing and maintaining close personal relationships, because they see people as means to their ends.
Reluctant Giver	Harmony	Reluctant Givers give in order to avoid conflict and keep the peace. There's a big difference between Manipulative Givers who have a hidden agenda, and reluctant givers who give because they think they should. The conflict for reluctant givers is between attending to their own needs and the needs of others. They give to avoid or end an argument, and often end up feeling that others take advantage of them. Reluctant Givers struggle with guilt, but this is different than the guilt experienced by the Guilty Taker. Whereas the latter feels guilty receiving, the former feels guilty for not giving. As Reluctant Givers learn to give more willingly, the guilt subsides and they experience more happiness and fulfillment in their relationships.
Contractual Giver	Mutuality	Contractual Givers are pragmatic, recognizing that give and take is necessary to meet their needs. They're willing to give as long as they get what they want in return. In contrast to Manipulative Givers, Contractual Givers are above board about their expectations, and they seek agreements that are fair and equitable. They know what they want from relationships, but they're not out to profit at someone else's expense. Contractual Givers tend to be businesslike: formal and structured. This is a carefully controlled, calculated, negotiated type of giving, with an emphasis on fairness. Such giving is commonplace in the work environment ("An honest day's work for an honest day's pay"), and when buying something ("Make sure you get it in writing"), but it's also prevalent in personal relationships. While Contractual Givers are usually trustworthy, they often have trouble giving spontaneously, or simply for the joy of making other people happy.

Table 2 *(Continued)*

Type	Intention	Description
Genuine Giver	Love	Genuine Givers are able to make commitments to others and to honor those commitments. There are no hidden agendas or ulterior motives, but rather authentic sharing. Having accepted themselves as persons, genuine givers are freed from self-doubt and personal insecurity to focus on the needs of others. When good things happen to other people they feel genuinely happy for them, which is one of the defining characteristics of love. In addition they have empathy and compassion for the less fortunate, and devote themselves to improving the human condition. Genuine givers are also willing to forgive others for wrongdoing, and avoid harboring bitterness and resentment. They offer uncritical acceptance, encouragement, and support, and give for the joy of giving. At the same time they're not too proud to ask for help, and when help is offered they receive it humbly and graciously. They're prepared to make sacrifices, but they don't allow others to take advantage of them. When dealing with others they seek a healthy balance between justice and mercy. If disagreements arise they deal with them in a direct and forthright manner, so relationships can be preserved and enhanced. Others find them very approachable, and their enthusiasm is contagious. No one becomes a totally Genuine Giver; this is a life-long process without any definitive end. Identifying and resolving internal conflicts can free people to become more genuine in their giving.

assert that the purpose of interpersonal behavior is to reduce anxiety and maintain self-esteem (for example, Sullivan, 1953; Leary, 1957). Anxiety is a ubiquitous factor in relationships, because self-worth is always vulnerable to being lowered.

People's sense of self-worth is diminished when an experience evokes either shame or guilt. Affect theorist, Silvan Tomkins, maintains that shame and guilt are the same affect, but are experienced differently due to perceived situational factors (see Demos, 1995). Shame results when people perceive themselves as incompetent; guilt results when people perceive themselves as immoral. Shame can be positive when it motivates people to try harder when they fail; guilt can be positive when it prevents people from harming others. Shame and guilt are negative emotions when they leave people with a diminished sense of self-worth. When leaders say that they do not want any surprises, what they really mean is that they want to avoid the shame that comes from not appearing to be on top of things.

Much of interpersonal behavior focuses on defending against threats to self-worth and coping with negative shame and guilt. Rising above such motives to focus on genuine giving can be daunting.

Consistent with these views, this model emphasizes that infants seek validation of self-worth, and if they do not attain it they are vulnerable to becoming adult Pure Takers; two year olds seek validation of competence, and if they do not get it they are vulnerable to becoming Insecure Takers; three year olds seek validation about being "good," and if they fail at this they are vulnerable to becoming Guilty Takers.

Nevertheless, the nine types do not represent discrete stages of development. In response to the challenges of life, over time individuals develop a mixture of all nine types in varying degrees, which explains the extremely wide variety of behavior in relationships. Some behaviors, such as terrorism and other acts of destructiveness, should humble

anyone claiming to be an expert in human motivation. While each person has a dominant or primary motivation, they are also influenced by other motivations in very complex ways. Even if an individual's dominant type is Genuine Giver, for example, he or she will also harbor other motives that influence and sometimes compete with this one. There is no such thing as a completely pure, uncontaminated motive. Every act involves a variety of motives, some conscious and some hidden. A holistic picture of a person's interpersonal motivations and their dynamic interrelationships can help us understand his or her behavior more fully.

Practitioners are often struck how little understanding people have about their interpersonal motivation.

Practitioners are often struck how little understanding people have about their interpersonal motivation. How often have you heard people say, "I have no idea why I did that," or ask, "Now why did I say that?" It is also interesting to note the discrepancies between how people perceive their motives and how others perceive them. This is why receiving 360-degree feedback can be unsettling and even devastating. The fact is most people have motives in relationships that are both beyond their awareness and rooted in negative experiences that have not been worked through. Consequently, these people are "stuck" at a level of functioning that inhibits genuine giving. Most of us have known a lot of people in the workplace that fit the definition of Pure Taker, Detached Taker/Giver, Manipulative Giver, Contractual Giver, and so on. Some are quite successful, and even rise to high positions of leadership,

but we can sense that something is limiting their effectiveness with others. They come up against the same brick wall repeatedly, unable to break through.

This model is being used to develop an instrument that identifies people's motives in relationships. Labeled the Interpersonal Motivation Scale™, it has both clinical and organizational applications. While norms are still being established, it is not surprising that the data so far indicate that the majority of leaders score highest on the Contractual Giver scale. This is consistent with Kegan's view that most people in the workforce are at the stage of development he calls the Institutional Self, which is one stage lower than the Interindividual Self (see Table 1). The focus of the Institutional Self is on personal autonomy and independence. Workers pursue these values within the context of an organization's structure and, therefore, seek to maintain status quo.

In contrast, the focus of the Interindividual Self is on intimacy and interdependence. People at this stage see beyond the limits of an organization's structure to the interpenetration of systems; they see the organization as functioning within a larger interdependent whole, which includes the community, other organizations, the nation, and the world. Such individuals have a deeper sense of affinity with the full gamut of humanity, enhancing their ability to bring about what we refer to as transformational change. With the challenges facing our world, we desperately need organizations that can reach beyond the narrow constraints of corporate self-interest to embrace broader, more unselfish visions for the future. As Eric Fromm has noted, such growth, ". . . can only be the result of dramatic changes in the social organization to convert it from a control-property-power orientation to a life orientation, from having and hoarding to being and sharing" (1973, p. 245). Indeed, it will take very mature leadership to bring this about.

In an organization of any size, a leader will encounter employees representing all nine types of interpersonal motivation; these employees will approach the leader with a wide variety of often conflicting perceptions and intentions. If left unchecked, peer pressure tends to shape the culture in a way that accommodates a mixture of motivations and behaviors, some of which are incompatible and even counter-productive. Peer pressure seldom raises the bar on organizational standards; this is almost always the province of visionary leadership. An effective leader is capable of making followers better people. But there is the catch: a leader can not move an organization to a higher level of functioning than he or she has achieved. A Reluctant Giver or Contractual Giver, for example, can not lead an organization toward a broader, more interdependent way of being because their intentions-motives-values will not support it.

Leaders will neither care about nor be capable of sustaining movement toward such higher-order interpersonal values as inclusiveness, diversity, servant leadership, stewardship, community, collaborative partnering, and empowerment, unless they possess the basic qualities of a Genuine Giver. A lot of leaders verbally espouse such lofty values-- it's quite fashionable these days--but they have not progressed far enough interpersonally to embed them fully in an organization's culture. Others often view this as hypocrisy, but in most cases leaders have simply reach the limits of their own interpersonal functioning.

Moving an organization toward higher and more consistent standards can be daunting, even for a Genuine Giver. Employees will test the lower limits to see if the leader "really means it." Some have become jaded by botched change efforts in the past, while others will not only want the new standards to fail but also work actively to make sure they do. To succeed, a leader must be able to connect with people where they are now, affirm their worth, and build from there. Many practitioners focus on working with leaders because if they can help leaders grow interpersonally, the potential exists to elevate the level of an entire organization. In recent years, this concept has been proposed and advocated by many scholars and consultants (for example, Bianco-Mathis et al., 2004; Goleman, 1995; Pearson, 1998, 2003;).

Changing Interpersonal Motivation through Executive Coaching

Demographic changes are currently impacting a new organizational reality. Millions of Baby Boomers will be retiring over the next 10 years, and there simply are not enough talented, younger people to take their place. A recent study by Executive Development Associates (2004) concludes that the top agenda items in executive development for the next 2 to 3 years would be to increase "bench-strength," and accelerate the development of high potentials. We can expect to see fierce competition to attract and retain the next generation of leaders. In addition, however, these individuals will require a lot of development because many of them are more comfortable with technology than with people, and lack the ability to establish rapport, build collaborative relationships, and resolve conflict, which are core leadership competencies. This is an area where OD and HRD can make a critical difference.

How could we speed up a leader's or potential leader's progress toward becoming a more Genuine Giver, or moving to a higher level of interpersonal maturity? Instead of trying to persuade people to embrace higher-order interpersonal values, one might ask: are you satisfied with your relationships? If they say "yes," they probably are not open to change; if they say "no," however, they are probably

in enough emotional distress to be open to assistance. This is important because people are not aware of the factors that are holding them back unless they are willing to examine at themselves honestly.

Executive coaches who use this model and instrument would be helping leaders increase their capacity for genuine giving;

Emotional distress often creates a window of opportunity where people are willing to let down their guard and search inwardly. Obviously, practitioners have to know when and when not to use a specific intervention. Some colleagues might think that leaders would not honestly answer the questions on the Interpersonal Motivation Scale™, and that they would find the labels for the nine types judgmental. The intent is to only use it with individuals who have a desire to improve their relationships or with organizations that want to move to a higher level of interpersonal functioning. With this as the criterion, to date there has not been a single objection from users. In fact, leaders have been often struck by the accuracy of their profile, saying such things as, "This is right-on," or "This describes me perfectly."

Executive coaches who use this model and instrument would be helping leaders increase their capacity for genuine giving; since people have a mixture of motivations in relationships, some of those motives will reduce that capacity. This opens the door to self-exploration, where leaders work to identify and work through issues that serve as barriers to interpersonal effectiveness. A combination of one-on-one coaching and a personal growth experience is suggested as a way to build self-awareness and sustain positive change. In a personal growth group,

participants can practice being givers in a safe environment.

The concept of "motivation" can be difficult to grasp, so the use of the following descriptors can be useful: needs, beliefs, feelings, values, and behavior (Hultman, 2002). As mentioned earlier, people's basic psychological need is to maintain and enhance a sense of self-worth. Interpersonal motivation types represent strategies for maintaining self-worth, some helpful and some harmful. Different types will vary in their beliefs, feelings, values, and behaviors. Beliefs are subjective assumptions, conclusions, and predictions. While all of these factors contribute to motivation, and should be looked at from a holistic, systems perspective, relationship barriers almost always trace back to negative or limiting beliefs about ourselves, other people, and life in general.

Feelings and behavior can be viewed as consequences of beliefs--thinking triggers emotions and shapes actions. The fundamental purpose of values, which are standards of importance, is to validate beliefs, and beliefs have a tremendous impact on the values people embrace. For this reason, many coaches focus on helping people identify and change beliefs that limit their relationship. Some of the approaches are Argyris and Senge's "Ladder of Inference" (Senge, 1994); the "Tree of Beliefs" (Bianco-Mathis et al., 2004); and "Dialectical Laddering" (Neimeyer, 1993). It is difficult to change values without first changing beliefs; when beliefs change, it opens the door to changes in values, feelings, and behavior. If you show a leader the information in Table 3, and ask if they hold any of the beliefs listed, or others similar to them, this would increase their awareness of relationship issues. Some suggestions for change are provided in Table 4.

Table 3

Beliefs, Feelings, Values, and Behavior Common to Different Interperasonal Motivation Types

	Beliefs	Feelings	Values	Behavior
Pure Taker	My needs are more important than other's. I should be able to have things my way. I'm better than others.	Fear of rejection	Satisfying immediate needs Attention Popularity	Selfish Self-centered
Insecure Taker	I'm less capable than others. I have to constantly prove myself. I lack self-confidence. I'm a failure.	Shame Fear of failure	Admiration Dependence Praise Reassurance of ability Recognition Security	Constantly asks for advice. Puts others on a pedestal. Seeks reassurance about abilities. Avoids taking risks. Devalues successes.
Guilty Taker	Others are more deserving than me. I always seem to do or say the wrong thing. I should be punished for my mistakes. I don't deserve to be forgiven. I'm no good. I'm a hopeless cause.	Guilt Fear of judgement	Approval Forgiveness Law abiding Mercy without justice Purity Reassurance of goodness Tact	Strives to be a "good person." Seeks reassurance about personal integrity. Dwells on past mistakes. Gives to atone for mistakes.
Rationalized Taker	I'm treated unfairly. Others are responsible for my problems. People should pay for hurting me. The world owes me. Don't get mad, get even.	Aggressive anger	Defiance Dominance Justice without mercy Power Rebellion Revenge	Abusive Aggressive Argumentative Defensive Threatening Unforgiving

Table 3 *(Continued)*

	Beliefs	**Feelings**	**Values**	**Behavior**
Detached Taker/Giver	If you don't get involved you won't get hurt. People should take care of themselves. I don't need people. People just want something from you.	Fear of losing control	Avoidance Freedom Independence Self-reliance Withdrawal	Only lets people get so close. Avoids obligations. Cautious, guarded. Avoids being vulnerable
Manipulative Giver	People will cheat you if you're not careful. It's a dog-eat-dog world. People are means to my ends. Never show weakness.	Passive-aggressive anger	Control Loyalty Obedience Prestige Status	Hidden agendas. Uses people. Takes advantage of others. Tries to make people feel obligated.
Reluctant Giver	It's better to go along with others than to make them upset. Conflict is bad. You shouldn't disappoint people.	Avoidance of guilt	Avoiding conflict Harmony Peace	Gives in order to keep the peace. Avoids conflict. Succumbs to pressure
Contractual Giver	Get it in writing It's better to be safe than sorry. Get your expectation out on the table. Everything is negotiable.	Avoidance of shame	Authority Formality Mutuality Order Reciprocity Structure Trust	Looks for a fair deal. Wants everything out in the open. Organized, efficient Hates surprises
Genuine Giver	People are an end in themselves. Every person is unique and special. You can't hurt another person without hurting yourself. We all need each other.	Contentment Enthusiasm Joy Peace	Accepting others Authenticity Collaboration Community Diversity Inclusiveness Interdependence Justice with mercy Love Servant leadership Stewardship	Gives for the joy of giving. Offers help without being asked. Makes sacrifices for others. Practices random acts of kindness.

Table 4
Removing Barriers to Genuine Giving

Types	Possible Actions
Pure Taker	Identify why you always seem to need more. Explore your fears about not having enough. Identify if you have a sense of entitlement. Practice being more grateful for what you have.
Insecure Taker	Explore the basis for feelings of inadequacy or incompetence. Identify the reasons for your lack of self-confidence. Stop indulging in self-pity. Examine why you trust other people's judgment more than your own. Develop greater self-confidence.
Guilty Taker	Identify and work through feelings of unworthiness. Explore your approval needs, and possible co-dependency issues. Examine your guilt about receiving from others. Forgive yourself for past mistakes. Avoid being overly critical of yourself. Examine why you enable others. Practice becoming a more gracious receiver.
Rationalized Taker	Identify the reasons for your anger. Examine your rationalizations and the purposes they serve. Reconcile yourself to the disappointments in life. Forgive others for hurting you. Resist justifying actions that are harmful to others. Practice treating others with more kindness.
Detached Taker/Giver	Examine your reluctance to make commitments. Explore the impact of past hurt on your relationships. Avoid forming generalizations, such as "You can't trust anybody." Identify if you are held back by fear of rejection. Forgive others for past mistakes. Ask for help when needed.
Manipulative Giver	Explore discrepancies between your stated and real motives. Examine your control needs. Work through feelings of bitterness and resentment. Be more honest and open in relationships. Remove the strings attached to your giving. Ask others to confront you when they sense a hidden agenda.
Reluctant Giver	Examine why you feel compelled to give. Explore possible co-dependency issues. Become more assertive. Develop more effective conflict-management skills. Practice becoming a more joyful giver.
Contractual Giver	Identify and deal with trust issues. Clarify assumptions behind your agreements. Make sure you don't have any "hidden terms" in your agreements. Give without expecting something in return.
Genuine Giver	Discover if your giving is limited by fear, guilt, or anger. Explore your underlying motives for giving. Work toward more unconditional acceptance of self and others. Identify and correct imbalances between giving and receiving.

Through executive coaching, many of us have seen people increase their capacity for genuine giving. Nevertheless, there remains a risk that they will revert back to previous ways of relating when they feel vulnerable or threatened. The old ways tend to operate as a default position because they "worked" in the past, even though they may have been costly in terms of negative consequences. You are familiar with the expression, "Two steps forward, and one step back." Unfortunately, when some people take a step back they become discouraged and give up. People will often stay with a known way of doing things, even if it has a negative impact on relationships, rather than try something they perceived as a risk to their self-esteem. Changing interpersonal motivation is difficult, requiring courage and determination; the coaching process must be sustained until the client develops the skills and confidence necessary to integrate the change permanent.

Executive coaches tend to use a combination of instruments, goal-setting, and structured feedback to guide the process of self-awareness (Goldsmith, et al., 2000; Whitworth, et al., 1998). The on-going coaching process centers on helping clients plan for and critique interactions. Successful planning should focus on the following questions:

1. What is the goal (intended result)?
2. What actions will you take to achieve the goal?
3. What issues do you anticipate?
4. How will you deal with the issues?
5. If I feel_____ I will_____ .

Successful interaction critique should focus on these questions:

1. What was the goal of the interaction?
2. During the interaction, what were your: Thoughts, Feelings, Actions.
3. What went well?

4. What would you do differently next time?

During the critique process, coaches should ask clients to avoid thinking in judgmental terms like success and failure. This almost always leads to discouragement and focuses instead on learning. Incremental improvement becomes evident over a period of time. Usually, small changes in behavior reflect larger internal changes. However, there is one caveat here: just like leaders can not guide organization to a higher level of interpersonal motivation than they have achieved, coaches can not take leaders to a higher level than they (the coaches) have achieved. Like leaders, coaches must have the courage to examine their own interpersonal motivation, identify and remove barriers to effective relationships (Bell & Nadler, 1979; Block, 2000; Whitworth, 1998). This is a process of continuous improvement--towards "genuine giving" for both the coach and the client.

One of the greatest challenges of our time is to develop leaders that can guide organizations beyond insular, self-serving goals to more interdependent, unselfish ways of functioning.

Conclusion

Our world is full of takers, but when was the last time you met one who was a good leader? One of the greatest challenges of our time is to develop leaders that can guide organizations beyond insular, self-serving goals to more interdependent, unselfish ways of functioning. Helping leaders become more genuine givers is a promising way to further this process. Leaders who have the courage to examine

themselves honestly and work through internal barriers to giving should not only enjoy healthier and more effective working relationships, but should also be able to champion the values necessary for a sustainable world.

References

Bell, C., & Nadler, L. (1979). *The client-consultant handbook.* Houston: Gulf Publishing.

Bianco-Mathis, V. E., Nabors, L. K., & Roman, C. H. (2004). *Leading from the inside out: A coaching model.* Thousand Oaks,CA: Sage.

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

Block, P. (2000). *The flawless consulting fieldbook and companion: A guide to getting your expertise used.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.

Collins, J. C., & Porras, J. I. (1994). *Built to last: Successful habits of visionary companies.* New York: HarperBusiness.

Covey, S. R. (1989). *The seven habits of highly effective people.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

De Geus, A. (1997). *The living company: Habits for survival in a turbulent business environment.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Demos, E. V. (1995). *Exploring affect: The selected writings of Silvan S. Tomkins.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and society*, (2nd ed.). New York: Norton.

Executive Development Associates. (2004). *2004 trends in executive development survey*, San Francisco, CA

Fitz-Enz, J. (1997). *The 8 practices of exceptional companies.* New York: AMACOM.

Fowler, J. W. (1981). *Stages of faith: The psychology of human development and the quest for meaning.* San Francisco: HarperCollins.

Fromm, E. (1973). *The anatomy of human destructiveness.* New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Goldsmith, M., Lyons, L., Freas, A., & Witherspoon, R. (2000). *Coaching for leadership: How the world's greatest coaches help leaders learn.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ.* New York: Bantam.

Hultman, K. E. (2002). *Balancing individual and organizational values: Walking the tightrope to success.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.

Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self: Problem and process in human development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive developmental approach to socialization. In Goslin, D. (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization: Theory and research.* New York: Rand McNally.

Kotter, J., & Heskett, J. (1992). *Corporate culture and performance.* New York: The Free Press.

Leary, T. (1957). *Interpersonal diagnosis of personality.* New York: Roland Press Co.

Loevinger, J. (1997). *Ego development: Conceptions and theories.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Maslow, A. H. (1962). *Toward a psychology of being.* New York: Van Nostrand.

Neimeyer, R. A. (1993). Constructivist approaches to the measurement of meaning. In Neimeyer, G. J. (Ed.), *Constructivist assessment: A casebook.* Thousand oaks, CA: Sage.

Pearson, C. S. (1998). *The hero within: Six archetypes we live by.* New York: HaperCollins.

Pearson, C. S. (2003). *The Organizational and Team Culture Indicator* (OTCI). CAPT (Center for Applications of Psychological Type).

Piotrowski, C., & Armstrong, T.R. (2004). The research literature in organization development: Recent trends and current directions. *Organziation Development Journal,* 22(2), 48-54.

Selman, R. L. (1980). *The growth of interpersonal understanding.* New York: Academic Press.

Senge, P. M. (1994). *The fifth discipline field book.* New York: Doubleday.

Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry.* New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

Whitworth, L., Kimsey-House, H., & Sandahl, P. (1998). *Co-active coaching: New skills for coaching people toward success in work and life.* Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black Publishing.