

---

Citation:

Jenkins, S (2014) John R. Wooden, Stephen R. Covey and servant leadership. International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching, 9 (1). 1 - 24. ISSN 1747-9541 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1260/1747-9541.9.1.1>

Link to Leeds Beckett Repository record:

<https://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/178/>

Document Version:

Article (Published Version)

---

The aim of the Leeds Beckett Repository is to provide open access to our research, as required by funder policies and permitted by publishers and copyright law.

The Leeds Beckett repository holds a wide range of publications, each of which has been checked for copyright and the relevant embargo period has been applied by the Research Services team.

We operate on a standard take-down policy. If you are the author or publisher of an output and you would like it removed from the repository, please [contact us](#) and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Each thesis in the repository has been cleared where necessary by the author for third party copyright. If you would like a thesis to be removed from the repository or believe there is an issue with copyright, please contact us on [openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk) and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

# John R. Wooden, Stephen R. Covey and Servant Leadership

**Simon Jenkins**

Carnegie Faculty of Sport and Education  
Leeds Metropolitan University, Leeds, LS6 3QT, UK  
E-mail: S.P.Jenkins@Leedsmet.ac.uk

## **ABSTRACT**

The aim of this stimulus article is to examine the notion of servant leadership with respect to legendary UCLA basketball coach John Wooden, and to compare his coaching philosophy which is expressed in his Pyramid of Success to the philosophy of management and self-help guru Stephen Covey as indicated in his best-selling book *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People* and related works. Both Wooden's Pyramid of Success and Covey's Seven Habits can be understood in terms of virtue ethics. Wooden has been regarded as a servant leader and Covey has promoted the notion of servant leadership. Drawing on autobiographical and biographical work on Wooden, it is argued that Wooden may be better thought of as a paternalistic leader rather than a servant leader.

**Key words:** Aristotle, Character, Coaching Philosophy, Habits, Management Guru, Paternalistic Leadership, Pyramid of Success, Religion, Virtue Ethics

## **INTRODUCTION**

John Wooden (1910-2012), a three-time All-American basketball player at Purdue University, is the only man who has been elected to college basketball's hall of fame as both a player and a coach [1, p. xxx]. Wooden's UCLA Bruins won ten NCAA Championships in twelve years: 1964, 1965, 1967-1973, and 1975. In 1999 Wooden was selected by an ESPN panel as one of the ten greatest sports coaches of the twentieth century and in the same year *Sports Illustrated* named him as the "Century's Best College Basketball Coach" [2, p. 6-7].

Stephen Covey (1932-2012) is the author of a number of books, including *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People* [3] which was first published in 1989 and by 2004 had sold over 15 million copies worldwide [4, back inside dustcover]. He was founder of the Covey Leadership Center and vice chairman of FranklinCovey Co.

Both Wooden and Covey were concerned with character and virtues. The similarity of their work has been shown by blogger Fernando Justino who compared Wooden's Pyramid to Covey's 7 (8) Habits, grouping Wooden's Pyramid blocks under each of Covey's Habits [5]:

Habit 1 – Be Proactive – Self-Control, Alertness, Initiative, Poise

Habit 2 – Begin with the End in Mind – Intentness, Industriousness

- Habit 3 – Put First Things First – Confidence
- Habit 4 – Think Win/Win – Team Spirit, Loyalty
- Habit 5 – Seek First to Understand.... – Skill, Friendship, Enthusiasm
- Habit 6 – Synergise – Cooperation
- Habit 7 – Sharpen the Saw – Condition
- Habit 8 – Effectiveness to Greatness – Competitive Greatness

Justino's motivation was to understand "great works" that he was trying to implement in his own life and to recommend others to read [5].

The first two sections of this article describe Wooden's Pyramid of Success and Covey's Seven Habits and elucidate some of the major influences on Wooden and Covey. The remaining sections introduce servant leadership and paternalistic leadership, and draw on published material by and about Wooden to enable the reader to consider whether he was a servant leader or a paternalistic leader.

## JOHN WOODEN INFLUENCES ON WOODEN

Wooden indicated in 1988 that the "greatest influence on my life was my late wife": "[Nellie was] the reason for staying in school when things were difficult from a financial point of view, and [my] support through all my years of teaching" [2, p. 158]. The men who influenced Wooden most in his life were: his father, Earl Warriner, Glenn Curtis, and Ward "Piggy" Lambert [2, p. 29]. In Centerton, Indiana, Earl M. Warriner was Wooden's country grade-school principal, teacher, and his first coach – and who Wooden credits for "instilling a sense of motivation" [2, p. 29]. Glenn M. Curtis was Wooden's high-school coach at Martinsville, Indiana. Wooden said that he "probably got most of his ideas about basketball and coaching" from Piggy Lambert [2, p. 30]. He described his father, Warriner and Lambert as mentors in that they were adults who provided direction and were a good example when he was young [1, p. 21].

John Wooden's philosophy of life and his coaching philosophy came largely from his father, Joshua [6, p. 25], who read the Bible daily and got his sons to read it too [6, p. 25]. A disciplinarian who was "strong in his moral principles, values, and ideals", Joshua convinced his son that "the only road to success was through education" [1, p. 7; 6, p. 6].

When Wooden graduated from elementary school, his father gave him a little card on which was written his own personal creed: 1) Be true to yourself; 2) Make each day your masterpiece; 3) Help others; 4) Drink deeply from good books; 5) Make friendship a fine art; and 6) Build a shelter against a rainy day [2, p. 12]. Along with a quotation on the back of this card<sup>1</sup> and "two sets of threes"<sup>2</sup>, the creed is what Wooden referred to as "timeless wisdom from a godly father" [2, p. 12; p. 14] and something that would shape his whole life [1, p. 8].

Wooden's favourite person was Mother Teresa [7] and his favourite American (who he quoted more than anyone else) was Abraham Lincoln [7; 2, p. 29]. Other people he admired

<sup>1</sup> Neville Johnson states: "In 1956, the Los Angeles Times reported that coach Wooden had given what he called "My Last Lecture" to UCLA students, wherein he discussed what his father had given him [i.e., an Adopted Creed, which I have always carried in my wallet]" [NJ, p. 12]. Wooden later added a seventh statement: "Pray for guidance and counsel and give thanks for your blessings each day" [2, p. 14].

<sup>2</sup> "Four things a man must do if he would make his life most true: to live without confusion clearly; to love his fellow men sincerely; to act from honest motives purely; to trust in God and Heaven securely" [1, p. 8; 2, p. 12]. "Never Lie, Never Cheat, Never Steal," and "Don't Whine, Don't Complain, and Don't Make Excuses" [2, p. 14].

included Jesus Christ, Benjamin Franklin, and Mahatma Gandhi [2, p. 29; 2, p. 139]. Wooden had numerous books on basketball and biographies of coaches as well as those from people like Winston Churchill who had “a certain impact on civilization as a whole” [7]. Wooden loved poetry and it was something he had in common with Glenn Curtis who “often quoted poetry at practice to illustrate a point...and I believe this influenced me to accept him and his ideas”. Being an English teacher, Wooden was an avid reader. He read a lot of philosophy, but couldn’t say that “any one specific idea or concept” influenced him [2, p. 175].

### WOODEN’S PYRAMID OF SUCCESS

The Pyramid of Success contains the foundation of Wooden’s leadership (“who I am”) [8, p. 57], defined his code of conduct and “characteristics that I valued, both on and off the court” [8, p. 71], is what he attempted to model his own behaviour with [8, p. 20], and was his “teaching tool” [8, p. 19].

When Wooden started working on his Pyramid in 1934 at the age of twenty-four during his first year of teaching at Dayton High School in Kentucky [8, p. 8], he defined success as “peace of mind which is a direct result of self-satisfaction in knowing you did your best to become the best you are capable of becoming” [2, p. 141]<sup>3</sup>.

Glenn Curtis used what he called “A Ladder of Achievement” which was a ladder with five or six rungs on an old cardboard poster [8, p. 17] which he used to motivate his players to improve their play with important tips referring to footwork, for example [8, p. 18]. Wooden incorporated five of the seven points from Curtis’ Ladder in his Pyramid of Success [9, p. 14]. A key difference between Wooden’s Pyramid and Curtis’ Ladder was their definition of success. For Curtis, success was defined in terms of beating another team [8, p. 18]. Wooden’s definition was rather different and was inspired by his mathematics teacher at Martinsville, Lawrence Schidler, who indicated to Wooden and his peers that success was not accumulating material wealth or gaining prestige but rather was a peace of mind from doing one’s best [2, p. 173; 6, p. 85]. Wooden was also influenced by his father’s words: “Never try to be better than someone else, learn from others, and never cease trying to be the best you could be” [7] and a verse he came across<sup>4</sup>. A key point made by his father was that trying to be the best you can be is under your control (unlike trying to be better than someone else) [1, p. 52; 1, p. 171].

Wooden wanted something “more comprehensive” and illustrative than Curtis’ ladder idea:

I remembered reading about the Great Pyramid of Giza in Egypt while I was a student at Purdue. It was the last of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World. ... [T]he Great Pyramid was constructed on a massive foundation whose huge cornerstones were the biggest and most important of the whole structure. ...The great management writer and analyst Peter Drucker, when asked who were the greatest managers of all time, answered, “The builders of the great Pyramids.” ... The Great Pyramid of Giza was built to last – and it did. The symbolism of all this effort seemed very practical to me. [8, p. 18]

<sup>3</sup> Neville Johnson stated: “The Pyramid of Success credo underwent a subtle change at the turn of the millennium”. The definition of success was changed to: “peace of mind that is a direct result of self-satisfaction in knowing that you *made the effort* to become the best you are capable of becoming” [2, p. 141; emphasis original].

<sup>4</sup> At God’s footstool to confess, a poor soul knelt and bowed his head. “I failed, he cried. The Master said, “Thou didst thy best, that is success.” [7]

Wooden completed his Pyramid in 1948 when he was discharged from military service:

When I went to Indiana State University, prior to coming to UCLA, I brought it to its present form and I haven't changed it much since then. I've never changed the cornerstones ["industriousness" and "enthusiasm"], although many other blocks have been eliminated or changed position within the structure. [10, p. 161]

#### FIRST TIER OF THE PYRAMID

Industriousness is essentially "hard work"; it is "the most conscientious, assiduous and inspired type of work" – "Perfection can never be obtained, but it must be the goal, and must be sought by determined effort" [10, p. 161]. A poem by Grantland Rice, "How to Be a Champion", epitomises Wooden's feelings on Industriousness<sup>5</sup>.

On Enthusiasm, Wooden believed: "You must truly enjoy what you are doing, otherwise, you can't force yourself to work as hard as it as you are capable of doing" [10, p. 162]. Both Glenn Curtis and Piggy Lambert had genuine Enthusiasm; while Curtis was "very demonstrative in expressing his Enthusiasm", Lambert had "a very controlled, intense manner" [2, p. 23].

In between the cornerstones of Industriousness and Enthusiasm, Wooden placed three blocks that involve working with others: Friendship, Loyalty, and Cooperation [8, p. 24; 10, p. 162]. Friendship involves mutual respect and camaraderie, which is "a spirit of goodwill that exists between individuals and members of a group" [8, p. 25]. Loyalty means "keeping your self-respect, knowing whom and what you have allegiance to, giving respect to those with whom you work" [10, p. 163] and Wooden quotes Polonius' advice to his son Laertes in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, "To thine own self be true" [8, p. 27]. On the matter of Cooperation, Wooden states: "Listen if you want to be heard. Always strive to understand the other point of view. Be interested in finding the best way, not your own way" [10, p. 163].

#### SECOND TIER OF THE PYRAMID

The blocks of the second tier of the Pyramid are Self-Control, Alertness, Initiative, and Intentness. Wooden regarded these personal qualities as more cognitive than those of the first tier which were "essentially values of the heart and spirit" [8, p. 31].

Self-Control is concerned with self-discipline and emotional control [10, p. 163], and Wooden believed that consistency is destroyed by emotionalism [8, p. 107]: "I demanded intensive effort – "positive aggression," I called it - with the goal of producing ongoing improvement rather than trying to get everybody excited and fired up about some arbitrary peak in performance" [8, p. 108]. In 1953 he wrote: "[W]ho is a greater personification of self-control than National Open Golf Champ Ben Hogan? His emotions are under control at all times" [2, p. 37].

Alertness refers essentially to "mental quickness" – "the ability to be constantly observing, absorbing, and learning from what's going on around you" [8, p. 34]. Wooden's father would remind him that most of one's learning would come from others, but this could only happen if one was alert [8, p. 35] and Wooden pointed to his hero Abraham Lincoln as exemplary in this regard [10, p. 164; 1, p. 184].

---

<sup>5</sup> "You wonder how they do it and you look to see the knack, you watch the foot in action, or the shoulder, or the back, but when you spot the answer where the higher glimmers lurk, you'll find in moving higher up the laurel covered spire, that the most of it is practice and the rest of it is work." [6, p. 86]

Initiative involves “the courage to make decisions, to act, and the willingness and strength to risk failure and take a stand even when it goes against the opinion of others” [8, p. 37]. Wooden adopted Piggy Lambert’s belief that the team making the most mistakes would win a game [8, p. 36]: “If we are afraid to do something, for fear of making a mistake, we will not do anything and that is the worst mistake of all. Realize that the road to achievement could be difficult, but don’t let the difficulty defer you from making the effort. ... Lincoln said, “The worst thing a parent could do for his children is doing the things that they could and should do for themselves” [10, p. 164-165].

Intentness is “not giving up, but the ability to resist temptation and stay the course, to concentrate on your objective with determination and resolve” [10, p. 165]. What Wooden refers to as “the great force” produced by Industriousness and Enthusiasm must be persistent [8, p. 38-39].

### THIRD TIER OF THE PYRAMID

The “heart of the pyramid” is essentially the “formula for teaching basketball” that Wooden learned from Piggy Lambert; i.e., condition, fundamentals and unity – what Wooden calls Condition, Skill, and Team Spirit in the middle tier of his Pyramid [8, p. 41-49]. With regard to Condition, Wooden believed that “you cannot attain proper physical fitness unless it is preceded by mental and moral Condition” [8, p. 43]. Skill in basketball referred to the “knowledge of and ability to, not only properly, but quickly execute the fundamentals” [10, p. 167]. Team Spirit is “a genuine consideration for others, an eagerness...to sacrifice personal interests or glory for the welfare of all” [10, p. 167].

### FOURTH TIER OF THE PYRAMID

The blocks of the fourth tier of the Pyramid are Poise and Confidence. Poise is defined as “being true to oneself, not getting rattled, thrown off, or unbalanced regardless of the circumstance or situation” [8, p. 50]. Wooden referred to Socrates, who said he prepared for death all his life by the life he led, to make the following point: “If you have character, you’re at peace, at ease with yourself. Therefore, you’re going to have poise and you’re going to function near your particular level of competency” [7]. Confidence is “well-founded self-belief: the knowledge that your preparation is complete [8, p. 51] but it “must be monitored so that it does not spoil or rot and turn to arrogance,” which is “the feeling of superiority that fosters the assumption that past success will be repeated without the same level of hard effort that brought it about in the first place” [8, p. 52].

### FIFTH TIER OF THE PYRAMID

The apex of the Pyramid, Competitive Greatness, refers to being at your best when your best is needed: “Enjoy the thrill from a tough battle” [8, p. 53]. For Wooden, Grantland Rice’s poem “The Great Competitor” captures what is meant by Competitive Greatness<sup>6</sup>.

There are a number of other qualities included in the Pyramid that constitute “the mortar holding the blocks together” [10, p. 169] and are “essential to the ultimate definition of success” [6, p. 91]. On one side of the Pyramid are ambition, adaptability, resourcefulness,

---

<sup>6</sup> “Beyond the winning and the goal, beyond the glory and the flame, he feels the flame within his soul, born of the spirit of the game, and where the barriers may wait, built up by the opposing Gods, he finds a thrill in bucking fate and riding down the endless odds. Where others wither in the fire or fall below some raw mishap, where others lag behind or tire and break beneath the handicap, he finds a new and deeper thrill to take him on the uphill spin, because the test is greater still, and something he can revel in.” [6, p. 90].

fight and faith; on the other side are sincerity, honesty, reliability, integrity, and patience:

“Ambition” must be carefully and properly focused and have noble and worthy purposes. Never let ambition cause you to sacrifice your integrity or diminish your efforts on any other aspect of the Pyramid. At the same time, you’ll never reach a serious goal unless you have the intention to do so. Be “adaptable” to any situation. Change is constant and inevitable. Know about it, grow with and learn from it and by it. “Resourcefulness” is simple to understand. Use your wits with proper judgment. ... It’s fun to create, to be clever, especially for worthwhile purposes. By “fight”, I mean determined effort. In basketball lingo, this means “hustle.” I like to say, “Be quick, but never hurry.” ... Have “faith” that things will turn out the way they should. We must do the things we can to make that a reality. ... For me that requires prayer. ... Believe in yourself and all that is good in the universe. ... “Sincerity” makes and keeps friends. It is the glue of friendship and team spirit. “Honesty” must occur at all times in all ways of thought and action. By being dishonest we deceive others as well as ourselves. By doing so we destroy our credibility and reputation and we lose our self-respect. ... If we are not honest or sincere, we cannot be counted upon as being “reliable”, the next element on the Pyramid. Others depend on us so we must earn and create their respect. The first requirement for a job is showing up. “Integrity” is purity of intention. Integrity speaks for itself. Sincerity, honesty, and reliability are components that encourage and lead to integrity. In Judaism, a man with this quality is referred to as a “*mensch*”, one of noble character. We must strive to act with rectitude, character, and dignity. We must never sacrifice our morals or values. Success is not easy to obtain, which is why “faith” and “patience” meet at the apex of the Pyramid. You must have patience and realize that worthwhile things take time, and should. Things that come easy, as a general rule, are not meaningful. [10, p. 169-171]

## WOODEN AND VIRTUES

Wooden sought players who had character and he believed that a leader with character will attract talent with the same [8, p. 73-74]. In 1966, Wooden stated in a magazine article:

I’m [at UCLA] as an educator, and I try to teach decency through intercollegiate basketball. Furthermore, the better the character, the stronger the basketball effort. Virtue cannot be learned from a playbook or from chalk talks by the coach. It comes from example. [2, p. 149]

Dahlggaard et al. [11] examined philosophical and religious traditions in China (Confucianism and Taoism), South Asia (Buddhism and Hinduism), and the West (Athenian philosophy, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam) for the answers each provided to questions of moral behaviour and the good life. The authors found that six core virtues recurred in these writings: courage, justice, humanity, temperance, wisdom, and transcendence. This convergence suggests “a nonarbitrary foundation for the classification of human strengths and virtues” [11, p. 203]. These six core virtues are defined as follows:

Courage – Emotional strengths that involve the exercise of will to accomplish goals in the face of opposition, external or internal; examples include bravery, perseverance, and authenticity (honesty).



Justice – Civic strengths that underlie healthy community life; examples include fairness, leadership, and citizenship or teamwork.

Humanity – Interpersonal strengths that involve “tending and befriending” others; examples include love and kindness.

Temperance – Strengths that protect against excess; examples include forgiveness, humility, prudence, and self-control.

Wisdom – Cognitive strengths that entail the acquisition and use of knowledge; examples include creativity, curiosity, judgment, and perspective (providing counsel to others).

Transcendence – Strengths that forge connections to the larger universe and thereby provide meaning; examples include gratitude, hope, and spirituality. [11, p. 205]

For Wooden “perhaps the most important word for a player or coach to keep in mind”, is balance, by which he meant “keeping things in proper perspective, not permitting either excessive exuberance or dejection to interfere with preparation, performance, or subsequent individual or team behaviour” [1, p. 103]. This is in line with Aristotle’s notion of virtue as a balance between two extreme vices of excess and deficiency<sup>7</sup>.

“Practice moderation and balance in all that you do”, was Wooden’s advice [8, p. 43]. The notion of balance was also invoked by Wooden in the Pyramid block of Poise: “I define poise as being true to oneself, not getting rattled, thrown off, or unbalanced regardless of the circumstance or situation” [8, p. 50]. Also embedded in Poise is the virtue of courage:

Poise means holding fast to your beliefs and acting in accordance with them, regardless of how bad or good the situation may be. Poise means avoiding pose or pretense, comparing yourself to others, and acting like someone you’re not. Poise means having a *brave heart* in all circumstances. [8, p. 50; emphasis added]

When discussing his father’s creed, Wooden states: “You must have the *courage* to be true to yourself” [1, p. 10; emphasis added]. Another block of the Pyramid, Initiative, is also concerned with courage with Wooden referring to “the courage to make decisions” [8, p. 36] and a leader having “the courage of his convictions and the will to act on them” [8, p. 38].

The virtue of temperance comes out strongly in Wooden’s Pyramid in terms of Self-Control (see above). The virtues of justice and humanity are all represented in the Pyramid; e.g., Friendship, Loyalty, cooperation, and Team Spirit. Not only moral virtues, but also intellectual virtues are included in Pyramid (especially in the second tier).

## STEPHEN COVEY CHARACTER ETHIC

From his in-depth study of the “success literature published in the United States since 1776”, Covey identified the “Character Ethic” of which Benjamin Franklin’s autobiography is representative, “being one man’s effort to integrate certain principles and habits deep within his nature” [3, p. 18]:

---

<sup>7</sup> Aristotle defines each virtue as a ‘mean’ or ‘intermediate’; i.e., as a balance between two extreme vices of excess and deficiency; e.g., courage lies between rashness and cowardice [12]. According to Aristotle, these balances mean that “judgment has an indispensable role in the life of the virtuous man” – a crucial virtue called phronesis – so that “excellence of character and intelligence cannot be separated” [12, p. 154]. Phronesis enables a person to find their own personal mean between excessive and deficient behaviour.



The Character Ethic taught that there are basic principles of effective living, and that people can only experience true success and enduring happiness as they learn and integrate these principles into their basic character. [3, p. 18].

The Character Ethic is an example of a paradigm, which Covey views as a map:

We all know that “the map is not the territory.” A map is simply an explanation of certain aspects of the territory. ... [A paradigm] is a theory, an explanation, or model of something else. [3, p. 23]

Covey distinguishes between values and principles by analogy to a map and a compass; values are internal, subjective and changing; principles are external, objective and unchanging:

When I was in New York recently, I witnessed a mugging skilfully executed by a street gang. I’m sure that the members of this gang have their street maps, their common values – the highest value being “Don’t fink or squeal on each other, be true and loyal to each other” – but this value, as it’s interpreted and practiced by this gang, does not represent “true north,” the magnetic principle of respect for people and property. [13, p. 94]

Principles are “proven, enduring guidelines for human conduct” and Covey argues that the same “basic core beliefs” (e.g., “You reap what you sow”) are taught by all the world’s major religions [13, p. 95].

## SEVEN HABITS

Covey presents the Seven Habits as a paradigm and which “provide an incremental, sequential, highly integrated approach to the development of personal and interpersonal effectiveness [3, p. 48-49]. The Seven Habits are also to be understood on a Maturity Continuum from dependence to independence to interdependence [3, p. 49]. The first three Habits are concerned with self-mastery and move a person from dependence to independence, while the next three Habits involve teamwork, cooperation and communication, moving a person from independence to interdependence (but this does not mean that Habits 1, 2 and 3 have to be perfected before working on Habits 4, 5 and 6 [3, p. 51]. Habit 7 is the “habit of renewal” and it thus “circles and embodies all the other habits” [3, p. 52].

*Habit 1 – Be Proactive* – is based on principles of responsibility/initiative, and a paradigm of self-determination [4, p. 154]; i.e., “we are responsible for our own choices and have the freedom to choose based on principles and values rather than on moods or conditions” [4, p. 152].

*Habit 2 – Begin with the End in Mind* – is based on principles of vision/values, and a paradigm of two creations/focus [4, p. 154]; people “identify and commit themselves to the principles, relationships and purposes that matter most to them” [4, p. 152]:

In the Nazi death camps where Victor Frankl learned the principle of proactivity, he also learned the importance of purpose, of meaning in life. The essence of “logotherapy”, the philosophy he later developed and taught, is that many so-called mental and emotional illnesses are really symptoms of an underlying sense of

meaningless or emptiness. Logotherapy eliminates that emptiness by helping the individual to detect his unique meaning, his mission in life. Once you have that sense of mission, you have the essence of your own proactivity. You have the vision and the values which direct your life. [3, p. 108]

Following both Peter Drucker and Warren Bennis, Covey distinguishes between leadership (what he calls “the first creation”) and management (“the second creation”): “Management is doing things right; leadership is doing the right things” [3, p. 101]. Habits 1 and 2 are concerned with personal leadership, and are “absolutely essential and prerequisite to Habit 3”:

You can’t become principle-centered without first being aware of and developing your own proactive nature. You can’t become principle-centered without first being aware of your paradigms and understanding how to shift them and align them with principles. You can’t become principle-centered without a vision of and a focus on the unique contribution that is yours to make. [3, p. 147]

*Habit 3 – Put First Things First* – is based on principles of integrity/execution, and a paradigm of priority/action [4, p. 154]; “it is living and being driven by the principles you value most, not by the urgent agendas and forces surrounding you” [4, p. 152]. Habit 3 is thus personal management and requires discipline [3, p. 148]. Covey invokes a computer metaphor to elucidate Habits 1, 2 and 3: “if Habit 1 says “You’re the programmer” and Habit 2 says “Write the program,” then Habit 3 says “Run the program”, “Live the program” [3, p. 169].

*Habit 4 – Think Win/Win* – is based on principles of mutual respect/benefit, and a paradigm of abundance [4, p. 154]; it involves “thinking in terms of abundance and opportunity rather than scarcity and adversarial competition” [4, p. 152-153].

*Habit 5 – Seek First to Understand, Then to be Understood* – is based on principles of mutual understanding, and a paradigm of consideration/courage [4, p. 154].

*Habit 6 – Synergise* – is based on principles of creative cooperation, and a paradigm of value differences [4, p. 154]; a synergistic team “is organized so that the strengths of some compensate for the weaknesses of others” [4, p. 153].

*Habit 7 – Sharpen the Saw* – is based on the principle of renewal and a paradigm of continuous improvement of the whole person [8<sup>th</sup>, p. 154; p. 156]; it involves “increasing your competency in the four areas of life: body, mind, heart and spirit” [4, p. 154], “regularly and consistently in wise and balanced ways” [3, p. 289].

## 8<sup>th</sup> HABIT

Covey later introduced an 8<sup>th</sup> Habit which builds on and reaches beyond effectiveness to greatness – Find Your Voice and Inspire Others to Find Theirs:

[V]oice lies at the nexus of talent (your natural gifts and strengths), passion (those things that naturally energize, excite, motivate and inspire you), need (including what the world needs enough to pay you for), and conscience (that still, small voice within that assures you of what is right and that prompts you to actually do it). When you engage in work that taps your talent and fuels your passion – that rises out of a great need in the world that you feel drawn by conscience to meet – therein lies your voice, your calling, your soul’s code. [4, p. 5]

## COVEY AND RELIGION

Using Thomas Luckman's notion of "invisible religion", Jackson argues that Covey "created an ostensibly secular and rational rhetorical vision that speaks to, and appeals to, the spiritual needs of a wide range of individuals, many of whom have removed themselves from the traditional primary institutions of religion" [14, p. 116]. Indeed, Covey states:

I believe that almost anyone who is seriously involved in any church will recognize that churchgoing is not synonymous with personal spirituality. ... Living the principles taught by the church can [give a person a deep, permanent security or sense of intrinsic worth], but the organization alone cannot. [3, p. 117]

In *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*, Covey states: "I believe that correct principles are natural laws, and that God, the Creator and Father of us all, is the source of them, and also the source of our conscience" [3, p. 319]. It has been indicated that *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People* is based heavily on Covey's earlier works on Mormonism, especially *The Divine Center* [14-16]. For example,

7 Habits refers to "natural laws in the human dimension that are just as real, as unchanging and arguably 'there' as laws such as gravity are in the physical dimension." [7 Habits, p. 32]. In *The Divine Center* Covey identifies these "laws of nature" as the teachings of the LDS Church which "enable the individual personality to grow and develop until eventually he can become like his Father in Heaven." [DC, p. 246]. For example, *The Divine Center* reveals that Covey derives his principle of being pro-active rather than reactive from Mormon scriptures. [DC, p. 176; 7H, p. 70-77]. [15]

Those who have read Covey's 7 Habits are familiar with his use of the term "map" for a paradigm of life. [7H, p. 29-35]. He writes, "The more closely our maps or paradigms are aligned with these principles or natural laws, the more accurate and functional they will be. Correct maps will infinitely impact your personal and interpersonal effectiveness far more than any amount of effort expended on changing attitudes and behaviors." [7H, p. 35]. In *The Divine Center* he identifies both correct and incorrect maps. Covey reveals that the true map is the LDS Church and that evangelical Christianity is a false map that limits the personal development of its followers. .... [DC, p. 81] [15]

According to Jackson, "Covey's Mormon-influenced message is given added credence by a mass audience that may still harbour some vague lingering suspicions about Mormonism but recognizes the unqualified success and celebrated loyalty and work ethic of the movement's followers" [14, p. 5]. However, Oliver contends:

Covey almost appears to have deliberately covered his Mormon roots. None of his Mormon published books such as *The Spiritual Roots of Human Relations*, and *The Divine Center*, appear in the "Also by Stephen R. Covey" list found in *The Seven Habits*. Rather large portions of text found in *The Seven Habits* were lifted directly from these other books with little or no change. ... Covey's operative principle is revealed in *The Divine Center*: "I have found in speaking to various non-LDS groups in different cultures that we can teach and testify of many gospel principles

if we are careful in selecting words which convey our meaning but come from their experience and frame of mind. [DC, p. 240]" [16]

### COVEY AND DRUCKER

Mullins points to the influence of Peter Drucker's *The Effective Executive* [17] on Covey's *Seven Habits* [3], especially that "our habitual behaviours come to comprise our character" and that this wisdom is ultimately derived from Aristotle [18]<sup>8</sup>. The terms "habits" and "effective" were "fundamental to Drucker's insights on management" [18] and Covey describes the Seven Habits as "habits of effectiveness" [3, p. 52]. This influence of Drucker is seen clearly in Covey's Habit 3 – Put First Things First – and the title of his sequel to *The Seven Habits*, which is *First Things First* [20]; Drucker stated: "Effective executives do first things first and they do one thing at a time" [17, p. 84].

The influence of Drucker is also seen in Covey's "4 Roles of Leadership" model, which comprises "four qualities of personal leadership – vision, discipline, passion and conscience – *writ large* in an organization":

Modeling (conscience): Set a good example.

Pathfinding (vision): Jointly determine the course.

Aligning (discipline): Set up and manage systems to stay on course.

Empowering (passion): Focus talent on results, not methods, then get out of people's way and give help as requested. [4, p. 114]

### COVEY AND ARISTOTLE

The chapter of *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People* that provides an overview of the 7 Habits begins with a quotation from Aristotle: "We are what we repeatedly do. Excellence, then, is not an act, but a habit" [3, p. 46]. Mullins argues that Covey's work is a "highly innovative and practical application of Aristotelian virtue ethics" [18] while another author argues that the cardinal values can be found in Covey's Seven Habits [21]. While these authors would be able to show how Covey's Seven Habits are related to the virtues articulated in Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, in *The 8<sup>th</sup> Habit* Covey draws on Aristotle's *Rhetorics* when articulating a "philosophy of influence" that also relates to Covey's Habit 2; i.e., Ethos ("model trustworthiness"), Pathos ("seek first to understand") and Logos ("then to be understood") [4, p. 129]. With regard to the 8<sup>th</sup> Habit, Covey states:

Aristotle said, "Where talents and the needs of the world cross, therein lies your vocation." We could say, "Therein lies your passion, your voice" – that which energizes your life and gives you your drive. [4, p. 76]

When Covey refers to "true success and enduring happiness" [3, p. 18], this alludes to Aristotle's highest good, Eudaimonia, which is commonly translated as 'happiness'. However:

Aristotle's own words reinforce the view that his objective is personal success. It is his twelve moral virtues that we can best see the objective toward which he is working, particularly in his choice of the two extremes on either side of each virtue.

<sup>8</sup> Kurzynski [19] argues that "Drucker's management theory is the embodiment of the Aristotelian virtue ethic", but (unlike Aristotle) Drucker maintained that character is not something that can be acquired [19, p. 370].

These extremes provide the clearest measure that the full purpose of his virtues is achieving the ultimate good, eudaimonia, a flourishing life, not necessarily an ethical or virtuous life. [22, p. 3-4]

Human flourishing requires both moral and intellectual virtues. The twelve moral virtues are: Courage, Temperance, Liberality, Magnificence, Magnanimity, Proper ambition, Patience, Truthfulness, Wittiness, Friendliness, Modesty, and Righteous indignation. The nine intellectual virtues are: Technical skill (techne), Scientific knowledge (episteme), Prudence (phronesis), Intelligence (nous), Wisdom (Sophia), Resourcefulness (euboulia), Understanding (sunesis), Judgment (gnome), and Cleverness (deriotes).

Bowden argues that Covey's *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People* emphasizes Aristotle's moral virtues but not his intellectual virtues [22, p. 6]. While moral virtues are developed by habit, intellectual virtues are developed by education/training from natural ability.

## **SERVANT LEADERSHIP AND PATERNALISTIC LEADERSHIP**

The term 'servant-leader' was coined by Robert Greenleaf and the following passage is widely quoted:

The Servant-Leader is servant first. ... It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. ... The best test, and difficult to administer is this: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, and more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society? Will they benefit, or at least not further be harmed? [23, p. 7; 24, p. 1230 ]

The greatest influence on Greenleaf's thinking about servant-leadership was Herman Hesse's "Journey to the East" (1956). Other influences included Albert Camus, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Paulo Freire, and Jesus Christ<sup>9</sup>.

From years of studying Greenleaf's work, Spears [26] identified the following set of ten important servant-leader characteristics: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community [26, p. 27].

In a recent review of the literature, Van Dierendonck identified the following six servant-leadership characteristics: empowering and developing people, humility, authenticity, interpersonal acceptance, providing direction, and stewardship [24, p. 1233].

A number of authors have described Greenleaf's conceptualization of servant-leadership as "a way of life" [27, p. 378] or "a personal orientation toward life which grows from a particular worldview" [28, p. 128]. Wallace argues:

---

<sup>9</sup> Although it is commonly believed that Greenleaf was strongly influenced by religious conviction and scriptural knowledge, Anderson [25] argues that there is little evidence to support this position and by his own admission Greenleaf had little exposure to churches, was not a "pious Christian" and dabbled in diverse religions and religious activities (e.g., Buddhist meditation) [25, p. 7].

Without having a sound, unified worldview that justifies the use of servant leadership; one falls prey to the reality that, ultimately, the reason is either utilitarian/pragmatic or situational. The utilitarian/pragmatic reason contradicts the idea that people are to be viewed as an end as opposed to a means, a key value in servant leadership. If the only reason we use the servant leadership approach is that it causes people to work harder to obtain organizational goals, then we undermine the very theory itself. If we take a purely situational approach, stating servant leadership can only work in certain settings and contexts, we again undermine some of the key values described in the theory. In the situational approach, humans are only to be valued if their culture or personal beliefs align with the theory. Pragmatism and situational ethics both fail as reasons for practicing servant leadership. [28, p. 118]

From a literature review of seven leading leadership styles (moral, ethical, spiritual, servant, charismatic, transformational, and visionary), Hackett and Wang [29] garnered 59 virtues/character traits and then reduced these to a “more parsimonious set of six” which combined Aristotelian and Confucian cardinal virtues: courage, temperance, justice, prudence, humanity and truthfulness<sup>10</sup> [29, p. 883, p. 889, p. 884]. Not only are these six virtues considered cardinal, they are also culturally universal, interact with each other, and are associated with ethical and/or effective leadership traits [29, p. 884].

According to Ayers [30], all major religions share the following views on love: “(a) love possesses great virtue, (b) some forms of love are superior to others, (c) the most altruistic expressions of love are the purest and most spiritual, and (d) supreme love flows from, and is found in, Deity” [30, p. 10]. Agapao (“selfless or altruistic love”) is borne out in the “foremost purpose of the servant leader”, which is “to place authentic value upon people, to affirm their worth, with the goal of building them up” [30, p. 11].

Wong [31] contrasted four different leadership styles in terms of attributes of leader, motive, power, effects; best for: *Autocratic leadership* - Oppressive dictator, control, coercive, fear; [best for] irresponsible, defiant; *Paternalistic leadership* - Benevolent dictator, loyalty, reward, dependence; [best for] dependent, immature; *Laissez-faire leadership* - Detached or weak leader: disengagement, hands-off, independence; [best for] creative, mature; and *Servant leadership* - Empowering and caring, developing workers, inspiring, commitment; [best for] all types of workers [31, p. 9].

Covey indicates that servant leadership involves developing relationships of trust, negotiating win-win performance agreements, setting up the conditions of empowerment before getting out of people’s way, clearing their path and providing help upon request [32; 4, p. 264]. With regard to Wong’s [31] categorisation, consider the following passage from Covey:

I recently attended a football game that demonstrated a magnificent contrast between the servant leadership and benevolent authoritarian styles of management. Both teams had great coaches. But as I watched the game, I could see one coach pacing up and down the sideline, making *every* decision on both offense and defense. In stark contrast, the other coach only got involved in the pivotal decisions, because he had set up a system of empowerment with his assistant coaches. [32; emphasis original]

<sup>10</sup> The four Confucian cardinal virtues are Ren (humanity), Yi (righteousness), Zhi (wisdom) and Xin (truthfulness) [29, p. 883].

## PATERNALISTIC LEADERSHIP

Paternalistic leadership has been defined by Farh and Cheng [33] as “a style that combines strong discipline and authority with fatherly benevolence” [33, 2000, p. 91; cited in 34, p. 567].

Authoritarianism refers to leader behaviours that assert authority and control and demand unquestioning obedience from subordinates. Under authoritarian leadership, subordinates comply and abide by leaders’ requests without dissent.

Benevolence refers to leader behaviours that demonstrate individualized, holistic concern for subordinates’ personal and family well-being. In return, subordinates feel grateful and obliged to repay when the situation allows.

[Morality] depicts leader behaviours that demonstrate superior personal virtues (e.g., does not abuse authority for personal gain, acts as an exemplar in personal and work conduct), which lead subordinates to respect and identify with the leader. [34, p. 573]

To understand the notion of person X acting paternalistically toward person Y by doing (omitting) Z, Dworkin [35] suggests the following conditions :

Z (or its omission) interferes with the liberty or autonomy of Y.

X does so without the consent of Y.<sup>11</sup>

X does so just because Z will improve the welfare of Y (where this includes preventing his welfare from diminishing), or in some way promote the interests, values, or good of Y.

Pellegrini and Scandura [34] argue that “there is abundant theoretical and some empirical literature suggesting that paternalism is strictly and genuinely benevolent and that it is distinct from authoritarianism” [34, p. 569].

In terms of paternalistic leadership, a distinction can be made between ‘authoritarian’ and ‘authoritative’ [36]. Both authoritarian and authoritative paternalism involve control. In authoritarian paternalism, subordinates comply with rules in order to receive rewards or avoid punishment. However, in authoritative paternalism, subordinates comply to rules loyally because of the leader’s benevolence [34, p. 574].

A similar distinction has been made in literature on parenting style and teaching style using the two dimensions of ‘responsiveness’ and ‘demandingness’:

Responsiveness, also described as warmth or supportiveness, is defined as ‘the extent to which parents intentionally foster individuality, self-regulation and assertion by being attuned, supportive, and acquiescent to children’s special needs and demands’.

Demandingness (or behavioural control) refers to ‘the claims parents make on children into the family whole, by their maturity demands, supervision, disciplinary

---

<sup>11</sup> Dworkin [35] states: “The second condition is supposed to be read as distinct from acting against the consent of an agent.”



efforts and willingness to confront the child who disobeys'. [37, p. 62, cited in 38, p. 33]

Four styles are identified: *Uninvolved* – low responsiveness, low demandingness; *Authoritarian* – low responsiveness, high demandingness; *Permissive* – high responsiveness, low demandingness; and *Authoritative* – high responsiveness, high demandingness. In terms of leadership, Dinham distinguished between authoritarian and authoritative as follows:

*Authoritarian* leaders are high on demandingness and expect compliance from all concerned. They have a traditional conception of leadership based on obedience and respect for positional authority and status. They tend not to negotiate or consult with staff, students or the community, but expect their orders to be obeyed without question. ... *Authoritative* leaders are also demanding. They are clear in their expectations of themselves, staff, and students. They communicate high standards and set an example that others seek to emulate. They are assertive, without over-reliance on the rules and sanctions of the authoritarian leader. [38, p. 35-36; emphasis added]

## **JOHN WOODEN: SERVANT LEADER OR PATERNALISTIC LEADER?**

In *Practical Modern Basketball* [9], Wooden quotes from Wilfered A. Peterson's essay, "The Art of Leadership:"

"The leader is a servant. As the Master of Men expressed it, "And whosoever would be chief among you, let him be your servant."

The leader sees through the eyes of his followers.

The leader says, "Let's go!," and leads the way rather than, "Get going!"

The leader assumes his followers are working with him, not for him. ..." [9, p. 5]

Stoll [39] regards Wooden's style of coaching as servant leadership because of the emphasis in his education-driven approach that he put on teaching through vignettes from his Pyramid of Success while he was on the court to develop his player's character. Taylor [40] showed that Wooden's coaching style is consistent with servant leadership, particularly in terms of his "strong affinity towards the growth of people" [40, p. xiii].

A *Sports Illustrated* article in 1964 pointed to paternalistic leadership:

...John Wooden rules with a fatherly concern, a fatherly discipline ("don't let that professorial manner fool you," says one coach, "he can be meaner than two snakes when he wants to be") and a catch-all collection of epigrams like, "I'd rather command respect than demand it," and "It's what you learn after you know it all that counts." [41]

David Halberstam wrote:

[T]here were those who coached against Wooden earlier in his career who thought his moral principles fell a little short of the Pyramid's specifications. In those days he was something of a holy terror. He disciplined his own players harshly, he was known to overheat his gym so that opposing teams would wilt in the fourth quarter,

and he ragged unmercifully not just refs but opposing players. Other coaches naturally disliked this and he did not have an enviable reputation among his peers. The ragging of opposing players, other coaches felt, was simply ugly; ragging referees seemed to pass on a dangerous subliminal message to college students, that if life did not go the way you wanted it to, it was because someone like a referee was whimsically screwing you, and the way to beat it was to try and trick the referee first. But gradually there was a feeling, starting in the mid-fifties, that Wooden was coaching better and attracting better players, and as his teams improved, so finally did his manners.

What other coaches resented about UCLA was the surface purity of Wooden and the more complicated morality of its athletic program. For the articles about Wooden that dealt at length with his virtues rarely mentioned the presence of a man named Sam Gilbert, a wealthy Los Angeles builder and fan of UCLA basketball, who helped with some of the more mundane aspects of bigtime basketball, such as keeping egocentric superstars happy. Gilbert liked to boast that he, not Wooden, really took care of the boys, helping them with their personal problems, helped them find jobs, and helped them with their pro contracts. [42, p. 315]

## LOVE AND CARE

For Wooden, “love” is the most important word in the English language [2, p. 125]. Early in his coaching career, Wooden told his players that he would “like” them all the same but soon found out that he couldn’t like them all equally. It wasn’t until he read a statement by legendary Chicago football coach, Amos Alonzo Stagg, that he better understood coach-player relationships [8, p. 81-82]:

One of my favourite coaches, Amos Alonzo Stagg, once said he never had a player he did not love. He had many he didn’t like and didn’t respect, but he loved them just the same. I hope my players know that I love them all. There are times I didn’t like them. There were times I didn’t like my own children, but it never had anything to do with my love for them. If people want to be basketball players, if they know you care for them, if you’re not a dictator and if you make them feel that they’re working with you, not for you, I don’t know why I couldn’t [coach the same way now that I did when I was coaching]. [7]

On the matter of dictator-style leadership, Wooden stated the following:

I believe there was a difference between General George S. Patton and General Omar Bradley. General Bradley had a great concern for those under his supervision. He knew what had to be done and he wasn’t looking for self-glory. If you saw the movie Patton, you saw a man who acted as a dictator. While I would want him on my side in time of war, I believe we should lead athletes and associates in a different manner. There are coaches out there who won championships with a dictator approach, among them Vince Lombardi and Bobby Knight. I had a different philosophy. I didn’t want to be a dictator to my players or assistant coaches or managers. For me, concern, compassion, and consideration were always priorities of the highest order. [1, p. 117]

A favourite quotation of Wooden’s was: “They won’t care how much you know until they

know how much you care” [43, p. 9]. Through having players fill out questionnaires, he would find out about their family and other personal details such as birthdays [2, p. 63]. One of his UCLA players (1973-1975), Dave Meyers said:

Before practice, he’d often be standing there as we walked onto the court. “How’s your mother, David? Have you called her?” “You over that cold, Jim?” “How’s the math class coming?” He knew us as people. You could tell he cared. [8, p. 218]

Another UCLA player (1970-1973), Swen Nater has written:

After several days of pondering his severe instructional methods, I approached him one weekday morning and requested a private conference. My agenda was to receive some sort of encouragement that would provide motivational fuel to keep me going. ... Coach invited me to sit and talk in his office and I unloaded my frustration. I expressed how much I wanted to learn, become better at my position, and progress, yet how difficult it was to accomplish those goals while knowing I was destined to sit on the bench. To that point in our relationship, his role in my life was that of a sergeant, but that image quickly changed. His demeanor was more like a father. I felt as though I was in the presence of love and understanding, care and empathy. He listened intently with warm, compassionate eyes fixed on mine, something I didn’t expect from a drill sergeant. For that half hour, he made me feel like I was the most important person in the world. [43, p. 6]

When Wooden violated NCCA rules such as bailing players out of jail for minor traffic violations it was because of the love and care he had for his players, who he regarded as family [2, p. 59; 8, p. 83-85]. Up until 1971 he always referred to his players as ‘my boys’ [2, p. 126-127].

#### TEACHER

Wooden believed that “effective leaders are, first and foremost, good teachers” [8, p. 92]. When he started out as a coach in 1933 he was “a leader who couldn’t teach but didn’t know it” [8, p. 93]. For Wooden, the key to teaching is patience and being able to listen to your players [2, p. 146]:

As an impatient first-year coach, I lacked these [teaching] skills and became quickly frustrated at the slow learning curve exhibited by the basketball players on the Dayton Greendevils team. ... I pushed harder and talked louder. Harder and louder were my teaching techniques. When that didn’t work, I started complaining to others about the players’ problems, lack of progress, and inability to learn what I was teaching. ... I am embarrassed to say that during my second week of practice as Dayton’s football coach, I got involved in a fracas with one of the players, a fight, because my teaching skills were so green and my fuse – my patience – so short. [8, p. 95]

#### DISCIPLINARIAN

Wooden admitted to being a disciplinarian, and he said: “There are lots of things I *suggest* my players do, and a few things that I *demand* they do. They learn that I stick by my demands” [44, emphases added]. This statement reflects the fact that over the years he

changed many of his “specific rules and penalties” to “strong suggestions and unspecified consequences”, thus giving him “great discretion” and allowing for “more productive responses to misbehaviour” to “lots of suggestions and fewer rules” [8, p. 170]. In 1969 Wooden said that, “When I got older, I became more tolerant. “I realize I’m not as strict as I used to be, but society isn’t as strict, either” [2, p. 121-122]. Wooden would later regret some of his earlier rigidity regarding rules. For example:

Smoking was cause for immediate dismissals – no questions asked. At South Bend High School, I summarily dismissed a top player from the team for the entire season for smoking. I had a rule. He broke it. ... At the time, I thought this was good, no-nonsense leadership. Of course, it meant I was ignoring extenuating circumstances and ramifications. The boy later quit school because of my actions and lost an athletic scholarship that would have helped him through college. To deprive a young man of a college education because he broke a no-smoking rule is simply inexcusable. I was too inexperienced to understand this.<sup>12</sup> [8, p. 170]

For Wooden the purpose of discipline was to correct, not punish [2, p. 121-122] and he never wanted to harm the dignity of the person being disciplined [2, p. 62]. He believed that criticism should occur when something good has occurred and that only the leader gives criticism [2, p. 173]. When asked about the role of discipline in his success, Wooden replied: “I say a coach has the greatest ally in the world if he isn’t afraid to use it, and that’s the bench. Put him on the bench. They all love to play” [7].

He once made Willie Naulls [UCLA, 1953-1956], who was trying for the conference scoring title, sit out a whole game because he had been late getting to the field house. And this year he didn’t start Hazzard against Army because [he] had been tardy for a training meal. [44]

Being on time was one of the ‘rules’ in a list entitled, “Normal Expectations”, that Wooden handed to all his players<sup>13</sup>. It can be seen that this list is based heavily on his Pyramid of Success.

Swen Nater explains the principle of “earned and deserved” in Wooden’s rule on tardiness:

Coach Wooden’s rule on tardiness – that he had the *option* to dismiss us from practice, with each situation and player judged differently – was a clear statement of his reasoning. ... We all liked this system and preferred it to one in which rules

---

<sup>12</sup> Wooden started smoking while he was in the service during World War II. During his early days as a coach, Wooden would smoke regularly but only during the off-season. In 1955, he quit for good [2, p. 72; 6, p. 103; 45].

<sup>13</sup> “Our chances of having a successful team may be in direct proportion to the ability of each player to live up to the following sets of suggestions. 1. Be a gentleman at all times; 2. Be a team player always; 3. Be on time whenever time is involved; 4. Be a good student in all subjects – not just in basketball; 5. Be enthusiastic, industrious, loyal, and cooperative; 6. Be in the best possible condition – physically, mentally and morally; 7. Earn the right to be proud and confident; 8. Keep emotions under control without losing fight or aggressiveness; 9. Work constantly – improve without becoming satisfied; 10. Acquire peace of mind by becoming the best you are becoming; 11. Never criticize, nag or razz a teammate; 12. Never miss or be late for any class or appointment; 13. Never be selfish, jealous, envious or egotistical; 14. Never expect favors; 15. Never waste time; 16. Never alibi or make excuses; 17. Never require repeated criticism for the same mistake; 18. Never lose faith or patience; 19. Never grandstand, loaf, sulk, or boast; 20. Never have reason to be sorry afterward.

The player who gives his best is sure of success, while who gives less than his best is a failure.” [2, p. 124]

and consequences were presented at the beginning of the season and, no matter who you were or what you had done, the rule determined what the consequences were to be. [43, p. 16-17; emphasis original]

As times changed, so did Wooden's dress code for his players on the road [2, p. 97; 8, p. 87]. Also on the road, he used to have bed checks but by 1971 he asked his players to come up with a reasonable curfew [2, 121]. One of his UCLA players (1969-1971), Steve Patterson, said:

"He is flexible on the basketball floor, but he seemed inflexible when he interfered with our private lives. It was a grandfatherly approach, but we resented it. We were out in the public eye so much that people would call him and say we were seen in a bar with a girl. ... He said we weren't taking care of ourselves. He said we were victims of a permissive society. He'd lock us in hotel rooms the night before games." [2, p. 68]

Even in 1972 Wooden did not permit long hair: "When it gets too long, it can get in the way in the court. It can flop down in a player's eyes, and it is an unnecessary handicap" [2, p. 122]. However, he did allow contemporary sideburns: "But I know these men have to live off the court, too, and sometimes they take pressure from the friends, so I have relaxed my standards a little" [2, p. 122]. The most well known stories about Wooden and his rules concern UCLA player (1972-1974) Bill Walton's dress and hair length; less well known is Walton asking Wooden for permission to smoke marijuana after a game:

By his senior year his UCLA team had won two championships in two years; and some of the players were clearly restless with Wooden's rules and pieties. Some of the seniors, including Walton and his close friend Greg Lee, were challenging the dress code and hair length. Practices were a little different from the past, perhaps not as intense. After all, two championships down, one to go, this was clearly the best team in the country. After all, Wooden told friends, these were modern players, different from the players of the past, less automatically accepting of regimentation. Perhaps it was important to be more flexible, and though he did not like it, Wooden bent somewhat. In his senior year Walton talked with Wooden about his need to smoke marijuana after a game. He asked for permission to go back to his motel or his apartment after a big game and smoke. He needed this, he said, to relax. It took him hours to come down from the excitement of competition. Wooden said he was absolutely against it. Walton insisted; he was so tense after a game it was costing him sleep and affecting his readiness for succeeding games. Finally, reluctantly, Wooden had given his permission. All right, he had said, but don't tell your teammates about it. It was an important moment: Walton was so good that the rules did not apply. For much of the season Wooden benched Greg Lee; other players on the team believed that Lee was benched for Walton's sins. ... Later he publicly blamed himself for becoming lax in dress and practice regimen; it had led, he told associates, to lack of discipline on court. [42, p. 318-319]

## ASSISTANTS

In Wooden's autobiography, Wilfred A. Peterson is quoted: "A leader is interested in finding the best way – not in having his own way" [6, p. 119]. Wooden believed that the leader

should make the final decision, but that the suggestions and ideas of others should be taken into account [1, p. 145]. One of his assistants Denny Crum, who was a UCLA player 1956-1959 said:

He never thought his way was the only way. ... His approach was to listen; if he thought it made sense, try it. If it works, great. If not, move on. He was always searching for ways to improve. ... He was open to suggestion and contrary thoughts, but he was tough. You had to know your stuff to convince him to change. He never did something on a whim. [8, p. 104-105]

The events of the 1962 season were pivotal in Wooden's development as a coach and he made changes not only from his own "reflections and research", but also "the minds of others" [8, p. 203]. Of particular importance was a conversation on the plane ride back from the NCAA Final Four competition with assistant coach Jerry Norman [8, p. 199]:

Shortly after he announced his retirement in 1975, in the aftermath of his final title run, Wooden confided to a young alumnus that he had blundered badly early in his career by associating too much with yes-men. "Whatever you do in life, surround yourself with smart people who'll argue with you," he said. Wooden didn't mention any names, but he was tipping his hat to one smart, argumentative assistant coach in particular. ... Jerry Norman...argued that a full-court, man-to-man defense forces the opponent to advance the ball with the dribble, which chews up time. ... Wooden eventually concluded that he had erred in not using a zone press earlier. ... [T]he zone press, Wooden came to realize, had additional virtues. It built morale and promoted cohesion. ... "People say he didn't have the horses before us," says [Jack] Hirsch. "No – he didn't win because he wasn't a great coach. He was a good coach who filled in all the blanks." Wooden agrees. "We'd have had a little better chance in earlier years," he says, "if I'd have known a little more." [46]

Biographer Neville Johnson stated that "Wooden leaned heavily upon and learned from his assistant coaches" [2, p. 43]. Jerry Norman (UCLA player, 1949-1952; assistant coach, 1960-1968) saw Wooden's strengths as "a great practice organizer", "a great practice coach", "a great fundamentals coach", and he knew "how to relate to the players for the most part" [2, p. 404]. Norman's primary contributions were on the technical and strategic side of the game and also recruiting [2, p. 404]. Wooden himself said: "I felt that the assistants would help me in overcoming my own weaknesses" [2, p. 44]:

There is no area of basketball in which I am a genius. None. Tactically and strategically I'm just average, and this is not offering false modesty. We won national championships while I was coaching at UCLA because I was above average in analyzing players, getting them to fill roles as part of a *team*, paying attention to fundamentals to details, and working well with others, both those under my supervision and those whose supervision I was under. Additionally, I enjoyed very hard work. [1, p. 113; emphasis original]

What Wooden articulated about his assistants resonates with Peter Drucker's wisdom:

Andrew Carnegie, the father of the U.S. steel industry, chose for his own tombstone:

‘Here lies a man who knew how to bring into his service men better than he was himself.’ ... Each of these steel executives was a ‘better man’ in one specific area and for one specific job. Carnegie, however, was the effective executive among them. [17, p. 61]

Drucker indicated that effective executives concentrate on making the important decisions [17, p. 95].

## CONCLUSION

Drawing on a *Sports Illustrated* article [46], a blogger by the name of Brian Virtue argues that early in his coaching career Wooden was “too tied to tradition, to his methods, and to the security of being the only one with a say” and that he did not become a great coach “until he began to understand and embody what it means to be a servant leader”. Brian Virtue believes that what is accounted in this article is “John Wooden’s *journey* towards servant leadership” [47, emphasis added].

It could be argued that Wooden was a paternalistic leader. In terms of two of the three dimensions from Farh and Cheng’s [33] model - benevolence and morality - Wooden had holistic concern for his players’ well-being and he was an exemplar in virtuous behaviour which earned the respect of his players. What about the third dimension of Farh and Cheng’s [33] model - authoritarianism? In terms of Aycan’s [36] model, Wooden’s leadership could be categorised as being authoritative rather than authoritarian paternalism; i.e., control with benevolence. Furthermore, using Dinham’s [38] distinction between authoritarian and authoritative leadership, Wooden (at least later in his career) could be categorised as authoritative because he consulted with his assistant coaches, communicated high standards and set an example for his players to follow, and did not rely too much on the rules and sanctions of the authoritarian leader.

## REFERENCES

1. Wooden, J. and Jamison, S., *Wooden: A Lifetime of Observations and Reflections On and Off the Court*, Contemporary Books, Chicago, IL, 1997.
2. Johnson, N., *The John Wooden Pyramid of Success: The Biography, Oral History, Philosophy and Ultimate Guide to Life, Leadership, Friendship and Love of the Greatest Coach in the History of Sports*, Rev. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., Cool Titles, Los Angeles, CA, 2004.
3. Covey, S.R., *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People*, Simon & Schuster, London, 2004. (1st edition published in 1989).
4. Covey, S.R., *The 8th Habit: From Effectiveness to Greatness*, Simon & Schuster, London, 2004.
5. Justino, Path of a Leader, <http://pathofaleader.blogspot.co.uk/2010/11/less-is-more-7-habits-vs-pyramid-of.html>
6. Wooden, J. and Tobin, J., *They Call Me Coach*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 2004.
7. Academy of Achievement, Interview: John Wooden Basketball’s Coaching Legend, 27 February 1996, <http://www.achievement.org/autodoc/page/woo0int-1>
8. Wooden, J. and Jamison, S., *Wooden on Leadership*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 2005.
9. Wooden, J.R., *Practical Modern Basketball*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1980.
10. Wooden, J., John Wooden’s Pyramid of Success Lecture, in: Johnson, N., *The John Wooden Pyramid of Success: The Biography, Oral History, Philosophy and Ultimate Guide to Life, Leadership, Friendship and Love of the Greatest Coach in the History of Sports*, Rev. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., Cool Titles, Los Angeles, CA, 2004, 160-171.
11. Dahlsgaard, K., Peterson, C. and Seligman, M.E.P., Shared Virtue: The Convergence of Valued Human Strengths Across Culture and History, *Review of General Psychology*, 2005, 9(3), 203-213.



12. MacIntyre, A., *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, IA, 1984.
13. Covey, S.R., *Principle-Centered Leadership: A Philosophy for Life and for Success in Business*, Simon & Schuster, London, 1992/1990.
14. Jackson, B., *Management Gurus and Management Fashions*, Routledge, London, 2001.
15. Gordon, B., A Closer Look at Stephen Covey and His 7 Habits, <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/news/2272225/posts>
16. Oliver, T., Covey's Paradigm for Success, <http://www.watchman.org/lds/coveyparadigmsuccess.htm>
17. Drucker, P., *The Effective Executive*, Heinemann, London, 1967.
18. Mullins, A., Stephen Covey: Reviving the Forgotten Notion of Virtue, [http://www.mercatornet.com/articles/view/stephen\\_covey\\_reviving\\_the\\_forgotten\\_notion\\_of\\_virtue](http://www.mercatornet.com/articles/view/stephen_covey_reviving_the_forgotten_notion_of_virtue)
19. Kurzynski, M., Peter Drucker: Modern Day Aristotle for the Business Community, *Journal of Management History*, 2009, 15(4), 357-374.
20. Covey, S.R., Merrill, A.R. and Merrill, R.R., *First Things First: Coping with the Ever-Increasing Demands of the Workplace*, Simon & Schuster, London, 1994.
21. Eternal Word Television Network, The Stephen Covey Phenomenon – An Evangelization Opportunity, <http://ewtn.com/library/business/covey.htm>
22. Bowden, P., Virtue Ethics, Aristotle and Organisational Behaviour, Australian Association for Professional and Applied Ethics, 12th Annual Conference, Adelaide, 28-30 September, 2005, <http://w3.unisa.edu.au/hawkeinstitute/gig/aapae05/documents/bowden-virtue.pdf>
23. Greenleaf, R.K., *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*, Paulist Press, New York, NY, 2002.
24. van Dierendonck, D., Servant Leadership: A Review and Synthesis, *Journal of Management*, 2011, 37(4), 1228-1261.
25. Anderson, J., The Writings of Robert K. Greenleaf: An Interpretive Analysis and the Future of Servant Leadership, Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, May 2008, [http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl\\_proceedings/2008/anderson.pdf](http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/2008/anderson.pdf)
26. Spears, L.C., Character and Servant Leadership: Ten Characteristics of Effective, Caring Leaders, *The Journal of Virtues & Leadership*, 2010, 1(1), 25-30.
27. Parris, D.L. and Peachey, J.W., A Systematic Literature Review of Servant Leadership Theory in Organizational Context, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 2013, 113, 377-393.
28. Wallace, J.R., Servant Leadership: A Worldview Perspective, *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2007, 2(2), 114-132.
29. Hackett, R.D. and Wang, G., Virtues and Leadership: An Integrating Conceptual Framework Founded in Aristotelian and Confucian Perspectives on Virtues, *Management Decision*, 2012, 50(5), 868-899.
30. Ayers, M.R., Agapao in Servant Leadership, Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, May 2008, School of Global Leadership & Entrepreneurship, Regent University, [http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl\\_proceedings/2008/ayers.pdf](http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/2008/ayers.pdf)
31. Wong, P.T.P., An Opponent-Process Model of Servant Leadership and a Typology of Leadership Styles, Servant Leadership Roundtable, 2003, <http://twu.ca/academics/graduate/leadership/servant-leadership/servant-leadership-roundtable-typology.pdf>
32. Covey, S.R., New Wine, Old Bottles, *Executive Excellence*, 1994, Dec, 3-4.
33. Farh, J.L. and Cheng, B.S., A Cultural Analysis of Paternalistic Leadership in Chinese Organizations, in: Li, J.T., Li, A.S. and Weldon, E., *Management and Organizations in the Chinese Context*, Macmillan, London, 2000, 84-127.
34. Pellegrini, E.K. and Scandura, T.A., Paternalistic Leadership: A Review and Agenda for Future Research, *Journal of Management*, 2008, 34(3), 566-593.
35. Dworkin, G., Paternalism, *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/paternalism/>

36. Aycan, Z., Paternalism: Towards Conceptual Refinement and Operationalization, in: Yang, K.S., Hwang, K.K. and Kim, U., eds., *Scientific Advances in Indigenous Psychologies: Empirical, Philosophical, and Cultural Contributions*, Sage, London, 2006, 445-466.
37. Baumrind, D., The Influence of Parenting Style on Adolescent Competence and Substance Abuse, *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 1991, 11(1), 62.
38. Dinham, S., Authoritative Leadership, Action Learning and Student Accomplishment, Asturalian Council for Educational Research, 2007, [http://research.acer.edu.au/research\\_conference\\_2007/3](http://research.acer.edu.au/research_conference_2007/3)
39. Stoll, S.K., Dr. Sharon Kay Stoll on John Wooden, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UCOYxqsxTwg>
40. Taylor, T., *The Servant Leadership of John Wooden*, Ph.D. Thesis, Pepperdine University, 2008.
41. Underwood, J., Five Midgets and a Wink at Nell, *Sports Illustrated*, 24 February, <http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/vault/article/magazine/MAG1075670/index/index.htm>
42. Halberstam, D., *The Breaks of the Game*, Ballantine Books, New York, 1981.
43. Nater, S. and Gallimore, R., *You Haven't Taught Until They Have Learned: John Wooden's Teaching Principles and Practices*, Fitness Information Technology, Morgantown, VA, 2006.
44. Cave, R., Wizards in the Land of Oz, *Sports Illustrated*, 19 March, 1962, <http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/vault/article/magazine/MAG1073621/index.htm>
45. Wolff, A., The Coach and His Champion, *Sports Illustrated*, 3 April, 1989, <http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/vault/article/magazine/MAG1068223/index.htm?eref=sisf>
46. Wolff, A., Birth of a Dynasty, *Sports Illustrated*, 19 March 2007, <http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/vault/article/magazine/MAG1108718/index.htm>
47. Virtue, B., Reflections on John Wooden, <http://www.brianvirtue.org/2010/06/reflections-on-john-wooden/>

