



## PRINCIPLE

### 7

# LEVEL 5 LADER

*Jim Collins said Five leaders and among them 'Level5' caught my attentions (in the book of Good to Great, © 2001). Other 1-4 levels of leader are known to us already:*

a) Capable Individual, b) Team member, c) Manager, and d) leader. He called it Executive for the level5 leader.

Also Daniel Pink wrote three kinds of leadership in his book, DRIVE (© 2009). These two books are similar: Pink wrote it in chronically, e.g, Primitive era to today. As already know 'Stick and Carrots' leadership, then 'managing leadership.' Now it is in giving autonomy leadership. He stressed that this old leaderships do not work anymore.

But Jim Collins found five levels of leadership through his research, and wrote in his book, Good to Great. He studied about 1,400 CEOs in the world so he and his team, actually graduate students at Stanford University, concluded in a word Humility/Professional which became the key concept of Level5 leader. I am using this leadership in my ministry right now. I am so grateful to his findings that gave us these invaluable insights.

This is what I got, in my paraphrasing, from his concept. As much we are bigger leaders, we need both, Humility/Professional definitely. In the mean time I found why it, these two' concept, and just these two are both sides of one

coin. We need these two sides clearly and completely. They are totally complimented each other.

Let's look at more in details. If we are only in humility person, people tend to neglect us. That's the people, human being. No blame on them. That's natural! In the other hands, if we are only being a professional, only have this side of gesture, behavior, people don't like us and feeling business-like, and cold-oriented. Even jealous toward us and envy as well.

But once we have both in humility and also in professional, people see us good and nicely, not neglected but respect us, because we are very humble and also very professional. That was Jim Collins and his team found from research.

Can we talk a bit more?; my personal story. I was actually humble man which means was born in the poor family at very countryside. My father was shoes repairman, and mother was just ordinary housewife. My elementary and junior high school at country which was very poor teaching. At high school also was not formal nice school, but commercial school which focused on the getting job after graduated. I also failed a few times to enter more higher schools, finally jumped into a small theological school not formal university. Whatever, I was generally poor person, so must be humbled automatically. People like me, but not that much capable-person, just ordinary person, and I cannot overcome this short-coming on myself.

Fortunately, really by God's grace with through this ministry, actually since meeting Dr. Melvin, my life is totally changed, somewhat became professional. I was very humble because I did not have much like others. But slowly, I got confident in myself. People know now I am professional in my area, e.g., Lay Pastors Ministry!

Now I am clearly understand what that mean of being a Level 5 leader; Humility/Professional. How about you? Are you having these two concepts in your life? I think I am now getting bigger than what I am. I need more in humility and more in professional, not for my own reputation, but for giving honor to Dr. Melvin, and ultimately to God. I want to be more closed person in this both area and hopefully ended up my life with satisfaction.

Big fish in the small pond. In the any organizations, any ministries, there are some people those who are very competent. They tend to think always: "Do I have to stay here more longer?" So once the organization, or ministry is not growing, not expansion, they can leave there any time! Because they are big fish, and uncomfortable to stay in the small pond. So only two options for us as a leader: to let them leave here, or to make the organization getting bigger. Definitely the latter is more wise option and definitely it's totally up to us, as a

top leader.

In the case of our Institute, those moments were there for a couple of times. In the beginning, actually, fish was small and pond was small as well, so no problem at all. And a few years later, e.g., exactly two years later big fishes came into our pond. And our pond was upgrading slowly and getting bigger pond helping by them, and expanded internationally, so big fish in our pond were satisfied with it slowly. I think they decided not to leave our Institute, because they think that they can grow in our pond, and pond became more and more bigger, just like river and later on it became just like ocean.

And something happened, that is the third stage. Just small fish those who started this institute couldn't survive in the big pond now. They are shrink and they might think to leave here and thinking by themselves, "I don't need to stay here any more, in this big pond." That's sad. So, some left and some is still with us but they are in a little behind the scene, behind the screen automatically. As a top leader, I can't keep them both, big and small fish in the one pond. That is challenged for me to manage this.

I found three ponds in the Kenya presently as well. LPM Kenya, LPM Seminary, and Melvin University. So it's good for people to put for them at proper place among those three different ponds.

Determined and loosen. This is related to our leadership as a level 5 leader: humble/professional. I think we better to be soft than harsh as a top leader, but once it's time to decide, we have to express something unusual, and actually it's better to determined than loosen as usual.

For instance, I have used illustration about sprinters and marathoners. Sometimes we need to run just like splinters, but at other times, we haven't to run so fast, and we need just like marathoner. So we have to figure out what we need for speed now, and we have to take an action which means to determination if we do figure out the timely demanding, then we can be a good leader, and not determined leader, then many things will be distorted!

Centralized and Decentralized. Many people in today's church, especially people in the lay ministry are saying "decentralized," NOT centralized in the ministry. Yes, definitely in the PACE ministry, it should be decentralized of management. Also Dr. Melvin stressed it in his two books.

But in the other side, there are many things which are centralized, and many characters in the Bible have that. Of course many churches including Koreans have changed a lot last two decades. Mostly are decentralized in the system internally, but there should be centralized in some parts, some areas.

Let's back to our ministry LPM. There are two styles in existence: For instance Headquarter of LPMI USA is in New Jersey, and it is a kind of control tower, e.g., managing the ministry all over the world. Main idea is centralized

from there. Not only there, but in LPM Korea is same as well. Headquarter, e.g., my role as a national leader is very important. Actually, 3-4 people including me are have main idea, leading group, main resources-developers, kind of R/D is from the HQ.

So the best way to do these is that Managing-centralized, but Ministry itself is decentralized.

Time to jump up. I think there are two cases to upgrade: upgrade a bit at same ministry or/and totally changed from the bottom. For our case, shift Seminary to University. So A little easier but in the other hand totally different from previous and very hard.

Sometimes we need to jump-up our ministry. For jump-up, we need energy to push-up. Of course we can't jump up in the one morning. We need to prepare for it. How about for a few months ahead of time, but depend on how big jump-up it is. What do we need? We need some energy which is saved, called ACCUMULATION and momentum, so it should be impelling force, in the other word Compelling force.

If we look at Jim Collins book, God to Great, we need to keep in mind of "Hedgehog Concept" which means focus totally on the ONE Thing with energy from individually and also team's resources, and keep in going in the time of close to jump up, we know the time to jump up. If we don't have enough energy to jump up, it does not work. Maybe people will get hurts because they are not ready, it's totally leader's responsible to prepared it. I think there will be a few times to jump up, or just one or two opportunities, so we have to use that opportunity nicely to make it.

In our case for shifting to University now, I think around December is the time of jump up. Now, mean while, we are preparing for now, making a lot of leverages, a lot of meetings of Steering Committee in Kenya. I found most of organizations could not jump up what they wanted to make it. Why? Not ready, so give up too early and too often so people around frustrated again and over again, so they did not trust their leader and also the organization as well. To fail of one or two times are acceptable to people, but more than that, more than often, they will turn off and leave in the end. That's ours, leaders's problem. I mean quality of leader is something shortage.

Yes we are running and moving our organizations smooth, but sometimes we need to determine to jump up, putting something up into there. At the final stage, I mean in the moment of jumping up, we need to be cult-like culture. People are hesitating even to the end of that moment, even a few seconds right before it happened. That's a people. In some way all of our effort last few years, few months we have done is actually doing for this moment. Am I correct? We can't to jump up in the one morning, many efforts should be

done last months or years, but the jumping moment will be taking only a few seconds, so, long way to prepare but ump up for a few seconds.

Culture is related to commitment. This is directly related to the church culture. If the church is good, the church will grow. Because a good culture accommodates everything. Lay Pastors Ministry is pursuing a healthy and good church-oriented. Culture is related to commitment. Finally, team ministry. Team ministry here is not referring to pastors and pastoral staff, but laypeople and laypeople, people to people. They have to have the team spirit, and so partners in ministry with their senior pastor and team concept among laypeople. That is not only YOU and ME, but the 'WE' concept has to be there.

I have read one book, "Me to We," because of the title that attracted my attention, so I bought, read, and also translated into Korean. The content was a dialogue between an old pastor and a young pastor. The young pastor has struggled with his church ministry, so the old pastor, I guess experienced pastor, advised him from Ephesians, to equip the saints for the work of ministry.

Partners in Ministry. I used to ask at the beginning of my teachings on lay pastoral care, "Do you think of yourselves and your pastors as 'partners in ministry?'" Not even one elder, deacons, deaconesses and other laypeople thinks about being partners in ministry. Most see themselves only as helpers who assist their pastors in doing their ministry.

Pastors think the same way church members are their helpers, assisting them in their ministry. This old way of thinking leaves churches, the Korean Church included, with minimal growth and in need of revival and spiritual maturity. Something needs to change.

Some pastors and church members are changing. One large church in downtown Seoul has taken the motto for the New Year, THE CHURCH OF PARTNERS IN MINISTRY. It is already known as a discipleship-making church. James Garlow, pastor of Skyline Wesleyan Church in San Diego, California wrote the book, Partners in Ministry (1998). The list of churches include the six-thousand-member Hallelujah Church in Seoul, where Dr. David Kim started a Lay Ministry Academy in 1990, and the Frazer Memorial United Methodist Church in Montgomery, Alabama, which has over 5,000 members engaged in various ministries.

Many internationally known individuals and parachurch organizations are committed to lay-clergy partnership: Dr. Paul Stevens, professor at Regent University, Vancouver, BC, Canada; Professor Greg Ogden, Fuller Seminary, Pasadena, California wrote, The New Reformation, in 1990; Dr. Robert Slocum (layman) wrote a book for laypeople, Maximize your Ministry(1990) Dr. Melvin J. Steinbron brought laity and clergy into partnership for congregational care by developing The Lay Pastors Ministry in 1978 in College Hill Presbyterian Church,

Cincinnati, Ohio. There are many more.

More Thirsty. Thirsty fish on the ground are looking for the way to discover water more and more diligently, more stronger, more harder, more widely, more deeply, and more urgently.

Just like that for making University is more and more stressful, more demanding emotionally, physically, psychologically. But I am finding that is difficulty to me but in some sense it makes me growing and growing. Without those challenges, we can't grow. Not only growing itself, I can't think of people a bit more deeply and also thinking of God's work, God Himself more and more deeply, personally, and His control in our ministry.

Life Philosophy and Purpose. There is a saying that people gather after seeing the leader's "philosophy of life." But getting together and cooperating or helping is different, which is that there must be a clear purpose.

For example, many people gather for Rev. Billy Graham. Because they heard about his life philosophy. But when they come here, what happens if they don't his purpose? They will disperse again.

Why are we together, dedicated, and sacrificed? That is because the purpose is clear.

When we gather, we gain strength. We shouldn't be alone. There are many differences between the energy we have alone, and the energy we create together. If you look at people who have done a great job in the ministry or in other fields, so-called cooperative energy has been transformed into a force and power. We need to bring that energy and power together.

There will always be these two things in the ministry, inside or outside the church. Is the philosophy of the life of a pastor/leader recognized by many people and well known? And when they get closer, is the purpose clear? Is it clear that the church's unique purpose, that is, the purpose God gave to it?

There is the American Institute of Auxano, a young pastor who studied from Dallas Theological Seminary, and he wrote a book called CHURCH UNIQUE (by Willis Mancini). The core of the book is that each church has a clear purpose given by God, and it must be discovered and polished to maximize it.

Setting a purpose is not simple and not as easy as well. I think we are about setting one of the most important purposes in one's life. Anyway, no matter how good a person is, it will be difficult to have a good partner without a clear purpose. The purpose should also be to have tangible results. It is difficult for those who cooperate and help to be together forever. However, in order to be together in the long run, visible and tangible consequences are essential.

Some people express their purpose in this way. It's likened to a convex lens,

which we've done when we were young. When the sunlight passes through the convex lens, hot heat is collected in one place and the paper burns.

The purpose is the same as the role of these convex lenses. When the purpose is clear, people join forces and commit themselves. However, if the purpose is unclear, people will disperse, as if the convex lens is removed and the heat is not collected.

The work of the Lord, and the great things must not be gathered alone, and the energy and power created together will be exerted when there is a purpose to maximize and create synergy. In other words, it is essential to have a good philosophy of life, and it is up to the leader to clarify the purpose.

Mindset. Dr. Carol Dweck, psychology professor at Stanford University, wrote the book *Mindset: the New Psychology of Success* (@ 2006, 2016), and I read it a few years ago, and read it again for writing it in this book.

Its main concept was that everything is depend on our mind-set, e.g., how we think of what we are. She studied many students at Stanford University and found from them in two kinds of students: One group was only believe their intellectual, so they were excellent students once they came into Stanford. Another group was those students whom were really ordinary, especially intellectually, so on.

But interestingly, as time going, the first group those who were excellent intellectually were shrinking slowly, and after all they were in the less level at their classroom, but the second group of students were try hard to overcome their short-coming, so they were growing and growing, and at last they become the leading group in the same classroom.

That's why Carol concluded the MIND-SET is really important for our personal lives. As you read whole of her book, nearly most of them are talking about mindset. I never used the term 'mindset' in the past, but actually all things are depends on our mindset, isn't it? I hope you to read the book and think of it in relating to the concept of mindset which Carol said.

Yes, we are encountering time to jump up. We can't and don't need to jump in every time, but the time is coming to jump up. Once we are about to jump up, we need many resources which means we need extraordinary energy, at times, we need enormous leverages to lift up, e.g., to push up. What do we need then? The author of *Good to Great*, Jim Collins says "Hedgehog Concept" in this case. Yes, I agree with him, but we need more in our particular situation. First, consenting of the people involved in; Second, saving energy what we called 'synergy' in that moment; Third, sufficient reasons for why 'now,' so on. Is Win-win the best? At business and work, Win-Win are what everyone pursues, and they also think and teach that it is the best. But is that true?

In the Bible, was Jesus a win-win? Jesus made a loose-win composition by

sacrificing himself on the cross. "I'm sacrificed, and they're saved." So if they're doing well, satisfied, and unhurt, rather, isn't loose-win right? Do I have to win?

As I come to Kenya and run the school, I continue to make myself aware that there must be endless negotiations and constant concession.

There are two challenges at the moment. On the outside, they are financial sponsors of the school from all over the world. The other thing is internally, the school staff, the university committee, etc. It is a series of continuous challenges. In this situation, there are three options: win-win, win-lose, and loose-win. Is the notion that I live only when I die too cliché?

The best is Win-Win, but this is just an ideal. The next option is to go to a compromise of 50:50. There is not 100 percent satisfied with both sides. Finished with 50% satisfaction. But the shared progress is 100 percent energy commitment.

In the end, it came to the conclusion that loose-win, so "I have to lose, and they win." So win-win can be just a nice slogan in some ways.

The giver has it. Wheat grains live when they fall to the ground. Is the word altruism necessary here?

I've had CPE a long time ago (although I'm now in a position to train students here), and most of the students then was self-centered, our advisor(supervisor) pointed out. In particular, I used to feel that altruism was absolute in the caring ministry.

Good personalities. Statistics show that 95% of people who subscribe to life insurance are moved by the personality of insurance agents rather than the insurance content itself.

Some people are good at sales, but many are not. In fact, such sales, or insurance. In addition, there are many cases of hesitation to buy things. I'd say I'm part of that kind.

When I was a seminary student, I had experience in sales as a part-time job. I've sold books and sold things. I wanted to earn my tuition. Furthermore, I had no experience in the field. In the end, I couldn't sell any. I found it very difficult to sell something to a complete stranger.

I think it reminds us that "rapport" is important in words that we know well. It also means mutual understanding, trust and cooperation. Rev. Melvin, who motivated the establishment of Melvin University, also wrote about this in a letter to lay pastors. What he's talking about is good rapport. It was said to be a tool to open each other's hearts, but he expressed harmony, familiarity, and even similarity.

Personality that makes others feel bad, personality that doesn't care about other people's rights, personality that always disagrees, personality that always creates discord. It is said that there is an enough chance of failure in this



nature. On the other hand, people who are good at negotiating with others and harmonize are more likely to succeed. In other words, it is very important to develop personality and character.

I've read Stephen Covey's book a few times over again. His conclusion was about characters. To emphasize this, in many ways, I have heard many illustrations.

Can a good personality be developed? I think it's possible. I think that personality and attitude can change, even if personality does not change. Furthermore, I think this is one of the reasons for studying and training. Usually, when you look at people with bad personalities, you find that they were not like that, but they are because of the situation and environment. Of course, it's often used by students, but there's a saying called Teachable! It is a concept used as a person who can be taught or as a person who accepts teaching well. When selecting staff from a team, they also use the initials FAT: Faithful, Available, and Teachable.

Then why is a good personality so important? First, it is very beneficial to yourself. There are times when you don't, and you become very hurtful to yourself. Therefore, it naturally appears in relationships with others, causing double wounds. Furthermore, the number of people suffering from triple and quadruple work increases as they show distorted expressions and behavior in all relationships. How sad it is for us to live in harm's way when we are supposed to help people!

Integrity of leader. Let's look at the meaning of the keyword, 'integrity': "the quality of being honest and having strong moral principles." I think this is the correct definition of it. There are two qualities: 1) being honest; 2) strong morality. Those two are the necessary qualities of the leader. People want to see their leader as an integrated person, so if the leader lacks these qualities they might be disappointed about their leader. On top of that, they might not forgive their leader for the lack of integrity.

Once we see the leader, we want them to get action according to their word, also to get word according to their action. Then we will put the label, "the man of integrity."

If so, what's the standard of integrity? Lack of enough? We cannot pretend to be integrated, and it is a natural appearance from word to action, from teaching to doing it.

People want their leader to be an example to follow. There are many qualities of being a leader. But here the critical quality is "integrity." As we know that human beings are not perfect, and leaders are not perfect people as well. We accept the limitations of human beings, and we forgive their faults and mistakes from time to time, but the issue here is that are they being honest

about their faults? or not. Trying to protect themselves? or open their heart? and accept or refuse their wrong doings? If they don't, people will not forgive. People are ready to forgive, but will close down once to be found leaders are not honest.

When are they trapped in this quality? Mostly money. Many pastors in the world, even in the States and in Korea, are trapped in greedy money. As a leader we have to be careful whether "greedy money," or "serve God." In the Magna Carta of the Lay Pastors Ministry, I Peter 5:2, "not greedy money (dishonest gain) but eager to serve (God)." This is a really good point.

Melvin wrote about 'integrity' at PACE Training Manual: 1) To possess integrity is to be incapable of compromising that which we believe to be true. 2) To possess integrity is to have a kind of inner strength which prevents us from bending to the influence of what is thought expedient or fashionable. 3) It is the inner steadfastness and an outward honesty, and suggests a wholeness upon which such consistency is founded.

Personal growth and organizational leadership. No matter what organization or institution it is, there is bound to be a leader. He needs two things, then the organization believes that it can succeed. But there is a book that clearly shows two things. One was Stephen Covey's Seven Habits, and the other was Jim Collins' Good to Great. Readers may have better resources, but personally, two books were useful.

First, the Good to Great book was published after researched a number of successful companies around the world, using the term Disciplined Thought, which ultimately boils down to two things. One is that even if there were difficulties in reality, they continued to push ahead. The other is that it focuses on the most important thing. So by leading the company, they were able to create eleven great companies out of hundreds of successful, good companies.

On the other hand, Stephen Covey's book is about developing good character and good personality. In a way, I came to the conclusion that good character is good in human relations, but that is not enough to succeed and lead a good organization or institution.

It's not bad to be named "He's such a nice guy". However, if the meaning of 'no ability' is implied in it, it cannot be accepted only as a compliment. It's a nuance that it's not enough. I am concerned about this.

I think the relationship between individual growth and organizational leadership has this relationship. So Stephen Covey's book is so good, but it will be the additional attraction if the corresponding leadership is developed.

This is also an inevitable task for a leader. The problem will be how individual growth harmonizes with the leadership of the organization and

creates synergy. It is natural to have both. In a word, it can be described as "a humble person with expertise." Professional & Humility. Maybe this is a contradictory thing.

However, it is an inevitable task because you can become a top leader only when you have both. Or else, he can only play the role of a staff member. Success and Achievement. Let's talk about Success and Achievement. The concept of "achievement" is more appropriate when asked how much success means to those who believe in Christ? Success is like a term in the business world, and achievement is the concept of accomplishing the work/ministry entrusted from the Lord, and to hear "well done."

Our Lord Jesus also expressed it with the word "Job Done"! We don't use the word Jesus succeeded very well. He has completed the task entrusted to him.

Is it easy to complete the given job? In fact, it's only possible to achieve it if you die! If there is still energy left, I think it has been achieved less. I think it is people's hearts that want to achieve at least one thing in their lives, and it would be desirable to leave the world after completing a given mission, but it is regrettable that they cannot achieve one thing.

Rather than trying to succeed, I try to fulfill my mission. I think it is wise to put all your heart and soul into it. Perhaps, as Pastor Melvin pointed out, it is in line with the need to go in the right direction rather than trying to be complete. In other words, it would be better to complete a given task than to pursue success, which is considered the biggest task.

Rather than having a successful life, I think it would be better to finish the given work completely. It's because we have almost more experience of failure than success. Few people will succeed in their entire life. It should be said that there are few. Therefore, even if it is not completely successful, wouldn't it give you a score if you achieve only one given field? Therefore, it seems that the expression of accomplishment is better than success.

To fulfill the mission given by the Lord. In both respects, "the mission of the pastor." The other one is, "The mission of a layman." The pastors can do this, but the mission of a layman is the key issue.

Personally, I argue that there should be a ministry given to laymen. Will only laymen help the pastor fulfill his mission? Furthermore, while fulfilling the mission given to laymen oneself (I want to call it a ministry), shouldn't laymen have the meaning and reward?

Like any pastoral theologian said, whoever it was, I think it's a meaningful story that when anyone believes in Christ, you're given two things at the same time: "Salvation and Ministry."●