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Abstract

Moral leadership as demonstrated through servant leadership and specifically, executive servant leadership is explored as a means to overcoming organizational resistance to innovation. Innovation is synonymous with change. Change is inevitable. Resistance to change is inevitable. This is an exploration of ways in which leaders engage others to mitigate change and resistance by strategically embracing innovation. Specifically, the paper examines the Executive Servant Leader’s moral obligation to identify and utilize emerging trends and leverage organizational capabilities to create opportunities by discovering new demands and accompanying innovations. Finally, the paper summarizes ways in which future research might address the challenges of individual and organizational resistance through Executive Servant Leadership.
In today’s globally competitive business environment, leadership is critical for successful implementation of innovative processes that strengthen an organization and the individuals in it. Innovation is imperative for organizational sustainability in times of uncertainty due to unprecedented technological change and economic upheaval. Leaders are called to mentor internal and external stakeholders as they navigate through a strategic journey that can captivate, encourage, and lift up individuals and organizations. Moral leadership is increasingly necessary when alliances are essential for innovation and organizational survival. Character, integrity, and values of the leader are tacit elements that can provide an infusion of organizational synergy. This consciousness enables a strategic mindset that affords the leader and stakeholders with a sense of confidence in making effective responsible and honorable decisions even though they are often traveling through previously uncharted territory. During such times, organizational change is natural, normal, expected, and often unavoidable. However, resistance to change is natural, normal, and not always handled well by leaders, individuals or organizations. It is the challenge of leaders to use organizational resistance constructively during times of change and when pursing innovative strategies. Moral leadership can aid in guiding an organization to meet its strategic objectives. Without moral leadership, or doing the right things for the right reasons, the future of the organization and its stakeholders becomes uncertain at best.

This paper defines Servant Leadership as a type of moral leadership. It considers the Servant Leader, as executive, delineated in the Executive Servant Leadership Scale (Vidaver-Cohen et al., 2010; Reed et al., 2011). The paper examines the Executive Servant Leader’s moral obligation to identify and utilize emerging trends and leverage organizational capabilities to create opportunities by discovering new demands and accompanying innovations.
Specifically, these processes are considered as related to the dimensions of Executive Servant Leadership: Interpersonal Support, Altruism, Building Community, Egalitarianism and Moral Integrity (Vidaver-Cohen et al., 2010; Reed et al., 2011). Finally, the paper summarizes ways in which future research might address the challenges of individual and organizational resistance through Executive Servant Leadership.

**Moral, Servant Leadership, Executive Servant Leadership: Dimensions, Organizational Resistance and Innovation**

**Moral Leadership**

Leadership that embraces and builds from internal values that are consistent with the needs and objectives of shareholders/stakeholders, programming/services including employees and others is moral leadership. The moral leader attempts to do right by all and to do each task to the best of his or her ability. This leader uses a moral compass as well as a strategic plan to navigate through turbulent environments, often toward unfamiliar destinations that are reliant on shared vision, trust, collaboration and innovation as elements of group success. The moral leader’s strategic map is a plan used to guide the process and minimize any unnecessary organizational resistance, but it relies on the internal compass and shared vision as a guide through what is unknown. If events appear to be in conflict with the course; such as a looming white water or sheer cliff that is unfamiliar, the moral leader shares decision making to develop others and to ensure the sanctity of the group above their own personal gain. The moral leader knows that conflict is inevitable and can be used constructively to develop individuals and strengthen perceptions by challenging individual or group beliefs. There are times when there seems to be no viable alternatives, but the moral leader knows that through shared leadership and development of others, both the organization and each individual can achieve their best. This
can result in diverse and sometimes unique team dynamics as well as collaboration and organizational success.

The moral leader is ethical in all his or her interactions with others. Brown and Trevino (2006) assert that ethical leaders, whom we also describe as moral leaders here, are “honest, caring and principled individuals who make fair and balanced decisions”. Thompson (2004) posits that in a highly complex multicultural domain of activity it becomes challenging for individuals to determine a moral focus and even more demanding for groups to attain a significant sense of moral unity. Leadership is viewed as a function of social power with a basic ethical endeavor that is inseparable (Thompson, 2004). From an educator’s perspective, leadership in any undertaking is a moral duty (Quick & Normore, 2004). Moral leaders are often teachers in their modeling of ethical behavior. Reed et al., (2011) report that “ethical leaders develop their followers by modeling behavior”. Leaders can be trained in accordance to applying policy and behavior; however this is half of the representation of leadership criteria (Maguad & Krone, 2009). Moral leadership is driven from within an individual, one’s values without devotion to any outside criteria of behavioral standards (Maguad & Krone, 2009). A moral leader is above just being acclimated to obeying rules and procedures; this is a person with values and principles based on desirability and the ability to evaluate individual situations with clarity of integrity (Maguad & Krone, 2009).

Another aspect of moral leadership is promoting community collaboration to build an organizational setting where its members have the freedom to understand and realize the advantage in fulfilling mutual goals, beliefs and purpose (Thompson, 2004). Despite leadership not being presented in a moral or ethical sense, an ethical solidarity is embedded in the core of a successful organization where tolerance and respect are not just a result of intelligence but are
aligned with the human spirit (Thompson, 2004). According to Becker (2009) ultimately it is the creation of the human culture and through continued advancement that can guide organizational members with consensus toward human needs and an ethical foresight of a moral society. Thus leaders in a moral sense are challenged by many factors however with a foundation of values and principles one can have an impact on a culture and essentially an organization. Ultimately moral leadership is doing the right thing (Maguad & Krone, 2009).

The moral leader serves a higher ideal than a single short term bottom line. At best, the moral leader serves a greater objective than mere personal or organizational gain. Reed et al., (2011) declare that, “Among the numerous other leadership frameworks presented in the Management literature, one that articulates the emotional, relational and moral dimensions of leadership in a practical and useful way is Servant Leadership”. Servant leadership is a concept introduced decades ago by an executive and management consultant, Robert K. Greenleaf ([1970] 1991).

Servant Leadership

We live in a place where worldview is constantly adapting, culture is being challenged and people who do not have leadership skills and/or an inner maturity get lost in a shuffle of cause after cause after cause. We must listen to the world around us to not just chase after the biggest, loudest, and newest thing. We must seek value and purpose, explore inter-connectivity and reinforce what is the common good. Servant Leadership is identified as a unique art of serving where there is focus on a common good and being a leader who serves this common good (Avolio & Gardner, 2005, Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership, 2011). The root is based on a responsive, conscious driven, long-term focus on the common good (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Servant leadership is specifically geared toward the concept that people have
the opportunity to act in the moment. People are ‘being’ and ‘doing’ which provides space for all persons to be a leader and a follower (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002; Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership, 2011). Actions and behaviors of the Servant Leader are based in finding ways to serve rather than lead. This opens opportunity for a diverse and global interaction with a holistic impact on community (Vinod & Sudhakar, 2011). Leaders must be aware of the sting that is associated with the use of power in leadership. Leaders influence others. If a leader forces influence they lose integrity which causes a tension and question of the power that the leader exudes (Tidball, 2012). Servant Leadership reduces the sting of power and tension in that the leader chooses to: seek the best in others, find something good about others and their progress, accept others leadership, desire to be accountable, care for others, love others, and listen (Tidball, 2012). Through the Servant Leader serving, it is essential that the leader mentor the mission and vision, sharing it out and steering the interaction toward the common good (Vinod & Sudhakar, 2011). Servant Leaders are altruistic in that they consider others before self. This action, behavior, concept and attitude, embraces a value of people and a common good on a deeper and more spiritual plane leading to success both in the organization and in self. If the servant is a leader and mentors this servant leadership, it generates a support and continuation of servant relations amongst shareholders (Patterson, 2003).

**Executive Servant Leadership and Dimensions**

Executive Servant Leadership was introduced by Vidaver-Cohen et al., (2010) and Reed et al., (2011) as a type of Servant Leadership that is based upon the model introduced by Greenleaf ([1970] 1991) and developed by scholars including those described in the previous section. The Executive Leader is charged with guiding an organization by leadership that “moves beyond inputs and outputs emphasizing the moral, emotional and relational aspects of
leadership” (Vida\-ver-Cohen et al., 2010). This is critical for innovative organizations as Servant Leaders in executive management can influence stakeholders, institutions and society, as well as organizational followers. Through Interpersonal Support, Building Community, Altruism, Egalitarianism, and Moral Integrity, the Executive Servant Leader can provide an organizational climate in which innovation can thrive and organizational resistance can be used to achieve organizational success without sacrificing the integrity of a values-driven organizational culture.

Interpersonal Support is used to develop followers and stakeholders. It enables individuals to develop their potential as it the organization develops a service-oriented culture. It enables the leader to assist others in becoming successful while treating them with dignity and respect and providing them with the authority to make decisions that affect their position within the organization (Vida\-ver-Cohen et al., 2010; Reed et al., 2011).

Building Community requires Executive Leader commitment to cohesion both within and outside the organization. It distinguishes the Servant Leader from all others by its focus on serving first (Greenleaf, [1970] 1991), valuing diversity of individuals, encouraging organizational commitment and cooperation. It is essential for both the Executive Servant Leader and the Servant organization (Vida\-ver-Cohen et al., 2010; Reed et al., 2011).

Egalitarianism encourages healthy debate of ideas and rejects the idea that the leader is superior to followers. It is reliant on sensitivity to all stakeholders’ critical thinking and is often displayed by the leader’s willingness to learn from all others, regardless of organizational level. It invites constructive criticism, providing a venue where innovation and creativity can thrive (Vida\-ver-Cohen et al., 2010; Reed et al., 2011).

Moral Integrity enables the moral person to develop, at all organizational levels. It encourages individuals to make a contribution “to the moral organization and moral society”
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(Vidaver-Cohen et al., 2010). It inspires trust in the organization, as well as in the leader and followers. It inspires higher values than mere “profit or personal gain” by refusing to “use deceit or manipulation for personal goals” (Vidaver-Cohen et al., 2010).

Organizational Resistance

Individual and organizational resistance are part of organizational change. Organizational change produces a reaction process (Kyle, 1993 as cited in Bovey & Hede, 2001, p. 372). The reaction process is an unconventional cycle of phases: initial denial, resistance, gradual exploration and eventual commitment (Bovey & Hede, 2001, p. 372). Resistance is a behavior that is a dependent variable. This variable can be exhibited via either or both physical and metaphysical actions and reactions, things that can or cannot be seen or heard, but which affect the intent and operationalization of change (Bovey & Hede, 2001). The executive servant leader realizes that organizational resistance is part of change and innovation. He or she creates an organizational culture that is open to exploring resistance as a creative developmental process that can result in a better future and expanded organizational vision.

Innovation

Innovation is “the cycle of change”… that… “begins with some sort of disruption with new data, participants, or goals that alter the status quo, new information, players, relationships, or objectives disrupt the existing way of being, and thus change”… innovation… “begins” (Sonea & Sonea, 2010). When innovation is introduced, it is important to have a strong and clear ethical stance based in the mission, vision and value of the organization (Weitzner & Darroch, 2010). This helps to support a transparency and ease of change in that the agreed upon culture, ethics, has been valued. When there are shadows cast, people or ideas not valued, people will likely shy away from sharing ideas (Johnson, 2012) or they will participate at a lower
Identifying and Emerging Trends and Opportunities for Innovation

Leadership drives strategy when identifying and utilizing emerging trends related to innovative opportunities. Innovative strategies are accompanied by risks and challenges when doing business in a global environment. Moral leadership defines who one is, emanating from internal values, in contrast to situational behavior (Maguad & Krone, 2009). The executive servant leader provides organizational stakeholders with tools to develop the ability to respect and nurture a culture of ethical clarity, responsibility, and trust without jeopardizing intelligent and spiritual independence of people who embody the organizational culture (Thompson, 2004, Reed et al., 2011). Thus moral leaders constantly mentor, develop and grow others. When an executive servant leader takes a strategic approach to mentoring, there are increasing opportunities for innovation, some of which may emerge as collaborative innovation and third-party enabled (DeGraff, 2009 as cited by Davidson, 2009, p. 1; Friedman & Angelus, 2009; Reed et al., 2011).

Collaborative innovation is open and a process that manages the interaction and collaboration of an inclusive set of partners for the purpose of new solutions in a business. The collaboration provides for a three step process of 1) Group think tanks where ideas are inputted, openly and thoughtfully, 2) Research and development where the innovation is piloted, and 3) Spin-outs where the products or services are set into motion throughout the organization (Forcadell & Guadamillas, 2002; Friedman & Angelus, 2009). Third-party enablers, also known as incubators, can be activated when there is a need to support innovative development. Third-party enablers provide a structure for development, nurturing and expansion (Mathernova &
LeBail, 2010). The development phase shapes the model and plan. During this phase, ideas are sought, training is provided and one-on-one assistance is available to create the connection to the model and plan. The next phase determines the feasibility of the innovation, providing continued training and one-on-one assistance as well as ideas for making the structure sound. The last phase includes expanding or growing the innovation organically or mechanistically, reproducing the organizational and innovation ecosystem (Mathernova & LeBail, 2010). Both the collaborative and third-party innovation strategies provide opportunity for a moral leader to embrace and build a program or service based from the value of the shareholder. They can be enhanced by the executive servant leader who offers interpersonal support, egalitarianism, altruism, building community, and moral integrity (Vidaver-Cohen et al., 2010; Reed et al., 2011).

Conscious and unconscious factors affect executive servant leader's decisions regarding innovation opportunity. Conscious factors influence the leaders’ awareness of decisions regarding innovative opportunities which are calculative and heuristic in nature and can be influenced by past experiences. These factors may also be based on one’s conscious data base and experience. According to College of Occupational Therapists of Ontario (2012) consciously competent practitioners are those who understand their strengths and limits, standards, guidelines and rules, and the values behind them along with making good choices both consciously and deliberately while being able to explain why a particular course of action is decided. Executive Servant leaders emphasize fairness and balance. They provide the means to create a shared vision focused on positive outcomes for both individuals and the organization. According to Becker (2009) moral leadership is the strain between cynical stances concerning human nature as
morally faulty promoting self-interest and a positive perspective emphasizing the foundation of morality, collaboration, and fairness.

The executive servant leader keeps an ear to the ground to identify emerging trends and innovative opportunities. Awareness of opportunities, others and self has direct and indirect impacts on accountability as related to risk-taking and innovation. It enhances leadership at all organizational levels to accept risk-taking and exercise an innovative mindset in alignment with organizational goals, as well as with moral leadership. Increasingly empirical research indicates that self-awareness relates with successful leadership (Ashley & Reiter-Palmon, 2012).

According to Ashley and Reiter-Palmon (2012) self-awareness is a deeply focused evaluative process where individuals look inward to make self/standard comparisons with the intent of enhancing self-knowledge and improvement. In a similar manner moral leadership and self-awareness encompasses a profound understanding of an individual’s emotions, strong points, limits, values and motives (Caldwell, 2010). Self-awareness is a basic element of emotional intellect and is essential to the ability of one to communicate and develop relationships of trust with others as leaders become more open to outside comments (Caldwell, 2010). The relationship of self-awareness to leadership suggests that leaders with higher levels of self-awareness tend to achieve better outcomes than those with lower degrees of self-awareness (Ashley & Reiter-Palmon, 2012). The importance of self-awareness in conjunction with conscious factors in decision making supports leadership when engaging in strategies to develop cross-cultural relationships to strengthen their company’s position in the global market for future growth. However, for the executive servant leader, self-awareness is a balancing act, ever focused on developing great ideas, great people and a greater goal than his or her personal success.
Leveraging Organizational Capabilities to Create Opportunities for New Demand and Markets for Evolving Innovation

Leveraging organizational capability is found through research and flexibility for change. This requires a strategy that honors a moral leader and developing culture all while diversifying the market with a streamlined focus to embrace “the future as it emerges” (Scharmer, 2000, p. 4; Forcadell & Guadamillas, 2002). The opportunity that arises through this form of leveraging is a new or renewed mission, value and culture that is customer focused, supports a shared leadership, and has the ability to be driven and able to adopt a radical change model. In order to effectively leverage new demands or market for emerging innovation, Scharmer (2000) postulates that the leader must use a style or concept of presencing. Presencing is an operational leadership discipline that considers three key elements of learning, change and cognition (Scharmer, 2000).

Leadership plays an essential role in strengthening the link of capabilities to innovation. One leadership approach that can enhance leveraging organizational capabilities may be transformational. Transformational leaders convey a shared vision motivating individuals under their guidance to see past their self-interests to benefit the group (Turner, Barling, Epitropaki, Butcher, & Milner, 2002). Emerging research indicates that servant leadership, a form of transformational leadership, supports organizational function and may relate to high levels of moral development (Turner et al., 2002; Johnson, 2012).

Leadership provides the foundation for knowledge strategies. According to Forcadell and Guadamillas (2002), by implementing knowledge strategies, an organization allows progress in its learning capability and knowledge base. Knowledge combines capabilities, abilities, information, and technology with the intent of improving product and processes thus becoming a
contributing element of competitive advantage (Forcadell & Guadamillas, 2002). Forcadell and Guadamillas (2002) emphasize that knowledge management strategy concentrates on constructing a chain of capabilities linked to innovation. Learning through inclusive, diverse and collaborative think tanks, surveys, strategic conversations and meetings offers a second source for reflecting on an array of shareholder experiences both internally and externally (Scharmer, 2000; Forcadell & Guadamillas, 2002). This form of second source learning and research, both internal and external, can identify what the current market and focus should be, identifying “requirements, quality, service, cost, innovation, security and a shared experience” (Forcadell & Guadamillas, 2002, p. 165). Leadership that uses this technique then refines the data with employees showcasing that ideas are not dependent on the leaders; rather they are dependent on the collective voice that leverages a common good (Forcadell & Guadamillas, 2002) which grows trust and loyalty. This leads to change and something that no one else has… an answer to specific, genuine needs which can create new demand and explore potential markets, thus an emerging innovation that has a competitive advantage.

According to Pasher and Ronen (2011) human capital directly relates to the people of the organization and their knowledge, innovation capabilities, and skills. Pasher and Ronen (2011) also consider the employee as the center point or main asset of the organization built on intellectual capital thus from a managerial perspective, knowledge workers are one of the core capabilities of a company and managing these individuals covers a wide area including hiring and retaining employees, bettering their skill set and potential, inspiring them to be creative and to share knowledge. Leadership provides the guidance to allow knowledge workers to maintain their drive and motivation. Turner et al., (2002) suggest that embedded in a leadership approach is moral reasoning that is related to employees’ views of their managers’ transformational or
transactional leadership behaviors. Research by Turner et al., (2002) moderately backs the point that leaders displaying greater levels of moral reasoning tend to exhibit more transformational or higher order transactional leadership behaviors than leaders possessing lower levels of moral reasoning. Thus moral leadership with a transformational or servant flavor further strengthens a manager's awareness of ethical clarity, responsibility, and trust while protecting the intelligent and spiritual independence of people who embody the organizational culture (Thompson, 2004).

Knowledge management boosts the leveraging of organizational capabilities by stimulating employee core competencies and capabilities channeling them into an effective integrated process that will be enhanced by motivational leadership practices encouraging employee empowerment in turn strengthening the knowledge base of employees and their ability to transfer knowledge and be creative in a team environment promoting innovation. The culmination of knowledge management in conjunction with moral leadership strengthens employee capabilities and the organizational structure providing a cultural setting for innovation that will lead the organization to opportunities for new demand in the global market.

**Overcoming Individual and Organizational Resistance**

Providing a space for innovation where the climate is moral and servant leadership driven supports innovation and decreases resistance. Supports or barriers to innovation can be applicable to both individuals and organizations. Consider the support or barrier of listening (Spears, 2010) and leadership that is leader:follower (Johnson, 2012) oriented. Leaders have traditionally been valued for their communication and decision making skills. As important as it is for those skills to be constantly reinforced, we must always be mindful of constantly being able to listen to not only those around us, but equally and sometimes more importantly, be able to listen to one's inner voice (Spears, 2010). If an individual or organization does not listen, it
sets up barriers. Listening can be defined as showing empathy, asking for clarification and providing non-evaluative feedback. Leadership that is leader: follower takes an individual choice and can be organizationally manifested. The traits of a leader:follower counter or challenge the traditional one person think tank and opens dialogue to a whole new realm of inclusive common good (Johnson, 2012). Both of these traits: listening and leader:follower, if misused or undervalued can be destructive and cause stalemates which are opposite innovation.

When assessing moral leadership approaches referring to individual and organizational resistance to change, leaders are faced with the challenge of perception and instilling greater ethical clarity in their leadership style to accomplish their objectives. According to Becker (2009) most of the cynicism relating to moral leadership in the business world is based on an out of the ordinary but widely held notion that organizations function in unethical space where any concern for ethics are barriers or non-beneficial to individuals within and outside of the organization. To some business ethics is an oxymoron pointing out that you conduct business or you are ethical, a leader can’t perform both (Becker, 2009). Burnes and By (2011) view leadership as a functional process combining individual wills, needs and results of dynamic collective will to meet various needs rather than being a task for the individual in charge. Leadership is also a dynamic process involving energy, modification, progression and exchange with interchanging values implying a difference between management and leadership where management follow a path of stability and leadership emphasizes change (Burnes & By, 2011). According to Burnes and By (2011) leadership approaches with respect to change are reinforced by a collection of ethical values that guide actions of leaders in determining positive or negative results of change initiatives. Burnes and By (2011) contend that leaders must have well defined
ethical beliefs and values associated with the approaches they embrace when instituting change and must be clear with respect to ethical strengths and weaknesses of these approaches.

These challenges of perception and instilling greater ethical clarity must be considered when weighing approaches of exercising moral leadership. These two elements embedded in ethical or moral leadership when properly utilized with build trust and credibility in the eyes of direct reports and groups within the organization as well as individuals externally observing the activities of the organization. With trust and credibility associated with a moral transformational approach leaders will gain respect and cooperation to increase the synergy within the organization to diminish the barriers of change and promote innovation. These two points must be considered when assessing a leadership approach to address resisting change.

Sir Frances Bacon is reputed to have stated that knowledge is power. To embrace a complex grid of knowledge individually and organizationally produces as stronger, more robust grid. An organization that is able to capture knowledge of its shareholders through knowledge management and fit the puzzle pieces together provides value for each individual shareholder as well as fortifying the organizational knowledge to pull from. Thus, innovation has a broader and deeper space from which to pull as well as providing a greater buy-in.

This leads to a consideration of insourcing versus outsourcing development. There are considerations of appropriate time and leadership tactics in which to embrace both in and/or outsourcing. A leader should be aware that both come with possibility of resistance. This resistance could be founded in a ‘not invented here’ syndrome, NIH, which is antonym to ‘proudly found elsewhere’ syndrome, PFE. The NIH worldview is exclusive and denotes the notion that products which are developed externally are subpar. The PFE worldview is inclusive and denotes the notion that products which are developed internally are subpar (Jain, 2011).
Consider a principled negotiation tactic and/or to counteract one worldview or the other, three leadership tactics that are in line with a moral leadership strategy that could be utilized are:

**Strategic Dialogue**

Strategic dialogue with leaders/managers/direct line regarding ethical decision making (Johnson, 2012; Kellerman, 2008; Bohm, 1991). Consider that all decisions must be in alignment with the mission, vision and values. If there is exclusivity, then NIH may be in alignment with the organizations innovation strategy. If there is an inclusive/common good, then a PFE may be in alignment with the organizations innovation strategy.

**Challenging worldviews**

Provide opportunity for diversity training that opens dialogue for an inclusive and common good rhetoric. Worldviews, inferences, and maturity levels create culture which “broadly defined, refers to a shared system of knowledge, language, social norms, values, and behaviors” (Johnson, Hill & Cohen, 2011 p. 137). Opening the opportunity for a diverse worldview opens space for innovation.

**Leadership Training**

Enhance various meetings and measurements, including performance reviews with expectations for implementation of servant leadership characteristics. Leaders/managers/direct line employees who participate in servant leadership activities tend to find deeper value in ‘the other’ (Thompson, 2010).

When leading change, there must be room for dialogue (Bohm, 1991). Strategically scheduling dialogue that provides opportunity for ethical decision making and challenge of worldviews is important. Not too close together, but not so far apart that the passion is
diminished. This form of moral and servant leadership training should be on a continuum, never ending and also evolving.

**Discussion and Propositions**

Vidaver-Cohen et al.’s, (2010) model identifies the structure of executive servant leadership and developed a scale to “Test if Leaders Dare to Care” (Vidaver-Cohen et al., 2010). Exploration of the scales five factors: interpersonal support, building community, altruism, egalitarianism, and moral integrity (Vidaver-Cohen et al., 2010) will provide foundational support for organizational importance to consider not only input and output, but also a return on investment of common good. Seven hypotheses have been identified for future study using the Dare to Care model:

1. Executive servant leaders who score moderate to high on the community building provide opportunities for cross-functional collaboration.
2. Executive servant leaders who score moderate to high on interpersonal support assist teams in completing objectives efficiently and effectively.
3. Servant lead organizations provide an organizational climate that fosters innovation.
4. Servant lead organizations provide an organizational climate that fosters organizational commitment.
5. Servant leaders develop servant leaders.
6. Servant leaders develop individual’s critical thinking skills.
7. Servant leaders encourage followers to utilize resistance constructively.

**Conclusion**

Moral leadership demonstrated through executive servant leadership has a direct correlation with change which affects organizational resistance as well as innovation. When an
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expedition or change is embarked upon, transparency, objective negotiation through a mapping/planning process as well as guidance or mentorship are important to keep in focus. A leader can experience innovation if the leader is flexible, open to dialogue, constantly learning as well as training and respectfully challenging worldviews.

Moral leadership is a necessity that continues to escalate with rising human and material costs of its failure (Maguad & Krone, 2009). The need for moral leadership is justified when considering the enormous societal costs stemming from substantial business and other organizational ethical failures over recent years (Maguad & Krone, 2009). Moral organizational leaders have the ability to resort to rationale that combine acceptance and respect with nurturing a culture of ethical clarity, responsibility, and trust. They do this without endangering intelligence and spiritual independence of the people who embody the organizational culture (Thompson, 2004). This paper sets the stage to explore whether the moral leader as executive and servant can play a critical role in strengthening the link of organizational capabilities for innovation.
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