# 3620 The Single Most Damaging Leadership Behavior

People Book · https://kb.jeffreysummers.com/docs/3620-the-single-most-damaging-leadership-behavior/

John Gottman spent decades studying what destroys relationships.

He identified four patterns — denial, defensiveness, stonewalling, and contempt — and ranked them by their predictive power. The first three are damaging. The fourth is categorically different.

Contempt is the single strongest predictor of relationship breakdown. More predictive than conflict frequency. More predictive than anger. More predictive than criticism. When contempt enters a relationship, the relationship is in fundamental trouble — because contempt communicates something that no amount of subsequent effort can easily undo.

It communicates: who you are doesn't count.

Not "what you did was wrong." Not "I disagree with your decision." Those are recoverable. Contempt is the signal that the other person's fundamental worth — as a human being, as a contributor, as someone whose perspective matters — is not respected by the person delivering it.

In a restaurant operation, contempt doesn't require overt mockery. It shows up in the eye roll when a cast member makes a suggestion. The dismissive response when someone raises a concern. The tone that communicates the operator's opinion of the person before the conversation has started. The quiet refusal to take seriously the observation of someone the operator has already decided doesn't have anything worth hearing.

It doesn't require repetition. A single contemptuous interaction in front of the cast sets the Unwritten Ground Rule immediately: this is how this person treats people here. Every cast member watching calibrates their behavior accordingly. The ones who value their dignity start looking for the door. The ones who stay learn that silence is the only safe response. The UGR that forms is the most expensive one available: speaking up isn't worth it.

And the operator wonders why they're always the last to know about problems.

## What Contempt Actually Looks Like

Contempt in a leadership context is rarely theatrical. It doesn't need to be. The most damaging version is subtle — so habitual the operator doesn't notice they're doing it.

The cast member who brings a concern and gets interrupted before finishing the sentence. The suggestion that gets dismissed without being considered. The question that gets answered with a tone that makes the questioner feel foolish for asking. The public correction that was designed to address behavior but landed as an attack on the person.

None of these require cruelty. They require only the absence of genuine respect — the quiet belief that the person in front of you doesn't have much worth hearing.

The cast member who experiences this consistently doesn't confront it. They absorb it. They stop bringing concerns. They stop making suggestions. They stop asking questions. They become compliant in the most expensive way possible — present in the body, absent in the investment.

That cast member isn't delivering the Guest Experience the operator designed. They're delivering the minimum required to avoid the next dismissal.

## The Pattern Conversation

The operator who recognizes contempt in their own leadership doesn't fix it by resolving the next incident more gracefully. They fix it by naming the pattern — to themselves first, and then to the people affected by it.

"I've noticed that when someone raises a concern, my response tends to shut the conversation down rather than open it up. I want to change that. Here's what I'm going to try to do differently — and I need you to tell me when I'm not."

That conversation is harder than the incident conversation. It requires the operator to name their own pattern rather than defending against an accusation. It requires the vulnerability the trust section identified as the precondition for a genuine relationship.

But it's the only conversation that changes the pattern rather than just managing the next instance.

The cast member who hears that conversation from an operator who means it doesn't just feel better about the specific behavior. They update the UGR: it's safe to tell this person the truth. That update is worth more than any policy change, any incentive program, or any team-building event

the operator could run.

Because the UGR that forms in the presence of genuine respect — the unwritten ground rule that says this leader actually wants to hear what I think — is the one that produces a cast willing to hold the standard when nobody is watching.

That's not a communication skill. That's culture.

And it starts with the operator's willingness to examine, name, and change the patterns in their own leadership before they compound into the culture they're trying to build.

## → See also: Fundamental 1: Perspective — 1.X The Snapshot Is Not the Truth

The operator who hasn't examined their own communication patterns is running on a snapshot of their leadership that may not reflect what the cast is actually experiencing. The self-awareness required to recognize contempt in your own behavior is the same discipline the Perspective fundamental argues for across every dimension of the operation.

## → See also: Fundamental 3: People — 3.X What Culture Actually Is

Contempt is the most efficient culture-killer available precisely because it operates in the absence of policy and direct supervision. The cast member who absorbs a contemptuous interaction doesn't wait for the policy manual to tell them how to respond. They update the UGR immediately — and the culture shifts before the next shift starts.