SERVANT LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS IN A HEALTH CARE

ORGANIZATION, AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH LEADER-MEMBER

EXCHANGE

by

William Manzi Freitas

A THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Science

Major: Leadership Education

Under the Supervision of Professor Leverne Barrett

Lincoln, Nebraska

December, 2003

SERVANT LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS IN A HEALTH CARE

ORGANIZATION, AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH LEADER-MEMBER

EXCHANGE

William Manzi Freitas, M.S.

University of Nebraska, 2003

Advisor: Leverne Barrett

Servant leadership is a concept which considers the human being as the most important asset of an organization. The paradox of the servant-leader is based on the leader being a servant or a steward nurturing the followers' needs and seeking to develop their potential.

This study was conducted with 330 associates and 19 top leaders of a hospital in the Midwest; it compares the six characteristics of servant leadership—value people; provide leadership; display authenticity; build community; share leadership; develop people—in the different sectors of a health care organization, and assesses how these characteristics relate to the quality of the leader-member exchange.

The Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) was used to verify differences between the characteristics of servant leadership in the several sectors of the hospital. The LMX-7 measured the quality of the relationship between leaders and follower. Then, the relationship between servant leadership and leader-member exchange was assessed.

The findings of this study indicated no significant differences in the scores of the OLA among the hospital sectors. Age positively correlated with 'value people,' 'display

authenticity,' 'build community,' and 'share leadership,' and 'develop people.' Tenure negatively correlated with 'provide leadership.'

Leaders responded significantly higher than non-leaders on 'value people,' 'display authenticity' and 'share leadership' subscales. And finally, a significant correlation was found between all of the six subscales of the OLA and the LMX-7 instrument.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It was a long road with many obstacles that took me to the accomplishment of this master thesis. However, along the way, there were many who provided me with support and guidance to conclude this journey. Although not mentioned, their names and deeds are written in my heart.

I am most thankful to my advisor, Dr. Leverne Barrett, for his wisdom and hours spent reviewing this thesis. Thanks, also, to the members of my graduate committee, Dr. Dan Wheeler and Dr. Dan Husmann for their expertise and suggestions.

It is with extreme appreciation that I want to thank my fellow graduate students, and the AgLEC department faculty members. Your friendship and support brought the vitality I needed to finish this program. A special mention goes to Dr. Ladeane Jha, Dr. Jerry Parsons, and Lilian Gomez for their encouragement and fruitful conversations.

I would like to recognize the Health Institution where my research was done. Although for ethical reasons I have not mentioned the name of the institution, it is important to me to say that the support of the human resources department was a blessing in the accomplishment for this paper. It is organizations like these, open to collaborate with research, that make the science of leadership so exciting.

Lastly, I would like to extend my gratitude to my parents. Even though we are separated by thousands of miles, I could feel the influence of their prayers on my behalf. Very special thanks go to the person who has most supported and inspired me, my wife Vivian. Thanks Vivian for your love, care and patience. I know how hard this time-consuming project has been on us, but without your dedication and understanding I would not have come this far.

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The second half of the nineteenth century was characterized by radical changes in the way we live. The quick development of human knowledge has immersed us in a new world, where time, space, and information are no longer a barrier for the world to become a global village. Developments in the social and behavioral sciences, computer engineering, biological engineering, medicine, arts, and even war science have brought a new meaning to our existence. Human beings can live better because research on the 'hard' as well as the 'soft' sciences is revealing the mysteries surrounding them and the universe.

Conversely, the beginning of the twenty-first century has been characterized by a dramatic paradox. Despite all scientific developments of the last century this century has inherited a range of problems that compromise our capacity to live better. Pollution, overpopulation, poverty and hunger, global warming, atomic threats, garbage, self-interested politics, greed, individualism, racial injustice, and economic inequities are some of the problems left over from the nineteenth century (Rost, 1991). The paradox can be stated in a single question: how is it possible that knowledge for the welfare of the human being can coexist with so much threat to human existence? The answer may lie in the approaches to leadership that have been predominant over time.

History shows that the art of leadership is perhaps as old as the existence of mankind. Leaders' influence and their decisions have been an essential element in shaping the history of the world. Consequently, poor leadership has been one of the most important causes of the problems inherited from the past. A recent example of leadership

influence shaping history is the number of scandals that have betrayed the trust of people in American companies. Unethical decisions on the part of CEOs, irresponsible behavior, and greed have directly and indirectly affected the lives and mindsets of many Americans.

Burns in 1978 (p.1) stated that, "one of the most universal cravings of our time is a hunger for compelling and creative leadership." During the last 95 years, thousands of empirical investigations on leadership have been conducted. Scientists have striven to understand what distinguishes effective leaders from non-effective leaders (Jago, 1982). Theories of leadership have been and are being developed in order to describe and prescribe effective leadership processes, which might reverse the problems inherited by the twenty-century and lead to a better world.

Despite the development of so many leadership theories over the years, there is still a cry for a new leadership style — a style that focuses on the followers and society in general; a style where selfishness gives place to unselfishness, humility and, a servant attitude. As Gardner (1995) stated, "a great many people who are not given to juvenile fantasies want leaders who are exemplary, who inspire, who stand for something, who help us to set and achieve goals (p. 4). Max DePree (2002) believed that the leader for the 21st century has to be a leader with a clear moral purpose and the ego removed from the 'game'. Falter (2000) proposed that only a leader with a servant attitude, strong ethics and moral, and a spiritual awareness of connectedness can create a community work environment and a climate conducive to change. This process can facilitate cross-functional integration, collaborative efforts, personal growth, skill building, feedback and conceptual awareness. Where can this leadership paradigm be found? Is it possible for a

leadership paradigm to focus on serving rather than being served, giving rather than receiving?

Background Information

This study looks at a new concept of leadership called servant leadership. Servant leadership is not a theory of leadership; it is a concept based on the leadership ideas developed by Robert Greenleaf in 1970. Despite not being a developed theory, servant leadership has received considerable attention in the popular press (Farling et al, 1999), and attracted the attention of leadership practitioners and a few scholars (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002).

Servant leadership is a concept that places service to others over self-interest and self-promotion. The term might be confusing because it is paradoxical. It calls us to lead by serving (Smith, 1995). However, the beauty of servant leadership is exactly in its paradoxical concept. Advocates of servant leadership believe that the servant leader can lead more effectively by serving others, and can build strength and unity by valuing differences (McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 2002).

Although the term servant leadership is reasonably contemporary, the concept seems to be very ancient in history. In the East, traditionally, deep values have centered on things like compassion, humility, gratitude, service to one's family and community, and service to ancestors. There is an emphasis on cooperation and trust (Zohar 2002). Servant leadership also has very old roots in many of the minorities and indigenous cultures, which were and still are predominantly holistic, cooperative, communal, intuitive and spiritual (Spears, 2002).

The term servant leadership was first coined in 1970 in the Robert K. Greenleaf's essay entitled 'The Servant as Leader' (Greenleaf, 1977). After reading Hermann Hesse's short novel 'Journey to the East' in 1960, Greenleaf concluded that a great leader is first experienced as a servant to others, and this simple fact is central to his or her greatness. Those whose primary motivation is a deep desire to help others are true leaders. Based on this insight and on his vast leadership practice, Greenleaf noticed that a new century needs a leadership in which institutions serve the community. Spears (2002) noticed that in all of Greenleaf's published work he discusses the need for a new kind of leadership model — a model where serving others (including employees, customers, and community) is the number one priority.

In his essay, Greenleaf (1977) describes the servant-leader as one who 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. He is sharply different from the person who is leader first, perhaps because of the need to assuage an unusual power drive or to acquire material possessions. For such it will be a later choice to serve—after leadership is established." (p. 7)

To Greenleaf (1977), the servant-first leader makes sure that other people's highest priorities are being served. If the followers grow as persons, become healthier, wiser, and more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants, and the least privileged in society also benefit, then the leader is a servant-leader.

Spears (2002), in a careful review of the Greenleaf's extensively work on servant leadership, identified ten characteristics of critical importance to the development of

servant-leaders: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community. However, these characteristics are based solely on Spears readings of Greenleaf s writings, and are not grounded in empirical research studies. They are Greenleaf's implicit model of leadership, and they were based on a keen intuitive sense of people and their relationships within institutions; therefore they comprise an intuition-based concept (Laub, 2000; Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002).

In order to determine the characteristics of servant leadership, Jim Laub (1999) in his doctoral dissertation did a comprehensive literature review on servant leadership from different authors and in different time frames. In addition to the literature review, he developed a three-part Delphi survey that was conducted with fourteen experts from the field of servant leadership. The experts were chosen based upon the fact that they had written on servant leadership or had taught at the university level on the subject (Appendix A).

The panel was asked to name and rate the characteristics of the servant leader. All characteristics that were rated "Necessary" to "Essential" in the final survey were used in the construction of an instrument to measure the characteristics of servant leadership. The three-part Delphi survey resulted in several characteristics of servant leadership that are listed as six categories in Table 1. A more detailed explanation of the methodology for developing the instrument is presented in chapter 3 of this study.

Table 1

Characteristics of Servant Leadership

Values People	• By trusting people
	• By serving others first
	• By receptive listening
Provides Leadership	• By envisioning the future
	• By taking initiative
	• By clarifying goals
Displays Authenticity	• By being open and accountable to others
	• By a willingness to learn from others
	• By maintaining integrity and trust
Builds community	• By building strong personal relationships
	• By working collaboratively with others
	• By valuing the differences of others
Shares Leadership	• By facilitating a shared vision
	• By sharing power and releasing control
	• By sharing status and promoting others
Develops People	• By providing opportunities for learning and growth
	• By modeling appropriate behavior
	• By building up others through encouragement and affirmation

Even though these six characteristics were found by using a Delphi technique, it is important to note that, from a scientific perspective, the concept of servant leadership is still lacking systematic research. From a practical perspective, some people suggest that servant leadership is too good to be true (Whetstone, 2002). In fact, servant leadership is seemingly unrealistic, encouraging passivity, not working in every context, sometimes serving the wrong cause, and related to the negative connotation of the term servant (Johnson, 2001).

Ruschman (2002) identified that at first glance, servant leadership seems like an easy concept — "be nice to your employees and customers and they will be happy, and the money will come in" (p.139). Yet, servant leadership is much more than a 'feel-good concept'; it is an integrated way of serving all people involved within an organization. It implies a good deal of risk-taking and tenacity, and a high degree of trust to make the changes that will foster a servant-led organization.

Interestingly enough, a variety of for-profit and not-for-profit corporations have taken the risk to adopt a servant philosophy by embracing servant leadership as an important and necessary framework for ensuring the long-term effects of related management and leadership approaches, such as continuous quality improvement and system thinking (Spears, 2002). Conley and Wagner-Marsh (1998), Faulter (2002) and Ruschman (2002) provide a list of business corporations that has adopted servant leadership. The Container Store (Dallas, TX); Southwest Airlines (Dallas, TX); TDIndustries (Dallas, TX); Herman Miller (Zeeland, MI); Men's Wearhouse (Freemont, CA); The Toro Company (Minneapolis,MN); Synovus Financial Corporation

(Columbus,GA); Duncan Aviation (Lincoln, NE) are some of business corporations

mentioned as being servant organizations.

Need for Study

There is a need for a systematic study of servant leadership since this concept

lacks support in the research-based literature. Bowman (1997) argues that although many

writers have provided examples of servant leadership in organizations, these examples

are only anecdotal evidence to support a sound theory of servant leadership. However,

Bernard Bass (2000) states that "the strength of the servant leadership movement and its

many links to encouraging follower learning, growth, and autonomy, suggests that the

untested theory will play a role in the future leadership of the learning organization" (p.

33). It is believed indeed that the profound philosophical foundation of servant leadership

will provide avenues for its future theoretical development (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002).

Therefore studies investigating the characteristics of servant leadership, and how they

compare and correlate to other better-known leadership measures are necessary. The

outcomes of such studies will provide a solid basis for strengthening the development of

servant leadership as a theory.

Problem Statement

The problem this study addresses is the lack of empirical research to identify the

relationship between the six characteristics of servant leadership, as proposed by Laub

(1999), and other leadership theories and their variables.

Purpose Statement

This study compares the six characteristics of Servant Leadership in the different sectors of a health care organization, and it assesses how these characteristics relate to the quality of the leader-member exchange.

Research Hypotheses

1) Are there differences in the characteristics of servant leadership as measured by the OLA instrument when comparing the Human Resources, Strategic Planning and Business Development, Nursing, Clinical and Support Services, and Finance sectors of the targeted health care organization?

2) Are there relationships between the characteristics of servant leadership as measured by the OLA instrument, and gender, age, level of education, and time in the organization?

3) Are there differences in the subscales scores of the OLA instrument between the upper level and management team and the associates of the hospital?

4) Are there relationships between the characteristics of servant leadership—values people; provides leadership; displays authenticity; build community; shares leadership; develops people—as measured by the OLA instrument, and the quality of leader-member exchange as measured by the LMX-7 instrument?

Significance of the Study

For the science of leadership this study is significant because it will:

- Assess the presence of servant leadership factors in a health-care organization.

- Verifies if the characteristics of servant leadership varies across different organizational functions.

- Investigate the relationship between servant leadership characteristics and the quality of leader-member exchange.

- Study the characteristics of servant leadership in a more systematic manner.

- Increase the number of empirical studies on servant leadership.

For organizations, the implications of this study are significant because it:

- May reveal the leadership characteristics that better relate to a higher exchange relationship between leaders and followers of the organization.

- Will evaluate the organizational strengths and weaknesses between what is intended and actual practice.

- May reveal possible differences on how leadership is perceived by leaders and followers.

- Can help leaders develop and align their behaviors with the organization vision, mission, and values.

- Will demonstrate any differences in leadership within the various departments of the organization, giving a clue where to design necessary interventions.

Definition of Terms

➢ Servant Leadership – It is an understanding and practice of leadership that places the good of those led over the self-interest of the leader (Laub, 1999).

➢ Paradox - A seemingly contradictory statement that may nonetheless be true (American Heritage Dictionary, 1992).

➢ Servant Organization – It is an organization in which the characteristics of servant leadership are displayed through the organizational culture and are valued and practiced by the leadership and workforce (Laub, 1999).

➤ Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA). A 66-item instrument that measures the six qualities of servant leadership in organizations, plus job satisfaction (Laub, 1999).

➤ Leader-member Exchange theory – A theory that describes how a leader and an individual subordinate develop an interpersonal relationship over time as the two parties influence each other and negotiate the subordinate's role in the organization (Yukl, 2002).

➤ LMX-7 – It is a seven-item scale to measure the leader-member exchange relationship (Yukl, 2002).

➤ Vertical dyad – It is the reciprocal influence processes composed of one person who has direct authority over another person (Yukl, 2002).

➤ Exchange relationship – It is the level of mutual influence between the leader and a follower. The level is composed of high or low exchanges (Yukl, 2002).

➤ High-exchange – It is a high degree of mutual influence and attraction between the leader and a few subordinates (Hughes, et al, 2002).

➤ Low-exchange – It is a low degree of mutual influence between the leader and a follower (Yukl, 2002).

Limitations

1. The study is confined to the employees of a health-care organization in the state of Nebraska.

2. Due to the unique sample available for the study, results may not be generalized beyond the specific population from which the sample was drawn.

3. Time and cost needed to utilize a larger sample comprised other limitations to this study.

Delimitations

1. The lack of empirical research on servant leadership restricted the study to only conceptual elements of this leadership style.

2. If the sample respondents fail to answer with candor, results might not accurately reflect the opinions of all members of the included population.

3. The OLA is the only instrument available at the moment to measure servant leadership characteristics.

4. The outcomes of the research are based on the confidence level of the instruments.

5. Leader-member exchange theory still has a number of conceptual weaknesses that limit its utility.

Summary

Chapter 1 has presented the need of a leadership style for which the human being is the most important asset of an organization. Servant leadership is a fairly new concept that is becoming popular in the practitioners literature. The paradox of the servant-leader is based on the leader being a servant or a steward nurturing the followers' needs and seeking to develop their potential.

Using a Delphi study, James Laub (1999) found six characteristics of servant leadership: values people; provides leadership; displays authenticity; build community; shares leadership; develops people. However these six characteristics need to be empirically studied in organizations and compared with other leadership measures. Thus, this study compares the six characteristics of Servant Leadership in the different sectors of a health care organization, and assesses how these characteristics relate to the quality of the leader-member exchange.

Chapter 2 contains a review of the leadership literature and compares it with servant leadership concepts developed by Robert Greenleaf. It also explains in more detail the leader-member exchange theory. Chapter 3 presents the methodology and procedures used to gather data for the study; information on the development of the OLA instrument, and a discussion of the reliability of LMX-7. The results of analyses, graphic representations, and findings emerging from the study are presented in chapter 4. Finally chapter 5 contains a summary of the study and findings, conclusions drawn from the findings, a discussion, and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

The purpose, research question, theoretical perspective, and justification for this thesis were discussed in Chapter I. The purpose of this chapter is to review the servant leadership literature and other leadership research. This chapter focuses on the leadership research related to the characteristics of leaders, and what the servant leadership literature says about these characteristics.

The first part of the literature review traces a parallel between the concept of servant leadership and the variables that make a leader effective: power and influence, values, personality, intelligence, and behavior. The discussion and the sequence of these variables are based on the book *Leadership Enhancing the Lessons of Experience, 4th Edition,* by Hughes, Ginnett, and Curphy (2002). The second part contrasts and compares servant leadership to transformational leadership and leader-member-exchange theories. Finally a table of dissertations on servant leadership is provided in the appendix in order to present how this philosophy has been researched so far (Appendix B).

Servant Leadership and Power

One of the most important variables of leadership is power-the capacity to produce effects on others (House, 1984), or the potential to influence others (Bass, 1990). Power also represents an inference or attribution made on the basis of an agent's observable acts of influence (Schrieshein & Hinkin, 1990). It is important to notice that power is a function of the leader, the followers, and the situation. Leaders can influence followers, but can also be influenced by them, while the situation may affect the way leaders use power (Hughes, et al, 2002).

French and Raven (1959) identified five sources, or bases, of power by which an individual can potentially influence others. The five bases of power are organized from the leader's perspective, yet it is important to note that followers also have varying amounts of power they can use to resist a leader's influence attempts.

- *Expert Power* - ability to influence others through relative expertise in particular areas.

- *Referent Power* - potential influence one has due to the strength of the relationship between the leader and the followers.

- *Legitimate Power* - it depends on a person's organizational role. It can be thought of as one's formal or official authority.

- *Reward Power* - it involves the potential to influence others due to one's control over desired resources.

- *Coercive Power* - it is the opposite of reward power. It is the potential to influence others through the administration of negative sanctions or the removal of positive events.

There has been considerable research addressing French and Raven's taxonomy of power, and generally the findings indicate that leaders who rely primarily on referent and expert power have subordinates who are more motivated and satisfied, less absent, and perform better (Hughes, et al, 2002).

Power and its use are central to servant leadership (Showkeir, 2002). Although there is no research on servant leadership and sources of power, the servant leadership literature suggests that servant leaders have their power from referent and expert sources. Robert Greenleaf (1977) saw power as being persuasive and coercive. Persuasive power

creates opportunities and alternatives, so individuals can choose and build autonomy. Coercive power is used to get people to travel a predetermined path. According to him the servant leader practices persuasive power and walks a fine line in most people's mind. By persuasion he means a leadership that causes change by convincement.

Influence Tactics

Whereas power is the capacity to cause change, influence is the degree of actual change in a target person's attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors. Influence can be measured by the behaviors or attitudes manifested by followers as the result of a leader's influence tactics (Hughes, et al, 2002).

Yukl and Falbe (1990) have identified ten types of influence tactics:

- Pressure Tactics - Use of demands, threats, or intimidation to influence targets.

- Upward Appeals - Use of appeals to higher management to gain compliance of the target.

- Exchange Tactics - Implicit or explicit promise of reward in exchange of compliance.

- Coalition Tactics - The agent seeks the aid or support of others to influence the target.

- Ingratiating Tactics - The agent attempts to get the target in a good mood before making a request.

- Rational Persuasion - Use of logical arguments or factual evidence to influence others.

- Inspirational Appeals - Use of emotional requests or proposal designed to arouse enthusiasm or emotions in targets.

- Consultation Tactics - The agent seeks the participation of targets in making decision or planning activity.

A strong relationship exists between the bases of power possessed by agents and targets, and the type of influence tactic used by the agent to modify the attitudes, values, or behavior of a target. Leaders with relatively high amounts of referent power may be more able to use a wide variety of influence tactics, as inspirational appeals, consultation, ingratiating, personal appeal, exchange, and even coalition tactics, to modify the behaviors of their followers. Leaders, who have only coercive or legitimate power, may be able to use only coalition, legitimizing, or pressure tactics to influence followers. In this case, coalition tactics are just pressure tactics taken one step forward, as these leaders can threaten other followers with disciplinary action if they do not persuade a fellow follower to change his attitudes or behavior (Hughes, et al, 2002).

Research has shown that hard tactics (i.e., legitimizing or pressure tactics) are usually used by someone in a superior position when resistance is anticipated, or when the other person's behavior violates important norms (Kipnis and Schmidt, 1985). Soft tactics (e.g., ingratiation) are usually used by someone on a disadvantaged position when resistance is expected or when the agent will personally benefit if the attempt is successful. Rational tactics (i.e., the exchange and rational appeal) is usually used when parties are relatively equal in power, when resistance is not anticipated, and when the benefits are organizational as well as personal (Hughes, et al, 2002). Hinkin and

Schriesheim (1990) found that the use of rationality was the most commonly used influence tactic, and was positively related to legitimate, expert, and referent power.

Although hard tactics can be effective, Kipnis (1984) demonstrated in an experiment that relying on them could change the way leaders see subordinates. Studying leaders' perceptions and evaluations of subordinates, Kipnis found that authoritarian leaders who use hard tactics judged their subordinates as less motivated, less skilled, and less suited for promotion. Democratic leaders who influence subordinates more through rational methods have a positive view of subordinates. Ironically, the act of using hard tactics leads to negative attributions about others, which, in turn, tends to validate the use of hard tactics in the first place (Hughes, et al, 2002).

The servant leadership literature suggests that a servant leader influences followers through rational persuasion and consultation tactics. According to Spears (2002) a servant leader relies on persuasion, rather than on his or her positional authority, in making decisions within an organization. The leader seeks to convince others, rather than to coerce compliance. He or she is effective at building consensus within groups. Greenleaf (1977) states that leadership by persuasion is successful because it brings change by convincement rather than coercion.

Need for Power

People vary in their motivation to influence or control others. McClelland (1975) called this process 'need for power'—individuals with a high need for power derive psychological satisfaction from influencing others. Researchers have identified two different ways of expressing the need for power: personalized power and socialized power.

"Individuals who have a high need for personalized power are relatively selfish, impulsive, and uninhibited, exercising power for their own self-centered needs. Socialized power motive is exercised in the service of higher goals to others or organizations and often involves self-sacrifice toward those ends" (Hughes, et al, 2002, p. 122).

Although the need for power has been found to be positively related to various leadership effectiveness criteria (McClelland and Boyatzis, 1982; Stahl, 1983), McClelland (1985) suggests that successful leaders have the ability to inhibit their manifestation of this need. Leaders who are relatively uninhibited in their need for power will act like a dictator; such individuals use power impulsively, to manipulate or control others, or to achieve at another's expense.

The definition of a servant leader by Robert Greenleaf (1977) shows clearly that a servant leader's need for power is based on socialized power. "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" (p.13). Advocates of servant leadership believe that distributing power encourages freedom, creativity, flexibility, individuality, and the creation of widespread business intelligence. "The distribution of organizational power encourages and gives value to dissent; and from dissent spring creative, superior answers to marketplace dilemmas" (Showkeir, 2002, p. 164).

Servant Leadership and Values

The possession of power leads inevitably to ethical questions about how power should and should not be used. Leaders can use power for good or ill, and the personal code of ethics and values a leader holds may be one of the most important determinants

of how power is used. The moral example a leader sets may become the model for an entire group or organization, for good or bad. (Hughes, et al, 2002).

Values are "constructs representing generalized behaviors or states of affairs that are considered by the individual to be important" (Gordon, 1975, p.2). They are formed through the contributions of diverse inputs, including family, peers, the educational system, religion, the media, science and technology, geography, and current events. Although one's values can change throughout one's life, they are relatively firmly established by young adulthood (Massey, 1979).

Leadership scholars have stressed the centrality and importance of the moral dimension of leadership. Gardner (1990) believes leaders must be judged on the basis of a framework of values, not just in terms of their effectiveness. Leaders should always treat others as ends in themselves, not as objects or mere means to the leader's ends. Burns (1978) maintains that leaders who do not behave ethically do not demonstrate true leadership.

According to England and Lee (1974), values can affect leaders in six different ways:

1) Values affect leaders' perceptions of situations and the problems at hand. If a leader values helping others she or he might see a work-related problem as an opportunity to help a subordinate. On the other hand, if the leader values occupational success above all else she or he might see the problem as an obstacle to achievement.

2) Values affect the solutions generated and the decisions reached about problems. If a leader values standing up for one's beliefs, then he or she may generate solutions or make decisions not considered politically correct in their organizations.

3) Values influence how leaders perceive different individuals and groups. Leaders may have a difficult time developing a closer relationship with followers whose values are different.

4) Values influence leaders' perceptions of individual and organizational successes. Leaders, who primarily value competitiveness, may assess leadership effectiveness differently from leaders who value helpfulness.

5) Values provide a basis for leaders to differentiate between right and wrong, and between ethical and unethical behavior.

6) Values also may affect the extent to which leaders accept or reject organizational pressures and goals. A leader who values obedience may never question the goals of the organization. A leader who values independence may often question and even resist the implementation of some organizational goals in their work units.

Values play a key role in moral reasoning, which is the process leaders use to make decision about ethical and unethical behaviors, or the manner by which leaders solve moral problems.

"Empirical studies of the ethical dimension of leadership have looked at factors affecting moral reasoning and ethical versus unethical behavior, the frequency or prevalence of unethical behaviors in the workplace, the relationship between values and leadership success, and the tolerance of unethical conduct in others" (Hughes, et al, 2002. p. 141).

Although researchers have reported that individuals with strong value systems tend to behave more ethically, highly competitive and unsupervised situations increased the likelihood of unethical behavior from people, regardless of their value systems. The

lack of formal ethical policy governing behavior, the absence of threat of punishment for

unethical behavior, and reward of unethical behavior tend to reinforce the use of

unethical behavior (Malinkowski & Smith, 1985; Trevino & Youngblood, 1990).

Despite the cynicism that exists about the ethical practices of people in some

leadership positions, studies have reported that managers with a strong sense of right and

wrong do appear to be better leaders. Both Ghiselli (1963) and Gordon (1975) reported

that leaders' personal values correlated positively with leadership effectiveness. An

important new line of research deals with efforts to develop a scale to assess a leader's

integrity. It has been well documented that a leader's success is powerfully affected by

perceptions of his or her integrity. On the other hand, it is not well understood how

impressions of a leader's integrity develops, how such perceptions change over time, nor

what leader behaviors are most critical in impacting perceptions of their integrity

(Hughes, et al, 2002).

Robert Greenleaf (1996) viewed 'a need for strength' as the solution for the ethical

dilemma. He defined strength "as the ability to see enough choices of aims, to choose the

right aim, and to pursue that aim responsibly over a long period of time" (p. 27).

According to him, the pursuit for strength is not an option but an ethical requirement. He

stated that:

> "The potentially strong person acquires, early in the mature years, the feeling of
>
> total responsibility for the wider community of which he or she is a part. This
>
> person doesn't necessarily act totally responsibly that might not always be
>
> appropriate for the novice but feels responsible, totally responsible. The things

that are good for the society please this person, and the things that harm it cause pain deep down inside" (p. 42).

Indeed, the entire concept of servant leadership has its foundation on ethical values. Imperative to servant leadership is the value of serving people. According to Greenleaf (1977) the difference between the traditional leader and the servant leader is the care taken by the servant leader "to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served" (p. 13). In order to take care of others' needs the servant leader has to develop the quality of self-awareness. Awareness helps the leader in understanding issues that involve ethics and values. The servant-leader lends himself to being able to view most situations from a more integrated and holistic position (Spears, 2002).

The values of a servant leader make him a steward and a healer. Stewardship is the ethical aspect of servant leadership. It means holding something in trust for another. Greenleaf's view of all institutions was one in which the CEOs, staff, and trustees all played significant roles in holding their institutions in trust for the greater good of society. It is a commitment to serving the needs of others (Spears 2002). As a healer the servant-leader has the potential for healing himself or herself and others. He or she recognizes that they have an opportunity to 'help make whole' those who have broken spirits and have suffered from a variety of emotional hurts (Spears, 2002).

To conclude this section it is important to mention that servant leadership proposes a new business ethic. This new ethic looks at the two major elements of business: the work and the person. For Greenleaf (1996) this new ethic implies that "the work exists for the person as much as the person exists for the work" (p. 117). Thus the

business will become a serving institution, providing meaningful work to the person and a meaningful service and product to the customer.

Servant Leadership and Personality

According to Hogan (1991) the term personality has at least two quite different meanings. First, it refers to the impression a person makes on others, a description and evaluation of the person in the eyes of others. Second, it refers to the underlying, unseen structures and processes inside a person. In other words, personality explains why people behave the way they do; why each person's behavior tends to be relatively similar across different situations, yet it also differs from another person's behavior (Hughes, et al, 2002).

Most of the research addressing the relationship between personality and leadership success has been based on the trait approach. Traits are defined as recurring regularities or trends in a person's behavior.

"The trait approach to personality maintains that people behave the way they do because of the strengths of the traits they possess. Although traits cannot be seen, they can be inferred from consistent patterns of behavior and reliably measured by personality inventories" (Hughes, et al, 2002. p.168).

Over the years a number of researchers using very diverse samples and assessment instruments have observed that behavioral patterns could be reliably categorized into five broad personality dimensions referred to in the personality literature as the Five Factor Model (FFM) of personality (Hogan, et al, 1994). Most modern personality researchers endorse some version of this model (Barrick & Mount, 1991;

Curphy, 1998; Hogan, 1991; Quirk & Fondt, 2000). The five major dimensions include surgency, dependability, agreeableness, adjustment, and intellectance.

- Surgency is also referred to as dominance, self-confidence, the need for power, or dynamics. It involves patterns of behavior often exhibited in-group settings and generally concerned with getting ahead in life. "Individuals higher in surgency are outgoing, competitive, decisive, impactful, and self-confident. Individuals lower in surgency prefer to work by themselves and have relatively little interest in influencing or competing with others" (Hughes, et al, 2002. p. 171).

- Agreeableness is also known as empathy, friendliness, or the need for affiliation. This personality dimension concerns how one gets along with, as opposed to getting ahead of others. "Individuals high in agreeableness tend to be empathetic, approachable, and optimistic; those lower in agreeableness are more apt to appear insensitive, distant, and pessimistic" (Hughes, et al, 2002. p. 171).

- Dependability is also known as conscientiousness. It does not involve interacting with others but rather concerns those behavioral patterns related to one's approach to work.

  "Leaders who are higher in dependability tend be planful and hardworking, follow through with their commitments, and rarely get into trouble. Those who are lower in dependability "tend to be more spontaneous, creative, and rule bending, and less concerned with following through with commitments" (Hughes, et al, 2002. p. 172).

- Adjustment is also known as emotional stability or self-control. It is concerned with how people react to stress, failure, or personal criticism. "Leaders higher in

adjustment tend to be calm and tend not to take mistakes or failures personally, whereas those lower in adjustment may become tense, anxious, or exhibit emotional outbursts when stressed or criticized" (Hughes, et al, 2002. p. 172).

- Intellectance is also known as openness to experience.

"Leaders high in intellectance tend to be imaginative, broad-minded, and curious; they seek out new experiences through travel, the arts, movies, etc. Individuals lower in intellectance tend to be more practical and have narrower interests; they like doing things the tried-and-true way rather experimenting with new ways. It is important to note that intellectance is not the same thing as intelligence-smart people are not necessarily intellectually curious" (Hughes, et al, 2002. p. 172, 173).

Research has shown that surgency, agreeableness, dependability, and adjustment correlates positively with leadership success-the higher an individual scores on these four FFM dimensions, the more likely he or she will be an effective leader (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994; Quirk & Fandt, 2000). Higher scores on intellectance are related to a leader's willingness to learn and look for a new job when downsized, but do not appear to be consistently related to leadership success (Hughes, et al, 2002).

Although there is no research on the relationship between servant leadership and personality, the servant leadership literature suggests that a servant leader would have a lower score in surgency and dependability, and a higher score in agreeableness, in adjustment, and intellectance. Characteristics as empathy, being a good listener, and open to knowledge are part of a servant leader's personality. The servant leader always empathizes and accepts the person. However, sometimes, he or she refuses to accept

some of the person's effort as good enough, as a mean for growth (Greenleaf, 1977). The servant-leader also seeks to identify and help to clarify the will of a group. According to Whetstone (2002), the servant-leader needs to abandon his own preconceptions of how to serve, so he or she can listen to others in defining their needs. He or she talks, listens to others, and from a real dialogue emerges a shared vision and a better one (Kiechel, 1995). According to Greenleaf (1996) a servant leader is open to knowledge, which is different from a quest for knowledge. A servant leader should respect, seek, and take reference from the available formal knowledge; cultivate his or her own resources of intuitive knowledge; and contribute to the general pool of management knowledge.

Servant Leadership and Intelligence

Another important leadership trait is intelligence. In general intelligence is defined by a person's all-around effectiveness in activities directed by thought (Cronbach, 1984).

"Research has shown that more intelligent leaders are faster learners; make better assumptions, deductions, and inferences; are better at creating a compelling vision and developing strategies to make their vision a reality; can develop better solutions to problems; can see more of the primary and secondary implications of their decisions; and are quicker on their feet than leaders who are less intelligent" (Hughes, et al, 2002, p. 184-185).

According to the Triarchic theory of intelligence (Hughes, et al, 2002), there are three basic types of intelligence: analytic, practical, and creative intelligence. Analytic intelligence is the general problem-solving ability, and can be assessed using standardized mental ability tests. Practical intelligence involves knowing how things are

done and how to do them. Creative intelligence is the ability to produce work that is both novel and useful (Sternberg, 2001).

Reviews on studies examining the relationship between intelligence test scores and leadership effectiveness or emergence have provided overwhelming support for the idea that leadership effectiveness and emergence is positively correlated with analytic intelligence. However, leadership situations that are relatively routine, unchanging, or require specific in-depth product or process knowledge may place more importance on practical intelligence than analytic intelligence. With respect to creative intelligence, leaders' primary role is not so much to be creative themselves as to build an environment where others can be creative.

"Leaders can boost the creativity throughout their groups or organizations in many ways, but particularly through selecting creative people in the first place, and providing opportunities for others to develop their creativity, and through broader interventions like making sure the motivation or incentives for others are conducive to creativity and providing at least some guidance or vision about what the creative product or output should look like" (Hughes, et al, 2002, p. 194).

Amabile (1985, 2001) has extensively researched the relationship between creativity and motivation. She has found that people tend to generate more creative solutions when leaders help them to focus on their intrinsic motivation for doing the task rather than focusing on the extrinsic motivation.

Freeman, et al (2002) quotes Greenleaf in saying that creativity is central to serving and leading. Because there is no preexisting formula that tells servant leaders what to do or how to do it, servant leaders must create their way into the answers. "The

leadership of trail blazers…is so situational that it rarely draws on known models. Rather, it seems to be a fresh creative response to here-and-now opportunities" (p. 258). For Freeman, Greenleaf seems to be suggesting an integral relationship between servant leadership and creativity when he says that "except as we venture to create, we cannot project ourselves beyond ourselves to serve and lead" (p. 257).

Another aspect of servant leader intelligence is foresight or the possession of an intuitive mind. Foresight is the servant-leader ability to understand the lessons from the past, the realities of the present, and the likely consequence of a decision for the future. Foresight or an intuitive mind may be the only characteristic that is inherited at birth (Spears, 2002).

Emotional Intelligence

Another important aspect of intelligence is what Daniel Goleman (1995, 1998) called emotional intelligence. He argued that "success in life is based more on one's self-motivation, persistence in the face of frustration, mood management, ability to adapt, and ability to empathize and get along with others than on one's analytic intelligence or IQ" (Hughes, et al, 2002, p. 198).

The emotional intelligence literature has demonstrated that stress tolerance, assertiveness, and empathy, can play important role in leadership success. It also has shown that human emotions are a very important part of one-on-one interactions and teamwork. "When recognized and leveraged properly, emotions can be the motivational fuel that help individuals and groups to accomplish their goals. When ignored or discounted, emotions can significantly impede a leader's ability to influence a group" (Hughes, et al, 2002, p. 198).

Emotions play a key role in servant leadership. A servant leader is empathetic, has a sense of purpose and ability to laugh. According to Greenleaf (1996) a person "can cultivate purpose to the point of having a glimpse of the ultimate and still remain connected with people and events, if one has humor, if one can laugh with all people at all stages of their journey" (p. 95). He further states that purpose and laughter must not separate. Each is empty without the other, for together they are source of strength. The servant leader is also able to get in touch with his or hers own inner voice, seeks to understand what the body, spirit, and mind are communicating (Spears, 2000).

Servant Leadership and Behavior

Behavior is the reflection of personality traits, values, and intelligence. Depending on a leader's traits, values, or personality it may be easier for him or her to effectively perform some leadership behaviors than others may. For instance leaders are high in agreeableness may find it easier to show concern and support for followers but may also find it difficult to discipline followers (Hughes, et al, 2002).

Research on behavior has indicated that leaders may be described in terms of two independent dimensions of behavior called consideration and initiating structure (Fleishman, 1973).

"Consideration refers to how much a leader is friendly and supportive toward subordinates. Leaders high in consideration engage in many different behaviors that show supportiveness and concern, such as speaking up for subordinates' interests, caring about their personal situations, and showing appreciation for their work. Initiating structure refers to how much a leader emphasizes meeting work goals and accomplishing tasks. Leaders high in initiating structure engage in

many different task-related behaviors, such as assigning deadlines, establishing

performance standards, and monitoring performance levels" (Hughes, et al, 2002,

p. 208).

Researchers have reported that leaders exhibiting a high level of consideration

have more satisfied subordinates, whereas leaders exhibiting a high level of initiating

structure often have higher-performing work units if the group faces relatively ambiguous

or ill-defined tasks (Bass, 1990). However, leaders whose behavior is highly autocratic

(an aspect of initiating structure) are more likely to have relatively dissatisfied

subordinates (Bass, 1990). These findings suggest that there is no universal set of leader

behaviors always associated with leadership success. The success of exhibiting task- or

people-oriented behavior will depend upon the situation (Hughes, et al, 2002).

There is a growing body of research that indicates that somewhere between 30

and 50 percent of managers and executives fail to build cohesive teams or achieve

business results. (Charan & Colvin, 1999; Hogan, et al, 1994). Research on managerial

derailment has demonstrated that the first derailment pattern has to do with an inability to

build relationships with co-workers.

"The derailed managers exhibiting this pattern of behavior were very insensitive

to the needs and plights of their followers and co-workers, and were often overly

competitive demanding and domineering. They embraced the "my way or the

highway" school of management. Many were also extremely arrogant and truly

believed no one in their organizations was as good as they were, and they let their

co-workers know it every chance they could" (Hughes, et al, 2002, p. 219).

The servant leader's use of power, values, personality and intelligence results in a high level of consideration for followers. The first thing a CEO must do to build a successful organization is to internalize the belief that people are first. The CEO must also acquire the ability to use and deal with power in such a way as to implement it affirmatively to serve. CEOs should also fulfill the role of facilitating and fostering the leadership capabilities of others, rather than feeling threatened by potential development (Fraker 1995). The servant-leader recognizes the tremendous responsibility to do everything within his or her power to nurture the personal, professional, and spiritual growth of employees (Spears, 2002). The servant-leader is committed to the growth of all followers and even the least privileged (Greenleaf, 1977).

The behavior of a servant leader will let people know:

"That they will have someone to turn to when the going gets hard. Servant-leaders often take on the role of mentor, giving their people someone to depend on. That means being there to cheer when things go well, and being there to comfort and advise when things go badly" (Bethel, 1995, p. 142).

The result of servant leadership practice in an organization will be the voluntary behavior of the employees. Greenleaf said that the most productive organization is one where

"there is the largest amount of voluntary action; people do the right things, things that optimize total effectiveness, at the right times because they understand what ought to be done, they believe these are the right things to do, and they take the necessary actions without being instructed."

Servant Leadership and Transformational Leadership

Burns (1978) defined a transformational leader as the one who motivates followers to work to transcendental goals instead of immediate self-interests, and for achievement and self-actualization instead of safety and security. The transformational leader gains heightened effort from subordinates as a consequence of their self-reinforcement from doing the task.

Transformational leadership is built upon a current body of research that addresses the transformational processes of leadership. Its model attempts to explain how leaders draw the attention of their subordinates to an idealized goal and inspire them to reach beyond their grasp to achieve that goal. The expected result is a higher order change in subordinates (Avolio & Bass, 1988).

Transformational leadership is composed of four characteristics:

- Individualized Consideration - The leader cares for the follower, and motivates the follower to pursue self-improvement. Through individual consideration, and giving the follower the big-picture, the leader helps the subordinate take on self-initiated leadership roles.

- Intellectual Stimulation - The leader motivates the cognitive growth of the follower, and stimulates the follower not think like the leader.

- Inspirational Motivation - The leader inspires the followers to go beyond their assumed limits, and to develop a vision of the future. Leaders communicate a vision to a subordinate who is then self-rewarded for obtaining that vision and turning it into reality.

- Idealized Influence - The leader's behavior, values, commitment to the vision and the organization standards becomes an ideal to the follower.

According to Avolio and Bass (1987) transformational leaders move followers beyond their self-interests for the good of the group, organization, or society; they don't react to environmental circumstances they create them. Thus leaders can establish an environment conducive to, and inspire followers to self-reinforced desired behaviors.

Research has shown that leader's behavior at lower levels may be more important than previously believed. In two meta-analyses, transformational leadership was more highly correlated with work-group effectiveness at lower level vs. higher leadership levels (Lowe, et al, 1996).

According to Yammarino, et al (1993) a transformational leader motivates subordinates to do more than originally expected. This is possible through three conceptual factors:

- Transformational leaders are more charismatic and inspiring in the eyes of their followers.
- Transformational leaders practice individualized consideration, paying attention to the individual differences and needs of their followers.
- Transformational leaders are intellectually stimulating.

Research has shown that transformational leadership positively predicts business performance, while the poorer forms of transactional leadership is negatively related to business performance (Howell and Avolio, 1993).

Transformational and Servant Leadership have many things in common. Burns (1978:20) stated that:

"[Transforming] leadership occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality [...] But transforming leadership ultimately becomes *moral* (italics in original) in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both leader and led, thus it has a transforming effect on both."

Bernard Bass (2000) points out that the transformational components of inspiration and individualized consideration are close to servant leadership. According to him, the transformational leaders strive to align their own and others' interests with the good of the group, organization or society. Both leadership styles facilitate the followers to transcend their own goals. Both seek a high relationship with followers through individualized consideration. Both inspire the followers with a vision, and finally both bring transformation.

The servant leader displays individualized consideration by accepting and recognizing people for their special and unique spirits. The servant-leader assumes the good intentions of co-workers and does not reject them as people, even while refusing to accept a wrong behavior or poor performance (Spears, 2002). Servant leaders intellectually stimulate followers by helping them to increase their skills to "the point that they will be able to perform just as well when their leader is not there as when he or she is there" (Blanchard 1998, p. 28). The servant leader inspires the follower by creating a vision with meaning-one with significance, one that puts the players at the center of things rather than at periphery. If companies have a vision that is meaningful to people, nothing will stop them from being successful (Bennis, 2002). And finally, the servant leader influences the follower with his or her ability to 'dream great dreams.' Looking at a

problem from a conceptualizing perspective means that the leader does not only focus on short-term operational goals but goes beyond day-to-day realities. Thus, servant-leaders seek a healthy balance between conceptual thinking and a day-to-day focused approach (Spears, 2002).

In spite of the common aspects, transformational and servant leadership have their unique characteristics. In transformational leadership the efforts of the leader towards the followers aim at attaining the goals of the organization. By contrast, the efforts of a servant leader are for the sole purpose of helping followers achieve their own goals. The servant leader facilitates the follower's goal without any external influence upon the dyadic relationship. This difference is basically rooted in the moral values of the servant and transformational leaders. The servant leader has a humanistic set of values, which allow him or her to see the follower as the most important asset of an organization. He or she is a healer who seeks to identify some means for building community among those who work within a given institution (Spears, 2002). By way of contrast, the transformational leader has an organizational set of values. The follower is important but the results of the transformation, measured by performance and dedication of the follower, are more important.

According to Farling, et al, (1999) servant leadership goes beyond transformational leadership in selecting the needs of others as its highest priority. The selfless service of the leader directly influences the followers, who consequently transform society.

Servant Leadership and Leader Member Exchange

The leader-member exchange (LMX) theory is distinguished from other leadership theories by its focus on the dyadic relationship between a leader and a member. Traditional theories seek to explain leadership as a function of leader's characteristic, the context, or an interaction between the two. However, the LMX theory adopts the dyadic relationship as the level of analysis (Gerstner & Day, 1997).

LMX says that a leader builds a different relationship with different followers. This relationship is high when it involves mutual trust, good communication, respect and some degree on sharing decision-making. The relationship is low when there is just an exchange between the leader and the follower, the leader acts like a supervisor, and there's not much mutual consideration between both sides. When the leader develops a high relationship with some followers, an in-group is created. An out-group is created when the leader has a low relationship with a group of followers. In other words, if more latitude is given to the subordinate, leadership relations will be produced. If less latitude is given to a subordinate, supervisory relations are likely to surface (Hughes, et al, 2002).

The consequences of LMX relationships are seen in the effectiveness and performance of followers. Multiple studies, using within and between analyses support the finding that individualized leadership effects that involve superiors who support a subordinate's sense of self-worth also receive performance from the subordinate that satisfies the superior. (Dansereau, 1995). Thus, LMX training teaches the importance of developing high relationship with all the members of a department or unit has become very important. It has been found that LMX training was an effective intervention on

producing positive outcomes in both employee productivity and overall job satisfaction

(Graen, Novak, Sommerkamp, 1992).

Research conducted by Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, (1975) has shown that:

◆ Within most units, very early in their development, an in-group (receiving high

leadership attention) and an out-group (receiving low leadership attention) were

found.

◆ Overall, the in-group received higher leadership attention and support than did the

out-group; specifically, the in-group:

♦ Knew what the leader expected, received more help from the leader, and

was more favored than the out-group members.

♦ All the while, the out-group identified the leader as a source of their

problems and providing a lack of knowledge regarding what is expected of

them.

♦ The out-group also indicated that they preferred higher additional attention

that did the in-group.

◆ Because of this level of attention by the supervisor, in-group members

experienced higher satisfaction than did out-group members in regards to:

♦ Intrinsic outcomes of their work, interpersonal relationships with the

leader, their supervisor's technical competence, and the value of their job

performance rewards.

According to Gerstner and Day (1997) other studies have linked LMX to

outcomes associated with member development, such as increased delegation (Leana,

1986), empowerment (Keller & Danserau, 1995), and mentoring (Scandura and

Schriesheim, 1994). Testing the hypothesis that high LMX was associated with transformational leadership, Deluga (1992) found support for individualized consideration and charisma as predictors of LMX quality.

LMX relates to servant leadership in the sense that a high quality leader-member exchange is expected of a true servant leader. A leader, who shows individualized consideration to some followers and not to others, is not a transformational leader. A transformational leader is aware of the human tendency of developing in and out-groups, seeking to be fair with all the members. The servant leader relationship with all members of his or her group is even superior to the transformational leader. For the servant leader is concerned in building a community where all aspects of the followers' life, even those who are not apparently work related, are satisfied.

In the opinion of Bausch's (1998) the secret of servant leadership is that it is grounded in a deep and objective understanding of the human person; it creates an environment or culture that nurtures new meanings of work in large and small organizations; and it does so by constantly striving to enhance the dignity of each and every person, but most importantly, the employees, who in turn, are impacted by the organization.

Summary

This chapter reviewed the servant leadership literature and the leadership research related to the characteristics of leaders. The first part of the chapter traced a parallel between the concept of servant leadership and the variables of power and influence, values, personality, intelligence, and behavior. The literature review indicated that the concept of servant leadership, based on Greenleaf's writing, is in concordance with

research findings in leadership. In other words, a leader with servant characteristics can be an effective leader.

The second part of the chapter compared servant leadership to transformational leadership and leader-member-exchange theories. It is seen from this review that servant leadership is also a form of transformational leadership, although, the servant leadership concept goes beyond the transformational leadership theory for it selects the needs of others as its highest priority. According to the servant leadership literature, the servant leader displays individualized consideration to all followers. Consequently a high leader-member exchange relationship with all followers will be a natural result from of servant leader's behavior.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

The purpose for conducting this study was to compare the six characteristics of Servant Leadership in the different sectors of a health care organization, and to assess how these characteristics related to the quality of the leader-member exchange.

Null Hypotheses

➢ H_o1 – There is no difference by sectors in the subscales scores of the OLA instrument.

➢ H_o2 – There are no relationships between the characteristics of servant leadership as measured by the OLA instrument, and the characteristics of the participants of the study as gender, age, level of education, and time in the organization.

➢ H_o3 – There are no differences in the subscales scores of the OLA instrument between the upper level and management team and the associates of the hospital.

➢ H_o4 – There is no relationship between the servant leadership characteristics as measured by the OLA instrument, and the quality of leader-member exchange as measured by the LMX-7 instrument.

Review of the Literature

To begin the study, a review of the literature was conducted. The review consisted of comparing the main variables and theories of leadership with the servant leadership concept, and a more detailed revision of the leader-member exchange theory.

The review was based on articles derived from main journals of leadership and organizational behavior; the writings of Robert Greenleaf; essays on servant leadership, and dissertations on servant leadership. Extensive use of EBSCO electronic reference was

used to identify and categorize articles and dissertations on servant leadership. The book *Leadership: Enhancing the Lessons of Experience, 4th Edition,* by Hughes, Ginnett, and Curphy (2002) was used to structure the sequence of the major topics in leadership studies.

Population

The health care organization selected for this research was a hospital, with 208 beds and 1844 employees, located in an important city in the Midwest of the United States. Four aspects compose the vision of this organization: compassion, integrity, excellence, and reverence. The principles that guide the organization in providing health care are based in four core values: healing ministry; human dignity; social justice, and healthier communities.

The hospital management structure included the president, three executive directors, and five vice-presidents. Below the top administration there was a variety of 30 directors. Thus, the population for this study consisted of the $N = 1844$ employees divided into 9 top leaders, 30 department directors, and 1805 workforce associates.

Sampling Design

A stratified sample method was used for this study. A random sample was drawn from each of the five sectors of the hospital, each sector represented by a vice president: mission & human resources; strategic planning & business development; nursing; clinical and support services; finance. Another random sample was drawn from the 39 leaders and directors of the hospital in order to test hypothesis three. Therefore, the sample was composed of 6 groups, the 5 sectors and the leaders group.

The stratified sample ensured that each sector was fully represented. The percentage each group made from the total number of participants determined the proportion of the sample for each group. Then using a table of random numbers, an equal number of participants was randomly selected in the corresponding group. According to Taylor-Powell (1998), to keep a 5% margin error with a 95% confidence level the sample size for N = 2000 has to be = 333 (16.65%). As the hospital population (N = 1844) was close to 2000, the sample size necessary for this study was 340 (17%).

To calculate the sample size of each group, the percentage representing each group was multiplied by 340 (17% of the total population) and the result divided by 100. However, the sample size was increased to n = 1106 (60% of the population) assuming a return rate of 31% of completed surveys, what would result in n = 342.

To calculate the percentage representing each group, the population of the group was multiplied by 100 and the result divided by the total population of the hospital. To calculate the proportion of the sample that must come from the group, the percentage representing each group was multiplied by 1106 (60% of the total population) and the result divided by 100.

Instrumentation

OLA

Laub (1999) developed a set of questionnaires, named Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA), to measure servant leadership (Appendix C). Because the OLA is a relatively new and not well-known instrument, it is necessary to explain how this instrument was developed.

The development of the OLA was divided in two phases. The description below is based on Laub's Synopsis of his dissertation.

Phase I – Finding the characteristics of servant leadership

This phase consisted of two parts. The first part involved collecting a list of characteristics of servant leadership from a thorough review of the current literature on servant leadership to determine what had been added to the work of Greenleaf.

The second part involved collecting from a panel of experts an agreed-upon list of the characteristics of a servant leader. Fourteen experts were chosen based upon the fact that they had written on servant leadership or taught at the university level on the subject. These experts took part in a three-part Delphi survey in which they received a series of three questionnaires. The first questionnaire provided a summary of the study and a brief description of the Delphi method. The panel was asked to list at least ten characteristics of the servant leader. Once they had completed the list they were asked to open an envelope that contained a list of characteristics drawn from the literature. Then they were asked to add to their list any of the characteristics from the literature listing they felt should be included. Along with this first questionnaire a statement of assumptions was included to establish a framework for the Delphi question. This statement read: "This study is based on the assumption that there are characteristics of the servant leader which are observable within the context of organizational and team life. The characteristics of the servant leader may include behaviors, attitudes, values and abilities." The Delphi question itself read: What do you judge to be the characteristics of the servant leader?

The second questionnaire presented a compilation of all of the lists received from round one. This compiled list was provided with a semantic differential rating scale on

which the experts were asked to rate each of the 67 items. The scale included four values

placed at regular intervals on a seven-point scale. The four values used were:

- Essential - Without this characteristic a person would not be a servant leader.

- Necessary - This characteristic would normally be present in a person who is a servant leader.

- Desirable - This characteristic is compatible with being a servant leader but is not really necessary.

- Unnecessary - This characteristic probably has little or no relation to a person being a servant leader.

Experts were also asked to add additional characteristics that they felt needed to

be added at this point. Three characteristics were added to the list for the next

questionnaire for a cumulative total of seventy.

The third questionnaire included the results of the responses to round two. The

results were presented using the same semantic scale as in round two with the median,

twenty-fifth percentile, and seventy-fifth percentile of each characteristic rating marked.

They were asked to rate each item once again, while providing their reasoning for any

responses that fell outside of the middle 50% of the group response.

The median and the interquartile range of total response for each item were

computed to determine which characteristics were rated as *Necessary* or *Essential* for

describing the servant leader. These characteristics then formed the basic constructs for

the development of the *OLA* instrument items. These items, along with their clustering

into six potential sub-scores are presented in the Appendix D. A sign test was run on the

interquartile ranges from rounds two and three to reveal a significant movement towards

consensus by the expert panel. A statistically significant, (p<.05), decrease was found in the interquartile range between round two and round three, indicating a move toward consensus, which provided a strong validation of the underlying constructs for the instrument.

Phase II – Building the OLA Instrument

Results from the Delphi survey were used as the constructs to write the instrument items. Likert-style items were written for each construct with more items being written for those that received higher ratings in the Delphi study. The items were written from three different perspectives, producing three different sections of the instrument: assessing the entire organization; assessing the leadership of the organization; assessing both from the perspective of the respondents' personal experience.

A panel of six people individually reviewed and judged the items to determine whether or not they represented the constructs. Each item was reviewed for clarity, grammar and structure. The judges also provided input as to the layout of the instrument and the understandability of the instructions. After clarifications and corrections were made, the initial instrument was ready for the pre-field test. The ordering of the 74 items in the instrument was determined randomly and no mention of "servant" or "servant leadership" was used in the instrument.

Twenty-two people participated in the pre-field test. In addition to taking the instrument, the group verified if the instrument and the individual items were understandable. Measures of reliability using a Cronbach-alpha coefficient (*a*) and item-total correlation using a Pearson correlation were run on this small sample to determine if the instrument was ready for the field test. Item-to-test correlations were run and those

with low scores were considered for changes. The instrument was revised for the fieldtest, resulting in 74 test items. Six additional items were added to provide a comparison of job satisfaction and servant leadership. It should be noted that the job satisfaction items are not a part of the OLA instrument but an additional instrument for the purpose of comparison.

For the field test 1624 instruments were distributed to 45 different organizations representing all of the following four sectors: religious non-profit organizations, secular non-profit organizations, for-profit organizations and public agencies. From a total of 847 people who participated in the field test from 41 organizations, 828 of the responses were useful. Respondents came from various states throughout the United States and one organization from the Netherlands.

The sample was almost evenly divided between female and male. All levels of education were represented with the majority being those with Some College or Undergraduate College. The largest percentage of respondents came from religious organizations (40 %) followed by business organizations and then educational organizations. Sixty-three percent identified themselves as Workforce, while 24% identified as Management/Supervision and 13% as Top Leadership. All age groups were represented with the majority being between 20 and 49 years of age. The respondents were overwhelming white (87%) with 7% identifying as Black-not Hispanic origin and 4% as Hispanic.

Data from the completed instruments were entered into SPSS software and were proofread to ensure accuracy. A reliability estimate was attained with a Cronbach Alpha. An item to total correlation was run on each item to determine the level of correlation of

each item with the total instrument. The relative strength of individual items was

evaluated to consider necessary revisions.

The mean score from the 828 usable instruments was 278.77; possible total score

is 370. The standard deviation was 48.78. Estimated reliability, using the Cronbach-

Alpha coefficient, was .98. The lowest item-to-test correlation was .41 and the highest

was .77, showing that all of the items have a strong correlation with the instrument as a

whole. Reliability estimates and item-to-test correlations were run as well as correlations

between scales. All of the six sub-scores—Values people, Develops people, Build

Community, Displays authenticity, Provides leadership and Shares leadership—revealed

high reliability scores along with high correlations between the scales. The means,

standard deviations and reliability estimates (*a*) for each potential sub-score is presented

are presented in table 2.

Table 2

Reliability Scores on Six Potential OLA Subscores

Potential Subscores	N	M	SD	a
Values people	828	53.84	8.88	.91
Develops people	828	37.37	7.78	.90
Build Community	828	45.20	7.87	.90
Displays authenticity	828	51.79	10.29	.93
Provides leadership	828	45.59	8.49	.91
Shares leadership	828	44.99	9.24	.93

Items were identified for possible revision or deletion based on the information

gained from the data analysis. Several exploratory factor analyses (principal components

solution) were conducted to look at several different dimensionalities with only one

yielding an appealing solution. A two-factor solution, using a varimax rotation, showed

evidence of items loading on the two sections of organizational assessment items and leadership assessment items.

In order to decrease the time it takes to complete the *OLA* instrument items were reduced from 74 to 60 based on selecting items with lower item-to-test correlations and items that could be removed without affecting instrument validity. Reliability and item-to-test correlations were run on the 60-item reduced instrument. The revised instrument had a mean of 223.79 on a total potential score of 300 and the standard deviation was 41.08. The alpha coefficient is .98. The lowest item-test correlation is .41 and the highest is .79. The reduced 60-item instrument maintains the same reliability and adherence to the foundational constructs as the longer instrument while eliminating unnecessary items, allowing for a shorter, easier-to-take instrument.

LMX-7

Since the LMX-7 is a well-known instrument there is no need of such detailed description of the instrument. However, a simple description of its reliability and use is provided below.

LMX-7 is a seven-scale instrument developed by Graen and Scandura (1987), measuring the respondents' relationship with their supervisor. Questions are presented with a seven-point, varying Likert scale response selection. The seven items are summed, resulting in an overall composite score representing the quality of exchange relationship (Scandura and Graen, 1984). Items of the LMX-7 include "I usually know where I stand with my supervisor," "my supervisor understands my problems and needs," "my supervisor recognizes my potential," "my supervisor would use his/her power to help me solve problems in my work," "my supervisor would "bail me out" at his/her own

expenses if needed them to do so," "I have enough confidence in my supervisor that I would defend his/her decisions if he/she were not present to do so," " my working relationship with my immediate supervisor is extremely effective."

The scale is reported with coefficient alphas of .89 (Schriesheim, et al, 1992). LMX-7 differs from the earlier VDL measures in that it does not focus on the amount of negotiating latitude a leader allows a member but rather on the nature of their general working relationship.

Although the term LMX is commonly found in the literature to refer to the dyadic relationship between a leader and a member, construct operationalization is far from consistent. Gerstner and Day (1997) in a meta-analysis of LMX theory identified several versions of the LMX scales. They concluded that the LMX-7 scale is by far the most frequently used LMX measure. They also found higher average alphas for the LMX-7 measure.

> "In addition to its higher average alpha, studies using the LMX-7 measure also tended to obtain higher correlations with outcomes than those using other measures. This difference may be partly due to smaller estimated measurement error for LMX-7. Thus, one implication of these findings is that LMX-7 appears to provide the soundest psychometric properties of all available LMX measures. As such, the LMX-7 is recommended to researches interested in assessing an overall (i.e. unidimensional) exchange quality." (p. 836, 837).

The results of Gerstner and Day's study (1997) also suggest that LMX is more reliably assessed from a member's perspective than from a leader's perspective, probably because "leaders may have a somewhat more complex, multidimensional construction of

exchange quality than members, as indicated by the lower overall LMX alpha estimate from a leader's perspective." (p. 837)

An issue that has been raised by numerous researchers concerns the potential multidimensionality of LMX. Gerstner and Day (1997) refer to Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995), who noted that Cronbach alphas for multimensional LMX measures were consistently in the .80—.90 range. Therefore, they concluded that even though LMX may comprise several dimensions, they are all highly related and can be adequately measured with a unidimensional measure of LMX, the LMX-7.

Data Collection

Surveying

For this study, the instruments were mailed to each randomly chosen participant. A specific contact person from the human resource department of the hospital coordinated the mailing of the instruments. A package was mailed to each participant. The package contained: the two instruments; a letter from the vice-president of human resources informing about the study; a consent form explaining the voluntary aspect, and the anonymity and confidentiality agreement, a self-addressed and prepaid return envelope in the name of the researcher (see Appendix E for the letter from the human resources department, consent form, and follow-up postcard). The packages were mailed on August 08, 2003. A total of 372 follow-up post cards were mailed three weeks later. The follow-up postcards were mailed only to participants of sectors in which the returned surveys were still insufficient to complete the minimum sample size necessary for that sector.

Data Analysis

The analysis procedures for this study focused on meeting the objectives

identified for this investigation. A code sheet was used to identify and describe each

question found in the OLA instrument. The returned questionnaires were examined for

illegible and incomplete data. If the respondent failed to complete parts of the

questionnaire, it was recorded as 'missing data.'

Different scales of measurement were used to categorize and characterize the

data. A nominal scale was used to account for the gender. Ordinal scales were used

measure the age, educational level, and time of employment of the sample. For the OLA

instrument the participants ranked each question from 1 – 5, and in the LMX-7 they

ranked their responses from 1 – 7. Therefore, an interval scale was used for both

instruments.

The results of the survey were entered into a database through Microsoft$^{©}$ Excel

for analysis. Using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) the data were

analyzed in three main steps:

1. A reliability analysis of the instruments.

2. Descriptive statistics—frequencies, ranges, means, and standard deviations.

3. Statistical tests and correlations of the variables according to the hypothesis:

    a) For hypothesis one, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) verified if

       there were any differences in the scores by groups in the subscales of the

       OLA.

    b) For hypothesis two, the Pearson product-moment correlation was used to

       verify the relationship between the characteristics of servant leadership

and gender; and the Spearman correlation d was used to verify the

relationship between the characteristics of servant leadership and age,

educational level, and tenure.

c) For hypothesis three, an independent T-test verified if there were any

differences in the subscale scores between upper management and the

associates.

d) For hypothesis four, a Person product-moment correlation was used to

verify if there was a relationship between the characteristics of servant

leadership and the quality of the leader-member exchange.

Summary

This chapter described the methodology of the study. A total of 1106 employees

of a hospital in the Midwest were randomly chosen from a population of 1844

employees.

The Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) was used to verify differences

between the characteristics of servant leadership in the several sectors of the hospital. The

LMX-7 measured the quality of the relationship between leaders and follower. Then, the

relationship between servant leadership and leader-member exchange was assessed.

CHAPTER IV

Findings

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to compare the six characteristics of Servant

Leadership in the different sectors of a health care organization, and to assess how these

characteristics related to the quality of the leader-member exchange.

This chapter presents the results of data analysis and findings of the study. The

Null Hypotheses were used as a statistical guide in this study. Therefore, the findings are

interpretations of the hypotheses.

The first part of this chapter focuses on the survey respondents, namely the

response rate, and demographic data. The second part provides answers to each one of the

four research questions.

This study used two surveys instruments. The Organizational Leadership

Assessment (OLA) was used to assess the characteristics of servant leadership within the

hospital. The Leader-member Exchange (LMX-7) was used to assess the quality of the

relationship between leaders and non-leaders of the institution. A reliability analysis

revealed that both instruments are highly reliable, a cronbach alpha coefficient of .97 for

the OLA, and .95 for the LMX. The cronbach alpha coefficients for the sub-scales of the

OLA ranged from .86 to .93 (Table 3).

Table 3

Cronbach Alpha Coefficients of the Sub-scales of OLA and the LMX-7 Scale

	Number of Items	Cronbach's α	Sample Size
Values People	10	.90	344
Provides Leadership	9	.86	346
Displays Authenticity	12	.93	344
Builds community	10	.87	342
Shares Leadership	10	.93	344
Develops People	9	.92	342
LMX	7	.95	345

Response Rate

A total of 1068 surveys were randomly sent to a sample of leaders and non-leaders, and 38 surveys were sent to the top leaders and directors. The overall return rate from the sample was 349 (31.6%). The follow-up request resulted in only 25 responses. Because the mean of these follow-up surveys were not different from the other surveys, they were just included in the total body of returned surveys. Two of the returned surveys were not used because of incomplete data.

Table 4

Survey Response Rate

Sectors	Mailed	Returned	%
Presidency & Human Resources	34	13	38.24
Strategic Planning & Business Development	51	18	35.29
Nursing	454	139	30.62
Clinical & Support Services	420	119	28.33
Finance	124	41	33.06
Top Leadership and Directors	23	19	82.61
Total	1106	340	31.56

Demographic Data

The study participants were predominately (85.7%) female. Seventy-one percent

of the total sample was between the ages of 26 and 55. One hundred twenty-five

participants held a bachelor degree (35.8%). Sixty-nine percent of the participants have

been with the hospital from less than one to ten years.

Table 5

Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N = 349)

Characteristics	N	%
Gender		
Male	44	12.6
Female	300	85.7
Age		
19-21	11	3.2
22-25	41	11.7
26-35	78	22.3
36-45	89	25.5
46-55	80	22.9
56-65	40	11.5
66+	8	2.3
Education		
High School	70	20.1
Associate	111	31.8
BA/Bs	125	35.8
MS/MA	33	9.5
PhD	3	1.4
Tenure		
0-5	171	49.0
6-10	70	20.1
11-20	57	16.3
21-30	34	9.7
30-40	10	2.9
40+	3	.9

Interpretation of Results Obtained for the Research Questions

A significance level of α = .05 was used to determine the significance of differences between the mean scores reported in this study. All questions were tested with null hypotheses.

Null Hypothesis 1

There is no difference by sectors in the subscales scores of the OLA instrument.

Research question one uses one-way Analysis of Variance to examine OLA sub-scales scores in each sector of the hospital. Table 6 presents the mean, standard deviation, and number of answers from each sector of the hospital.

The one-way Analysis of Variance indicated that the P-values for all OLA subscales were greater than alpha at 0.05, meaning that there were no significant differences in the scores of the OLA among the hospital sectors (Table 7). Therefore, null hypothesis 1, was accepted.

Table 6

Mean and Standard Deviation of the Sub-scales of the OLA in each Sector of the Hospital

Sectors	Values people			Provides leadership			Displays authenticity		
	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n
1	3.88	.67	13	3.77	.64	13	3.72	.76	13
2	4.08	.42	18	4.07	.48	18	3.91	.63	18
3	3.88	.57	134	3.90	.54	138	3.81	.63	137
4	3.79	.70	119	3.78	.61	117	3.69	.73	116
5	4.05	.58	41	3.99	.56	41	3.99	.63	41

Table6- – Continued

Sectors	Build Community			Shares leadership			Develops people		
	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n
1	3.78	.66	13	3.68	.94	13	3.72	.88	13
2	4.11	.39	18	3.77	.65	18	3.88	.68	18
3	3.93	.50	136	3.77	.69	137	3.83	.66	134
4	3.86	.63	118	3.60	.79	117	3.68	.81	117
5	4.04	.46	38	3.92	.65	40	3.90	.71	41

Sector 1 = Presidency & Human Resources

Sector 2 = Strategic Planning & Business Development

Sector 3 = Nursing

Sector 4 = Clinical & Support Services

Sector 5 = Finance

Table 7

One-Way Analysis of Variance for the Difference in the OLA Sub-scales between Sectors

Variable and Source	df	SS	MS	F	Sig.
Values People					
Between Groups	4	3.00	.75	1.96	.10
Within Groups	320	122.51	.38		
Provides Leadership					
Between Groups	4	2.50	.62	1.94	.10
Within Groups	322	103.59	.32		
Displays Authenticity					
Between Groups	4	3.09	.77	1.70	.15
Within Groups	320	145.71	.46		
Builds community					
Between Groups	4	1.92	.48	1.60	.17
Within Groups	318	95.23	.30		
Shares Leadership					
Between Groups	4	3.60	.90	1.67	.16
Within Groups	320	172.66	.54		
Develops People					
Between Groups	4	2.35	.59	1.09	.36
Within Groups	318	170.64	.54		

In order to strengthen the verification of the results for hypothesis 1, a second one-way analysis variance was done. In this new analysis the OLA five point likeart-scale was reduced to four points. The item number 3 'undecided' was eliminated. This procedure resulted in a slight change on the means with no significant difference among the sectors of the hospital. A table with means and the ANOVA is presented at the appendix G.

Null Hypothesis 2

There are no relationships between the characteristics of servant leadership as measured by the OLA instrument, with the gender, age, level of education, and time in the organization.

The findings related to this null hypothesis were achieved by using two correlation analyses. The first one was the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients to determine linear relationship between the subscales of the OLA and gender. Because gender is a dichotomous variable, it was first converted to numerical values and then the Person correlation was used. Age, educational level, and tenure are ordinal data, thus it required the use of Spearman correlation.

The Pearson correlation (Table 8) did not find any significant correlation between gender and the characteristics of servant leadership as measured by the OLA instrument.

Results of the Spearman correlation (Table 9) indicated that age and tenure have a significant correlation to some characteristics of servant leadership. Age positively correlated with 'values people,' 'displays authenticity,' 'build community,' and 'shares leadership,' and 'develops people.' Tenure negatively correlated with 'provides leadership.'

Thus null hypothesis two was partially rejected.

It is important to notice that although tables 8 and 9 presents the correlations of all variables, the relationship among the subscales of the OLA, and the relationship among the demographic variables were not analyzed in this study.

Table 8

Pearson Correlations for Sub-scales of the OLA as a function of Gender.

Measures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1) Values people	--						
2) Provides leadership	.78**	--					
3) Displays authenticity	.91**	.82**	--				
4) Build Community	.86**	.77**	.82**	--			
5) Shares leadership	.86**	.82**	.90**	.79**	--		
6) Develops people	.88**	.84**	.90**	.81**	.90*	--	
7) Gender	-.20	.07	-.04	-.03	-.03	.02	--

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

Table 9

Spearman Correlations for Sub-scales of the OLA as a function of Age, Education, and Tenure.

Measures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1) Values people	--								
2) Provides leadership	.75**	--							
3) Displays authenticity	.88**	.79**	--						
4) Build Community	.83**	.75**	.81**	--					
5) Shares leadership	.84**	.77**	.89**	.76**	--				
6) Develops people	.86**	.81**	.86**	.79**	.84**	--			
7) Age	.22**	.06	.18**	.13*	.16**	.09*	--		
8) Education	-.05	-.07	-.01	-.02	-.02	-.06	-.02		
9) Tenure	.04	-.10*	.02	.03	-.01	-.06	.48**	.01	--

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

 * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

Null Hypothesis 3

There are no differences in the subscales scores of the OLA instrument between upper level and management team and the associates of the hospital.

An independent T-test was used to determine whether the sample of leaders differed significantly from the sample of non-leaders. The independent t-test is used when the two sample are different in size for it evaluates the mean differences between two different populations (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2000).

When comparing the differences using T-tests (Table 10), leaders responded significantly higher than non-leaders on the 'values people' subscale, $t(342) = 2.24$, $p <.05$, two-tailed; on 'displays authenticity' subscale, $t(342) = 2.76$, $p <.01$, two-tailed; on the 'shares leadership' subscale, $t(342) = 2.93$, $p <.01$, two-tailed. Therefore, null hypothesis 3 was rejected.

Table 10

Differences in the OLA Subscales between Leaders and Non-leaders

Measure	Leaders Scores			Non-leaders Scores				
	M	SD	N	M	SD	n	df	t
Values people	4.21	.33	19	3.89	.62	325	342	2.24*
Provides leadership	4.06	.48	19	3.87	.57	327	344	1.39
Displays authenticity	4.23	.39	19	3.79	.68	325	342	2.76**
Build Community	4.15	.32	19	3.92	.55	323	340	1.84
Shares leadership	4.23	.42	19	3.72	.74	325	342	2.93**
Develops people	3.99	.44	19	3.78	.73	323	340	1.21

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
 * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Null Hypothesis 4

There is no relationship between the servant leadership characteristics as measured by the OLA instrument, and the quality of leader-member exchange as measured by the LMX-7 instrument

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were used to determine if there is any significant relationship between the six characteristics of servant leadership and the quality of leader-member exchange.

Results of the correlation (Table 12) indicated a high correlation at the level $p < .01$, two tails, between all of the six subscales of the OLA instrument and the LMX-7 instrument. The significant correlations presented in Table12 support rejection of null hypothesis 4.

Table 11

Means and Standard Deviations for the Six Subscales of OLA and the LMX-7 Scale

Measure	M	SD	n
Values People	3.90	.61	344
Provides Leadership	3.88	.57	346
Displays Authenticity	3.82	.67	344
Builds community	3.93	.54	342
Shares Leadership	3.75	.73	344
Develops People	3.79	.72	342
LMX	37.82	.19	345

Table 12

Pearson Correlations and Coefficient Alphas for the Subscales of OLA and the LMX-7 Scale

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1) Values People	**.90**						
2) Provides Leadership	.78**	**.86**					
3) Displays Authenticity	.91**	.82**	**.93**				
4) Builds community	.86**	.77**	.82**	**.87**			
5) Shares Leadership	.86**	.82**	.90**	.79**	**.93**		
6) Develops People	.88**	.84**	.90**	.81**	.90**	**.92**	
7) LMX	.78**	.63**	.72**	.64**	72**	.75**	**.95**

Note. Coefficient alphas are presented in boldface along the diagonal.
All coefficients are significant at $p < .01$, two-tails.

It is important to notice that the Pearson correlation one-tail was also run to contrast with the two-tail. Although the correlation coefficients were smaller, the correlation of LMX-7 with all subscales of the OLA was still significant at the level $p < .01$.

Summary

This chapter presented the findings related to the research questions for this study. Data analyses failed to reject hypothesis 1 and rejected hypothesis 2, 3, and 4.

Conclusions and recommendations based on these findings are presented in chapter V.

CHAPTER V

Summary, Conclusions, Discussion, and Recommendations

Summary

This study was designed to compare the six characteristics of servant leadership—values people; provides leadership; displays authenticity; build community; shares leadership; develops people—in the different sectors of a health care organization, and to assess how these characteristics relate to the quality of the leader-member exchange. The specific research hypotheses were:

1) Are there differences in the characteristics of servant leadership as measured by the OLA instrument when comparing the Human Resources, Strategic Planning and Business Development, Nursing, Clinical and Support Services, and Finance sectors of the targeted health care organization?

2) Are there relationships between the characteristics of servant leadership as measured by the OLA instrument and gender, age, level of education, and time in the organization?

3) Are there differences in the subscales scores of the OLA instrument between the upper level and management team, and the associates of the hospital?

4) Are there relationships between the characteristics of servant leadership—values people; provides leadership; displays authenticity; build community; shares leadership; develops people—as measured by the OLA instrument, and the quality of leader-member exchange as measured by the LMX-7 instrument?

The literature review of this study traced the concept of servant leadership and the possible potential connection to variables of power and influence, values, personality, intelligence, and behavior. It also compared servant leadership to transformational

leadership and leader-member-exchange theories. According to the servant leadership literature, the servant leader displays individualized consideration to all followers. Consequently a high leader-member exchange relationship with all followers will be a natural result from a servant leader's behavior.

This study was conducted with 330 associates and 19 top leaders of a hospital in the Midwest. The Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) was used to verify differences between the characteristics of servant leadership in the several sectors of the hospital. The LMX-7 measured the quality of the relationship between leaders and follower. Then, the relationship between servant leadership and leader-member exchange was assessed.

The findings of this study were the following:

A one-way Analysis of Variance indicated no significant differences in the scores of the OLA among the hospital sectors. The Pearson correlation did not find any significant correlation between gender and the characteristics of servant leadership as measured by the OLA instrument. The Spearman correlation indicated that age and tenure have a significant correlation to some characteristics of servant leadership. Age positively correlated with 'values people,' 'displays authenticity,' 'build community,' and 'shares leadership,' and 'develops people.' Tenure negatively correlated with 'provides leadership.'

Independent T-test determined that leaders responded significantly higher than non-leaders on 'values people,' 'displays authenticity' and 'shares leadership' subscales. And finally, results of the Pearson correlation indicated a high correlation between all of the six subscales of the OLA and the LMX-7 instrument.

Conclusions

This section presents conclusions drawn from the findings and results of the data analysis.

Null hypothesis one failed to be rejected: there was no difference by sectors in the subscales of the OLA instrument.

When comparing each sector of the hospital, namely, human resources, strategic planning and business development, nursing, clinical and support services, and finance, with each characteristics of servant leadership, mean scores among the sectors were very close not yielding a significant difference.

Null hypothesis two was partially rejected: there were no relationships between the characteristics of servant leadership as measured by the OLA instrument with gender, and with level of education. Results of the analysis showed that only age and tenure correlated with some characteristics of servant leadership.

Null hypothesis three was rejected: there was a significant difference in the subscales scores of the OLA instrument between the upper level and management team and the associates of the hospital.

When comparing the differences between leaders and non-leaders, leaders responded significantly higher than non-leaders on the 'values people,' 'displays authenticity,' and 'shares leadership.'

Null hypothesis four was rejected: there was a significant relationship between the servant leadership characteristics as measured by the OLA instrument, and the quality of leader-member exchange as measured by the LMX-7 instrument.

Results showed that significant correlations existed between the subscales of the OLA and the LMX-7 instrument.

Discussion

The result of the first hypothesis has shown that there was no difference in the way the participants of the study perceived the characteristics of servant leadership in their respective sectors. Although no significant difference was found, it is important to notice that the means of each sector was higher than 3, within a range from 1 to 5, for each sub-scale of the OLA. A mean of 1 and 2 reflects that the participants disagreed with the characteristics of servant leadership being measured. Consequently, 3 reflected they were undecided, and 4 and 5 that the participants agreed.

The score ranges were: 'values people' 3.79 – 4.08; 'provides leadership' 3.78 – 4.07; 'displays authenticity' 3.69 – 3.99; 'build community' 3.78 – 4.11; 'shares leadership' 3.60 – 3.92; 'develops people' 3.68 – 3.90. From these means, it can be deduced that the hospital has a tendency of being a servant led organization.

It can be hypothesized that since this organization is a not-for-profit institution, and linked to a religious organization it may have an influence in the leadership of the organization. Other reasons that might influence the leadership are the core values of the organization: a healing ministry, human dignity, social justice, and healthier communities. These core values are aligned to the servant leadership concept that the followers grow as persons, become healthier and the least privileged also benefit (Greenleaf, 1977).

On the other hand, methodological reasons might have affected the results. The sample for this study was drawn from the sectors of the hospital; however, some sectors

such as nursing, and clinical and environmental services have several departments under them. It is possible that differences might be found when comparing between departments instead of sectors. However, that would require a bigger sample and it is out of the scope of this study.

Hypothesis 2 was partially rejected because age and tenure were the only demographic factors to present a significant correlation with the characteristics of servant leadership. Age positively correlated with 'values people,' 'displays authenticity,' 'build community,' 'shares leadership, and 'develops people.' Although a significant correlation was found, the correlation coefficient was very low. When measuring the strength of the relationship, by squaring the correlation value, the coefficient of determination ($r2$) resulted in 4% for values people, 3% for displays authenticity, 1% for build community, 2% for shares leadership, and less than 1% for develops people. Tenure negatively correlated with 'provides leadership.' The strength of the relationship between tenure and provides leadership was also very low; it was less than 1 percent.

Even though the significant correlations were low, a Scheffé post-hoc test was used to verify if there were any significant differences in the means of the different age and tenure groups. The post-hoc test did not find any differences.

Surprisingly gender, and level of education, did not present any relationship with the characteristics of servant leadership. It is possible that a methodology with a bigger sample might bring different results.

The results of hypothesis 3 revealed a significant different perception between leaders and non-leaders towards the characteristics of servant leadership. The mean

scores of leaders in relation to 'values people,' 'displays authenticity,' and 'shares leadership' were higher than the non-leaders.

These results show a discrepancy in the way leaders and non-leaders see some aspects of leadership in the hospital. It is important to notice that a servant leader values people by trusting people, serving others first, and by receptive listening. The servant leader displays authenticity by being open and accountable to others, willing to learn from others, and maintaining integrity and trust. And finally a servant leader shares leadership by facilitating a shared vision, sharing power and releasing control, and by sharing status and promoting others (Laub, 1999).

One of the explanations for the inflated perception of the characteristics listed above may be found under the situational favorability model. According to Hughes, et al (2002) this model is the amount of control the leader has over the followers. Thus, the more control a leader has, the more favorable the situation is from the leader's perspective. However, in this study followers did not have the same perception; they saw the leaders with a lower perception than the leaders perceived themselves.

Concerning the methodology of this study, one of the reasons that might have influenced the results, is the fact this sample of leaders is composed of vice-presidents and department directors. According to the person responsible for the human resources department at the hospital, they have eliminated middle management positions. Therefore, leaders of large departments might not have the same contact with the department members as supervisors or team leaders would have, thus the extent of their belief or practice of servant leadership is not getting to the lower levels. It would be very

interesting to adapt the OLA instrument for a 360 degree approach, so the difference would be better verified.

The analysis of hypothesis 4 has indicated a high correlation at the level $p < .01$, two-tails and also one-tail, between all of the six subscales of the OLA instrument and the LMX-7 instrument. When measuring the strength of the relationship, by squaring the correlation value, the coefficient of determination ($r2$) resulted in 61% for values people, 40% for provides leadership, 52% for displays authenticity, 41% for build community, 52% for shares leadership, and 56% for develops people. It is important to note that a correlation measures and provides a description of a relationship. It does not explain why the two variables are related (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2000).

Therefore, this hypothesis is limited only to find a relationship between servant leadership characteristics and the quality of leader-member exchange. This correlation cannot be interpreted as a proof of a cause-effect relationship between the two variables.

The servant leadership concept is based on a meaningful relationship between the leader and the follower. Thus, it is not surprising that there is a relationship between the characteristics of servant leadership and the quality in the dyadic level. Furthermore, research on LMX has shown that the higher the quality of the exchange, the more relational the interaction between the leader and subordinate (Pillai, 1999).

The findings of this study support findings which have found a relationship between high LMX and increased delegation (Leana,1986); empowerment (Keller and Danserau,1995); mentoring (Scandura and Schriesheim, 1994). Finally, Deluga (1992) who found a support for individualized consideration and charisma as predictors of LMX quality.

Scandura (1999) has reported that LMX has been positively related to job satisfaction, productivity, and career progress of managers, and negatively related to turnover and employee complains. Therefore, it could be speculated that a servant led organization would also be benefited by the positive relationship of LMX presented above by Scandura.

Recommendations

Recommendations for practice and for further studies include:

- Although no significant differences were found when comparing the sectors scores of the OLA, some sectors scores had their mean below 4, in 1 – 5 scale, in all characteristics of servant leadership. Therefore, there is a margin for improvement if the organization wants to be a servant led organization. In order to improve these scores, the organization could focus their leadership training in the specific servant characteristics needed for each sector.

- Special training sections on servant leadership characteristics could be designed for the leaders. These sections would focus the factors that have shown a discrepancy between leaders and non-leaders, namely, values people, displays authenticity, and shares leadership.

- A replication of the study in a similar but not-for-profit organization to verify if the espoused philosophy of the organization influences the results.

- A similar study with a stronger focuses on personal characteristics to measure how gender, age, educational level, time in the organization, and race relate to servant leadership characteristics.

- Future research on servant leadership could hypothesize that, contrary to the results of this study, leaders and non-leader perceptions should be the same in a servant led organization.

- The data of the present study should be analyzed to find the direction of the relationship between the characteristics of servant leadership and LMX. More advanced statistics methods can reveal if the characteristics of servant leadership predict LMX or vice-versa.

- It is also necessary to design of more studies comparing the characteristics of servant leadership and other leadership variables as those presented in the literature review of this study.

REFERENCES

Amabile, T. M. (1985). Motivation and creativity: effects of motivation orientation on creative writers. *Journal of Personal and Social Psychology*, 48, 393-99.

Amabile, T. M. (2001). Beyond talent: John Irving and the passionate craft of creativity. *American Psychologist*, 56, 333-36.

American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (3rd ed.). (1992). Houghton Mifflin Company

Avolio, B. & Bass, B. (1988). Transformational leadership, charisma, and beyond. In J. Hunt, H. Baliga, H. Dachler, & C. Schriesheim (Eds.), Emerging leadership vistas (pp. 29-50). Lexington, MA: Heath.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: *A meta-analysis. Personal Psychology*, 44, 1-26.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7 (3), 18-40.

Bausch, T. (1998). Servant-leaders making human new models of work and organization. In L. Spears, & M. Lawrence (Eds.), Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership (pp. 230-245). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Bennis, W. (2002). Become a Tomorrow Leader. In L. Spears, & M. Lawrence (Eds.), Focus on leadership: Servant leadership for the 21st Century (pp. 101-109). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Best, J., & Kahn, J. (1989). *Research in Education* (6th Ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Bethel, S. M. (1995). Servant-Leadership and corporate risk taking: When risk taking makes a difference. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), Reflections on leadership. How Robert Greenleaf's theory of servant leadership influences today's' top management thinkers (pp. 135-148). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Blanchard, K. (1998). Servant-leadership revisited. In L. Spears, & M. Lawrence (Eds.), Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership (pp. 21 - 28). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Bowman, M.A. (1997). Popular approaches to leadership. In P.G. Northouse (Ed.), Leadership: Theory and practice (pp. 230-260). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Charan, R., & Colvin, G. (1999, June 21). Why CEOs fail. *Fortune*, 69-82.

Conley, J., & Wagner-Marsh, F. (1998). The integration of business ethics and spirituality in the workplace. In Spears, L. (Ed.), *Insights on Leadership: Service, Stewardship, Spirit, and Servant-Leadership*. (pp. 251-57). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Cronbach, L. J. (1984). *Essentials of psychological testing* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Curphy, G. J. (2000). *Users guide and interpretative report for the leadership personality survey*. Minneapolis: Personnel Decisions International.

Danseraeau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role-making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 46-78.

Dansereau, F. (1995). A Dyadic approach to leadership: Creating and nurturing this approach under fire. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 479-490.

Deluga, R. J. (1992). The relationship of leader-member exchange with laissez-faire, transactional, and transformational leadership in naval environments. In K. E. Clark, M. B. Clark, & D. P. Campbell (Eds.), Impact of leadership (pp. 237-247). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Deluga, R. J., & Perry, T. J. (1994). The role of subordinate performance and ingratiation in leader-member exchanges. *Group and Organization Management*, 19, 67-86

DePree, M. (2002). Servant leadership: Three things necessary. In L. Spears, & M. Lawrence (Eds.), Focus on leadership: Servant leadership for the 21st Century (pp. 89-97). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

England, G. W., & Lee R. (1974). The relationship between managerial values and managerial success in the United States, Japan, India, and Australia. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 411-419.

Falter, J. (2000). *The company as family: Perceived strengths of Duncan Aviation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

Farling, M.L., Stone, A.G., & Winston, B.E. (1999). Servant leadership: Setting the stage for empirical research. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6 (1/2), 49-72.

Fleishman, E. A. (1973). Twenty years of consideration and structure." In E. A. Fleishman & J. G. Hunt (Eds.). Current developments in the study of leadership. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Fraker, A. (1995). Robert K. Greenleaf and business ethics: There is no code. In L. Spears (Ed.), Reflections on leadership: How Robert Greenleaf's theory of servant leadership influences today's top management thinkers (pp. 37-48). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Freeman, T. L., Isaksen, S. G., & Dorval, K. B. (2002). Servant-Leadership and Creativity. In L. Spears, & M. Lawrence (Eds.), Focus on leadership. Servant leadership for the 21st Century (pp. 257-267). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

French, J., & Raven, B. H. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies of social power (pp. 375-384). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Gardner, J. (1995). The cry for leadership. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), The leader's companion: Insight on leadership through the ages (pp. 3-7). New York: The Free Press.

Gardner, J. W. (1990). *On Leadership*. New York: Free Press.

Gerstner, C., & Day, D. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 6, 827-844.

Ghiselli, E. E. (1963). Intelligence and managerial success. *Psychological Reports*, 12, 89.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell.

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell.

Gordon, L. V. (1975). *Measurement of interpersonal values*. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. In B. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior, Vol. 9 (pp. 175-208). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Graen, G., Novak, M., & Sommerkamp, P. (1982). The effects of leader-member exchange and job design on productivity and satisfaction: Testing a dual attachment model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 30, 109-131.

Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly, 6*(2), 219–247.

Gravetter, F. & Wallnau, L. (2000). *Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences* (5th ed). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Greenleaf, R. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Greenlead, R. (1986). On becoming a servant leader: the private writings of Robert K. Greenleaf. D. Frick & L. Spears (Eds.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Hinkin, T.R., & Schriesheim, C.A. (1990). Relationships between subordinate perceptions of supervisor influence tactics and attributed bases of supervisory power. *Human Relations*, 43, 221-237.

Hogan, J. (1991). Personality and personality measurement. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology: Vol. 2. (pp. 873-919). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Hogan, R, T., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What do we know about personality: leadership and effectiveness? *American Psychologist*, 49, 493-504.

House, R. J. (1984). *Power in organizations: A social psychological perspective*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Toronto.

Howell, J. & Avolio, B. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 891-902.

Hughes, R, Ginnett, R., & Curphy, G. (2002). *Leadership: Enhancing the lessons of experience* (4th Ed.). Irwin, McGraw-Hill.

Jago, A. (1982). Leadership: Perspective in theory and research. *Management Science*, 3 (28), 315-336.

Johnson, C. (2001). *Meeting the ethical challenges of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Keller, T. & Dansereau, F. (1995). Leadership and empowerment: A social exchange perspective. *Human Relations*, 48, 127-146.

Kiechel, W. (1995). The leader as servant. In L. Spears (Ed.). Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant leadership influenced today's top management thinkers (pp. 121-125). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Kipnis, D. (1984). The view from the top. *Psychology Today*, 18 (12), 30-36.

Kipnis, D., & Schmidt, S. M. (1985). The language of persuasion. *Psychology Today*, 19 (4), 40-46.

Laub, J. (1999). *Assessing the servant organization: Development of the organizational leadership assessment (OLA) instrument – A brief synopsis of a dissertation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton.

Leana, C. R. (1986). Predictors and consequences of delegation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 2, 754-774.

Lopez, I. (1995). Becoming a servant-leader: The personal development path. In L. Spears, (Ed.), Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant leadership influenced today's top management thinkers (pp. 149-160). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7 (3), 385-425.

Malinkowski, C. I., & Smith, C. P. (1985). Moral reasoning and moral conduct: An investigation prompted by Kohlberg's theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 1016-1027.

Massey, M. (1979). *The people puzzle: Understanding yourself and others*. Reston: VA: Reston.

McClelland, D. C. (1975). *Power: The inner experience*. New York: Irvington.

McClelland, D. C. (1985). *Human motivation*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foreman.

McClelland, D. C., & Boyatzis, R. E. (1982). Leadership motive pattern and long-term success in management. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 737-743.

McGee-Cooper, A. & Trammell, D. (2002). From hero-as-leader to servant-as-leader. In L. Spears, & M. Lawrence (Eds.), Focus on leadership: Servant leadership for the 21st Century (pp. 141-151). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Pillai, R., Scandura, T. & Williams, E. (1999). Leadership and organizational justice: similarities and differences across cultures. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 30(4), 763-79.

Quirk, M.P., & Fondt, P.M. (2000). *The second language of leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Rost, J. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.

Ruschman, N. (2002). Servant leadership and the best companies to work for in America. In L. Spears, & M. Lawrence (Eds.), Focus on leadership: Servant leadership for the 21st Century (pp. 123-139). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Scandura, T. A. (1999). Rethinking leader-member exchange: An organizational justice perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(1), 25-40.

Scandura, T., & Graen, G. (1984). Moderating the effects of initial leader-member exchange status on the effects of a leadership intervention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 579-584.

Scandura, T. & Schriesheim, C. A., (1994). Leader-member exchange and supervisor career mentoring as complementary constructs in leadership research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 1588-1602.

Schriesheim, C. A., & Hinkin, T. R. (1990). Influence tactics used by subordinates: A theoretical and empirical analysis and refinement of Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson subscales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 246-57.

Schriesheim, C. A., Scandura, T. A., Eisenbach, R. J., and Neider, L. L. (1992). Validation of a new Leader-Member Exchange Scale (LMX-6) using hierarchically-nested maximum likelihood confirmatory factor analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52, 135-147.

Sendjaya, S., & Sarros, J. (2002). Servant leadership: Its origin, development, and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership and Organization Studies*, 9 (2), 57 - 64.

Showkeir, J. D. (2002). The business case for servant-leadership. In L. Spears, & M. Lawrence (Eds.), Focus on leadership. Servant leadership for the 21st Century (pp.153-165). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Smith, R. (1995). Servant-leadership: A pathway to the emerging territory. In L. Spears, (Ed.), Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant leadership influenced today's top management thinkers (pp. 198-213). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Spears, L. (2002). Tracing the past, present, and future of servant leadership. In L. Spears, & M. Lawrence (Eds.), Focus on leadership. Servant leadership for the 21st Century (pp. 1-16). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Stahl, M. J. (1983). Achievement, power, and managerial motivation: selecting managerial talent with the job choice exercise. *Personnel Psychology*, 36, 775-789.

Sternberg, R. J. (2001) What is the common thread of creativity? Its dialectical relationship to intelligence and wisdom. *American Psychologist*, 56 (4), 360-62.

Tar, D. L. (1995). The strategic toughness of servant leadership. In L. Spears (Ed.), Reflections on leadership: How Robert Greenleaf's theory of servant leadership influences today's' top management thinkers (pp. 79-83). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1995.

Taylor-Powell, E. (1998*). Sampling (G-3658-3).* Madison: University of Wisconsin-Extension, Cooperative Extension.

Trevino, L. K., & Youngblood. S. A. (1990). Bad apples in bad barrels: A causal analysis of ethical decision-making behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 378-85.*

Whetstone, J. T. (2002). Personalism and moral leadership: The servant leader with a transforming vision, business ethics. *A European Review*, 11 (4), 386-392.

Yammarino, F. J., Spangler, W. D., & Bass B. M. (1993). Transformational leadership and performance: A longitudinal investigation. *Leadership Quarterly*, 4, 81- 02.

Yukl, G. A. (2002). *Leadership in organizations*. 5th ed. Upper Saddle River,NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yukl, G., & Falbe, C. M. (1990). Influence tactics in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 416-423.

Zohar, D. (2002). Servant leadership and rewiring the corporate brain. In L. Spears, & M. Lawrence (Eds.), Focus on leadership. Servant leadership for the 21st Century (pp. 111-121). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

APPENDIX A
Experts in Servant Leadership Panel

The 14 participants included:

Larry Spears, The Greenleaf Center for Servant-Leadership; Ann McGee-Cooper and Duane Trammell, Ann McGee-Cooper & Associates (note: these two worked together on a single response for each part of the survey and are therefore counted as one respondent); Jim Kouzes, Learning Systems, Inc,/The Tom Peters Group; Dr. Bill Millard, Life Discovery and World Servants; Lea Williams, Bennett College; Dr. Joe Roberts, Suncoast Church of Christ; Jack Lowe, Jr., TD Industries; Dr. Pam Walker, Cerritos College; Grace Barnes, Azusa Pacific University; Ann Liprie-Spence, McMurray University; Deborah Campbell, Servant Leadership Community of West Ohio; Dr. Ted Ward, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School and Michigan State University; Bishop Bennett Sims, The Institute for Servant Leadership.

APPENDIX B
Summaries of empirical findings on servant leadership

Sub ject	Study	Type of sample	Method	N	Main findings
Bus	"Perspectives of servant-leadership and spirit in organizations" Horsman, J. Ph.D. 2001	Organizations of various types.	Quant.	608	Congruency of servant-leadership and personal aspects of spirit.
Bus	"Servant-leadership: Belief and practice in women-led businesses" Braye, R. Ph.D. 2000		Qual.		No significant difference between women and men beliefs in Servant leadership.
Bus	"Barriers to servant leadership: Perceived organizational elements that impede servant leader effectiveness" Foster, B. Ph.D. 2000	Large Corporation	Qual.	20	Barriers had a real effect on servant leaders.
Edu	"Servant leadership: Moral foundations and academic manifestations" Markwardt, R. Ph.D. 2001	Professors of higher education	Qual.	5	Servant leadership encompasses religious/ philosophical beliefs. It depends on a moral base.
Edu	"Visionary leader behaviors and their congruency with servant leadership characteristics" Lubin, K. Ed.D. 2001	County superintendents	Qual.	18	Congruency of visionary leader behaviors with servant leadership characteristics.
Edu	"Servant leadership qualities exhibited by Illinois public school district superintendents" Girard, S. Ed.D. 2000	School superintendents	Qual.		Superintendents displayed servant leadership.

Edu	"An investigation of servant-leadership in public school superintendents in the state of Indiana" Livovich, M. Ph.D. 1999	School superintendents	Qual.	229	Higher the education more servant-leader-like.
Edu	"Servant leadership and the public school superintendent" Wheaton, C. Ph.D. 1999	School Staff	Qual.	12	No identification of effective servant leadership.
Edu	"An evaluative study of azusa pacific university's operation impact program" Barnes, G. Ph.D. 1999				
Edu	"Assessing the servant organization: development of the servant organizational leadership assessment instrument" Laub, J. Ed.D. 1999	42 Organizations	Qual/ Quant.	828	OLA was found to be a reliable.
Edu	"The meaning of servant leadership" Van Kuik, A. Ph.D. 1998	School leaders	Qual.	4	Concept of servant leadership.
Edu	"Images of servant leadership in education" Taylor-Gillham, D. Ed.D. 1998	Educational organizations	Qual.		Enhance the theoretical study of servant leadership.
Edu	"A Case Study Of Servant Leadership" Walker, P. Ed.D. 1997	Community College	Qual.		Potential of servant leadership.
Edu	"The development of a SL style for the central Baptist college board of trustees" Hoshaw, R. D.Min. 1985	Board of trustees			

Psy	"Turning points in the development of male servant-leaders" Boyer, G. Ph.D. 1999	Male leaders	Qual.	15	Possibility to anticipate servant-leadership.
Rel	"The conceptualization and perception of biblical servant leadership in the Southern Baptist Convention" McMinn, T. Ed.D. 2001	Church staff	Quant/ Qual.	N/A	Lack of servant leadership.
Rel	"A profile analysis of the perceived Situational Leadership II and servant leadership styles of senior associate pastors" Thoman, R. Ed.D. 2001		Quant/ Qual.		
Rel	"Church leadership: the next generation. A model for promoting servant leadership for the 90's and beyond" Allen, B. D.Min. 1991				
Rel	"Two types of people-oriented leaders: an exploration of servant leadership in the church educational system using gestalt therapy" Woodward, G. Ph.D. 1988	Religious educators	Qual.		Beliefs consistent with servant leadership.
Rel	"A theology of servant leadership" Kirkpatrick, J. D.Miss. 1988		Qual.		

Rel "The development and implimentation
     of a training program for local church
     officers designed to clarify leadership
     roles and teach the concept of a servant
     leader" Mamanua, J. D.Min. 1984

Reli "A study of servant leadership in
     Korea"
     Moon, S. Th.M. 1999

Reli "Increasing lay leadership through the
     servant/follower leadership model"
     Rusk, D. D.Min. 1998

APPENDIX C
OLA Instrument

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

Dear Associate:

My name is William Manzi Freitas; I am a candidate to the Masters of Science in Leadership Education at the University of Nebraska – Lincoln. I am inviting you to participate in a research study investigating the relationship between the characteristics of servant leadership and the leader-associate relationship at (hospital name).

I am aware that the hospital is a very fast paced environment and I know how busy you are. However, by donating from 15 to 20 minutes of your time to answer this survey, you will be helping me to graduate, and helping the hospital administration in adjusting the hospital mission and values with the existent leadership practice.

Any information that is obtained from this survey will remain confidential. Your identity will remain confidential. The hospital administration will never see the raw data. Further information about this research you can find at the **Informed Consent Letter** enclosed to the survey.

I am counting on you with this project with a grateful heart for your collaboration. Wishing all the best,

William

Please, answer the following demographic questions:

1. What is the department you work?
_____
2. Gender: ___Male ___Female
3. Age: ___19-21 ___22-25 ___26-35 ___36-45 ___46-55 ___56-65 ___66+
4. Education: ___High School ___Assoc. ___BA/BS ___MS/MA ___PhD
5. Years at St. Elizabeth: ___ 0-5 ___ 6-10 ___11-20 ___21-30 ___30-40 ___40+

ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT

Please provide your response to each statement by placing an X in <u>one</u> of the five boxes *

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	**Strongly Agree**

In general, people within this organization:

1	Trust each other
2	Are clear on the key goals of the organization
3	Are non-judgmental – they keep an open mind
4	Respect each other
5	Know where this organization is headed in the future
6	Maintain high ethical standards
7	Work well together in teams
8	Value differences in culture, race & ethnicity
9	Are caring & compassionate towards each other
10	Demonstrate high integrity & honesty
11	Are trustworthy
12	Relate well to each other
13	Attempt to work with others more than working on their own
14	Are held accountable for reaching work goals
15	Are aware of the needs of others
16	Allow for individuality of style and expression
17	Are encouraged by supervisors to share in making *important* decisions
18	Work to maintain positive working relationships
19	Accept people as they are
20	View conflict as an opportunity to learn & grow
21	Know how to get along with people

Directors, Supervisors and Top Leadership in this Organization:

22	Communicate a clear vision of the future of the organization
23	Are open to learning from those who are *below* them in the organization
24	Allow workers to help determine where this organization is headed
25	Work alongside the workers instead of separate from them
26	Use persuasion to influence others instead of coercion or force
27	Don't hesitate to provide the leadership that is needed
28	Promote open communication and sharing of information
29	Give workers the power to make *important* decisions
30	Provide the support and resources needed to help workers meet their goals
31	Create an environment that encourages learning
32	Are open to receiving criticism & challenge from others
33	Say what they mean, and mean what they say
34	Encourage each person to exercise leadership
35	Admit personal limitations & mistakes
36	Encourage people to take risks even if they may fail
37	Practice the same behavior they expect from others
38	Facilitate the building of community & team
39	Do not demand special recognition for being leaders
40	Lead by example by modeling appropriate behavior
41	Seek to influence others from a positive relationship rather than from the authority of their position
42	Provide opportunities for all workers to develop to their full potential
43	Honestly evaluate themselves before seeking to evaluate others
44	Use their power and authority to benefit the workers
45	Take appropriate action when it is needed
46	Build people up through encouragement and affirmation
47	Encourage workers to work *together* rather than competing against each other
48	Are humble – they do not promote themselves
49	Communicate clear plans & goals for the organization
50	Provide mentor relationships in order to help people grow professionally

51	Are accountable & responsible to others
52	Are receptive listeners
53	Do not seek after special status or the "perks" of leadership
54	Put the needs of the workers ahead of their own

In viewing my own role:

55	I feel appreciated by my supervisor for what I contribute
56	I am working at a high level of productivity
57	I am listened to by those *above* me in the organization
58	I feel good about my contribution to the organization
59	I receive encouragement and affirmation from those *above* me in the organization
60	My job is important to the success of this organization
61	I trust the leadership of this organization
62	I enjoy working in this organization
63	I am respected by those *above* me in the organization
64	I am able to be creative in my job
65	In this organization, a person's *work* is valued more than their title
66	I am able to use my best gifts and abilities in my job

* The grading grid was excluded from the appendix.

APPENDIX D
Items of the OLA Clustered into Potential Subscores

Potential *Subscores*	*Categories*	*Items* *Servant leaders:*
VALUES PEOPLE	**By believing in people** *Maintaining a high view of people*	• Respect others • Believe in the unlimited potential of each person • Accept people as they are • Trust others • Are perceptive concerning the needs of others • Enjoy people • Show appreciation to others
	By putting others first *Before self*	• Put the needs of others ahead of their own • Show love and compassion toward others
	By listening *Receptive, non-judgmental*	• Are receptive listeners
DEVELOPS PEOPLE	**By providing for learning and growth** *Developing potential*	• Provide opportunities for people to develop to their full potential • Leaders use their power and authority to benefit others • Provide mentor relationships in order to help people grow professionally • View conflict as an opportunity to learn & grow • Create an environment that
	By modeling	• Lead by example by modeling appropriate behavior • Models a balance of life and work and encourages others to do so
	By encouraging	• Build people up through encouragement and affirmation

Potential Subscores	Categories	Items Servant leaders:
BUILDS COMMUNITY	**By enhancing relationships**	• Relate well to others • Work to bring healing to hurting relationships
	By working collaboratively *Emphasizing teamwork*	• Facilitate the building of community & team • Work with others instead of apart from them
	By valuing the differences of others *Differing gifts, cultures, viewpoints*	• Value differences in people • Allow for individuality of style and expression
DISPLAYS AUTHENTICITY	**By being open to being known** *Willing to be transparent*	• Admit personal limitations & mistakes • Are open to being known by others • Promote open communication and sharing of information • Are accountable & responsible to others
	By being learners *Being self aware, open to input from others*	• Are non-judgmental - keep an open mind • Are open to learning from others • Are flexible - willing to compromise • Evaluate themselves before blaming others • Are open to receiving criticism & challenge from others
	By maintaining integrity *Honest, consistent, ethical behavior*	• Are trustworthy • Demonstrate high integrity & honesty • Maintain high ethical standards

Potential Subscores	*Categories*	*Items* *Servant leaders:*
	By envisioning the future *Intuition as to direction for the organization*	• Has a vision of the future • Uses intuition and foresight to see the unforeseeable • Provides hope to others • Encourages risk taking • Exhibits courage • Has healthy self-esteem
PROVIDES LEADERSHIP	**By taking initiative** *Moving out ahead*	• Initiates action by moving out ahead • Is competent - has the knowledge and skills to get things done
	By clarifying goals *Understanding what it takes to get to the vision*	• Is clear on goals and good at pointing the direction • Is able to turn negatives into positives (threats to opportunities)
	By sharing power *Empowering others*	• Empowers others by sharing power • Is low in control of others • *Uses* persuasion to influence others instead of coercion
SHARES LEADERSHIP	**By sharing status** *Issues of position, honor self-promotion*	• Is humble - does not promote him or herself • Leads from personal influence rather than positional authority • Does not demand or expect honor and awe for being the leader • Does not seek after special status or perks of leadership

APPENDIX E
Cover Letter, Consent Form, and Follow-up Postcard

University of Nebraska Lincoln

INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL LEADERSHIP,
EDUCATION AND COMMUNICATION

Informed Consent Letter

Exploring the extent of servant leadership characteristics in a health care organization.

You are invited to participate in a research study investigating the existence of the characteristics of servant-leadership in _____ (health institution name). Results from this study may aid the hospital administration in adjusting the hospital mission and values with the existent leadership practice. Participation in this research will take approximately 15 to 20 minutes of your time and is not considered as part of your job activity. There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research. You have been randomly selected to participate in this research because you are a full-time or part-time employee in a health care institution, and you are 19 years old or older.

Although demographic type questions (age, gender, race, and time working at hospital) are asked, any information that is obtained from this survey will remain confidential. Your identity will remain confidential. The data will be stored in the locked office of Dr. Leverne Barrett in the University of Nebraska - Lincoln. The data will only be seen by the investigator and faculty advisor during the study and for three years after the study is complete. The hospital administration will never see the raw data. The information obtained from this study will be published in a thesis and may be published in journals or presented at meetings.

You may ask questions before completing the survey research. You may call the investigator at any time, phone (402) 325-9775, ask to leave a message for William Manzi Freitas or try Dr. Leverne Barrett at (402) 472-9791. If you have questions concerning your rights as a research subject that have not been answered by the investigator, you may contact the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board at (402) 472-6965.

You may decide whether or not to participate or you may withdraw from this research survey at any time. Your decision will not adversely affect your relationship with the investigators, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, and Saint Elizabeth Regional Medical Center. Your decision will not result in a loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

You are making a voluntary decision whether or not to participate in this study. Submitting the survey to the database certifies that you have read and understood the information presented. After completing the survey, please, use the self addressed and stamped envelop to return your survey. Your answers will be entered into a database for statistical analysis purpose. After 10 days, if we have not received your answers a

follow-up letter will be mailed to you as a reminder. You may keep a copy of this mail as your copy of the consent form.

Thank you for your time and attention to this research,

William Manzi Freitas, Principal Investigator   Office: (402) 325-9775
Dr. Leverne Barrett, Faculty Advisor   Office: (402) 472-9791

300 Agricultural Hall / P.O. Box 830709 / Lincoln, NE 68583-0709 / (402) 472-2807 / FAX (402) 472-5863

August 6, 2003

Dear Associates:

We would ask that you would take 15-20 minutes of your time to fill out the enclosed survey on behalf of a research project being completed by William Freitas.

The Human Resource Department has been working with William in regards to his project and has given approval for him to use our employment base for his study. If you have any questions, you can either call William at 325-9775 or (contact name) at xxx-xxxx. There is a self-addressed, stamped envelope for you to return the survey, or you may drop it off at the Human Resource office.

I appreciate your time and support in helping William complete this project.

Sincerely,

(vice-president name)
VP, Human Resources

Follow-Up Notice

Hello!

This is a follow up regarding the research study investigating the characteristics of

servant leadership at (hospital name). You were asked to respond to this survey few

weeks ago. If you have already completed the survey, please disregard this notice. If you

have not, I would appreciate you taking 15 minutes of your time to respond and send it

using the self addressed envelop. In case you need another copy of the survey, please,

contact (contact name) at the Human Resources department.

Thank you for your attention,

William M. Freitas

APPENDIX G
Mean, Standard Deviation, and ANOVA for Hypothesis 1 with the

'Undecided' Item Eliminated.

Mean and Standard Deviation of the Sub-scales of the OLA in each Sector of the Hospital – Undecided Item Removed.

	Values people			Provides leadership			Displays authenticity		
Sectors	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n
1	3.4000	1.03199	13	3.3590	.97199	13	2.9936	1.21976	13
2	3.7333	.74043	18	3.7778	.87489	18	3.4259	1.06023	18
3	3.4435	.97524	134	3.4796	.92490	138	3.2842	1.05074	137
4	3.3387	1.02718	119	3.2994	1.00011	117	3.1282	1.06690	116
5	3.6927	1.00658	41	3.6206	.90471	41	3.5854	1.01798	41

	Build Community			Shares leadership			Develops people		
Sectors	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n
1	3.2692	1.03633	13	3.2231	1.18754	13	3.2564	1.18407	13
2	3.7389	.89452	18	3.0722	1.32390	18	3.4198	1.02726	18
3	3.5396	.89229	136	3.2273	1.11009	137	3.3661	1.05769	134
4	3.4437	1.03052	118	2.9881	1.20966	117	3.0887	1.23851	117
5	3.6098	.92217	38	3.3805	1.17669	40	3.4580	1.18327	41

One-Way Analysis of Variance for the Difference in the OLA Sub-scales between Sectors - Undecided Item Removed.

Variable and Source	df	SS	MS	F	Sig.
Values People					
Between Groups	4	5.373	1.343	1.371	.244
Within Groups	324	317.429	.980		
Provides Leadership					
Between Groups	4	6.020	1.505	1.669	.157
Within Groups	324	292.165	.902		
Displays Authenticity					
Between Groups	4	7.908	1.977	1.760	.137
Within Groups	325	365.089	1.123		
Builds community					
Between Groups	4	2.744	.686	.754	.556
Within Groups	325	295.692	.910		
Shares Leadership					
Between Groups	4	6.278	1.570	1.147	.334
Within Groups	324	443.363	1.368		
Develops People					
Between Groups	4	7.038	1.760	1.342	.254
Within Groups	325	426.152	1.311		