

Servant Leadership:

Theory & Practice



Volume 4, Issue 1
Spring 2017

Executive Editor

Phillip Bryant, Columbus State University
bryant_phillip1@columbusstate.edu

Associate Editors

Steven Brown, Georgia Gwinnett College
sbrown77@ggc.edu

Victor V. Claar, Henderson State University
vclaar@gmail.com

Kevin Hurt, Columbus State University
hurt_kevin@columbusstate.edu

Kathleen Patterson, Regent University
kathpat@regent.edu

Neal Thomson, Columbus State University
thomson_neal@columbusstate.edu

Editorial Assistants

TJ Thompson, &
Dorothy Bryant (Guest Assistant)

Publication

Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice
© D. Abbott Turner College of Business
Columbus State University
ISSN: 2332-2063

Online

www.sltpjournal.org



www.facebook.com/sltpjournal



www.twitter.com/sltpjournal

Submissions

Please submit to csuepress.columbusstate.edu/sltp/

Mailing Address

SLTP Journal
Turner College of Business
Columbus State University
4225 University Avenue
Columbus, Georgia 31907

ABOUT THE PUBLISHER



TURNER
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

COLUMBUS STATE UNIVERSITY

Columbus State University is a state university governed by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. It is located 100 miles southwest of Atlanta in the mid-sized urban city of Columbus on the border of Georgia and Alabama. The university enrolls nearly 8,800 students who come primarily from communities throughout Georgia. The school is also a popular destination for students in neighboring Alabama counties. Over the past decade, aggressive recruitment efforts have increased the number of students hailing from other regions of the United States and foreign countries.

The Turner College of Business enrolls students in undergraduate business and computer science disciplines, as well as an MBA designed for working professionals, an online MBA, a Master of Science in Organizational Leadership, and graduate programs in Computer Science. The online MBA is offered through the Georgia Web MBA program, a consortium of AACSB-accredited schools in Georgia. The college has strong ties to the local community, and provides educational opportunities and economic development assistance to the citizens, businesses and industries located in the region. As an AACSB-accredited program with smaller average class sizes, and a dedicated faculty and staff, the Turner College offers one of the best buys in management education in the region.

As part of its commitment to applied research and faculty development, the Turner College is the proud publisher of *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice*.

MANUSCRIPT SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

Please read the following submission guidelines before submitting a manuscript to *SLTP*. If a manuscript does not conform to the guidelines, then it may be returned by the editors without review. In addition, please read the journal policies.

Manuscripts should be submitted electronically to: csuepress.columbusstate.edu/sltp/. Files should be sent in a Microsoft Word format. The files must be readable by Windows-based computers. All correspondence should take place through csuepress.columbusstate.edu/sltp/. While all submissions should be electronically submitted, if any additional materials need to be delivered to the editors, their address is:

Servant Leadership: Theory and Practice
Turner College of Business
Columbus State University
4225 University Avenue
Columbus, GA 31907

Please include contact information for all of the co-authors for the submission including addresses, email addresses, and phone numbers. Please keep a copy of the manuscript to guard against lost or damaged submission files.

Submissions should consist of no more than 35 double-spaced manuscript pages of proper text, not including the title page, abstract, references, tables, or figures. Be aware that the use of different software, fonts, character spacing, and margins can significantly alter the amount of text per page. The author should ensure that there are around 25 lines of 12-point text in Times New Roman font, with a 1 inch margin on all sides.

Manuscripts should be prepared according to the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (latest edition)* and may be copyedited for bias-free language (see Chapter 3 of the *Publication Manual*). Authors are responsible for including publishable quality charts, tables, graphs, and illustrations that do not require significant effort on the part of the journal to make ready for publication. Authors should own the copyright or have permission to use all of the materials included (See the journal policies for further details). All citations within the manuscript must be cited and appear alphabetically in the current APA format. In alignment with APA policies, authors may not submit the same manuscript for concurrent consideration by two or more journals.

Submissions will be considered for inclusion within the journal based on the following:

- Fit with SLTP's mission
- Theoretical and/or applied value
- Study sample, study design, and methodological rigor
- Quality of the literature review
- Quality of theoretical reasoning
- Quality and appropriateness of the analysis of the results
- Quality of the discussion and implications of the study as it relates to theory and practice
- Quality of writing, including clarity, parsimony, and organization of content

Any comments or questions should be addressed to: editors@sltpjournal.org.

Contents

Introduction	9
Phillip Bryant	
Cultivating Servant Leaders in Secondary Schooling.....	12
CHAN, Kong Wah Cora and Gloria So	
Strengthening Decision-Making Skills of New School Leaders through Mentoring and Service.....	32
Donna Augustine-Shaw and Robert Hachiya	
Servant Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness: Examining Leadership Culture among Millenials within a US National Campus Ministry	53
Valorie Nordbye and Justin Irving	
Discovering the Self-Interest of Servant Leadership: A Grounded Theory.....	75
Eric Russell, Jeffrey Maxfield, and Jamie Russell	



Servant Leadership:
Theory & Practice
Volume 4, Issue 1, 9-11
Spring 2017

Introduction – Volume 4, Issue 1

Phillip Bryant, Columbus State University
Executive Editor, SLTP

Welcome to Volume 4, Issue 1 of *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice (SLTP)*. Your editorial board is happy to count you among our readership, and we are proud to report that you are a valued one of many. Since our inception in 2014, we've earned quite a footprint. According to Google Scholar, other published works have cited *SLTP* 49 times, twice in the highly respected *Journal of Business Ethics* (Newman, Schwarz, Cooper, & Sendjaya, 2015; Lapointe, & Vandenberghe, 2015).

According to the editors' dashboard at csuepress.columbusstate.edu/sltip/, *SLTP* has been downloaded 2149 times by 305 institutions (educational, governmental, commercial, etc.) across 97 different countries. Finally, including this edition, we've distributed print editions to over 1500 readers. Thank you for helping us move the field of servant leadership forward as both a theory and a practice.

Now, to our current edition -- three of the 4 articles herein explore leadership in educational environments. Chan and So thematically analyze qualitative data to conclude that service learning is a pathway to cultivate servant leaders in secondary schooling. My personal favorite contribution by Chan and So is their three stage servant leadership training framework through which youth practice Spears' (2010) servant leadership characteristics.

Augustine-Shaw and Hachiya also explore with us leadership in the primary and secondary school systems. Specifically, they collected three years of data from Kansas' Educational Leadership Institute (KELI). According to Augustine-Shaw and Hachiya, KELI provides mentoring support to first-year school superintendents and principals. Over 95% of mentors and mentees in the program reported positive effects of the program including additional skills in ethical decision making, professional growth, and building leadership capacity.

Nordbye and Irving took a look at the relationship between servant leadership and organizational effectiveness among millennials across a multi-campus college ministry. Their analyses suggest a positive relationship. Interesting in this article was the context of millennials leading millennials – a combination we will see in more organizations over the coming decade as baby boomers and generation X-ers retire and millennials continue to enter the workforce.

In our fourth and final article of this edition, Russell, Maxfield, and Russell follow up on Eric Russell's 2015 *SLTP* article entitled "Servant leadership's cycle of benefits" with a quantitative study. The authors' analyses lead them to assert that "leaders realize personal benefits from serving the needs of followers." According to this study, "service to others is in the self-interest of the leader."

One final note about *SLTP*'s editorial processes moving forward. We will be accepting manuscript submissions solely through csuepress.columbusstate.edu/sltp/. Authors who submit manuscripts to editors@sltpjournal.org or myself at Bryant_phillip1@columbusstate.edu will be instructed to submit at the csuepress website. This will allow us to better serve our authors, reviewers, and readers and to track journal performance data. Our current website, sltpjournal.org will remain active and redirect visitors to the csuepress website.

REFERENCES

- Lapointe, É., & Vandenberghe, C. (2015). Examination of the Relationships between Servant Leadership, Organizational Commitment, and Voice and Antisocial Behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-17.
- Newman, A., Schwarz, G., Cooper, B., & Sendjaya, S. (2015). How servant leadership influences organizational citizenship behavior: The roles of LMX, empowerment, and proactive personality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-14.
- Russell, E. (2016). Servant leadership's cycle of benefit. *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice*, 3(1), 52-68.
- Spears, L. C. (2010). Servant leadership and Robert K. Greenleaf's legacy. In *Servant Leadership* (pp. 11-24). Palgrave Macmillan UK.



Cultivating Servant Leaders in Secondary Schooling

CHAN, Kong Wah Cora, University of Bristol
Gloria B. K. So, University of London

Abstract

This empirical study explored learners' experiences of a service learning co-curricular program. Learners aged 15 to 17 of a Hong Kong international school were interviewed in three semi-structured focus groups. These qualitative data were analyzed thematically, and reveal that these participants had opportunities to develop servant leadership traits through their service learning process. It is argued that secondary schools can be a suitable training ground to cultivate servant leaders. The servant leader traits as listed by Spears (2010) are good components of a character education program. A servant leadership training framework is presented with three stages: serving, leading, and building community. Through this framework, youth serve through empathetic listening and action. They lead with intentionality and pursue a growth mindset. They make plans and persuade others into building community. Through discussion, practice, and reflection, service learning is a pathway to cultivate servant leaders in secondary schooling.

Keywords: Service Learning, Servant Leader, Servant Leadership Training Framework

The concept of servant leadership is unorthodox in the sense that it is not about heroic leadership, but the development of others for their betterment. A servant leader has emergent authority and uses such authority ethically and morally as a basis to serve others. A servant leader is a giver in social interaction, who defines and measures the success of their leadership by the well-being and advancement of those whom he/she leads.

The term servant leadership was first coined by Robert Greenleaf (1970) in his essay series titled *The Servant as Leader*. The literature review of this paper outlines Greenleaf's philosophy of servant leadership with two illustrations. The values and characteristics of a servant leader are described and culminate with a biblical example. The merit of youth leadership training is also discussed. This leads to the unfolding of the research rationale, questions, conceptual framework and design. The interview results provide evidence of learners, developing servant leadership qualities in the process of working through various community service projects. The latter part of this paper presents a servant leadership training framework in secondary schooling. The authors argue that secondary schooling could and should cultivate servant leaders among students, through curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular program designs.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A servant leader has dual roles which are interconnected and interchangeable. Trompenaars and Voerman (2009) explain that servant leader is a compound noun; the word *servant* is not a modifier of the word *leader*. Yet, Greenleaf emphasizes that the best leader is first a servant and servant leadership is a choice:

It begins with the natural feeling one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. That person is sharply different from one who is leader first. ... The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant-first to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served. The best test, and difficult to administer, is that: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? (Greenleaf, 1970, p.13).

Furthermore, Greenleaf asserts that service to others develops legitimate power for leadership:

A new moral principle is emerging which holds that the only authority deserving one's allegiance is that which is freely and knowingly granted by the led to the leader in response to, and in proportion to, the clearly evident servant stature of the leader (Greenleaf, 1977, p.10).

A servant leader focus in leadership is for others to reach for their full potential. An effective leader has the combination of servanthood and leadership competency, but it begins with a servant heart, the focus of placing others before self. The being of a servant is the identity of a servant leader and the title of a leader is the role one plays in his/her sphere of influence.

Greenleaf's idea of servant leadership comes from his interpretation and application of *Journey to the East*, a novel written by Hermann Hesse (1956). The story is about a

group of men going on a mythical journey and each of them has his own aspiration and dream. One of the men is Leo, a servant who does chores and encourages the others with his songs and positive spirit. In an unfortunate turn of the plot, Leo goes missing. Subsequently, the group falls apart and the journey dissolves itself. The narrator wanders for years and is eventually taken to the Order that had sponsored the journey. He is surprised to find Leo and comes to the realization that Leo, being the servant, was truly the head of the Order. Greenleaf's view of Leo is that:

Leo portrays at once two roles that are often seen as antithetical in our culture: the servant who, by acting with integrity and spirit, builds trust and lifts people and helps them grow, and the leader who is trusted and who shapes others' destinies by going out ahead to show the way (2003, p.32).

Leo embraces the hybrid identity of a servant leader, serving by leading and leading by serving.

Another important aspect of servant leadership is the mentorship and friendship, as illustrated between Charlotte the spider and Wilbur the pig in the children's classic, *Charlotte's Web* (White, 1952). Wilbur, who was born a runt, lives in the barnyard of Zuckerman. With the help of Charlotte, Wilbur enters a county fair, becomes famous and escapes the fate of slaughter. Prior to the passing of his best friend, Wilbur asks Charlotte why she has helped him. Charlotte replies,

I wove my webs for you because I liked you. After all, what's a life anyway? We're born; we live a little while; we die. A spider's life can't help being something of a mess, with all this trapping and eating flies. By helping you I was trying to lift my life up a trifle (White, 1952, p.164).

Charlotte and Wilbur's symbiotic relationship brings wholeness to both the leader and the led. As well, Charlotte and Wilbur live in a barn, a community with different animals under the same roof, showing the importance of friendship and mentorship between distinctly different characters. The farewell speech of Charlotte to Wilbur hints at the transcendent nature of human beings to live beyond one's self-imposed limitations and the importance of uplifting and encouraging others as a method of establishing meaning for self.

Values of a Servant Leader: Diversity and Relationships

A servant leader values diversity and acknowledges the intrinsic worth of each member in the community. Each member is valuable and has different talents that are integral to the whole. A servant leader desires to create the context in which these gifts can be developed and polished. De Pree (1989) states that a servant leader is committed to an institutional population as "a reflection of God's diversity, not of our choices" (p.86). This implies that a servant leader aims to celebrate differences, rather than promote

identical followers. A servant leader values diversity in their community and enables others to discover and reach for their own potential for the good of the team as well as growth of the individual. This is collaboration, in which everyone contributes for collective success, instead of competition, in which they compete against each other for survival of the fittest.

A servant leader considers that power passes through, but not from him/her (Blanchard, 2007). He/she is entrusted with moral and ethical responsibilities, to use his/her emergent power for the benefit of others. A servant leader values relational effectiveness. He/She intends to use referent power and relational authority to create opportunities for others to become autonomous.

Ten Characteristics of a Servant Leader

Spears (2010) derived a set of ten characteristics of a servant leader from Greenleaf's writings. Spears believes that these traits are critically essential to the development of servant leaders.

1. Listening. A servant leader listens carefully to what is being said and not said. He/She seeks to identify and help clarify the will of others. Listening is more than a technique, but an attitude in understanding. In addition, a servant leader pays attention to his/her own inner voice through ongoing reflection.

2. Empathy. A servant leader is an empathetic listener, demonstrating acceptance and understanding. A servant leader assumes the good intentions of others. A servant leader conveys to others that their value is not based on their performance, but who they are as people with intrinsic worth.

3. Healing. A servant leader recognizes that people may come with broken experiences and suffer from emotional hurts. He/She reaches out to others who are hurt and brings healing and restoration to them. They partner together to overcome life's obstacles and mend relationships. Healing empowers one to accept opportunities for growth and further development.

4. Awareness. A servant leader needs to view situations holistically, evaluating issues against ethics, power, and values. Greenleaf (1977) states that "able leaders are usually sharply awake and reasonably disturbed. They are not seekers after solace. They have their own inner serenity" (p.41). Solitude in the art of withdrawal enhances the servant leader's general awareness and self-awareness, restoring inner serenity.

5. Persuasion. A servant leader does not coerce others into compliance or performance. A servant leader convinces others to reach consensus. A servant leader is relational, and persuades others to collaborate and achieve collective success.

6. Conceptualization. A servant leader is a visionary who has great dreams. He/She cannot be consumed by short-term operational goals and lose sight of the big picture and vision for the institution. It takes discipline and practice to balance conceptual thinking and a day-to-day operational approach.

7. Foresight. A servant leader learns from past mistakes and has a good understanding of present reality. A servant leader foresees possible future events and anticipates their consequences from trend analysis. A servant leader is conscious of making ethical choices to avoid future failure.

8. Stewardship. A servant leader is a steward who is committed to serving the needs of others. In addition, a servant leader is held accountable for the success of the organization in meeting its goals, as well as its relationship with and impact on the society.

9. Commitment to the Growth of People. A servant leader has a growth mindset, believing that everyone can gain new understanding and has the potential to reach higher levels of achievement. A servant leader desires to nurture and is interested to facilitate the personal, professional, and spiritual growth of self and others. This implies that one can spot a servant leader because people around him/her grow in knowledge, skills and an overall outlook for life.

10. Building Community. A servant leader builds community in order to connect people within an institution so they can draw support from one another and find their sense of belonging. A servant leader draws people together to form supportive networks.

Overall, the philosophy, values and characteristics of servant leadership are personified in Jesus Christ, the center figure of the Holy Bible. Jesus, as presented in the Holy Bible, is the son of God and the holy servant. The son of God chose to become a servant. His divine nature was concealed so that his human nature was brought forth. Jesus accepted people from all walks of life. He not only spent time with his family and disciples, but also befriended prostitutes, tax collectors, and the outcast of society. He not only preached in synagogues and had dialogues with the Pharisees, priests and teachers of the Law, but also taught and fed thousands who followed him. He listened, he empathized, and he healed.

In the concept of servant leadership, the leadership aspect is emphasized and legitimized through the process of serving. Jesus used his power to serve others providing healing to the sick, hope for the despairing, and comfort for the weary. He endured the cross and became the way to mend the broken relationships between God and humanity. He was the capstone on which the community of believers established their shared vision and faith. An analogy of a church is a body with many parts; each part is unique in its function and is valuable to the overall health of the body (1 Corinthians 12: 12-30). A servant leader develops others to be and become servant leaders. Jesus asked his disciples to emulate him, saying “now that I, your lord and teacher, have washed your feet, you also

should wash one another's feet. I have set you an example that you should do as I have done for you" (John 13:14-15). Servant leadership, as demonstrated in Jesus, is a blend of immanence with transcendence, and servanthood with leadership. The ontological imperative of servant leadership is the person *being* a servant and then *becoming* more effective in his/her role, to serve others.

Relevance of Servant Leadership Training to Learners in Secondary Schools

Servant leadership has relevance in various arenas, seasons, and stages of life, including character development of learners in secondary schooling. In the book *The Case for Servant Leadership*, Keith advocated that

Servant-leaders can be government officials, business executives, academic administrators, non-profit leaders, military commanders, coaches, friends, or neighbors. Servant-leaders do most of the things that other leaders do - they provide a vision, they motivate, they manage, they communicate, and so forth. What sets servant-leaders apart from other leaders is that they are focused on others, not just themselves, and they are motivated to make life better for others, not just for themselves. This difference in focus and motivation is what really distinguishes servant-leaders, regardless of their titles, roles, or positions (Keith, 2008, p.9-10).

Servant leadership is a style of leadership that offers a framework for individuals to find meaning in work and life. Finding meaning in life is powerful to sustain one's intrinsic motivation, as well as emotional and mental health. It is a source of deep happiness, despite various circumstances. These qualities are desirable for adolescent learners to determine the purpose and priorities of their present study and future career and family path. Hence, servant leadership training should be considered in secondary schooling.

Youth Leadership Development

While there is a plethora of research on qualities of adult leadership (Brown, 2004; Ciulla, 2004) and the development of youth as future leaders (Wheeler & Edlebeck, 2006), the area of investing in youth development for leadership for the present has not been as widely explored. Youth leadership literature often focuses on prevention strategies to risky behavior of youth (Whitehead, 2009), civic activism (Kirshner, 2007; Ginwright & James, 2002), and educational leadership program development (Larkin & Mahoney, 2006). As a result, investigating literature on adult leadership paradigms gives insight to what defines leadership for individuals. Although for youth, who are in the midst of identity formation and where collective belonging is prioritised, there is much that can be applied from adult leadership literature in explaining how leadership opportunities can mold identity and create a sense of belonging.

The process of youth development is often seen as a transient period. Youth undergo rapid changes in their physical, psychological and social state, as their identities are fluid. How youth take up issues, the spaces in which they do, and their understanding of these issues all shift at a rapid pace (Linds, Goulet & Sammel, 2010). As a strategy to develop youth leadership, youth are continually supported through consistent and structured activities that further deepen knowledge, their commitment, and opportunity for action (Wheeler & Edlebeck, 2006). Educators also have a role in creating spaces as places for critique, hope, and action (Allen, 1999). Adolescents in particular appear to have an innate motivation for self-expansion, which is achieved through including others in the self (Bracher, 2006). Guided by adult educators as “threshold people” (Daloz Keen & Parks, 1996, p.53), this process of self-expansion is a type of transformative learning, where youthful mindsets shift, impacting their interactions with their community and the world (Daloz et al., 1996). Through adult guidance in the process of youth transformation and self-awareness, individuals can foster a desire for self-directed learning, develop an awareness of how they might change oppressive power structures, and build confidence and skills to work for collective change (Brown, 2004). Students can then experience education as something they do, not as something done for them, where they “become conscious about their presence in the world. The way they act and think when they develop all of their capacities, tak[ing] into consideration their needs, but also the needs and aspirations of others” (Freire & Betto, 1985, p.14-15). These are elements that are needed in the development of youth leadership.

The philosophy, values and characteristics of servant leadership is applicable to youth leadership development. So (2014) defined that

Youth leadership is the relational process of negotiating authority, sharing abilities, and equipping individuals with the common vision that all individuals can be leaders to benefit their sphere of influence in the present, regardless of age or position (p.13).

So considered that service learning is an avenue for youth leadership development. With adult guidance and mentorship, youth leaders are empowered to make decisions, take ownership of the actions, share responsibilities with their peers, and reflect on their growth. Their relationship is similar to Charlotte and Wilbur in *Charlotte's Web*. The role of a youth leader can change as these young individuals have been equipped to possess the ability to positively influence their personal sphere of influence and equip others to become leaders. The promotion of servant leadership in positive youth leadership development can be another method of leadership where decisions are made to enhance the entire group. Servant leaders see their role as a position of responsibility, value fairness and integrity, and measure success by the work, support, and dedication of all members (Libby, Sedonaen, & Bliss, 2006). Servant leadership does not focus on selfish ambition or one particular individual, but the facilitation and equipping of the group for the common good, a skill that should be developed in youth leadership development.

The belief, values, and character traits of servant leadership challenge youth leaders to examine their roles and responsibilities in their present community and future society. Greenleaf (1970) stated that servant leadership is not a management technique but a way of life, allowing those who make this choice to unleash its power and promise. The concept of servant leadership is applicable and beneficial to youth leadership development.

Purpose of the Study, Research Questions, and Conceptual Framework

The aim of this study is to explore a possible pathway to cultivate servant leadership attributes among learners in secondary schooling. This empirical study is conducted in a secondary school in Hong Kong. In recent years, there have been empirical studies of servant leadership with adult participants at school setting in the areas of school climate (Black, 2010), organizational commitment (Cerit, 2010), student achievement (Lambert, 2004), job satisfaction (McKenzie, 2012), and teaching effectiveness (Metzcar, 2008). The nature of servant leadership study of secondary learners (aged 15-17) is lacking and can be a worthwhile exploration. Hence, the following research questions are formulated.

1. Can servant leadership training be a part of a secondary school co-curriculum program?
2. How is servant leadership developed in learners at a secondary school?

Empirical studies of servant leadership are multi-faceted, with scholars' interests ranging from the attributes of servant leaders (Spears, 2010), and the behaviors of servant leaders (Sendjaya, 2003), to the culture of servant leadership organization (Laub, 1999). This research study aims to focus on the character development of learners and their journey towards servant leadership. Hence, the conceptual framework is based on the ten characteristics of servant leaders as outlined by Spears (2010). They include listening, empathy, healing, awareness, conceptualization, foresight, persuasion, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and community building.

METHOD

This is a qualitative study, through the lens of an interpretivist, exploring the experiences of learners aged 15 to 17, who chose to participate in a co-curricular program of a secondary school in Hong Kong. Under this lens, participants' reality is socially constructed and the way of knowing is developed experientially by each of the subjects through their personal interaction with their context (Creswell, 2003; Crotty, 1998).

Context

The study context is a K-12 international school in Hong Kong. The purpose of the co-curricular program is to provide learners, teenagers and young children, agency to act and a voice in addressing various social justice issues in their local context. They are

encouraged to be change agents and take action to make a difference in their community through teaching, mentorship, and service projects.

In an academic year, fourteen secondary students (aged 15 to 17) signed up for this program. They received weekly training from their program coordinator (the teacher in charge of this program). They also worked in teams of four to five students, co-planning their activities. Each of them met with an assigned primary 4, 5, or 6 grade class regularly to develop and act upon a community project until its fruition. When each participant met with the assigned primary class, the classroom teacher was present to provide support as needed. These secondary participants also met with the primary classroom teachers for briefing, planning, and receiving feedback.

Participants

The secondary learners who participated in the service learning program were invited for focus-group interviews. Out of fourteen participants, eleven of them took part in three focus-group interviews. They were referred to as student-leaders by the primary students.

Research Design

The student-leaders who worked with the same grade level primary classes were grouped together for an interview of 60 minutes. The Grade 4 focus group had four interviewees. The Grade 5 focus group had four interviewees. The Grade 6 focus group had three interviewees. These focus groups were grade-level specific, with an intent that interviewees of the same group had similar experiences, so that purposeful discussion could be achieved.

The three focus-group interviews were semi-structured with guiding prompts. The purpose of the guiding questions was to stimulate dialogue among interviewees in a focus group. The interviewees recalled, described, and reflected on their experiences as well as substantiated their stories with evidence. Semi-structured interviews allowed interviewees freedom to express their thoughts and provide parameters for their discussion, thus the collected data were on the topic of research. An interpretivist, Elliott (2012) also used semi-structured interviews as his research design as it allows one to “tell their own stories in their own words with a minimum of structure and constraint (p.66).”

The interviews were audio recorded to create verbatim for the thematic analysis as outlined in the *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (Miles & Huberman, 1994). All the focus-group interviews were conducted by the main researcher. The main researcher and a second researcher read and coded the transcripts independently. Afterward, they discussed and agreed on the final codes and categories of the data. This practice aims to establish inter-rater reliability of data interpretation.

Prior to each focus-group interview, interviewees gave their written consent, acknowledging their understanding of this research, agreeing to participate in the interview and giving permission for the audio recording.

Validity

This is insider research which was conducted at the workplace of the researchers. The familiarity of the research field in terms of its context and participants is deemed to be advantageous for this study because collected data can be interpreted with authenticity. Hemmings (2009) recommended that the nature of insider research is beneficial for youth studies, especially with adolescent learners. The trusting relationship between the researchers and the participants facilitates genuine sharing of experiences. It is argued that the participants of this study are minors and consideration of their maturity is critical. When the participants are put at ease because of their familiarity with the researchers, they are likely to share their experiences freely. The relationship between the researchers and the participants can have a positive impact on their willingness to disclose their views. Insider researchers have potential for collecting data which contribute to credible findings.

In order to collect credible data, the interview questions asked for interviewees' experiences, which prevented students from answering with what they thought would please the interviewer. In each focus group, the interviewees engaged themselves in dialogue with each other and the interviewer's main role was to listen, record, and transcribe their conversations. This arrangement was purposeful in managing power-distance among participants and between the interviewer and the interviewees. Participants did not respond directly to the interviewer's questions, but had dialogue with their peers.

Furthermore, inter-rater reliability was achieved with having the two researchers analyze the transcripts. Only those excerpts which were agreed upon by both researchers were classified into codes and categorized into themes. These two researchers are conscious of researcher biases and aim to generate evidence-based interpretations of the subjects. This practice fulfills the ethical and substantive validity of interpretivist qualitative research as outlined by Augen (2000).

Results

Qualitative data in the form of transcripts collected through the focus-group interviews were analyzed thematically. Analysis consisted of (a) affixing codes, (b) sorting the codes by patterns of commonality and differences, and (c) identifying themes. Bernard and Ryan (1998) discussed that text could be analyzed either as an object in and of itself or as a proxy for experience. Text as object of analysis focuses on the linguistic structure and meaning within text and word. Text as proxy for experience focuses on one's perceptions, feeling, knowledge and behavior as embedded in the text. It is argued that English is not the interviewees' first language, and teenagers are often not selective in their

choice of words. Hence, it is deemed appropriate to analyze the transcripts thematically as proxy for experience.

Seven themes were identified from the codes. They were (a) listening, (b) empathy, (c) empathy and healing, (d) awareness, (e) planning: conceptualization and foresight, (f) persuasion, and (g) community building. The theme of awareness was subdivided into purpose, reflection, stewardship, development of self and development of others. The theme of community building was also subdivided into perseverance, teamwork, and relationship. Quotations were selected among the sorted codes as evidence to support the identified themes. Reference to a quotation was indicated with the altered code such as 4p4j.

Listening. Listening to others is not only a technique, but an attitude to understand others' needs and interests. The student-leaders guided the primary classes to decide on their service projects with the vision of coming up with a topic collectively as a group. For example, one class focused on the social issue of poverty within the community, another class focused on the treatment of domestic helpers in Hong Kong. One verbatim is:

5p1z: As a class, I discussed with my students in the first class of what the students wanted to do. I gave them a list of social issues in Hong Kong and they created the list themselves, and the hot topic was (domestic) helpers.

Empathy. The student-leaders put themselves into the elementary school students' perspective. They looked for ways that appealed to children in order to stir their interests in social issues regarding the community. One verbatim is:

4p4j: You need to think from their perspective, whether they would enjoy this lesson. If they enjoy the lesson, everything that they hear will sort of [be] going into their mind and they actually remember.

Empathy and Healing. The student-leaders gradually developed relationships with the young children. They did not only focus on their class's learning about social issues in the community, but also cared about their well-being. They looked for ways to encourage children who were marginalized in the classroom and built them up as individuals. One verbatim quote is:

5p6z: Apparently he was being bullied... I felt very bad for the kid [be]cause I know what it feels like to be excluded... When I come in the room, he smiles and he gets along. He jumps and plays. So, I choose him for everything.

Awareness. The student-leaders were able to articulate clearly their roles, objectives of joining the program, and their needs for personal growth. The theme of awareness is

subdivided into five sub-themes: purpose, reflection, stewardship, commitment to the growth of self, and commitment to the growth of people.

Purpose. Student-leaders joined this school co-curricular program with clear purposes in mind. Many of them expressed that they enjoyed working with younger children. Others were interested to conduct service projects in the community. Some of them joined because they wanted to develop their skills set. One verbatim quote is:

4p1j: It would be a very good experience for me to grow and to get the hands on experience to actually teach kids. I was actually planning to study education when I go to university.

Reflection. During the year, student-leaders worked in teams. They reflected and shared their success and failure. They planned collaboratively for improvement. Self-awareness and general awareness help the student-leaders to become effective in their interaction with the younger children. Two verbatim quotes are:

5p3d: Every time I go for the class, I try to figure out what method of teaching captures their attention... I am trying to cater them to make an impact.

4p6c: When I teach these students, I realize that I am lacking in these areas and I need to improve myself. I should be more organized, more punctual, and more confidently teaching them about things that we are going to learn.

Stewardship. The student-leaders were teachable, accepting feedback, reflective regarding their behaviors, and making corrections as needed. One verbatim quote is:

5p2z: There was a time when I slacked off and my teacher said that I needed to get back on track. I think that she was right. There [is] a lot of work. That's why I join (this school program), to be more responsible, to organize and teach a class.

Commitment to the growth of self. The student-leaders stepped out of their comfort zone. They learned new skills, became confident and developed perseverance through various challenges they faced in the program. Personal growth is especially seen in the context of a community, where others' needs and/or support encouraged student-leaders to grow. Three verbatim quotes are:

5p6n: I can definitely say that I can stand crowds now. I can talk in front of them. There is a lot more comfort now.

5p7j: I am involved in so many things. It teaches me to plan out stuff and try to follow the plan as best as I can.

6p41: The confidence you gain from teaching the kids, you can apply it to other daily skills.

Commitment to the growth of people. The student-leaders took their responsibilities seriously. They made an effort to deepen the younger children's understanding of social issues. They supported them to take action to address these social issues. One verbatim quote is:

5p1j: I make sure that they understand what a social issue is. They listed out a bunch of social issues for me. I showed them that the basis of these social issues was poverty.

Planning: Conceptualization and Foresight. The student-leaders were able to articulate what they wanted to accomplish with the classes by the end of the school year. They learned to make plans for their activities. They were conscious of time as a limited resource. They were able to guide younger children to complete their set goals. Two verbatim quotes are:

4p2j: We want to teach them that the process of growing a plant takes hard work. When we waste food, it's like throwing away all the hard work that people did for when they produced food. We just want them to know that we can't take food for granted.

5p5d: It is good to plan ahead. I started to look online and asked other people for help. I asked people who were in this program last year. There is a student who is autistic. I asked my dad (for advice because) he works with autistic people.

Persuasion. The student-leaders tried to use various activities to ignite the younger children's interest and engagement. They persuaded others to accept their suggestion and gave opportunities for others to contribute their input to the project. One verbatim quote is:

5p2j: At first, they wouldn't think of buying things for other people just to give away and not getting anything [back]. I try to teach them that they don't need something in return to do something good. We played this simulation. We used that to spur out emotion... They were the ones who came up with this idea. [At the end,] we donated the food to [a charity].

Community Building. The student-leaders served and led groups of primary students in various service projects within their local community. The theme of community building is subdivided into three sub-themes: perseverance, teamwork, and relationship.

Perseverance. One aspect of community building is the quality of perseverance. As crucial as planning goes, so is perseverance. The founder of the service learning program had a vision, and her passion was contagious. A few learners were curious, joined the program, and learned to persevere with her in this journey. Community building requires ongoing perseverance. One verbatim quote is:

6p5a: I would never [have] thought of this as a program to start off with. The first few months I thought that was not going to work. She persisted [in] it! Personally, it makes me more confident that I can start something.

Teamwork. Community building can be a daunting task, but it becomes less intimidating through collaboration and putting their strength together. Student-leaders built meaningful working relationships in their team. One verbatim quote is:

4p5c: We share our strategies. Also inspiration. We get each other tips. We come together and talk about it. We know where everybody is at. We can keep everybody in the same level, or around.

Relationship. The relationship between the student-leaders and the young children extended beyond the classrooms. This co-curricular program facilitated students across grades to interact with one another. A healthy community is a place where social interactions flourish. Two verbatim quotes are:

4p6s: Every time I see my kids walking in the hallway, they say “Hi” and I feel so proud of them.

5p7j: When I see them in the library, they always come up to me and say “Hi”. They tell me about their stuff and I like talking to them.

Overall, the purpose of this empirical study is to explore a possible pathway to cultivate servant leadership qualities among learners in secondary schooling. The results of this study showed that the co-curricular program provided opportunities for learners to develop the attributes of servant leaders. The following section discusses a possible training framework for servant leadership development in learners of secondary schools.

DISCUSSION

The ten essential characteristics as identified by Spears (2010) are: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and community building. With a growth mindset

and teachable attitude, learners can cultivate these traits through cycles of discussion, practice, and reflection. Repetition helps adolescent learners to develop habits and support their character formation. These traits are categorized into three progressive stages of (I) serving, (II) leading, and (III) building. Table 1 presents a re-organization of Spears' ten characteristics of a servant leader into a framework of servant leadership training for adolescent learners.

Table 1:
Matching Spears' Servant Leader Attributes with Chan and So's Framework of Servant Leadership Development for Adolescent Learners

Spears' ten characteristics of a servant leader	Chan and So's framework of servant leadership development
1. Listening 2. Empathy 3. Healing 4. Awareness 5. Persuasion 6. Conceptualization 7. Foresight 8. Stewardship 9. Commitment to the growth of people 10. Building community	(I) Serving <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listening • Empathy • Healing
	(II) Leading <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Stewardship ◦ Commitment to the growth of people • Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Foresight ◦ Conceptualization • Persuasion
	(III) Building <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community

Stage 1: Serving

Learners serve through listening to others, expressing empathy for others, and bringing healing to others. Listening is an expression of interest to know more about others and their context. Through listening, learners are able to put themselves into others' shoes, empathizing the others' thinking and feeling. Empathy motivates the learners to look for opportunities to bring acceptance and healing. Healing comes in many forms. From the research results, it can be words of encouragement and appreciation. It can be equipping others with new knowledge and skills. It can be paying attention and spending time with others.

Stage 2: Leading

A servant leader is first one who supports the whole group. The lead component of the servant leadership discussion with learners begins with self-awareness of their inner voice and the purpose for leadership, based on servant leadership philosophy and values. In order to lead well, learners need to be stewards of their time, energy, talents and resources, for the betterment of others. Learners should be actively seeking their own growth and supporting others' growth.

Subsequently, learners can be given training on developing plans. They learn to examine their tasks conceptually, anticipate pitfalls and develop a timeline to build parts into a whole. The habit of planning ahead helps learners to become responsible stewards.

Furthermore, learners need to know that a servant leader is assertive, but not aggressive. A servant leader does not force an idea on others, but persuades others to be open-minded and take risks in trying out new methods and ideas despite risks that may be involved. Even when facing objection and/or obstacles, a servant leader perseveres and develops resilience. It is important to know that followers do not accept a servant leader's advice because of his/her debating technique, but his/her genuine care and relational authority.

Most importantly, servant leadership is a lifestyle. A servant leader leads by role modeling. The best persuasion is to impact life with life. When a leader walks the talk, he/she earns the followers' respect and they emulate their servant leader.

Stage 3: Building

From an emergent to a veteran servant leader, one grows in his/her sense of responsibility for his/her community. This requires the learners to practice all the traits in the serve and lead stages. They may fail, but they learn through their struggles. The mentoring and training from teachers, teamwork with peers, and the responsiveness and enthusiasm from the community members form a supportive network which motivate, encourage, and affirm the servant leaders in their journey of growth. The outcomes of building community are to (a) support the diversity of individuals in a community; (b) facilitate individuals of a community to form supportive networks; and (c) celebrate collective success instead of competition for the fittest.

Overall, the three stages of servant leadership training are categorized with the actions of serve, lead, and build. Through cycles of discussion, practice, and reflection, learners in secondary schools build servant leadership habits. Schools may follow this framework to cultivate servant leaders among learners.

CONCLUSION

In summary, this empirical study presents evidence of learners' experiences in serving others and their communities during a co-curricular program. The authors advocate that servant leadership is a framework for character education of learners in secondary schools. The philosophy of servant leadership as well as the values and attributes of a servant leader should be incorporated in education and leadership development of adolescents in schools. This can be accomplished through purposeful curricular, co-curricular and extracurricular design.

Our education system needs to look beyond global ranking and curriculum reform. Our education system needs an awakening and noble challenge: to cultivate learners as responsive and responsible servant leaders, who serve and lead in their community, with the motive of benefitting those who are served to become "healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants" (Greenleaf, 1970, p.13).

Suggestions for Future Research

Research on servant leadership development among learners in secondary schooling is lacking. A framework of training servant leaders in secondary schools is presented in this paper. An implementation of this framework and collection of learners' experiences through reflective journals would validate and further develop this idea.

Furthermore, Chan (2016) argued that a servant leader has a growth mindset and develops his/her capacity to serve others. A servant leader perseveres over challenges when he/she works and walks with others along the learning journey. The practice of servant leadership in a learning community cultivates learners with resilience and a growth mindset. Hence, it is possible that learners in secondary schools, who are exposed to servant leadership qualities and have opportunities to practice servant leadership, develop a growth mindset and grit (Duckworth, 2015). It is beneficial to further research the outcomes of servant leadership training in learners of other secondary schooling as well as the impacts this type of program has in the development of youth leaders post-graduation.

REFERENCES

- Allen, J. (1999). A community of critique, hope, and action. In J. Allen (Ed.), *Class actions: Teaching for social justice in elementary and middle school*. New York: Teachers College.
- Angen, M.J. (2000). Evaluating interpretive inquiry: Reviewing the validity debate and opening the dialogue. *Qualitative Health Research*, 10(3), 378-395.
- Bernard, H. R., & Ryan, G. (1998). Text analysis. *Handbook of methods in cultural anthropology*, 613.
- Black, G.L. (2010). A correlational analysis of servant leadership and school climate. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 13(4), 437-466.
- Blanchard, K. (2007). *Leading at a higher level*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bracher, M. (2006). *Radical pedagogy: Identity, generativity, and social transformation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brown, K.M. (2004). Leadership for social justice and equity: Weaving a transformative framework and pedagogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(1), 77-108.
- Cerit, Y. (2010). The effects of servant leadership on teachers' organizational commitment in primary schools in Turkey. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 13(3), 301-317.
- Chan, K.W.C. (2016). Servant leadership cultivates grit and growth mindset in learners. *Servant Leadership: Theory and Practice* 3(2), 12-22.
- Ciulla, J.B. (2004). Leadership ethics: Mapping the territory. In J.B. Ciulla (Ed.), *Ethics, the Heart of Leadership*. Westport: Praeger Publishers.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-method approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London: Sage.
- Daloz, L.A., Keen, C.H., Keen, J.P., and Parks, S.D. (1996). *Common fire: Leading lives of commitment in a complex world*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- De Pree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an art*. New York: Dell Publishing.
- Duckworth, A. L. (2015). *Grit: The power of passion and perseverance* [Kindle DX version].

- Elliott, M.L. (2012). *Servant first: A multicase study exploring servant leadership in community college instructional administrators*. (Doctoral thesis). Graduate School of Western Carolina University, Western Carolina.
- Freire, P. and Betto, F. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation*. Amhurst: Bergin and Garvey.
- Ginwright, S. and James, T. (2002). From assets to agents of change: Social justice, organizing, and youth development. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 96, 27- 46.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis, IN: Robert K. Greenleaf Center.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (2003). The servant as leader (original 1970 edition). In H. Beazley, J. Beggs, & L. C. Spears (Eds.), *The servant-leadership within: A transformative path*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Hemmings, A. (2009). Ethnographic research with adolescent students: Situated fieldwork ethics and ethical principles governing human research. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics: An International Journal*, 4(4), 27-38.
- Hesse H. (1956). *Journey to the East*. New York: Noonday Press.
- Keith, K.M. (2008). *The case for servant leadership*. Westfield: The Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership.
- Kirshner, B. (2007). Introduction: Youth activism as a context for learning and development. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 51, 367-379.
- Larkin, R. and Mahoney, A. (2006). Empowering youth to change their world: Identifying key components of a community service program to promote positive development. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44, 513-531.
- Lambert, W.E. (2004). Servant leadership qualities of principals, organizational climate, and student achievement: A correlational study. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66(02), 430. (UMI No. 3165799).
- Laub, J.A. (1999). *Assessing the servant organization: Development of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) instrument*. (Doctoral thesis). Florida Atlantic University, Florida.
- Libby, M., Sedonaen, M., and Bliss, S. (2006). The mystery of youth leadership development: The path to just communities. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 109, 13-25.
- Linds, W., Goulet, L., and Sammel, A. (2010). *Emancipatory practices: Adult/Youth engagement for social and environmental justice*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

- McKenzie, R.A. (2012). *A correlational study of servant leadership and teacher job satisfaction in a public education institution teaching* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Phoenix).
- Metzcar, A. M. (2008). *Servant leadership and effective classroom teaching* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://pqdtopen.proquest.com/doc/288396317.html?FMT=AI> (UMI No. 3344705).
- Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.W. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). London, Sage.
- Sendjaya, S. (2003). Development and validation of servant leadership behavior scale. *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, School of Leadership Studies, Regent University, August*, 1-11.
- So, G.B.K. (2014). *Adolescent youth perspectives on student leadership and global citizenship within a social justice youth development program framework*. (Master thesis). University of London, London.
- Spears, L.C. (2010). Character and servant-leadership: Ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders. *The Journal of Virtues & Leadership*, 1(1), 25-30.
- Trompenaars, F. and Voerman, E. (2009). *Servant leadership across culture: Harnessing the strength of the world's most powerful leadership philosophy*. Oxford, OX: Infinite Ideas Limited.
- Wheeler, W. and Edlebeck, C. (2006). Leading, learning, and unleashing potential: youth leadership and civic engagement. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 109, 89-97.
- White, E.B. (1952). *Charlotte's web*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Whitehead, G. (2009) Adolescent leadership development: Building a case for an authenticity framework. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 37(6), 847- 872.



Strengthening Decision-Making Skills of New School Leaders through Mentoring and Service

Donna Augustine-Shaw, Kansas State University
Robert Hachiya, Kansas State University

Abstract

The Kansas Educational Leadership Institute (KELI) addresses an identified need in providing mentoring and induction support to Kansas superintendents and principals stepping into the role for the first time. KELI coordinates statewide efforts through strong collaboration with partner organizations. The well-structured model provides a year long, on-site, individualized mentoring experience delivered by trained mentors along with monthly resources and regional and state networking in a safe and reflective environment. A major focus during the experience is gaining additional skills in ethical decision-making. In a 3-year trend of program completion data, 96%-100% of mentees enrolled in the program indicated that participation in KELI helped them grow professionally. Mentors agreed indicating positive results for new superintendent leadership development when completing KELI's program requirements. The KELI model maintains a focus on building leadership capacity and can serve as a state model.

Keywords: Mentoring, School Leaders, Kansas Educational Leadership Institute (KELI)

Mentoring to Serve

School and district leaders direct and shape new initiatives and serve in complex political school and community systems. Research states that quality leadership makes a difference in student achievement and in schools and communities (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). In their first year as new superintendents, principals, or assistant-level leaders, virtually all face high demands and levels of accountability from stakeholders, and the skills they possess in making ethical decisions is critical. Local boards of education and communities hiring a new principal or superintendent must recognize that mentoring and induction for a new school or district leader is a priority investment, providing essential support in the first years of practice. As new school and district leaders eagerly take the helm and begin to guide targeted improvement initiatives that involve multi-faceted decisions at all levels of the organization, a well-designed mentoring and induction program can serve as a life-line to help propel the new leader past initial challenges to long-term positive impact. Skilled and servant-minded mentors can make a difference, providing calm and experienced voices as the new school leader forms new skills, strategies, and understanding of the local context (Autry, 2001).

State mentoring and induction programs for new school and district leaders vary greatly with respect to requirements and program design as these initiatives strive to meet the needs of new principals and superintendents (Beem, 2007). Mentoring programs are frequently not supported by funding or quality planning processes. Adequate funding and quality planning for mentoring programs are frequent problems, and training for mentors is also difficult to attain (Alsbury & Hackman, 2006). In addition, time for new school leaders to engage in mentoring is often limited, creating the need for programs that respect demanding schedules and designate meaningful activities that promote professional growth for these novice leaders.

Induction programs for new educational leaders offer orientation activities over several years that increase knowledge of the specific school system along with an emphasis on professional learning when the trajectory for growth is high. A continued focus on effectiveness and developing skills of the novice leader in induction programs can include mentoring as an essential component, however, some induction programs do not include mentoring by experienced veterans as a support. Mentoring programs can also exist exclusive of a larger induction initiative. Examples of induction practices include guidance with internal district leaders such as the superintendent, networking with other novice and experienced leaders, participation in state associations, attendance at seminars, shadowing and observation, professional reading, and district orientation events (Villani, 2006). Mentoring as a component of induction programs or as a stand-alone initiative is a powerful technique in providing critical developmental support to new school and district leaders.

Mentoring support for new school and district leaders can serve to bridge the gap between what new leaders know when they enter their position, what experiences they have had, and what they need to know in acquiring knowledge and skills while on the job

(Villani, 2006). School leadership can be lonely with few avenues to discuss fears, ask questions, and explore solutions before decisions are made. Furthermore, routine demands, administrative dilemmas, and emergency situations can overwhelm new leaders (Hatch & Roegman, 2012). New school and district administrators who have an opportunity to learn alongside seasoned veterans can acquire resources and strategies to establish priorities and use their time to focus on what matters most. In complex school environments, mentors can provide meaningful guidance and experience to new leaders who can be unfamiliar with the extent and influence to which every decision impacts the system. Mentors who surround new leaders with confidence and communicate with enthusiasm, strengthen the relationship and therefore, the work of the new leader (Bloom, Castagna, Moir, Warren, 2005).

An important foundation in the mentoring process is improving the ability to make consistently good decisions responding to daily events, crises that arise, accountability demands to improve, and the continual needs of the people the principal or superintendent leads. Superintendents not only make decisions responding to requests and inquiries from school board members, but also to their own leadership team, building leaders, and teachers. These groups seek strong leadership, and the decision-making skill of the superintendent is a major factor determining the success of the school district, as well as the personal tenure of the superintendent. Similarly, decisions made by principals are equally impactful. Problem solving and responding to daily situations often requires a new principal to consider tradition, stakeholder interest, and complex factors with not much time to reflect on probable outcomes. Decisions made by leaders may come in the form of taking an affirmative action, or by taking no action; but in either outcome, a decision-making process is needed to occur to lead to that action.

Defining the Need for Mentoring New Leaders

Accomplished school leaders possess clear goals, have unique needs, and note important learning occurs on the job (Bloom, Castagna, Moir, & Warren, 2005). New school leaders facing significant transition, reflect on both their past and future opportunities, and seek increased understanding of their own leadership style as they begin new challenges. Laughlin and Moore (2012) stated, “dedicated mentoring is a proven support structure needed for individual growth” (p. 38). Robinson, Horan, and Nanavati (2009) affirmed that mentoring “helps accelerate learning, reduce isolation, and increase the confidence and skill of newly appointed school leaders” (p. 35). Job-embedded and contextual specificity add to understanding of school and district priorities. Experienced mentors assist new leaders in defining their individual style, assist with managing their time, and work with adults as they encounter each leadership issue (Malone, 2000). Exemplary mentors, distinguished in their leadership skills, establish relationships void of fear and judgment and assist new leaders in developing strong networks. Mentors who listen first, hold positive expectations for growth, and focus on the needs of the new leader, uphold principles of servant-minded leadership (Greenleaf, 1977/1991). The formation of integrated knowledge and skill through effective mentoring

practices engages new leaders on their most important task of developing a school climate focused on supporting student learning.

Turnbull, Riley, and MacFarlane (2015), in their study of principals, reported on the extent to which three support approaches led the principals to actual change in work practice and defined the need for mentoring new school leaders. In that study, individual support from a mentor/coach rated higher than did support received from supervisors or professional development. Mentoring relationships provided a critical base to learn in an individualized approach through observations, confidential reflection, and thinking deeply about leadership implications. A purposeful and necessary emphasis on problem-solving with practical and real-world application has dominated mentoring approaches in the field of education.

Context of the Mentoring and Service

In response to a defined need for professional learning for new district and school leaders in the state of Kansas, a consortium of leadership stakeholders recommended the establishment of the Kansas Educational Leadership Institute (KELI) to provide standardized and intense mentoring support for new superintendents and principals. The planning efforts of this consortium resulted in agreement on the need, design, and implementation of the Institute in May, 2011. A hallmark of KELI is collaboration with partner organizations. Partner representation included the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE), United School Administrators of Kansas, Kansas Association of School Boards, Kansas School Superintendents Association, and the College of Education (Department of Educational Leadership) at Kansas State University. Initial mentoring and induction service began with new superintendents in 2011-2012, followed by mentoring and induction program support to new principals in 2013-2014.

An additional need was created by KSDE regulations enacted in 2014 requiring all initially licensed building and district leaders to complete a full year of mentoring and induction in an approved state model program to move to their full professional license. Compliance required every local school district to design and submit for approval or select an approved state program meeting detailed guidelines by 2015-2016. The following elements are required to adhere to state guidelines:

- Alignment to Interstate School Leadership License Consortium (ISLLC) (Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), 2008) as well as Kansas professional leadership standards
- One year of mentoring and induction to include a minimum of 40 contact hours and three face-to-face meetings
- Options for state-wide networking and collaboration

- Opportunity for support beyond the first year
- Program evaluation, and
- Criteria for mentor selection and training (KSDE, 2015).

These new requirements passed by KSDE prompted KELI to respond to a field-based need to begin service to all state leadership groups including assistant superintendents, assistant principals, and special education directors, assistant directors, and coordinators. The core mission of preparing P-12 formal leaders to serve Kansas schools by continuing support in the initial years of practice through mentoring and induction enabled new leaders to develop successful paths to serving school and community stakeholders in every local district.

As new building and district leaders move from leadership preparation to their initial year on-the-job, support is essential. A resource guide (KSDE, 2015) provided districts with additional guidance and rationale outlining the need for support. KSDE included application of leadership preparation standards and connection to leadership position responsibilities in expectations for mentoring and induction program approval. Standards emphasize knowledge, skills, and dispositions critical to school and district leadership while application of these newly acquired skills materializes as leaders move into practice. The guidance provided by KSDE, via the resource guide, established a clear vision that makes a difference in this important transition through quality mentoring and induction support as new leaders serve their local school and district communities.

A State-Approved Program

As an approved mentoring and induction program in Kansas, KELI's vision provided mentoring and induction for new superintendents, new principals, and other leadership positions, as well as professional learning designed to address the needs of all school and district leaders and leadership teams. The structured mentoring and induction program established requirements whereby mentors foster a safe, confidential, and reflective environment for new leaders. The rural nature of Kansas positions many Kansas superintendents and principals living hours away from colleagues who work in similar roles, making face-to-face discussions with others difficult. In addition, superintendents located in these rural areas often wear many hats and serve as principals or hold director-level responsibilities and therefore, do not have other on-site administrators to share experiences. Through KELI's mentoring and induction strand, trained and experienced mentors support new executive leaders as they embrace exciting challenges in their school, district, and community. In their service, mentors share insight, focus on the individual needs of the new leader in their unique setting, and guide decision-making with their mentees on local district topics as well as state and national impact issues. New school and

district leaders apply thoughtful decisions in their local district context and focus on priority goals established by the Board of Education and community.

The KSDE recognizes KELI as a regional professional learning center. Upon the completion of KELI program requirements, new leaders can move to their professional Kansas license or earn credits towards license renewal. The mission of KELI is to collaborate and share resources to support professional growth of educational leaders needed in Kansas schools for the 21st Century. KELI's program, recommended by Kansas superintendents and principals, provided an individualized approach to mentoring and induction for new leaders as they embrace dynamic responsibilities and make decisions that influence student learning and guide overall improvement.

KELI receives guidance from the partner-based steering committee and a field-based advisory council comprised of practitioners. KELI's partners and advisors provide ongoing support through expertise and collaborative planning. KELI has been providing mentoring to new superintendents in Kansas since 2011 and has served 94 first-year superintendents during the first five years of operation. In the first three years of operation, KELI has served 56 new principals since 2013.

Program Design

The program design for KELI resulted from investigation, research, and best practice strategies discussed by initial consortium and agency members. Selected key works in this study of effective mentoring practices included Lipton, Wellman, and Humbard (2003); Gray, Fry, Bottoms, and O'Neill (2007); and The Wallace Foundation (2007). In developing the building and district level mentoring programs, practitioners and state-affiliated professional leadership organizations in Kansas were closely involved in recommending program requirements for building and district leader mentoring and induction requirements.

KELI program requirements include currently practicing principals recommended by their superintendents and retired superintendents delivering individualized, on-site support to new leaders in their local context. A deliberate process considers essential variables that match the mentor and mentee to geographic location, school level and size, and situational experience. Mentors and mentees utilize various forms of additional communication throughout the year (phone, email, etc.) to enhance on-going communication. Mentors also conduct on-site performance observations agreed upon with their mentee, with the goal of providing confidential feedback to the mentee for professional growth. The structure of KELI's program is focused on building capacity in new leaders through professional learning, monthly checklists, cohort networking, involvement in professional organizations, and an end-of-year reflective activity. Through these professional learning activities, new leaders exposed to regional and state resources gain knowledge and insight into operational and professional connections for future collaboration.

Experienced and carefully selected mentors serve new leaders in Kansas through the KELI model. One-on-one, site based mentoring sessions allow experienced superintendents and principals to share knowledge and perspectives with novice leaders. On-site visits occur monthly for new district leaders and five times during the year for new school leaders. Mentors establish a year-long relationship with each mentee and focus on building capacity in the new leader. Reiss (2007) noted that new leaders need “just-in-time opportunities for ongoing, confidential dialogue with a thinking partner to dialogue, brainstorm and develop strategies that benefit the system” (p. 16). One new superintendent commented,

I found that the time just to talk with my mentor was the most valuable part of the program. We spoke about the most current legislation or issues that came up that week. I knew that my mentor had been there and they could give me the ideas, resources, and reassurance I needed.

Another mentee shared, “[My mentor] helped me think about issues from multiple perspectives.” Another new principal commented, “My mentor administrator has been outstanding and has talked me through a few tough situations and that has really eased some of my decisions throughout the year.”

In addition to the one-on-one individualized visits, KELI’s service-minded program provides feedback to new leaders on two performance demonstrations selected by the mentee and mentor. Typically, a board of education meeting is selected by new superintendents as one of the performance observations in the local district and a staff meeting or parent meeting is often selected at the principal level. Mentors provide insightful and confidential feedback to the mentee after attending the agreed upon observation. This highly customized approach to visiting mentees on-site enables mentors to better understand important contextual and demographic needs in the school and district setting. Another valued resource used by both new superintendents and principals to plan is the monthly checklist of activities and research-based articles. The monthly checklist, developed by mentors and KELI staff, assists new leaders in planning for upcoming tasks and reports as well as providing an opportunity to clarify responsibilities with mentors at on-site visits.

As part of KELI’s focus on building capacity in new leaders, strong networking opportunities are included in program components through fall and spring cohort meetings and attendance at professional organization meetings. Mentees attend fall regional cohort sessions hosted by mentors and a statewide cohort meeting. During these cohort sessions, mentees share first year challenges and collaborate with other leaders in their geographic region as well as discuss statewide topics of interest. These cohort sessions provide a venue for informed perspective and sharing. One mentee commented, “One of the most valuable parts of the program for me was the networking with peers that is basically a requirement

of the program.” The mentee continued, “The chance to meet with this cohort group and listen to each other’s problems and solutions was invaluable as a first-year superintendent.”

Another valued component in KELI’s program is attendance at professional organization meetings. Knowledge of the impact on local issues is gained by attending designated district or building statewide meetings. Often, mentors attend these meetings with their mentees to enhance understanding, networking, and relationship building. In line with best practice, mentees are encouraged to reflect on their first-year experiences and provide an end-of-year reflection to capture personal and professional growth. Mentors focus on coaching skills, outlined responsibilities, evaluation criteria, and goal setting.

New superintendents and principals completing the KELI program have an opportunity to receive continued, but less intensive, support in year two of their practice. Mentors typically serve new leaders they have previously worked with during year two. On-site visits by skilled mentors is provided quarterly and focuses on gaining additional resources and solving challenges by thinking through and reflecting on decisions best suited for the local district and community. Second year participants continue to receive monthly checklists and other resources and attendance is encouraged at cohort sessions.

Professional Learning for Leaders

In a continuum of services for leadership development, KELI’s program includes professional leadership seminars aligned to specific needs of all school leaders in Kansas. In this second strand, professional development seminars are designed to address current topics and highlight the role of the leader. The vision for professional learning purposefully connects relevant topics with a clear focus on the role and decision-making responsibilities of the leader and is jointly developed with KSDE and other state administrative professional organizations. The professional development seminars present new knowledge by content experts, panel practitioners’ application in local Kansas districts, and opportunities for leadership discussion and networking. The meaningful context of KELI’s leadership seminars showcases collaborative planning among building and district leader participants. These seminars also provide a vital link to state and national issues that impact local school district implementation. This effective model for professional learning has proven to fill a defined need for leadership development in Kansas.

A Closer Look at Mentors

By recommendation of KELI planners, all mentors have experience as Kansas superintendents and principals. Most superintendent mentors are retired to better work within restrictive time demands and hectic schedules while most principal mentors are currently practicing to ensure relevancy on current position tasks and issues. Mentors are selected based on consideration of their professional qualifications, experience as a successful Kansas practitioner, mentoring experience and coaching skills, and overall

desire and commitment to serve a designated number of mentees. Mentors continue their professional learning by attending statewide meetings and professional reading on current topics. Mentors serve in geographic proximity to current year mentees and are placed with new leaders of common experiences in small and large schools/districts, districts with multiple leadership roles, and similar backgrounds in level of school (i.e., elementary, middle, high school). Mentors share that giving back to the profession, along with highly rewarding experiences, fuels their desire to provide continued service to the field as mentors and enables them to grow and learn alongside their mentees.

Villani (2006) stated that supporting mentors in the development of mentoring skills leads to substantial results. KELI mentors participate in professional coaching training to increase their skills and provide coach-like support to mentees. Building and district mentors participate in coaching training during the first two years as a mentor and have continued opportunity to participate throughout their service. Training modules delivered in an on-line format allow busy principals and district-level leaders to actively engage in training via distance in their local setting and at a convenient time. Coaching training sessions are provided by a nationally certified trainer and incorporate knowledge and tools focused on being a coach-like mentor and developing a coaching mindset through active listening, paraphrasing, positive intent, probing questions, and reflective feedback (Cheliotis & Reilly, 2010). Mentors practice new skills in a confidential and safe environment in practice labs incorporating real-life situations and application of coaching tenets in discussion and role-playing. Guided training allows mentors to develop professional skills they can use in their current school setting as leaders and as they work with mentees. Professional development for mentors also occurs from reflection and networking with other building and district leaders.

The selected coaching model for KELI mentors (Cheliotis & Reilly, 2010) provides a framework to nurture coach-like behaviors and develop understanding of effective skills in coaching for mentors. One mentor noted, “I have grown as a leader and provide appropriate support for my staff through coaching. I no longer feel I need to have all the answers. Instead, I listen, ask appropriate questions and work as a team to find solutions.” Another mentor noted, “I am a much better listener and have increased my awareness of the value of my role in the conversation.” A mentee shared,

My mentor is a very good listener and is willing to spend the time to help me become a successful principal. He helped me think through different solutions to situations that I may not have come up with on my own, without his coaching.

KELI mentors form a leadership team for the program, meeting regularly during the year to discuss issues important to new school and district leaders and provide feedback on program improvement. Mentors are a critical link and source of information in meeting the needs of new state leaders in an ever-changing local, state, and national education landscape.

KELI's needs-focused mentoring approach hones in on the development of greater decision-making skills. A meaningful relationship between the mentor and mentee is one of the most critical elements in mentoring programs (Alsbury & Hackmann, 2006). Daresh (2001) also identified additional characteristics of effective mentors for school administrators. Mentors for school superintendents and principals must possess relevant administrative experience and an earned regard for effectiveness in their knowledge and practice. Important to successful mentoring is the ability of the mentor to articulate a vision, embrace multiple solutions to complex issues, ask probing questions to guide decision-making, and understand how to get things done in political systems.

Moving Mentoring to a Deeper Level: A Focus on Decision-Making

A critical support to new leaders is the guidance provided by experienced mentors in decision-making. Without effective decision-making on the job, new leaders will face criticism in the beginning stages of their leadership. Daily problem-solving along with long-term impact of significant decisions, makes the role of the mentor an essential support to new school leaders. Ethical decision-making serves as one example where mentors collaborate with their mentees. School building and district licensure programs teach decision-making models in required courses and the same concepts continue to be developed through mentoring support during the first years of practice. New leaders are often encouraged to reflect on what they feel are the characteristics of people they know who consistently make good decisions, and characteristics of those who consistently do not make good decisions. Most new leaders believe that good decision makers are those who take the time to gather information, weigh their options, and then have the courage to decide. Most also feel that consistently poor decision makers are too quick to act, neglecting to take time to gather information, which in turn limits their options. They also feel that poor decision makers very often lack the courage to decide in the first place, which forms a very negative impression on the perception of leadership.

These characteristics only tell part of the story, for they do not say how the decision makers ultimately decided what to do after they contemplated the facts and circumstances that confronted them. Leaders frequently face situations where their decision-making skills are tested, and in some cases, they are presented with problems---where they must choose between a set of known solutions. This can be a very complex process for any new leader necessitating support from experienced mentors who can share perspectives and ask questions that force the new leader to consider implications, better informing their decisions. Mentees can also be faced with arguably a more difficult scenario---a dilemma that Kidder (1995) has described as being forced to choose between different choices where every potential answer could be the right choice. New superintendents and principals are faced with consistent, multi-faceted and complex issues that include opposing ideas, frameworks, perspectives, and goals related to the problem where their decision is required.

The prospect of how to respond to daily events, continual change, and managing school reform and improvement presents a responsibility for a superintendent or principal that never ends. Decision making in education can range from mundane daily tasks to decisions that have potentially life-altering consequences for children and adults. Foster (1986) stated “Each administrative decision carries with it a restructuring of human life: that is why administration at its heart is the resolution of moral dilemmas” (p. 33). When faced with continual change, superintendents and principals know how they respond to change not only impacts the adults they lead and the students they are responsible for, but also their professional tenure.

Therefore, it is imperative to have a foundation, framework, and mentoring support to enable the new leader to make consistently good decisions that produce positive and desirable results. Kidder (1995) provided a framework for resolving dilemmas surrounding choices that must be made when the options present themselves as right versus right. The application for the school leader is that there are many decisions that must be made where all options may be the right choice, but there are distinct differences between the choices, and only one option may be chosen. To illustrate, school superintendents and principals often face the challenge of balancing the rights of students and the responsibility to ensure the safety of all students (Hachiya, Shoop, & Dunklee, 2014). When faced with the choice of having to suspend or expel a student, it is right to consider the long-term effect the expulsion has on the student but also right to consider the safety implications for all students. It should be noted that the choices presented are not necessarily desirable choices; instead they are oftentimes the only choices available. A new leader, faced with these realistic dilemmas, can think through the ramifications of these choices with experienced and confidential mentors who have experience and knowledge, and understand the nature and complexity of the issue.

School leaders are required to make decisions affecting their schools or districts that are not exclusively bad or good. In other words, there may be change that is welcomed and exciting: the addition of a new program; the opening of a new school; or the addition of new leadership team members. At the opposite end the change might be very unwelcomed, such as the change presented due to deep budget cuts, new regulatory requirements, or sudden shifts in enrollment. In any circumstance, the decisions made while responding to changes and demands impact the potential result of the change, creating long-term consequences.

In a mentoring relationship, the blending of personal and professional codes helps both the mentor and mentee to gain additional perspective from each other. Mentoring relationships rooted in trust and confidence, provide a safe place for new leaders to increase their problem-solving and decision-making skills, keep them engaged in collaborative exchanges, and increase the likelihood they will remain in the profession (Lipton, Wellman, & Humbard, 2003).

As mentors explore effective resolution principles with mentees, they often consider solutions involving the greatest good for the greatest number, explore the purpose of the action, or pose a scenario whereby the decision-maker places him or herself into the situation the other person is facing (Kidder, 1995). Mentors further press new leaders to assess the consequences of the action or decision as policies are reviewed or developed that affect the system. As leaders reflect deeply on the magnitude of their decisions, they often discover that some decisions are more beneficial to some than others. The consequence of a decision can impede innovation. For example, if one person is allowed to do it their way, everyone will want to do it their own way. Good decision-making can also involve thinking about doing to others what you would want to have done to you. School leaders assess their own personal feelings of the results and gain a sense that their work makes a positive difference in the lives of others. Complex decision-making can also push leaders to make decisions that have an undesirable impact on others yet still must occur. Effective decision-making skills guided by experienced leaders through mentoring conversations, help frame the thinking for mentees as they face both daily events and longer-term dilemmas or problems. With greater practice and experience, more consistent and positively impactful decisions can be made.

Other paradigms aimed at understanding how to approach ethical decision-making and resolving situational dilemmas exist. These include the ethics of justice, care, critique, and the profession (Stefkovich, 2006). Superintendents and principals who understand the frameworks that philosophers and educators have developed over the years give themselves a foundation to make consistently sound decisions. Leaders understand that answers are not always in front of them in obvious ways, making it necessary for them to make decisions when implications are unclear.

While there are many approaches to decision-making, a practice for new leaders would be to think in terms of fairness, equity, and justice. Mentors can pose situational dilemmas to place leaders in real-life circumstances that require decisions involving individual liberties such as freedom of speech and social and economic inequalities. When new leaders take these concepts into consideration, they often provide the greatest benefit to the least advantaged and provide the greatest opportunity for everyone (Rawls, 1999). When new leaders make decisions through an ethic of justice, those in the least advantaged position are given fair treatment.

The ethic of care is vital and shifts thinking towards empathy and compassion. In 1998, Sernak combined the paradigms of justice and care and called for school leaders to balance their power with care, in relation to building a positive school climate. In the ethic of critique, the new leader might consider the issues of power and privilege, as well as culture and language. This paradigm would be related to the concepts of social justice, where decision-making would consider those who are marginalized within their school culture.

Shapiro and Stefkovich (2005) argued for a fourth paradigm that includes the ethic of the profession. The ethic of the profession integrates both personal and professional codes. Model codes of ethics for educators can be found at both the national and state levels, such as those from the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC). The Model Code of Ethics for Educators national standards help guide decision-making in practice, and come from standards set forth by various educational groups and organizations (NASDTEC, 2016). When mentors utilize standards to guide their conversations with new leaders, a clear application between theory and practice emerges and real-life problems provide the context for discussion.

While such professional standards can serve to guide new leaders as they deal with the challenges they face, without question they are blended with the personal codes and values the principal also possesses. The blending of professional and personal codes both play a critical role in educational decision making, and account for different decisions by principals faced with similar circumstances and facts. Mentors must allow mentees to “think through their own issue, rather than telling them what to do,” focusing them on the solution and engaging them in positive conversations that stretch their thinking (Rock, 2006, pp. 35-36).

When faced with educational issues, using the paradigm of considering the best interest of the student often leads towards more consistent, and better decisions (Shapiro and Stefkovich, 2005). If individual students are treated with fairness, respect, and care, the message is sent to others that they too, will be treated similarly. Stefkovich (2006) stated that decisions related to the students’ best interest are those incorporating individual rights, teaching students to accept responsibility for their actions, and respecting students. This foundation helps principals make decisions that help fulfill their obligations as school leaders. The application of acting in the best interest of the student can be made for most situational dilemmas faced by new leaders.

Relevance to Mentors and Mentees

Throughout the mentoring year, the development of effective decision-making skills is a consistent and major focus. Every action a leader takes involves a decision of some order. Ciulla (2003) referred to the “Hitler” problem, which is the conflict between ethics and effectiveness. Answering the question whether Hitler was a good leader would depend on if the definition of a good leader was someone who gets people to perform tasks or functions. Such a conversation may be relevant in an ethical leadership discussion today between KELI participants when examining various state and national educational issues. While perhaps the example using such historical figures or events is extreme, the important message is that mentoring relationships such as those fostered by KELI mentors allow for open discussion and a learning experience different from any other a new leader will have. The greater the number of problems, dilemmas, and quandaries that can be discussed during the mentoring process, the greater the likelihood there will be growth during the first year. The focus on ethical decision-making is just one of many potential growth

possibilities for new leaders supported by experienced mentors in contextualized situations.

The responsibilities school leaders face is at times daunting, and it is difficult enough to make life-impacting decisions on their own; but they become even more difficult when you must make decisions related to backed up sewer systems, bus schedules that become impacted by road closures, school lunches that were spoiled by a broken freezer, or a controversy brought to school through social media. Beckner (2004) noted that there was a time when ethical decisions were easier to discern---in earlier times people tended to have greater acceptance of rules and expectations. Today where information is immediate and change necessary, leaders must understand facets of decision-making and conclusions that combine a variety of systems of thought. The conclusion is that it is imperative to learn how to become a better, more consistently good decision maker; and that mentoring relationships can help nurture and grow those skills.

With the mentoring relationship, core values of professional responsibility are discussed, analyzed, developed, and shared between not only the paired mentors and mentees, but with everyone involved with KELI in a broader sense. The decision-making concepts and codes of ethics bring together the understanding for the common good in education for every school district involved in the program. The KELI experience helps to identify common problems and dilemmas of the profession through networking experiences and helps participants gain further understanding of their professional responsibilities. One of the greatest of those responsibilities is the ethical use of the power they possess. Leadership is more than an ability to merely get things done, and depends not just on the outcomes, but the quality of the means and ends of leaders' actions.

METHOD

Program evaluation of KELI is conducted in multiple ways. KELI staff meets four times annually with district program mentors and twice annually with building program mentors to obtain informal feedback on program effectiveness, field-based needs of mentees, and overall suggestions for improvement. Relevant programming topics are also shared with the organization's governance structure. Mentors are encouraged to self-reflect annually on their practice. KELI administers a perception survey to capture essential feedback from all program mentees and mentors at the end-of-year. Careful review of this feedback is conducted and adjustments are made in program requirements and structure because of this on-going and critical input.

In the spring, an electronic survey is administered to all mentees and mentors participating in the KELI program to gain insight into perceptions of program participants on the effectiveness of the mentoring and induction program. Principal mentors and mentees completed the KELI mentor/mentee survey in 2013-2014 (mentor n = 16/17; mentee n = 16/18) and 2014-2015 (mentor n = 14/14; mentee n = 17/17) on their program experience. In 2015-2016, the mentor/mentee survey was revised and included principals,

assistant principal mentees and special education coordinators (mentor n = 21/21; mentee n = 29/32). The survey contained questions developed by KELI staff, rated by a five-point Likert scale and open-ended questions. Selected survey Table 1. In a three-year trend, 90% of mentors and mentees agreed that KELI mentoring/induction support is helpful to a first-year building leader. Results also highlighted that 100% of mentors agreed that serving as a KELI mentor is a personal professional learning experience during the same three-year period.

Table 1
KELI Building Program Mentoring and Induction Perception Survey Results

Question	2013-2014		2014-2015		2015-2016	
	Mentor n=16/17	Mentee n=16/18	Mentor n=14	Mentee n=17	Mentor n=21	Mentee n=29/32
KELI mentoring/induction is helpful to a first-year building leader	93.75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	90%
Multiple face-to-face interactions with a mentor are essential to effective mentoring/induction support	93.75%	100%	100%	94.44%	100%	72%
Small group cohort meetings with area mentors and mentees are helpful to new principals	80%	81.25%	71.43%	83.33%	81%	76%
Meaningful feedback should be provided by the mentor to the new leader after observing actual leadership performance	100%	93.75%	100%	94.44%	100%	79%
Receiving the monthly checklist is helpful to new leaders	81.25%	100%	93.33%	94.44%	95%	86%
Attending professional meetings is helpful to a new leader	75%	75%	100%	94.44%	100%	90%
The coaching training sessions strengthen my skills as a mentor	93.75%	NA	93.33%	NA	95%	NA
I apply the skills I learn in coaching training as a leader in my own district	100%	NA	93.33%	NA	95%	NA
Serving as a KELI mentor is a personal professional learning experience	100%	NA	100%	NA	100%	NA
I recommend other first year leaders participate in KELI	NA	100%	NA	100%	100%	86%

Note. Numbers represent percentage responding “agree to somewhat agree”

Superintendent mentors and mentees completed the KELI mentor/mentee survey in 2013-2014 (mentor n = 5/5; mentee n = 10/11), and 2014-2015 (mentor n = 6/7; mentee n = 16/16) as well as for the first two years of program operation. The electronic survey is administered annually and was completed end-of-year by participants on their program experience. The survey for mentors and mentees, developed by KELI staff, contained questions rated by a five-point Likert scale and open-ended questions. In 2015-2016

(mentor n = 14/14; mentee n = 27/29), the mentor/mentee survey was revised and included superintendents, assistant superintendents, special education directors, and special education assistant directors. Table 2 highlights selected survey results from the last 3 years of data obtained from the perception surveys.

Table 2
KELI District Program Mentoring and Induction Perception Survey Results

Question	2013-2014		2014-2015		2015-2016	
	Mentor n=5	Mentee n=10/11	Mentor n=6/7	Mentee n=16	Mentor n=14	Mentee n=27/29
The KELI program gives mentees appropriate access to the mentor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
The frequency of face-to-face mentor interactions met the mentees' needs	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Interaction with a mentor helped the mentee solve problems	100%	90%	100%	100%	85.71%	100%
The KELI mentoring program helped mentees grow professionally	100%	100%	100%	100%	92.86%	96%
Mentees used the KELI program to address current matters in their districts	100%	90%	100%	100%	100%	96%
Cohort meetings were helpful	100%	100%	83.33%	93.75%	85.71%	93%
The training provided by KELI helped me be a more effective mentor/coach	100%	NA	100%	NA	100%	NA
% rating the KELI program as an effective support program for a first-year district leader ranging 8 to 10 (10=highest)	100%	90%	94%	100%	100%	100%

Note. Numbers represent percentage responding "agree to somewhat agree"

It is noteworthy that 100% of mentees and mentors felt the frequency of face-to-face mentor interactions met the needs of mentees for the entire three years of program operation. During 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 of operation, 100% of mentors and mentees agreed the KELI mentoring program helped mentees grow professionally. In 2015-2016, 93% of mentors and 96% of mentees agreed. In addition, 100% of mentors agreed that

training provided by KELI helped them be a more effective mentor/coach during the three years of survey administration. One mentee commented,

The KELI mentoring program was a tremendous asset to me over the last year as I have begun to navigate the district leadership role. I appreciate the purposeful interaction between my mentor and I. If this would have been a mentoring situation structured by ‘call me if you need anything’, I wouldn’t have taken the time to stop and even think about what I needed, let alone take the time to initiate the conversation.

Another first-year superintendent noted,

I feel that the KELI mentoring program has been well worth the investment. The experience that the mentors bring to the field and the match between mentor/mentee was exceptional. Just having a mentor to call, text, or email to ask questions and run thoughts by helped time and time again. Without this relationship, it would have been complete survival mode.

The KELI program is experiencing rapid program growth in response to an increased awareness of mentoring and induction and new guidelines requiring a year of mentoring by the KSDE. KELI is continuing to serve new superintendent and principal leaders in Kansas schools while embracing service to assistant-level leadership positions, including leaders in special education. Through involvement and collaboration of expert field practitioners and state representatives, KELI’s design for new programs continues to tailor to the specific needs of these leadership positions.

DISCUSSION

KELI’s service to support new school and district leaders in Kansas through quality mentoring and induction and highly experienced and trained mentors enables new leaders to transition more smoothly into their first years on-the-job. Mentors and program requirements build essential understanding of the impact of decision-making in varied local district contexts. Considering the individualized needs of leaders (i.e., rural, suburban, urban) in varied settings will strengthen KELI’s ability to more fully meet the distinct needs and challenges in unique settings. KELI’s continued analysis of program feedback is critical to responding to the changing needs of leaders as they embrace state and federal initiatives and use of technology to enhance the mentoring experience. The opportunity to conduct both qualitative and quantitative research in the future will lead to additional recommendations in determining the effect of mentoring relationships on program outcomes. Engaging in this inquiry would strengthen KELI’s continued work in the field and its formal evaluation program.

Leading in school districts today is complex, thus requiring an adaptive approach to serving new leaders in the second and third year of practice. In addition, embracing ideas shared by mentors and mentees provides KELI with an innovative lens to program improvement. These targeted areas for future recommendations to improve and sustain KELI's work in the field and positively impact decision-making for new leaders embraces new possibilities to lead successfully in twenty-first century schools.

CONCLUSION

New school and district leaders face a myriad of challenges as they move into their first year of practice, facing interconnected systems and unfamiliar demands. The promise of support offered by trained and experienced KELI mentors who form a trusting bond and confidential relationship focused on service to new leaders provides a foundation on which new school and district leaders can grow and learn. It is common for any first-time administrator to lack understanding of what they do not know as they move into a new set of broader system-level responsibilities. Through KELI, new principals and superintendents begin to form strong ties, embrace initial expectations, and build relationships with their district and community stakeholders. Through individualized and trusted mentoring and professional development, new school leaders develop capacity to address school and district goals and community needs. Honest dialogue among mentees and mentors informs daily practice and collaborative conversations begin to address organizational goals, inform decision-making, and create an impactful focus on quality teaching and learning. Relationships formed between mentors and mentees enable new leaders, uncertain of the right direction, to assume their new roles and responsibilities with increased perspective, information, and confidence.

High quality mentoring and induction provides critical support during professional transitions. Keenly aware of their need to serve new leaders and support their efforts to make sustained system improvements, experienced and trained principal and superintendent mentors, provide new state leaders with a deep understanding of how decisions impact local stakeholders and strategically plan for change to develop organizational and leadership capacity. The needs and influence of the school principal and district superintendent identifies a clear responsibility for every district and state to develop and maintain meaningful and focused mentoring. Mentoring relationships and mentoring to serve makes a difference in the professional development and strengthening of decision-making skills that impact students and staff for every new leader serving local school and district communities.

REFERENCES

- Alsbury, T.L., & Hackmann, D.G. (2006). Learning from experience: Initial findings of a mentoring/induction program for novice principals and superintendents. *Planning and Changing*, 37(3-4), 169-189.
- Autry, J.A. (2001). *The servant leader: How to build a creative team, develop great morale, and improve bottom-line performance*. Roseville: Prima Publishing.
- Beckner, W. (2004). *Ethics for educational leaders*. Boston, MA: Pearson/A and B.
- Beem, K. (2007). Superintendent mentoring the state way. *The School Administrator*, 64(4), 10-17.
- Bloom, G., Castagna, C., Moir, E., & Warren, B. (2005). *Blended coaching: Skills and strategies to support principal development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Cheliotis, L.M.G., & Reilly, M.F. (2010). *Coaching conversations. Transforming your school one conversation at a time*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2008). *Educational leadership policy standards: ISLLC*. Washington, D.C.
- Ciulla, J. (2003). *The ethics of leadership*. South Melbourne, Australia: Thomson/Wadsworth.
- Daresh, J.C. (2001). *Leaders helping leaders*. (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Foster, W. (1986). *Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Gray, C., Fry, B., Bottoms, G., & O'Neill, K. (2007). Good principals aren't born – they're mentored: Are we investing enough to get the school leaders we need? SREB: Available at <http://www.sreb.org/publication/good-principals-arent-born-theyre-mentored>.
- Greenleaf, R. (1977/1991). *Servant leadership*. The Robert K. Greenleaf Center and Paulist Press, 18-23.
- Hachiya, R., Shoop, R., & Dunklee, D. (2014). *The principal's quick reference guide to school law* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Hatch, T. & Roegman, R. (2012). Out of isolation. *Journal of Staff Development* 33(6), 37-41.
- Kansas State Department of Education. (2015). *District Mentor and Induction Program Guidelines*. Topeka: Kansas State Department of Education. Kidder, R. M. (1995). *How good people make tough choices*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Laughlin, K. & Moore, H. (2012). Mentoring and leadership: A practical application for one's career path. *Journal of Adult Education*, 41(1), 34-40.
- Lipton, L., Wellman, B., & Humbard, C. (2003). *Mentoring matters: A practical guide to learning-focused relationships*. MiraVia, LCC.
- Malone, R. (2000). Principal mentoring. *National Association of Elementary School Principals Research Round-Up*, 17(2), 2-5.
- National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC). (2016). *Model Code of Ethics for Educators (MCEE)*. *Nasdtec.net*. Retrieved 7 June 2016 from http://nasdtec.net/?page=MCEE_Doc.
- Rawls, J. (1999). *A theory of justice*. (Rev. ed) Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Reiss, K. (2007). *Leadership coaching for educators: Bringing out the best in school administrators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Robinson, J., Horan, L., & Nanavati, M. (2009). Creating a mentoring coaching culture for Ontario school leaders. *Adult Learning*, 20(1), 35-38.
- Rock, D. (2006). *Quiet leadership: Six steps to transforming performance at work*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Sernak, L. (1998). *School leadership: Balancing power with caring*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sharpiro, J., & Stefkovich, J. (2005). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education*. (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Stefkovich, J. (2006). *Best interests of the student*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- The Wallace Foundation. (2007). Getting principal mentoring right: Lessons from the field. New York, NY: Available at www.wallacefoundation.org.
- Turnbull, B.J., Riley, D.L., & MacFarlane, J.R. (2015). Districts taking charge of the principal pipeline. Rand: Available at www.wallacefoundation.org.
- Villani, S. (2006). *Mentoring and induction programs that support new principals*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Waters, J., Marzano, R., & McNulty, B. (2003). Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. Available at <http://www.mcrel.org>.



Servant Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness: Examining Leadership Culture among Millennials within a US National Campus Ministry

Valorie C. Nordbye, Bethel University
Justin A. Irving, Bethel University

Abstract

This research project used self-typing paragraphs to assess the leadership style of each organizational area within a national campus ministry. Research participants selected from four leadership styles: (a) autocratic, (b) paternalistic, (c) servant, and (d) laissez-faire. Data from five historical organizational reports were used to measure whether each organizational area was growing, plateaued, or shrinking. The findings were compared to determine if there was a relationship between leadership style area growth defined by staff recruitment and the total number of campuses with ministry programs. Findings indicate there is a positive relationship. Areas for which the highest number of staff chose servant leadership as the style of their area also experienced the greatest degree of growth. Conversely, the area with the least amount of servant leadership responses was the area experiencing the greatest decline in staff recruitment and ministry numbers. Spearman's rho and Chi-square analyses indicated statistically significant relationships between servant leadership culture of an area and three measures of area performance.

Keywords: Servant Leadership, Leadership Effectiveness, Organizational Performance, Campus Ministry, Millennials.

Little research has been conducted on leadership with college students and even less has been written on campus ministry. This research examines the effectiveness of a servant leadership culture within a campus ministry context. It goes beyond the scope of worker contentment and productivity to support the premise that servant leadership is positively related with quantifiable results in the success and growth of the organization. This is even more pertinent because college students are the next generation of leaders and workers, and success with them points us to the likelihood of future success in the workplace if servant leadership is an effective leadership approach with this generation.

The research of this project set out to assess whether there is a positive relationship between leadership culture and growth within a national campus ministry. After tabulating staff and program numbers for five years and assessing the leadership culture for each organizational area, a positive relationship was found. Those areas that were strongest in servant leadership style were also the areas seeing growth. The area that was the weakest in servant leadership style was the one that had experienced the greatest decline in staff and ministry numbers. Additionally, Spearman's rho and Chi-square analyses demonstrated the positive relationship between servant leadership practice and higher levels of performance.

Because the organization being studied works primarily with millennials in the university setting, and because the staff of this organization are primarily comprised of millennials, this article will compare servant leadership to the preferences and traits of the millennial generation. A theoretical argument is built for the use of servant leadership with college students and organizations that work heavily with the millennial generation. Following the theoretical argument is a description of the process of data collection, the findings of the analyses and the implications of study findings.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Organizational Culture and Leadership Style

Organizational performance is influenced by many factors. For instance, in the business sector a company's market share as well as the levels of bargaining power among buyers and suppliers will influence overall performance. But such factors are not the only ones to consider. On this point, Cameron and Quinn (2005) note that when organizations experience failure it is a neglect of organizational culture that is "the most frequently cited reason for failure" (p. 2). Put positively, Cameron and Quinn note of successful companies that "their most important competitive advantage, the most powerful factor they all highlight as a key ingredient in their success, is their organizational culture" (p. 4).

Organizational culture is typically considered at the level of an overall organization, but, as Cameron and Quinn (2005) note, "organizational cultures may be comprised of unique subcultures" (p. 148). These subcultures are typically characterized by both

“common attributes that make up an overarching culture typical of the entire organization,” but also may “differ perceptibly” from other subcultures in the organization (Cameron & Quinn, p. 148). In the study reported in this article, the researchers engaged staff members in light of performance measures in seven organizational areas. This approach allowed for analysis of the data from both the perspective of the whole of the organization’s staff, and the distinct subcultures in these seven areas.

Cameron and Quinn’s (2005) Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument contains six content dimensions that capture elements of organizational culture. One of these dimensions is “the leadership style and approach” (p. 151). In the present study, the main leadership style the researchers studied was the servant leadership style that characterized the organizational divisions studied. Because of this focus in the study, the following section provides a brief overview of the servant leadership literature informing the present study.

Servant Leadership

Greenleaf introduced the term “servant leadership” in 1970 to the business world in his now famous essay, “The Servant as Leader.” Key theorists and researchers have engaged Greenleaf’s discussion in the years since. One of those authors was Spears (1995) who set out to distill a list of the characteristics of a servant leader based on Greenleaf’s work. Spears felt that Greenleaf’s essay worked well for those who were conceptual thinkers but that for some a more concrete list would be helpful. His ten characteristics are: Listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community (Spears, 2010).

Another author who further developed Greenleaf’s work was Senge (1995). Senge felt that servant leadership was the best leadership style to engage in systems thinking. Senge, who found Greenleaf’s essay both simple and profound, wrote that “The Servant as Leader” offers a “new basis for ‘health’” (Senge, 1995, p. 234). Rather than just correct a problem, servant leadership lays the groundwork for an approach that seeks to understand what makes permanent change difficult and addresses the underlying forces that cause the problem. In an earlier article, Senge develops another key thought, building a case that the organizations that will have the greatest success in today’s rapidly changing environment will be learning organizations. Senge describes a learning organization as one where the leader designs, teaches, is a steward and creates a shared vision (Senge, 1990). Senge’s description of a leader in a learning organization is best met by a servant leader.

In the late 1990s Laub (2003) further explored the concept of leader as servant and set out to answer three key questions: “How is servant leadership defined? What are the characteristics of servant leadership? Can the presence of these characteristics within organizations be assessed through a written instrument?” His creation of the Servant

Organizational Leadership Assessment (SOLA) provided for the first time an assessment tool to determine the leadership culture of an organization (1999). In the opening remarks of his dissertation, Laub gives a possible explanation for why servant leadership has increasingly changed the landscape of leadership.

In the past 25 years we have seen a dramatic increase of women in the workplace, a growing ethnic and racial diversity and a desire to see the workplace serve as a learning environment for personal growth and fulfillment. These changes, among others, have prompted a reexamination of the effectiveness of the traditional leadership model of power and authority. The traditional model has held prominence since the beginning of time, and our history is written around the use and abuse of leadership power. There is a growing call for new leadership thinking and a new vision of organizations that place service to others over self-interest and self-promotion (1999, p. 3).

After Laub's (1999) work, empirical research demonstrating the effectiveness of servant leadership grew. One popular treatment is Collins' (2001) work in *Good to Great*. Although Collins landed on the language of level 5 leaders to capture a leader who combines humility with fierce resolve, Collins acknowledges in his work that he considered the language of servant leaders to describe these effective leaders. Other studies analyzed servant leadership's impact on various organizational outcomes such as organizational citizenship behavior (Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010), job satisfaction (Irving, 2005; Mayer, Bardes, & Piccolo, 2008), firm performance (Peterson, Galvin, & Lange, 2012), and team performance (Hu & Liden, 2011; Irving & Longbotham, 2007). Such literature provides good reason to believe servant leadership will contribute to performance in an organization composed primarily of millennial staff as well.

Biblical Leadership Style and Servant Leadership

Because this study was conducted within the context of a campus ministry, biblical perspectives on leadership style and servant leadership are also relevant to the organization and study. The authors are persuaded that servant leadership is not only an effective contemporary leadership practice based on the growing body of empirical studies, but also historically and biblically grounded. Noting the biblical roots of servant leadership, Sun (2013) argues that the core servant identity dimensions of calling, humility, empathy, and agape love are often used in Christian literature and the Bible. Sun further notes that "the best known example of a leader governed by servant identity is the Lord Jesus Christ" (p. 549).

In Scripture the leadership style presented by Jesus is that of a servant. In Mark 10, after arguing about who is the greatest, the sons of Zebedee ask if they might sit in places of honor next to Jesus. His answer enlightens his followers on his view of authority, power and leadership.

Jesus called them together and said, "You know that those who are regarded as rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their high officials exercise authority over them. Not so with you. Instead, whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be slave of all. For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many." (Mark 10:42-45 TNIV)

Jesus contrasts the leadership practices of the Gentiles to the service orientation emphasized in this passage. Two words are used in this passage to describe the leadership of the Gentile rulers. The first is *katakuriuo*, which translates to lord against, that is to control or subjugate. The second is *katexousiaz*, which means to have or wield full privilege over someone. Juxtaposed against this description, Jesus tells his disciples that if they desire to be great or first they must be the servant or even the slave of all. He then reminds them that even he did not come to be served, but to serve and sacrifice his life for many.

The model of leadership presented here by Jesus is a rebuff of a hierarchical or autocratic model. Leadership is not about honor or position but about serving the needs of the follower. Leaders should be sacrificial in their leadership, and with strong language Jesus makes it clear that His followers are to take their example of leadership style from his own example of servant identity.

Leadership and College Students

The challenges previously noted in this article by Laub (2003) are present on today's college campus. Unfortunately, there has been little research done on the leadership preferences of college students with the exception of the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Student LPI) developed by Kouzes and Posner in 1998 and updated in 2006. Kouzes and Posner found that most leadership development programs for students came from the business world, so they created an inventory of student leadership behaviors and actions. These behaviors were categorized into five leadership practices: modeling the way, inspiring a shared vision, challenging the process, enabling others to act, and encouraging the heart (Posner, 2004).

The five categories were arrived at by asking students to describe their actions and behaviors when they are at "their personal best as leaders" (Posner, 2004, p. 443). The results give us a better understanding of what leadership style works on the college campus. These results may also be an indicator of what style will be more effective in the future because today's college student will be tomorrow's leader. As servant leadership emphasizes follower-oriented practices, dimensions like encouraging the heart and enabling others to act in Kouzes and Posner's model are consistent with a servant leadership approach.

Additional research on millennials and leadership that was more limited in scope was conducted by Nordbye (2015). Nordbye found that 85 percent of students in a college ministry gave servant leadership as their preferred leadership style to work under. The respondents chose from self-typing paragraphs describing autocratic, paternalistic, servant and Laissez-faire leadership styles. Additionally, respondents indicated they were willing to sacrifice pay and benefits to work with a boss they liked and to work at an organization that complemented their personal values and social practices (Nordbye, 2015).

Millennial Generation and Leadership Style

In the campus ministry that is the focus of this study, 10% of the staff are in college and 58% are under age 35. Growth in campus ministry is closely tied to student leadership development for two key reasons. A completely staff-led campus ministry is limited in size to the number of staff leading. With strong student leadership a campus ministry can grow considerably larger, as student leaders assume many of the leadership needs of the group. The second reason student leadership is important is that the majority of new staff come from student leaders. For this reason it is important to investigate which leadership culture is most effective with college students and organizations serving college students.

Though research on effective leadership styles among college students is rare, there is an abundance of books and articles on the preferences and traits of the millennial generation. By comparing these characteristics for millennials with current leadership styles there is evidence that some styles are more attractive to millennials than others and by implication will be more successful with them. The millennial generation was born on or after 1982 (Howe & Strauss, 2000). They began attending college in 2000 and hit the workforce about 2004 and will continue to do so until 2022 (Hershatte & Epstein, 2010). Beinhoff (2011) argues that millennials “hold opinions, attitudes, values, and technological competencies that are very different from the generations that preceded them” (p. 2225). In light of this, a careful evaluation of which leadership styles fit best with the millennial generation’s characteristics and preferences is critical. What follows are some of the major descriptions given for millennials and a comparison of those against four common leadership styles: autocratic, paternalistic, servant and laissez-faire.

For this comparison, the description of the first three leadership styles will be those of Laub (2003). First, *autocratic* leadership is one of “self-rule” where the organization exists to serve the needs and interests of the leader first. This often leads to the oppression of the worker to satisfy the wishes of the leader. Second, *paternalistic* leadership is one of leaders seeing themselves as parent to those led. This parental view of leadership encourages the led to take on the role of children. This leads to an unhealthy transactional leadership that operates more on compliance rather than true individual motivation. Most organizations find themselves operating within this understanding of leadership. Third, *servant* leadership is characterized by the six key areas of servant leadership noted below in Table 1. This view sees leadership as serving the needs of those led over the self-interest of the leader. In this kind of organization all people are encouraged to lead and serve. This

produces a community of care where the needs of all are served and the organization is able to put its energy into fulfilling its shared mission.

Laub (2003, p. 3) describes the six key areas in the following chart (See Table 1):

Table 1

Laub's (2003) Servant Leadership Characteristics

Characteristics	Associated Behaviors
Values People	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – By believing in people – By serving others' needs before his or her own – By receptive, non-judgmental listening
Develops People	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – By providing opportunities for learning and growth – By modeling appropriate behavior – By building up others through encouragement and affirmation
Builds Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – By building strong personal relationships – By working collaboratively with others – By valuing the differences of others
Displays Authenticity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – By being open and accountable to others – By a willingness to learn from others – by maintaining integrity and trust
Provides Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – By envisioning the future – By taking initiative – By clarifying goals
Shares Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – By facilitating a shared vision – By sharing power and releasing control – By sharing status and promoting others

The fourth leadership style that will be used for comparison is laissez-faire and was added to Laub's styles by Wong and Page in a paper at the same 2003 Roundtable conference. Wong and Page (2003) describes laissez-faire as a leadership style that is hands-off and has the effect of being detached, weak and disinterested.

The first defining characteristic of millennials contrasted against the above four leadership styles is that they trust that the organization will act in their best interest. According to a study of 800 business students from four universities, 60% agreed with the statement, "I trust authority figures to act in my best interest" (Hershatter & Epstein, 2010, p. 215). This trust is based on a belief that the system is equitable and that hard work and positive results will be rewarded and encouraged. According to Hershatter and Epstein, at its roots is the way millennials have been raised. Juxtaposing this trait against leadership styles the best fit is servant leadership. Autocratic does not act in the follower's best interest but in the leader's best interest. Laissez-faire acts essentially when a problem arises but not proactively in the best interest of the follower. Paternalistic does care for the follower but

as the name implies it is in a parental manner and the ultimate goal is not the development of the follower, as it is with servant leadership. As Laub (2003) points out, the relationship is intrinsically unhealthy and tends more toward compliance. According to Hershatter and Epstein, younger workers tend to want to choose “the specific tasks in which they will engage and the conditions under which they will engage in them” (Hershatter & Epstein, 2010, p. 217). This added understanding of expectations on the part of millennials toward the organization indicates that though paternalistic leadership cares for the follower, the parental type control will come into conflict with millennials.

Millennials value teamwork, community and collaboration (Hershatter & Epstein, 2010). Servant leadership is the style most aligned with these three core values. Spears (1995) states that servant leadership is based on teamwork and community, and goes on to say that it is a model that attempts to involve others in the decision making process. Spears elaborates, “Today there is a growing recognition of the need for a more team-oriented approach to leadership and management. Greenleaf’s writings on the subject of servant-leadership helped to get this movement started, and his views have had a profound and growing effect” (p. 2). Laub (2003) lists building community as one of his six descriptors of servant leadership and specifically states that working collaboratively with others is part of this process.

A recognized trait of millennials, which is sometimes viewed as negative, is their need for guidance, reassurance and direction (Hershatter & Epstein, 2010). This can be frustrating to managers who may feel they must spend a large amount of time assisting millennials to function well at work. Instead of the millennial helping with the workload, the millennial may actually initially increase the workload. Though this may be draining to any leadership style, only the servant leadership style has the development of the follower as a key tenet to its philosophy of leadership. Greenleaf put it best himself in his statement that, “The best test is: Do those served grow as persons; do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants?” (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 27). Millennials need assistance in becoming more autonomous and again servant leadership holds this as a basic precept.

Not only do millennials often require a high degree of guidance and reassurance, they generally have an expectation that organizations will accommodate them (Hershatter & Epstein, 2010). The autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles have nothing in their tenets to address this expectation and even if the paternalistic style might see accommodation as positive, it is done in a paternalistic manner which in and of itself might be distasteful to millennials. With a basic premise of serving followers, servant leadership is best suited to accommodate the needs of millennials in the workplace.

The expected and desired relationship with the workplace that millennials have is different from previous generations. They often expect to bring about change through their work and for that reason the values of the organization and its authenticity can be extremely important to millennials (Hershatter & Epstein, 2010). Covey describes the process of

leadership alignment as defining the organization's vision, mission and values and then making sure that all the structures and systems reflect those three (Covey, 1989). This approach is often important to millennials because it speaks to the authenticity and integrity of the organization. Laub (2003) lists authenticity as another one of the six elements of servant leadership, reinforcing that servant leadership is a well-suited style for millennials and organizations serving millennials.

Comparing each of the four styles to the needs and preferences of millennials yields several observations. Although the *paternalistic* style of leadership may address the desire of millennials for more guidance, there is also a limitation in that this leadership approach will not be attractive to millennials desiring involvement in decision making processes. A *Laissez-faire* leadership approach does not address the needs of millennials either, but arguably is a style that at least does not interfere with preferences of this generation. Though there are elements of compatibility for millennials in these two styles, these leadership approaches are not an overall good fit for millennials.

It is difficult to find anything attractive for millennials in the *autocratic* style because the autocratic approach to leadership is not focused on the good of the worker but rather that of the leader. This top-down, and often heavy-handed, leadership approach goes against the needs and preferences of millennials. Their high need for guidance, along with their expectations of the organization, are not met in the autocratic leadership approach.

Considering the four leadership styles, *servant leadership* seems to best address the preferences and expectations of millennials. Though there may be limited research conducted on leadership style preferences among millennials, based on a comparison of millennial traits and characteristics and common leadership styles it may be proposed that servant leadership is the best fit. In this study—a study conducted in an organization staffed primarily by millennials and serving a millennial population—organizational performance measures are examined alongside the leadership culture in the seven organizational divisions. This will provide relevant data for considering the relationship between organizational performance and leadership culture among a dominantly millennial population.

METHOD

Organizational and Sample Characteristics

The campus ministry that is the focus of this research is broken down into seven areas with an area supervisor responsible for leading each division. Following its launch in 1965, the ministry was comprised of independent campus ministries that had little connection to one another other than a national student conference held each summer. For the first 15 years the ministry grew but by the 1980s it began to decline in ministries, staff and student numbers.

In 1992 the ministry was restructured into regions with a supervisor appointed to oversee the ministries and facilitate expansion. Following this structural change, the national ministry began to grow overall but that growth was not uniform. Some regions saw growth, some stayed the same size and others declined. When one region lost its supervisor it steadily declined until only one campus ministry remained. However, the new region to which that supervisor was relocated also saw decline. In 2005 the remaining four regions were subdivided into seven areas in an attempt to shrink the geographical area size for which each supervisor was responsible to oversee. Once again the growth of each area varied significantly. What remained constant was the growth or lack of growth pattern for each individual supervisor. This provides historical rationale for believing leadership culture relates to organizational performance.

Though there can be many contributing factors to the expansion of an organization, the consistency of growth for some regions and areas and the lack of growth for others indicated that leadership style was an influence. This was particularly apparent in those regions and the areas that had maintained the same supervisor for nearly two decades. In no instance had an area grown significantly and then begun to shrink under the same supervisor.

Data Collection

The evaluation tool for this research was self-typing paragraphs. This instrument was chosen because of accuracy and for the ease of use. According to James and Hatten in a study done in 1995, self-typing paragraphs prove as accurate as other models of assessment and are desirable because of their ease of use.

In 2003 Laub presented a paper at Regent's Servant Leadership Research Roundtable where he noted that historically servant leadership has been contrasted to autocratic leadership. The weakness in this approach is that in most instances the alternative to servant leadership is not autocratic but paternalistic leadership. Laub then specifies three categories: autocratic, paternalistic and servant.

For this project, four paragraphs were written based on the four leadership styles Wong and Page used in their 2003 typology of leadership styles (Wong & Page, 2003). Wong and Page used Laub's (2003) three categories, autocratic, paternalistic and servant and added laissez-faire as a fourth. Prior to the appointment of regional supervisors, the organizational leadership style of the campus ministry being researched was essentially laissez-faire. For this reason using Wong and Page's four leadership styles, which included laissez-faire, was preferable over using only the three utilized by Laub.

The next step was to write the paragraphs in language that was not pejorative. When these paragraphs were sent out, the labels were removed for fear that the terms might be understood in a negative light. For clarification purposes they are included here. The

rewritten paragraphs were:

Autocratic - Leadership decisions are made primarily by those at the top and other staff are rarely consulted nor are their needs considered. Decisions are made which appear to primarily benefit the leader. Staff are expected to follow instructions even if they strongly disagree with them.

Paternalistic - Leadership decisions are made primarily by those at the top and staff have limited input into decisions. Leaders feel they know what is best for the ministry and make their decision based on that assessment. Staff are encouraged and cared for by the leadership even if they don't feel that they have much input into decisions.

Servant - Leadership decisions are made by the leader or staff best qualified to make the decision. Leaders express a high concern for the wellbeing of the staff and function more as partners in the ministry. Leaders are respected and model good leadership.

Laissez-Faire - There is little leadership for the area and staff are left to work independently. Leaders step in only when there is a serious problem or need.

All staff who had been on campus for at least three months were sent the paragraphs. Those removed from the list had been appointed less than three months or had been securing funding and not working directly with their area leadership. Those on campus less than three months were not sent paragraphs under the assumption that their exposure to the ministry was too brief for them to give an accurate assessment of the area leadership style. In addition to current staff, any staff who had resigned from staff in the previous six months were included. The staff were told that their individual responses would be seen only by the national supervisor and that their confidentiality would be protected. Six staff had no area supervisor and therefore reported directly to the national supervisor. The results of those six were removed from the responses, because those staff might not be completely candid in their responses to their supervisor. After these adjustments were made a total of 57 possible respondents were left assessing seven different areas.

Reminder emails clarified that the staff were to rate the leadership style of their area and not their own personal style on campus. This was done to address a few responses requesting clarification. The option was given to all staff to change their answers if they had mistakenly evaluated their own style or misread the question.

To determine the growth of each area the staff and ministry numbers for each area were analyzed for five and a half years. The staff of this ministry fill out six-month reports twice a year. Three categories were created: growing, plateaued and shrinking. Growing areas were those where the ministries in the area had increased by four and the staff numbers by six or more in the five-and-a-half-year period being measured. Plateaued areas ended the time period with the same number of

ministries and had only a staff increase of four or less. Shrinking areas lost one or two ministries and gained less than two staff. The emphasis was placed heaviest on ministry expansion because some staff appointments are short term with no potential for that person to ever plant or even direct a ministry. These staff help their specific ministry but will not be able to directly contribute to the growth of an area.

Data Analysis and Findings

After tabulating results from organizational reports for five years, of the seven areas, two fell within the growing category, two plateaued and three shrinking (see Table 2).

Table 2
National Campus Ministry Growth and Area Leadership Style (N=50)

Area	5 Year Staff Numbers	5 Year Ministry Numbers	Respondents	Servant Leadership
Growing 1	Increase of 11	Increase of 4	13	92%
Growing 2	Increase of 6	Increase of 4	11	100%
Plateaued 1	Increase of 4	Same	6	83%
Plateaued 2	Increase of 3	Same	5	80%
Shrinking 1	Increase of 2	Decrease of 1	6	83%
Shrinking 2	Increase of 2	Decrease of 2	5	80%
Shrinking 3	Increase of 1	Decrease of 2	4	50%

Of the 57 staff surveyed for organizational leadership culture, 50 responded with answers and one abstained stating that the survey was not truly anonymous because the person collecting the responses knew him. Six staff failed to respond to the survey and did not give a reason for their nonparticipation. Of the missing responses, only two were currently working with the ministry. Six former staff were sent surveys with only two responding. As a general rule, former staff are more likely to be candid in their responses, especially if those responses are negative, because they no longer work for the organization or have working relationships that may be damaged by negative feedback.

Only three staff currently employed at the time of the study failed to return a response or abstained from responding. The area with only four staff received responses from all staff in the area. One area with only six staff received only five responses and one area with seven received six. The other missing responses were from the two largest areas with one missing three responses out of 16 surveys sent and one receiving ten out of twelve surveys sent. The 50 responses out of the 57 total staff fell within the guidelines established by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) for research within finite populations. Though an attempt was made to broaden the number of staff surveyed by including six former staff, the final result was that 48 current staff out of 51 responded making the results fairly comprehensive. Based on Krejcie's and Morgan's guidelines, the results of the 48 will be representative of the entire population of current staff.

Forty-three staff making up 86% of the staff responded that servant leadership was the organizational leadership style of their area. Four staff or eight percent chose Laissez-Faire and three staff or six percent chose paternalistic. No respondents selected autocratic. Autocratic leadership style is the least desirable style for millennials, therefore it is not surprising that no staff selected this style as operating in any area.

Breaking down organizational leadership culture according to the growth taxonomy listed above found that the overall percentage of staff who chose the paragraph describing a servant style was highest in those areas that were growing. In the area experiencing the greatest growth, amounting to eleven additional staff and four additional ministries, the area leadership style was 92% servant with one person giving an alternate paragraph of parental. In the other area categorized as growing, the result was 100% servant. This area saw six additional staff and four additional ministries. The five areas categorized as plateaued or shrinking had responses from four to six staff and the results were between 80-83% servant style except for the smallest area which came out only 50% servant. This area had an increase of one staff and decrease of two ministries over the five and a half years surveyed. In the other two areas categorized as shrinking, both had one respondent describe the style as laissez-faire. The same was true for the two areas categorized as plateaued.

For those staff responding with an answer other than servant leadership, there was no clear connection of years with the organization or gender. Four had been with the ministry less than five years and three had been with the organization around 10 years. Likewise, there was no connection found with gender. Four were men and three were women. Considering age, four of the seven non-servant responses were 21 to 26; the remaining were 31 to 46. Though those under 30 who responded with a non-servant answer were around the same percentage as the overall staff numbers under 30, it is interesting that staff over 50 all responded with a servant answer. This may be explained by different expectations. Older people are more likely to have worked in organizations where employees were expected to follow directions and little was done to serve their needs or take into account their emotions (Parolini, 2005). For these older staff, any element of servant leadership may have been adequate to prompt a servant leadership response. For younger staff, the converse may be true in that any lack of a servant leadership style will evoke a non-servant leadership answer. They expect servant leadership and where it is weak they are more likely to choose another leadership style as operating in their area.

All seven area supervisors responded and all seven listed servant leadership as the style of their area. Because they were evaluating the leadership style of the area in which they are the primary leader, their responses might be considered more subjective or biased. The tendency to self-enhance by over-claiming strengths or accomplishments is a recognized problem in any self-evaluation tool (Paulhus, Harms, Bruce & Lysy, 2003). This may well not be a conscious decision but the result of self-deception. Area supervisors may have read the paragraphs, determined which leadership style they desired to describe

themselves and chosen that style rather than the style closest to their actual style. Because of this, the researchers ran Chi-square and Spearman's rho analyses using the data set of 43 non-area supervisors (findings reported below).

Though staff were asked to assess the leadership culture of the area, the leadership style of the leader, in this case the area supervisor, would influence responses. The presence, or lack thereof, of servant leadership traits in a leader is reflected in a follower's perception of whether or not an organization practices servant leadership (Parolini, 2005). Because the area supervisor's leadership style is so closely tied to the leadership culture of the area and since the area supervisor's response may be biased in their assessment of themselves, it seems prudent to at least consider the data with their responses removed.

When the responses of the area supervisors are taken out of the data, the servant leadership percentage goes down. This change drops those areas with six respondents to 80% servant leadership and those with five to 75% servant leadership. For the area with four responses the percentage drops to 33% servant leadership. For the number one growing area the percentage drops only .7% and the second has no change because the respondents returned a 100% servant leadership response. Given the possible bias of the area supervisors in assessing essentially themselves, these percentages may be more true to the reality of the leadership style and demonstrate a greater variance between growing, plateaued and shrinking areas.

In addition to the above analysis, the researchers conducted Chi-Square and Spearman's rho analyses. From this examination, the researchers identified several statistically significant findings. These analyses were conducted on the non-supervisor staff population. Table 3 provides an overview of the statistically significant Spearman's rho correlations.

Table 3
Spearman's rho Correlations (N=43)

	Servant Leadership Culture	
	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)
Area Growth	.335	.028
5 Year Ministry #s	.357	.019
5 Year Staff Growth #s	.324	.034

Drawing from Table 3, noteworthy and statistically significant correlations include (a) a positive correlation with servant leadership and area growth, (b) a positive correlation with servant leadership and five-year ministry numbers, and (c) a positive correlation with servant leadership and five-year staff numerical growth.

In addition to the Spearman's rho correlation analysis, Chi-square analyses were conducted in order to examine the significance of the relationship between the leadership culture of an area and key organizational measures of area performance. The researchers

identified statistically significant findings with each of these measures of area performance (see Table 4). Chi-square analyses were also conducted on the relationship between the leadership style of an area and age of staff, years on staff and age of area leader. No statistically significant findings were found in the relationship between leadership culture and age, years on staff and age of leader.

For these analyses, the mean was calculated for each of the associated variables. For instance, the mean for Area Growth was 2.23. Reported numbers above this were labeled as 1 for a growing area. Reported numbers below this were labeled as 0 for an area not growing. These variables were then tested against whether an area was categorized as a servant leadership culture or not (paternalistic, autocratic, or laissez-faire). The researchers include the statistically significant findings here in Table 4.

Table 4
Chi-Square Tests (N=43)

	Value	Servant Leadership Culture	
		Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Pearson Chi-Square	Fisher's Exact Test
Area Growth	.325	.033	.046
5 Year Ministry #s	.325	.033	.046
5 Year Staff Growth #s	.325	.033	.046

The Chi-Square analyses confirm the significance of the associations found in the Spearman's rho correlation analysis. This is important because it confirms that the leadership culture of an area is not statistically independent of area growth and five-year performance measures in the current study. Said positively, area growth and performance is statistically dependent on area servant leadership culture.

DISCUSSION

Based on the findings of this research, it appears that even a small deviation from servant leadership can have a negative impact on the growth of campus ministry. That four of the five areas categorized as plateaued or shrinking fell within the 80-83% of the responses being servant leadership and the fifth, which was the area with the greatest decline, had only 50% respond servant leadership seems to support that servant leadership has a significant impact on campus ministry. Combining the two areas experiencing growth, there was only one deviation from a servant leadership response despite the fact that the combined responses amounted to 24 of the 50 responses. For the plateaued and shrinking areas the responses other than servant totaled six of the 26 responses.

The variance between paternalistic and laissez-faire responses when servant leadership was not chosen was also intriguing. In the four areas that fell within 80-83% servant leadership, the leadership style chosen was laissez-faire. This might suggest that the area supervisors were too hands-off in their leadership style and needed to adjust their leadership to provide more care and involvement for their staff. The fact that these areas still came out as 80-83% servant leadership suggests that it was not a major tendency but impactful just the same.

In the one area that scored only 50% servant leadership, the results were even more conclusive with 50% responding that paternalistic leadership was the style of the area. This area was the smallest area and had lost two ministries in the previous five years. At only a 50% response for servant leadership rather than 80-83%, the results indicate that the leadership style was at best a blend of servant and paternalistic. This was in contrast to the other plateaued or shrinking areas which might have been considered mostly servant leadership but perhaps too hands-off. Because the variance from servant leadership was higher, it mitigates a conclusion that paternalistic leadership is less effective than laissez-faire in campus ministry. It may simply be that the farther a leadership style diverges from servant leadership the more profound the negative impact on growth will be. Given that most businesses today practice paternalistic leadership (Laub, 2003), this does at least raise the question of whether the next generation of followers will remain in organizations that continue strongly paternalistic leadership practices.

Given how important those under 30 are to the future of business alone, it is noteworthy that there is not more research on which leadership styles are most effective in organizations working with this population. By comparing their generation's traits to current leadership styles it is arguable that the servant leadership style best fits the characteristics of the millennial generation and for organizations serving this population. This may in part explain why servant leadership practice has been growing, for as more and more of the millennial generation enter the workforce their influence on organizations and corporations will increase.

When Jesus commands his disciples to be servants in their leadership, he does so as a moral imperative that should define those who follow him. He does not elaborate on the advantage of this style for those who are leaders or to the group or organization. It is doubtful that his listeners saw any benefit beyond that to the follower. What is apparent from this research is that the benefit of servant leadership extends beyond the follower to the organization as a whole. So while servant leadership is a moral imperative for Christians, it is also pragmatically advantageous for campus organizations to practice it as a leadership style. This conclusion may extend beyond campus ministry to any organization that works heavily with millennials.

Regarding the Spearman's rho and Chi-square findings, the noteworthy and statistically significant findings included in Tables 3 and 4 further confirm the relationship between servant leadership and the positive performance of ministry areas. Servant

leadership was positively correlated with overall area growth and five-year staff and ministry performance numbers. This provides an important affirmation that servant leadership is positively associated with important measures of organizational effectiveness. In this study, measures of organizational performance are statistically dependent on the servant leadership of an organizational unit.

Study Strengths and Limitations

Overall, the study has important strengths to note. First, it was conducted in a live organizational context both staffed by a majority of millennials and serving a millennial population. This allowed the researchers to explore the theoretical relationship between servant leadership and millennials, and then test to see if servant leadership was a preferred approach among an organization serving this population. Second, because this study targeted specific measures of organizational performance, the study provides important insight not simply on leadership style preference, but the contribution leadership makes to overall performance.

While the study has noteworthy strengths, it is important to identify related limitations as well. Though the instructions sent with the self-typing paragraphs stated that the assessment was to be of the leadership style of the area and not their own personal style, some staff requested clarification. The option was then given to all staff to change their answers if they had mistakenly evaluated their own style or misread the question.

In the self-typing paragraphs the final sentence for servant leadership read, “Leaders are respected and model good leadership.” The use of the phrase “good leadership” for this leadership style and the absence of the phrase’s use for the other styles had the potential to bias the responses. If staff determined that servant leadership was the best response and were concerned with giving the desired response of the leadership, they may have chosen this style over the one they actually felt best described the area leadership style.

Another possible confusion with selecting the leadership style might occur where a follower prefers a paternalistic or laissez-faire leadership style. In this case the follower may influence the working relationship between leader and follower especially in the unstructured environment of campus ministry, which involves setting and completing goals rather than a close office type environment where tasks are assigned and carried out.

One staff person felt the survey was not anonymous and chose to abstain from making an assessment. It must be acknowledged that others may have felt the same and chose to give the response that appeared to be the most flattering, rather than abstain and risk being perceived as contrary. As previously noted, the instructions clarified that individual responses would be seen only by the national supervisor and that their confidentiality would be protected.

Additionally, although the sample size was representative of the organization's staff population, it was a low total number from which to work for analysis. To help address this, the relationship between organizational performance and leadership style was examined through multiple analyses. Similarly, the difference in the size of the areas lent itself to less balance in results. One area had 16 staff and another had four. Within the smaller areas, one non-servant response made up a greater percentage than in the larger areas. While this challenges the findings when looked at by area, this is one of the reasons the researchers also looked at the data across the whole of the staff. The Spearman's rho and Chi-square analyses were employed as a way to evaluate the impact of leadership style beyond an area-specific level of analysis.

It also is important to recognize that leadership style does not exist in a vacuum. The followers of an area and the relationship of the leader and follower, as noted by Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory, may influence leadership dynamics in an organization (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). The growth within an area is not only influenced by the leadership style but also by the followers and their relationship to the leader among other factors. So, though this study contrasted and compared growth to leadership culture, there are other factors that might influence growth such as follower motivation, expectations and competence, and the strength of the working relationship between the leader and the follower. In one of the shrinking areas, some staff avoid interference on the part of the area supervisor. Such a tense working relationship undoubtedly has a negative impact on growth. Though the area supervisor attempts to recruit staff, the rest of the staff have done little to support that goal, likely due to the above noted factors.

Recommendations for Future Research

Though limited in scope to one organization, the present study indicates that a positive relationship exists between servant leadership and organizational performance. Larger studies, and studies in other contexts, would help to reinforce these findings. The population focused upon in this study was campus ministers. This population serves millennials in the college environment, and many of these campus ministers are categorized as millennials. Further research needs to be done to determine if the connection between servant leadership and growth exists with populations serving other generations.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the relationship between servant leadership and organizational performance in one organization. The organization studied primarily works with millennials. Because of this, the project contrasted the characteristics of the millennial generation against four leadership styles: autocratic, paternalistic, servant and laissez-faire. A study of the relevant literature suggested that the style most compatible with millennials was servant. Ministry and staff numbers for a national campus ministry were analyzed to ascertain which areas were growing, plateaued or shrinking. The staff of these same areas were asked to select a leadership style representative of the leadership in their area. Their

responses were compared to the growth of each area. The areas where servant leadership was selected in the highest percentages were also the areas that were growing. This finding was bolstered by the findings of the Spearman's rho and Chi-square analyses. Both analyses confirmed a statistically significant association between area performance and the servant leadership of an area. The study confirms that organizational performance was statistically dependent on a servant leadership style, and provides important insight into factors associated with organizational effectiveness.

REFERENCES

- Beinhoff, L. (2011). The millennials: A survey of the most cited literature. *CHOICE: Current Reviews for Academic Libraries*, 2225-2231.
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2005). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Collins, J. C. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap... and others don't*. Random House.
- Covey, S. R. (1989). *The seven habits of highly effective people: Restoring the character ethic*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- 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.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The Servant as Leader*. Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Applied Studies.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977/2002). *Servant-leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Hershat, A., & Epstein, M. (2010). Millennials and the world of work: An organization and management perspective. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), 211-223.
- Howe, N., & Straus, B. (2000). *Millennials Rising the Next Great Generation*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Hu, J., & Liden, R.C. (2011). Antecedents of team potency and team effectiveness: An examination of goal and process clarity and servant leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 851.
- Irving, J. A. (2005). Servant leadership and the effectiveness of teams. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66(04A), 1421. (UMI No. 3173207).
- Irving, J. A., & Longbotham, G. J. (2007). Team effectiveness and six essential servant leadership themes: A regression model based on the items in the organizational leadership assessment. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2, 98-113.
- James, W. L., & Hatten, K. J. (1995). Further Evidence on the Validity of the Self Typing Paragraph Approach: Miles and Snow Strategic Archetypes in Banking. *Strategic Management Journal*, 16(2), 161-168.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2006). *Student Leadership Practices Inventory: Facilitator's Guide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*(3), 607-610.
- Laub, J. (1999). Assessing the servant organization: Development of the servant organizational leadership (SOLA) instrument. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60*(02), 308. (UMI No. 9921922)
- Laub, J. (2003). From paternalism to the servant organization: Expanding the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) model. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved September 22, 2016, from http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/home.cfm
- Mayer, D. M., Bardes, M., & Piccolo, R. F. (2008). Do servant-leaders help satisfy follower needs? An organizational justice perspective. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 17*, 180–197.
- Nordbye, V. “Providing Relevant and Effective Leadership for Millennials.” D.Min. diss., Bethel University, 2015.
- Parolini, J. L. (2005). Investigating the Relationships among Emotional Intelligence, Servant Leadership Behaviors and Servant Leadership Culture. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved September 22, 2016, from http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/home.cfm
- Paulhus, D. L., Harms, P. D., Bruce, M. N., & Daria C. Lysy, D. C. (2003). The over-claiming technique: measuring self-enhancement independent of ability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(4), 890-904.
- Peterson, S. J., Galvin, B. M., & Lange, D. (2012). CEO servant leadership: Exploring executive characteristics and firm performance. *Personnel Psychology, 65*, 565–596.
- Posner, B. Z. (2004). A Leadership Development Instrument for Students: Updated. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(4), 443-456.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). The Leader’s New Work: Building Learning Organizations. *Sloan Management Review, 32*(1), 7-23.
- Senge, P. M. (1995). Robert Greenleaf’s legacy: A new foundation for twenty-first century institutions. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf’s theory of servant-leadership influenced today’s top management thinkers* (pp. 217-240). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Spears, L. C. (1995). Servant leadership and the Greenleaf legacy. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf’s theory of servant-leadership influenced today’s top management thinkers* (pp. 1-14). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Spears, L. C. (2010). "Servant Leadership and Robert K. Greenleaf's Legacy." In D. Van Dierendonck & K. Patterson (Eds.), *Servant Leadership: Developments in Theory and Research* (pp. 11-24). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sun, P.Y. (2013). The servant identity: Influences on the cognition and behavior of servant leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(4), 544-557.
- Van Dierendonck, D., & Patterson, K. (2010). *Servant Leadership: Developments in Theory and Research*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnell, C. A., & Oke, A. (2010). Servant leadership, procedural justice climate, service climate, employee attitudes, and organizational citizenship behavior: A cross-level investigation. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 517–529.
- Wong, P. T. P., & Page, D. (2003). Servant leadership: An opponent-process model and the revised servant leadership profile. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved September 22, 2016, from http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/home.cfm



Discovering the Self-Interest of Servant Leadership: A Grounded Theory

Eric J. Russell, Utah Valley University
R. Jeffery Maxfield, Utah Valley University
Jamie L. Russell, Utah Valley University

Abstract

This qualitative study set forth to discover how senior level leaders from multiple for-profit sectors perceived the benefits derived from serving the needs of followers. The study emerged from a thorough review of the literature and advances the knowledge of servant leadership philosophy by identifying the benefits to being a servant leader. The study involved 14 participants who were willing to anonymously complete the questionnaire developed by the researchers. To discover how different leaders perceived the benefits from serving followers, the researchers employed a grounded theory design, allowing for a rich understanding of the participants' interpretations. The coding and data analysis process revealed a single theoretical finding: leaders realize personal benefits from serving the needs of followers. The implications of this study seemingly address the skepticism surrounding servant leadership by identifying how service to others is in the self-interest of the leader.

Keywords: Servant Leadership, Benefits, Self-Interest, Grounded Theory

The purpose of this qualitative grounded theory research was to discover how senior level leaders perceived personal benefits derived from serving the needs of their followers. This study builds upon the conceptual work of Russell (2016) who argued the existence of an ongoing tangible and intangible benefit cycle between leader and follower. Russell

(2016) claimed that the leader who served followers was in fact serving self due to an ongoing tangible/intangible benefit cycle. The central question guiding this research asked: how do senior level leaders interpret the personal benefits derived from serving the needs of their followers?

Russell's (2016) work originated from a question posed by Feldman (2014) who asked, "What is the impact of being a servant leader on the servant leader himself/herself" (p. 13)? Feldman's (2014) concern was in regard to a lack of literature addressing the benefits of being a servant leader. Appealing to the self-interest of others is seemingly the easiest way to move an idea or vision forward; for this work, that idea is servant leadership (Locke, 1689/1949).

Consequently, the lack of works identifying the servant leader's self-interest fuels the skepticism surrounding the philosophy that the servant leader functions in servitude (Denning, 2010; Heskett, 2013; Monroe, 2013). Skeptics of the philosophy seem to believe that becoming a servant leader is an altruistic self-sacrifice (Denning, 2010; Heskett, 2013; Russell, 2016). Making the case as to why being a servant leader is in the leader's self-interest is a way of overcoming such skepticism.

The goal of this study was to discover how individual leaders perceived the benefits derived from the followers' needs being served, thus growing in his/her leadership abilities. The study's 14 participants were senior level leaders from for-profit organizations headquartered in the Western United States. The implication of the work involves reducing the skepticism surrounding servant leadership philosophy by discovering how serving a follower's needs serves the self-interest of the leader.

A desire to give a voice to the study's participants was the reason the researchers chose a qualitative research method (Camic, Rhodes, & Yardley, 2003). The qualitative method using a grounded theory design possesses the ability to glean a rich participant interpretation of experiences resulting in theoretical discovery (Camic et al., 2003; Glaser & Strauss, 1999). Additionally, Winston (2010) argued that servant leadership philosophy needed more qualitative research to understand the influence this philosophy has on individuals and organizations. It is the aim of this work to advance the understanding of the philosophy.

This work begins with a review of the literature. Empirical works presented in the literature review formed the study and became the foundation for the study's questionnaire (Babbi, 1998). The work moves to present the review of the literature, the research methodology and study design, the results of the grounded theory analysis, and a discussion surrounding the research findings and their relationship to the literature. This work concludes by identifying the implications of the study and future research ideas.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The thorough review of the literature came together to form this study. In addition, the script used to glean an understanding of the participants' interpretations came directly from the literature. It begins by addressing the basis of servant leadership philosophy. The literature review then moves on to address the specific areas of servant leadership relating to follower growth, meeting follower needs, follower independence, empowerment, follower success, trust and loyalty, building community, creativity, and innovation (Patterson, 2003; Spears, 2010; Winston, 2003; Yoshida, Sendjaya, Hirst, & Cooper, 2014). This section of the article ends with a delineation of the concepts of rational selfishness, self-interest, and the theoretical concept of servant leadership's cycle of benefit.

The Servant Leadership Philosophy

Almost 50 years ago, Robert Greenleaf conceptualized the modern philosophy of servant leadership. In his seminal essay *The Servant as Leader* (Greenleaf, 1970), he penned a theoretical concept to possibly overcome toxic managerial and leadership practices within organizations. Greenleaf's (1977/2002) work argued that the individual that desires to serve others, emerges as an authentic leader. This authentic leader is one who is gifted power from the followers, a power earned through trust (Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Hunter, 2004; Spears, 2010).

The basic tenant of servant leadership according to Greenleaf (1977/2002) states,

Servant leadership 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. The leader first and the servant first are two extreme types. Between them, there are shadings and blends that are part of the infinite variety of human nature (p. 27).

The servant leadership philosophy consists of three fundamental questions. The first asks, "do those served grow as persons (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 27)?" The second question is, "do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 27)?" And the third question asks, "what is the effect on the least privileged in society--will they benefit or at least not be further deprived (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 27)?" These fundamental questions have become the cornerstones for research and writings on the philosophy. Since the time Greenleaf published *The Servant as Leader* (1970) almost 5 decades ago, authors and researchers have expanded servant leadership into the leadership philosophy that it is today.

Autry (2001) brought forth the philosophy to the masses, making the case for the servant leader as a pathway for organizational success. Autry (2001) argued that the servant leader moved beyond the status quo by realizing success comes from the work and efforts of those served. Hunter (2004) expanded upon the philosophy's aspect of legitimate power and strength, arguing that true power comes as a gift from followers; the servant leader holds these gifts sacred and strives to never lose them. This desire to serve followers as a servant leader is a natural state of being, brought forth from one's inner self and a moral love for others (Blanchard, 1999).

Years after Greenleaf (1970) wrote his original essay, academics and writers came forward to identify specific aspects of the philosophy (Farling, Stone, & Winston, 1999; Page & Wong, 2000; Russell & Stone, 2002). These works would become the building blocks of future research and study on the philosophy. Larry Spears, a mentee of Robert Greenleaf and a student of the philosophy, came forward with specific characteristics of servant leadership (Spears, 2010). Spears (2010) identified from the work of Greenleaf, certain qualities that servant leaders possess. Though not exhaustive, the characteristics identified in servant leaders are: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community (Spears, 2010).

Besides Spears (2010), researchers came forward to identify virtual constructs of the philosophy. The premise was servant leadership transcended other leadership practices and demanded its own identified constructs (Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2004). Patterson (2003) identified the constructs of the servant leader, while Winston (2003) identified them for the servant follower. Patterson's (2003) seven constructs of the leader were agapao love, humility, altruism, vision, trust, empowerment, and service. Winston's (2003) constructs of the servant follower are agapao love, commitment to the leader, self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, altruism towards the leader/leader's interest, and service. The servant leader-servant follower relationship is a cycle of service to one another (Winston, 2003).

These central works involving the philosophy come together to form this research study. As the review of the literature moves on, the next section addresses the growth of followers that stems from the leader serving their needs.

The Growth of Followers

Discussed in the previous section, the first question Greenleaf (1977/2002) posed regarding servant leadership asked, "do those served grow as persons (p. 27)?" This question goes to the heart of servant leadership and what it means to be a servant leader. As a leader, understanding the philosophy is accomplished by asking, "Do one's followers grow as persons?". If the answer is no and one's people remain in status quo, then that is a failure of leadership. However, if the answer is yes, that is a success of leadership (Turner, 2000).

When Spears (2010) identified the characteristics of the servant leader, one of those characteristics was a commitment to the growth of people. This commitment relates to a servant leader's desire for people to be more tomorrow than they were today. It's about seeing one's people transcend, becoming future servant leaders (Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Sendjaya, 2015). As Spears (2010) argued:

Servant leaders believe that people have an intrinsic value beyond their tangible contributions as workers. As such, the servant leader is deeply committed to the growth of each and every individual within his or her organization. The servant leader recognizes the tremendous responsibility to do everything in his or her power to nurture the personal and professional growth of employees and colleagues (p. 23).

As followers grow both as persons and leaders, they become greater assets to the organization (Sendjaya, 2015). As greater assets, they are able to grow beyond their former selves and face both greater challenges and new opportunities (Vinod & Sudhakar, 2011). This growth strengthens the organization's future, allowing for a more capable workforce that is both able and ready to take on new challenges (Sendjaya, 2015).

Meeting the Needs of Followers

The core relationship of the servant leader-servant follower is based upon meeting each other's needs so in turn they meet the needs of the organization. Within that relationship is recognition that all people have certain needs. These needs can be as basic as the physiological need for things like food and shelter, to greater needs associated with individual growth and belonging (Maslow, 1943). In any case, serving these needs is a priority for those professing to be a servant leader.

Human need is the cornerstone for growth; the more basic the need the more essential it is. As Maslow (1943) stated, "for the man who is extremely and dangerously hungry, no other interest exists but food" (p. 375). This example of basic human need underscores Greenleaf's (1977/2002) argument for the servant leader to meet the needs of followers. It comes from an understanding that if the essential needs of the person are not being met, that person cannot be expected to grow. The individual remains in a state of surviving, essentially preoccupied with the need for the basic (Maslow, 1943; Maslow, 1965).

Meeting the needs of followers involves giving one's people the knowledge, skills, abilities, and tools they need to be successful. This in no way is charity, nor is it a handout. In fact, it is just the opposite. The servant leader who seeks to serve the needs of the follower benefits by the follower's ability to grow and thus serve the needs of both the leader and the organization (Russell, 2016). The follower is free to transcend the thoughts and mental focus of basic needs, growing as an individual and performing at a higher level (Maslow, 1965). The individual follower becomes "more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 27)."

Independence and Empowerment of Followers

The autonomous follower becomes the independent follower, one who can be delegated to and empowered (Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Patterson, 2003). This type of follower is one that moves beyond the need for supervision and constraint, becoming loyal to the organization and its leadership (Ndoye, Imig, & Parker, 2010; Ton, 2014). Empowerment is a gift of trust from the leader to the follower (Ton, 2014). Often times, the follower appreciates this gift; it becomes a strengthening of the leader-follower relationship; the follower finds satisfaction in their new independence (Ton, 2014).

To empower one's followers is to gift to them one's trust as a leader, believing in the followers' abilities, thus allowing one's self to let go of control (Patterson, 2003; Zhang & Bartol, 2010). The empowered follower makes decisions and charts courses independent of direct oversight (Greenleaf, 1996). Being autonomous and trusted in their abilities, they can move forward. The leader is at ease because he or she realizes that the follower is both capable and worthy of authority. The follower moves comfortably forward due to the trust he or she has for the leader, aware that the leader is supportive of their endeavors and decisions (Patterson, 2003).

The independent follower is one that is emotionally mature and capable of taking on greater responsibility (Young-Ritchie, Laschinger, & Wong, 2009). Because the servant leader is committed to follower needs and growth, followers are able to transcend their role within the organization, thus becoming leaders themselves (Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Spears, 2010). This frees the leader from the time and responsibility of basic supervision, allowing him or her to focus attention on other opportunities (Zhang & Bartol, 2010).

Success of Followers

Smith (1759/2010) wrote there are times when individuals serve and encourage others simply "for the pleasure of seeing it" (p. 3). In this instance, the individual is not serving another for compensation, nor is he or she doing so to gain support. He or she is simply serving someone to experience the joy that comes from another's success. This, however does not always need to be the case, as another reason is for the benefit of all.

Grant (2013) found that in this idea, everyone benefits, is a win for all involved. As individual followers succeed, leaders succeed. In addition, the success of followers becomes a direct measuring stick as to what kind of leader one is (Greenleaf, 1996). It is about understanding how this works. As a leader, when one's followers succeed, the organization and the leader are better off. The followers' success is not a stand-alone experience where only the followers benefit; their success is the leader's success (Grant, 2013). For example, a follower is able to develop a new system that the leader envisioned, which saves the organization both time and money. The follower is successful and rewarded for his or her work, the organization benefits from the time and money saved, and the leader benefits from having a successful new system. This is a win for all involved (Grant, 2013).

The success of followers comes from leaders who serve follower needs so they can carry out the vision. This can be something as simple as educational benefits that allow followers to pursue advanced academic degrees and certifications or something far more complex like leadership mentoring and job shadowing for career advancement. These are only a couple of the many ways followers can grow and succeed (Ton, 2014). The success of followers creates an atmosphere of achievement that becomes contagious. It opens the organization up to healthy competition and drive (Conley, 2007).

Trust and Loyalty

The servant leader is one who understands that trust is the foundation of all relationships (Patterson, 2013). Trust is the cornerstone to gaining legitimate power (Greenleaf, 1977/2002). When followers trust a leader, that leader is gifted the power of decision, becoming a trustworthy servant to the people (Greenleaf, 1996). What this means is that followers who trust their leader, will carry out the leader's vision and orders; they do so not out of fear, but rather, out of love stemming from the trust of the leader (Greenleaf, 1996).

This creates a culture of loyal following, one where individuals perceive that their best interests are in the mind of the leader (Chan & Mak, 2014). Furthermore, it is an understanding of followers that the best interest of the organization align with their best interest (Elliker, 2016). An organization is the people and without them, it is a hollow entity. The servant leader links the organization and its people; he or she envisions it as a system that works together for the greater good (Heskett, Sasser, & Schlesinger, 1997). The servant leader aligns and serves these needs, creating a culture of shared loyalty that strengthens trust (Chan & Mak, 2014). This leads to an environment where followers, leaders, and the organization are successful (Grant, 2013).

Trust does not come to the servant leader easily; it is earned over time (Caldwell & Clapham, 2003). An organizational atmosphere of trust is honed through honesty and dedication (Caldwell, Davis, & Devine, 2009). This trust is easy to lose (Caldwell et al, 2009; Greenleaf, 1996). Trust for the servant leader is vital, it is where power comes from (Greenleaf, 1996). The trusted leader, whose followers are loyal, is a powerful leader free to make decisions and chart the course for the organization. The trusted leader easily persuades others to follow, for followers desire to serve their trusted leader (Spears, 2010).

Trust creates a positive organizational environment that takes little effort to navigate. Such an atmosphere fosters a culture of openness, pride and ownership (Caldwell & Clapham, 2003). This organizational culture is built upon trust and dual leader-follower loyalty, creating a community of belongingness (Caldwell & Dixon, 2010; Maslow, 1943).

Building Community

By nature, people are social creatures who desire both belonging and acceptance (Maslow, 1943). The servant leader is keenly aware of this need to belong and strives to

build a community (Spears, 2010). This is why Spears (2010) identified building community as a characteristic of the servant leader. Social belonging is a basic need of the person, often times those who are marginalized or isolated from a community suffer negative psychological repercussions (Maslow, 1943).

Building community begins by creating an environment of inclusion, one based upon trust and driven by a desire to bring people together for the greater good (Spears, 2010). The servant leader becomes a steward to this community, serving those within it so it can thrive (Block, 2013). Taft (2012) noted, as a steward you are responsible for the community of followers within the organization, as well as the organization's interaction with the outside world. This extends the community of belonging beyond the organizational borders by creating greater roles and responsibilities.

As a steward to the community, the servant leader is accountable for its health and wellbeing (Block, 2013; Spears, 2010). The servant leader understands that a healthy community is made up of healthy followers, whose needs are met so they can collectively work towards a better tomorrow. Moreover, it is a healthy community that fosters ideas and gives way to creativity and innovation (Conley, 2007; Ton, 2014).

Creativity and Innovation

As the needs of followers are met, they begin to transcend as individuals, finding their pathway to self-actualization (Maslow, 1943). It is at the point of self-actualization that the follower's creativity and innovation comes alive (Conley, 2007). The self-actualized follower is able to let go of the search for basic physiological needs, freeing their time and allowing them to focus on greater things (Liden, Wayne, Chenwei, & Meuser, 2014). The servant leader fosters creativity and innovation by serving the follower's needs, thus allowing for self-actualization (Liden et al., 2014).

Research has shown that servant leadership fosters creativity and innovation (Yoshida et al, 2014). The servant leader's action towards followers naturally gives way to creative behaviors and innovative ideas (Yoshida et al, 2014). It seemingly goes beyond simply serving the needs of followers; it exists because followers believe their leader trusts them and they trust their leader (Caldwell et al, 2009). They trust that their leader desires them to be innovative and creative, moving beyond what exists in the moment. In addition, they trust that their leader will support their ideas and remove the barriers holding back progress (Oliverira & Ferreira, 2012).

The servant leader understands that the future of the organization does not rest upon him or her, but rather on the shoulders of its people. The more innovative and creative the people, the brighter the organization's future (Ton, 2014). For the servant leader is keenly aware that without an organization there is no need for a leader, and that no organization exists without the people. The innovative spirit of followers is nurtured and served by the servant leader. From that service, followers self-actualize and the leader benefits (Russell, 2016).

Rational Selfishness, Self-Interest, and the Cycle of Benefit

The concept of rational selfishness involves doing something for which one ultimately benefits in a way that does not negatively impact another (Rand, 1964). For example, an individual decides to start a business. For the business to function, he or she must hire employees. In this case, the employees' benefit from paid work and benefits; however, the founder of the company, if successful, will realize greater prosperity. Most likely the motivation for starting the company had little to do with benefiting others, but rather, self. For whatever the reason, the founder desired to be a business owner. Nevertheless, being a rational selfish decision to own a business, others, in this case employees of said business, are not negatively impacted, but rather have secure employment. This is free market appeal based upon the self-interest of both parties. In this case the leader and follower benefit from one another (Smith, 1776/2002).

Rational selfishness involves appealing to one's self-interest, both acknowledging and accepting that there are tangible and intangible benefits to self from one's actions (Schwartz, 2015). Appealing to the self-interest of others is a pathway for the servant leader to persuade people to accept an idea, carry out a vision, or take on a task (Spears, 2010). As Locke (1689/1949) argued, it is easier to make the case for something by highlighting how it is in the self-interest of another. The ability to persuade others by engaging their self-interest is a way to benefit one's own self-interest without the use of coercion or force (Rand, 1966). This is a moral practice that recognizes the worth of others, as well as the worth of self.

Biddle (2002) argued that being aware of one's self-interest is a moral issue. The individual who takes care of self does not have to rely on others to do it (Biddle, 2002). This is a rational selfish decision that allows individuals to come together for the greater good, yet at the same time ensuring each individual's self-interest (Blau, 1964; Grant, 2013).

For the servant leader, this involves understanding when one serves the needs of others, tangibly and/or intangibly, it benefits the leader. This is known as servant leadership's cycle of benefit (Russell, 2016). The cycle is an ongoing exchange of self-interest where the leader serves the follower and the follower serves the leader; from that service both leader and follower benefit (Russell, 2016). This work attempts to bring Russell's (2016) concept to life in the words of senior level leadership, interpreting their perceptions of the benefits to self, derived from meeting the needs of followers.

METHOD

The setting of this qualitative grounded theory research study took place at for-profit organizations located in the Western United States. The researchers employed a grounded theory design to conduct the study. Grounded theory design is a systematic approach of data collection and analysis leading to theoretical discovery (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser &

Strauss, 1999). The design allows for an analysis of data using a constant comparative method (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser & Strauss, 1999).

To conduct the study, the researchers developed a script consisting of open-ended questions to be used as the study questionnaire. The script avoided key terms and language that could compel participants to answer questions in a specific way in order to avoid researcher bias (Babbi, 2010). The researchers developed the script using existing empirical works pertaining to leadership to glean an understanding of the participants' interpretations and perceptions of the benefits to self from serving followers, see Table 1. The script's questions asked participants to interpret the personal impacts, effects, and benefits resulting from serving others. For example, one of the script questions asked, how does it affect you as a leader when your followers succeed? Participants answered the questions privately, in writing, by accessing the questionnaire anonymously through an online database called Qualtrics®. Participation in the study was voluntary and took less than 30 minutes.

Table 1
Specific Script Areas of Focus and Sources

Area of Focus	Sources
Follower growth	Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Sendjaya, 2015; Spears, 2010
Meeting the needs of followers	Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Sendjaya, 2015; Spears, 2010
Follower independence	Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Patterson, 2003; Young-Ritchie et al, 2009; Zhang & Bartol, 2010
Follower success	Grant, 2013; Greenleaf, 1996; Vinod & Sudhakar, 2011
Follower trust	Caldwell & Clapham, 2003; Chan & Mak, 2014; Grant, 2013; Heskett et al., 1997; Patterson, 2003
Follower loyalty	Caldwell & Dixon, 2010; Chan & Mak, 2014; Grant, 2013; Heskett et al., 1997; Patterson, 2003
Positive community	Block, 2013; Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Spears, 2010; Taft, 2012
Follower creativity and innovation	Conley, 2007; Liden et al, 2014; Oliverira & Ferreira, 2012; Yoshida et al., 2014

Sampling

The population used in this study consisted of 14 senior level leaders from multiple for-profit organizations headquartered in the Western United States; see Table 2. The skepticism surrounding the philosophy primarily stems from the for-profit sector and was the deciding factor as to why the researchers elected to focus the study on leaders from for-profit organizations (Denning, 2010; Heskett, 2013; Monroe, 2013). The participants ranged in age from 43-64, with 12 being male and 2 being female. To protect the anonymity of the participants, specific organization, age and gender information is not disclosed.

Table 2
The Participants of the Study

Participant	Organizational Position	For-Profit Sector
Participant 1	President	Technology
Participant 2	Chief Financial Officer	Energy
Participant 3	President	Architecture
Participant 4	Senior Partner	Legal Services
Participant 5	Associate Vice President	Food Production
Participant 6	Managing Director	Finance
Participant 7	Chief Operating Officer	Conglomerate
Participant 8	Director of Operations	Health & Wellness
Participant 9	Senior Director	Educational Services
Participant 10	Production Officer	Agriculture
Participant 11	Vice President of Marketing	Conglomerate
Participant 12	Director of Sales	Leisure/Sporting Goods
Participant 13	Lead Project Manager	Technology
Participant 14	Chief Executive Officer	Conglomerate

The researchers used a type of purposeful sampling known as expert sampling (Patton, 2002). The justification for using the purposeful-expert sampling process is it allows for theoretical discovery involving data collection and analysis from pre-selected specific experts (Patton, 2002). Participants were individually recruited to be a part of the study on an ongoing basis. The researchers relied on data saturation to determine the study's sample size (Glaser & Strauss, 1999). Saturation, as it pertains to qualitative research, involves data collection and analysis to a point where nothing new emerges (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser & Strauss, 1999). No more participants were recruited once saturation occurred.

Data Collection

Data collection consisted of multiple questionnaires obtained from leaders from for-profit organizations headquartered in the Western United States. Prior to conducting this study, the researchers obtained permission from their University Institutional Review Board to conduct both a pilot study to determine the script's veracity, and this research study. The pilot study involved several leaders from an academic organization who agreed to answer the questions in the form of a written answer survey (Babbi, 1998, 2010). The pilot study allowed the researchers to edit and refine the questions in order to develop a rich and meaningful script for the actual research study (Babbi, 2010).

To protect the study participants, the researchers removed any personal identifiers. To ensure trustworthiness, the researchers triangulated data sources from multiple participants, had another researcher preform an analysis for comparison, and presented the data as in-depth rich descriptions in the results section (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). In addition, the researchers followed a specific, systematic grounded theory approach to analyze the data and established a secure database for data collection and storage to ensure data reliability (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Garson, 2013; Glasser, 1998).

Data Analysis

The data analysis began with the researchers organizing and preparing the data for analysis, removing any personal identifiers of each of the participants and assigning numbers, then reading thorough the data, taking notes, and writing memos (Glasser, 1998). The researchers utilized a tiered process for the sorting and analysis of the data, which consisted of constant comparisons (Glasser & Strauss, 1999). The researchers analyzed the data using a hand coding process (Basis, 2003). The hand coding process allowed researchers to spend a lot of time reading and rereading the data, color-coding different attributes and writing notes and ideas down (Basis, 2003; Charmaz, 2006; Garson, 2013; Glasser, 1998).

The coding process first identified overarching open codes consisting of single words and short phrases (Charmaz, 2006; Glasser & Strauss, 1999). The open codes revealed specific relationships resulting in axial codes (Charmaz, 2006). The axial codes converged to form the selective codes, reaching saturation to reveal and relate the core categories that allowed for the study's theoretical development with attributes (Charmaz, 2006; Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Glasser & Strauss, 1999). The theoretical findings are presented in the results section of the article. The researchers then interpreted the theoretical findings, reporting them in the discussion section. The findings resulted in a greater understanding of how leaders perceive and interpret the benefits to self that come from serving followers, as well as the development of propositions for future studies (Glasser & Strauss, 1999).

Results

A single theoretical finding emerged from the data analysis of the questionnaires: leaders realize personal benefits from serving the needs of followers. The two attributes that converged to form the theoretical finding were, validation as a leader and freedom from management. Each attribute is composed of several themes; see Table 3.

The following section presents the theoretical finding's attributes that resulted from the data analysis in the words of the participants. To protect the identity of the participants, each was assigned a "P" and a number.

Table 3
Theoretical Finding with Attributes and themes

Theoretical Finding	Attributes	Themes
Leaders realize personal benefits from serving the needs of followers	Validation as a leader	By realizing the needs of followers are met; Seeing followers succeed; Building a positive organizational community; Followers becoming creative and innovative; Relationships built upon trust and loyalty
	Freedom from management	As followers grow as leaders themselves; As followers become independent; As followers become capable of being empowered

Attribute 1

The first attribute within the theoretical finding was validation as a leader. The different themes that formed the attribute validation as a leader were, by realizing the needs of followers are met, seeing followers succeed, building a positive organizational community, followers becoming creative and innovative, and relationships built upon trust and loyalty.

By realizing the needs of followers are met. P11 wrote, “You can’t expect the person who is following to do their job correctly and efficiently if you don’t give them what they need to do the job.” P12 claimed that giving followers what they need, “Allows everyone to accomplish more.” P13 added to this by saying, “When the personal needs of followers are met, leaders are able to look toward increasing their influence for good.” Adding to this P1 wrote, “When needs are being met, followers are free to focus on their tasks and to develop their skills. My business runs more smoothly and clients are being served.” P9 stated, “If there is a situation where someone does not feel as though his or her needs are being met, they will not last long term and it is better for everyone to change the situation.” P2 wrote that, “Life is better for all of us; it comes from aligning follower’s needs with the needs of the firm.”

Seeing followers succeed. As followers become successful, P2 noted that “Successful followers set good examples for other followers, they become mentors and the circle is complete.” P2 added:

We all grow, our clients are happy and we are more profitable which lifts all of us. When our followers succeed this can happen. Life is good for all when everyone succeeds. This kind of success helps all boats rise.

This leads to success for all involved as P10 claimed, “As team members succeed it is a win for the whole team.” P10 went on to say, “Meeting the needs of team members means that you get to know each member of your team and can do what is best for each individual. This creates an openness that turns into synergy with in the team.”

P14 sees the validated leader as one whose success is shared with the organization stating, “When those I work with succeed, it is a step for the company toward success.

P3 added to this by saying, “It makes the entire organization stronger and increases the ability for the company to achieve our objectives.” This happens, as P3 noted because “People will act what is in the best interest of the community, not necessarily just for themselves.” P8 supported this claim by stating, “We all do better.” This according to P12 is “Very uplifting.” In addition, it validates a leader’s pride as P5 discussed:

It also gives me great pride in their accomplishments. It is fun to see them take on opportunities and to do and come up with things even better than you were able to do. I think the only thing you can be sure of is change and that things never stay the same. When others take what you have helped them achieve to an even better place, it is a great thing to see.

P6 added to this by stating, “It is the best part of my job. I love seeing others succeed.” P11 noted personal satisfaction saying, “I love to see those who follow succeed. It makes me happy. To see them doing well is most always a win-win for the company.” P4 stated that it’s “a sense of accomplishment to see the overall growth of the staff.” P1 claimed, “It affirms that leadership is on the right track.” P3 expanded on this saying, “It makes me look good. People look at how followers grow and succeed, which inspires other to join this team.” This, as P4 referred to the success of followers, “stimulates the leader achievement attitude.” As P3 wrote, this success flows from “Alignment and ability to generate results, independent thinking, and new ideas flow to the top.” P9 noted that when a follower succeeds, “their success becomes a positive for all involved.” P9 wrote that seeing followers succeed, “gives me fulfillment and satisfaction in my work.”

Building a positive organizational community. P1 noted that success “creates a positive environment that is critical to success. It is easier to lead in a positive environment.” P14 discussed how the role of a leader changed in this environment by noting, “My role becomes more of an integrator than a task manager. I focus more on bringing people together to develop and share ideas, rather than ride them for results.” P14 supported this idea by saying, “With the proper environment, great ideas are the lifeline of a long-term, successful organization.” P7 reflected on the strength of community stating, “We are stronger as a whole than as individuals.” P10 added to this stating, “You are able to leverage your time in places you are strong and hopefully you see and add members to your team that are strong where you are weak to create a stronger team.” P12 addressed the community as a cycle stating, “I think leaders should have regard for the team, and the team a high level of regard for the leader and work very hard to truly “see” each other.” P1 noted a positive community “is critical to success. It is easier to lead in a positive

environment.” P9 stated that a positive environment allows for “Win-win situations, which makes the organization sustainable.” P7 addressed the topic of belonging stating, “Not everyone has the chance in a work setting to be seen and appreciated. That is all everyone wants and needs.” P7 went on to say when followers feel as if they belong, “I know they will speak up and bring up new ideas to help me if I am not understanding; this relieves pressure and helps people be themselves; it also leads to a fun work environment.”

Followers becoming creative and innovative. The validated leader is able to realize creativity and innovation as P11 discussed, “The more creativity and innovation they have, the better idea’s we come up with.” P12 expanded on this stating, “Creativity and innovation have a snowball effect and creates a culture of openness and innovation, it raises the boat for everyone, and everyone wins.” P7 added to this noting, “Letting people be creative and innovative makes people more vested and brings a feeling of ownership.” On the topic of innovation, P13 noted, “Innovation and creativity aren’t particularly my strengths so when someone else has them it just makes us a more complete team.” P1 stated, “Independent thought and creativity are sought after in my field.” P6 added that, “I feel like I am more creative and innovative if people that are creative and innovative surround me.” P2 argued that, “It inspires me. Every smart leader looks for this in every hire he/she makes. Creativity is at the heart of what our firm is about.”

Relationships built upon trust and loyalty. P10 noted, “Trust is key to any relationship and it works both ways. As trust is built, it only strengthens your team.” P8 discussed the trusted validated leader as one whose followers “Can open up to, creating open communication.” P14 added to this saying, “When they trust me as a team leader, generally the input that they give is productive and positive. The changes they suggest are less emotionally charged and more geared toward helping the company being more productive.” This trust leads to loyalty. P3 stated, “They will look out for the best interests of the leader and organization, they will tell you the truth and communicate openly with you without fear.” P8 noted that this loyalty matters because “If they understand and believe in the mission and can independently help build our business then I’ve succeeded.” P11 went on adding, “It’s always good to have loyal people working with you. You know they have your back when you need them.” P12 noted that loyalty is more than to a person, and the benefit is when, “followers are loyal to principle than to an individual.” P14 expanded on this stating that when trusted, it “Makes my role easy, and we are able to retain better talent.”

When there is trust and loyalty P13 wrote, “They won’t be fighting against me; we’ll be performing as a team.” P4 added, “Trust creates loyalty and cohesiveness among the team.” P9 said trust leads to better relations, “Loyalty builds trust in both directions, improving transparency, openness, feedback, and joy.” P11 added, “When there is trust and loyalty work doesn’t feel like work.” According to P1, trust leads to “supportive relationships that improve the product.” P7 noted that these relationships causes one to be “open to others’ thoughts and who they are as individuals.” P6 summed this up by saying:

When people are loyal it makes me feel like I want to do more for them.
 When they are disloyal I feel like energy is wasted because I have to look
 over my shoulder and deal with all kinds of soap opera-like nonsense.
 people are loyal we can focus on business and creating value.

P2 noted that, “We all benefit because we waste time dealing with the negativity of ‘non-trust.’” Otherwise, incredible time, energy, and resources are wasted on dealing with non-trust, which has nothing to do with building a successful business.” P4 went on to state that trust “fosters a more loyal and rounded team approach.” P5 added:

Trust is one of the hardest things to get and easiest to lose. As they trust
 you that they have the freedom to make decisions, followers make them
 without you, the outcomes are as good as, and sometimes even better than
 if you were involved.

P6 added, “When there is trust there is no drama day-to-day. We can go farther and do more things when there is trust.”

Attribute 2

The second attribute within the theoretical finding was freedom from management. The different themes that formed the attribute freedom from management were, as followers grow as leaders themselves, as followers become independent, and as followers become capable of being empowered.

As followers grow as leaders themselves. P1 stated, “As they grow, followers become leaders themselves. Followers can become relied upon as partners. Their different perspectives can enhance a team.” P7 claimed that it goes to building on strengths, stating:

I am helping to create an environment of independency growing to
 interdependency. Just that process of life is great and people are genuinely
 accepted for who they are and thus genuinely appreciated for who they
 are. It’s about seeing them for their strengths and helping them develop
 their strengths.

P14 stated that, “I am genuinely excited for the associate when they grow as an individual. My hope is that at some point, they may become better than I am.” As P6 discussed, “When followers’ grow, the conversations get more interesting and we can solve more problems together.” P6 added, “When I can meet the needs of followers I feel like they are fully engaged and really want to be part of things.” This growth occurs, as P5 stated, when the leader, “Tries to focus on taking stress away from our associates so that they can be more involved in the whole process.” It is fulfilling for the leader to see this growth as P8 noted, “I am impacted when I can watch people around me grow individually. To help them gain the tools and the confidence in their own abilities is the purpose of real leadership.” P10 wrote, “As followers grow they then become able to take on added

responsibilities and even leadership roles, which then frees me to leverage my time more effectively.” P10 stated that when followers grow, “It helps me grow and learn. I only hope others learn a quarter of what I learn from them.”

P5 reflected on leading teams stating, “As the teams grow it has given me opportunity to move to other opportunities in the company.” P7 wrote, “As they grow everyone grows, there are things I learn from them as much as they learn from me. The more we all know, the more the opportunities there are for the company and everyone grows.” P5 added that as followers grow, “It creates the opportunity to grow yourself with different opportunities.” P1 claimed that as followers grow, “It makes me a better leader. Their example inspires me personally, a follower’s success inspires others on the team.” P5 noted, “With associates growth and development my role becomes easier.”

P11 also discussed this stating, “I really feel the more the follower learns and grows the easier the job for the leader.” According to P4, another aspect comes from followers “developing a sense of thinking outside of the box and extending their ability to grow within the organization.” P13 added to this stating:

As followers grow from studying and applying correct principles, they begin to worry less about their social standing and focus more on what’s effective and real. This makes the leadership role much easier because I can focus on how to help move things forward rather than on damage control from social and emotional immaturity.

This growth leads to success as P4 claimed, “It provides an opportunity for excellent succession planning within our company.”

As followers become independent. P1 wrote, “I see this as the goal of leadership: to have followers capable and willing to operate under less guidance.” P13 went on to say that “If truly independent, they will be much more effective. Once they are truly comfortable within they can look outward. There is much more capacity for greater results because less time is required to change paradigms.”

P8 noted that such feelings lead to “freeing up my time to help others.” P14 stated, “Associates that have their needs met, will perform at a higher level, they will be happier, they will contribute more.” P14 went on to state, “I am able to accomplish more as a team leader. It allows me to focus more on items that are important long term.” P2 also discussed this as freeing time to focus noting, “It gives me the opportunity to follow other pursuits like expanding the business. It provides time for me to grow relationships with our stakeholders and customers.” P11 stated that, “It makes my job easier, it makes for better confidence in the direction we choose to go.” P3 added to this by writing that there is, “more time to dedicate to bigger issues.” In addition, P5 stated, “The time you would be using to take care of the little things that take up your day are eliminated and you can focus on the things that make life for all easier, fire prevention instead of firefighting.” P6 also addressed having time freed up saying, “More independence is a great thing, if people can

solve their own problems it means we can move on to other things. I don't have to be involved in every little detail for progress to happen." P11 noted that, "Your job becomes easier because they don't need to be told what to do and need much less supervision." P14 added, "I am able to focus more on the important items that need to get done." P5 noted that this "Makes my life easier every day and it is exciting to see the changes or improvements that are coming together." P4 noted that it "provides the ability to facilitate organizational development without having to micromanage the business and staff." As followers become independent, P8 noted that it, "helps me to see things I might not see, and perhaps courage to do something I wouldn't have done." In addition, P8 noted, "Independence is beautiful. As those I help gain independence and grow there is an opportunity for me to learn from them."

As followers become capable of being empowered. P3 stated that empowered followers "create a dynamic organization where people feel motivated, empowered and assume ownership." Capable followers, according to P3, lead to "more alignment, ability to delegate and empower, and more feedback." P1 addressed the benefits to empowerment stating, "Accountability is increased in a positive way; quality and outcomes are generally better." P5 added, "If followers believe in what they are doing to make a difference, the environment becomes magical and a great place to be." P13 wrote that the basis for empowerment comes from, "Recognizing each other's strengths and applying them where they make the most difference." P10 summed it up by saying, "You don't have to micro-manage anything, you do your job and team members do their jobs and things get done in an effective/synergistic way." P4 noted that "It provides a better sense of confidence in the decision making process." P9 noted that when followers can be empowered, "It is liberating and fulfilling." P7 noted that as followers are empowered, "My role becomes a lot less, I let them go and just know things will get done. Now I move to that role as an interpersonal supporter hoping to get them to that level."

DISCUSSION

The emergent theoretical finding discovered in the data analysis was: leaders realize personal benefits from serving the needs of followers. The attributes that formed the theoretical finding were validation as a leader and freedom from management. The theoretical finding emerged from the writings of the 14 participants that took part in the study. The theoretical finding and the two attributes appear to demonstrate how the self-interest of a leader benefits by serving followers.

The first attribute, validation as a leader, supports Greenleaf's (1977/2002) argument of legitimate power that comes to the leader as a gift from one's followers. To be validated as a leader involves the realization that one's followers perceive them as a legitimate leader (Greenleaf, 1996). The validated leader is one whose followers desire to serve his or her needs and carry out the vision (Patterson, 2003; Winston, 2003). In addition, the validated leader is one whose followers become innovative and creative thus benefiting both the leader and the organization (Liden et al., 2014).

The second attribute, freedom from management, aligns with Greenleaf's (1977/2002) claim that those served are more likely to become servant leaders. As followers are served they grow as leaders, they are then ready to be empowered and delegated to (Patterson, 2003). Leaders move beyond the role of direct supervision by serving their followers in a way that they can grow, thus developing self-efficacy (Spears, 2010; Winston, 2003). When followers are empowered and capable, leaders are then free to take on new challenges and opportunities (Ndoye et al., 2010).

These attributes are in-line with servant leadership writings claiming that the servant leader eventually transcends their role to become stewards of the organization (Block, 2013; Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Spears, 2010). This transcendence leads to the leader's self-actualization (Conley, 2007; Maslow, 1965). The benefit to being a self-actualized leader is the realization of greater authority, strength, and success (Greenleaf, 1996; Russell, 2016; Sendjaya, 2015).

CONCLUSION

The theoretical finding of this study advances the understanding of servant leadership philosophy by discovering the benefits to one's self-interest from being a servant leader. The researchers identified a theoretical concept that supports Russell's (2016) claim that there seems to almost always be a tangible and/or intangible benefit to both leader and follower resulting from the servant leader-servant follower relationship.

The implication of the theoretical finding is twofold. First, is its ability to address the realized self-interest, which results from being a servant leader (Feldman, 2014). The second is its possibility for reducing the skepticism surrounding the philosophy that it is one-sided servitude that only benefits those served by the leader (Denning, 2010; Heskett, 2013; Monroe, 2013).

This study is limited to the data collected from the 14 participants in the form of a written questionnaire. The questionnaire did not allow the researchers to ask follow-up questions or seek clarification to answers. Moreover, the questionnaire did not allow for discovering how these leaders arrived at their position of leadership, whether they envisioned themselves as a servant leader, or how they may have benefited from a servant leader in their career. The researchers recommend future studies that utilize interviews with participants. In addition, the researchers recommend future studies that recruit participants in order to discover when they themselves realized they were becoming a servant leader, as well as what type of leader they desired to be.

REFERENCES

- Autry, J. (2001). *The servant leader: How to build a creative team, develop great morale and improve the bottom-line performance*. New York, NY: Crown Business.
- Babbi, E. (1998). *Survey research methods*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Babbi, E. (2010). *The practice of social research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Basit, T. (2003). Manual or electronic? The role of coding in qualitative data analysis. *Educational research*, 45(2), 143-154.
- Biddle, C. (2002). *Loving life: The morality of self-interest and the facts that support it*. Glen Allen, VA: Glen Allen Press.
- Blanchard, K. (1999). *The heart of a leader: Insights on the art of influence*. Tulsa, OK: Honor Press.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Block, P. (2013). *Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest*. San Francisco, CA: Barrett-Koehler.
- Caldwell, C., & Clapham, S. E. (2003). Organizational trustworthiness: An international perspective. *Journal of business ethics*, 47(4), 349-364.
- Caldwell, C., Davis, B., & Devine, J. A. (2009). Trust, faith, and betrayal: Insights from management for the wise believer. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84(1), 103-114.
- Camic, P., Rhodes, J., & Yardley, L. (2003). Naming the stars: Integrating qualitative methods into psychological research. In Camic, P., Rhodes, J., & Yardley, L. (Ed.), *Qualitative research in psychology: Expanding perspectives in methodology and design*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Chan, S. C., & Mak, W. (2014). The impact of servant leadership and subordinates' organizational tenure on trust in leader and attitudes. *Personnel Review*, 43(2), 272-287.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide to qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Conley, C. (2007). *Peak: How great companies get their mojo from Maslow*. Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-Bass.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *The basics of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denning, S. (2010). The problem with servant leadership. [Web log comment]. Retrieved from http://stevedenning.typepad.com/steve_denning/2010/04/o-lord-its-hard-to-be-a-humble-leader.html

- Elliker, J. (2016). Understanding the ontological conflict between servant leadership and organizations. *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice*, 3(2), 72-89.
- Farling, M., Stone, A., & Winston, B. (1999). Servant leadership: Setting the stage for empirical research. *The Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 6(1), 49-72.
- Feldman, D. (2014). What if we took servant leadership seriously? *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice*, 1(1), 12-15.
- Garson, G.D. (2013). *Grounded theory*. Asheboro, NC: Statistical Publishing Associates.
- Glaser, B. (1998). *Doing grounded theory: Issues and discussions*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1999). *Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Piscataway, NJ: Adline Transaction.
- Grant, A. (2013). *Give and take: A revolutionary approach to success*. New York, NY: Viking.
- Greenleaf, R. (1970). *The servant as a leader*. Indianapolis, IN: Greenleaf Center
- Greenleaf, R. (1977/2002). *Servant-leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R. (1996). *The ethic of strength*. In D. Frick & D. Spears (Eds.), *On becoming a servant leader* (pp. 13-99). New York, NY: Jossey-Bass.
- Heskett, J., Sasser, W., Schlesinger, L. (1997). *The service profit chain: How leading companies link profit and growth to loyalty, satisfaction, and value*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Heskett, J. (2013). Why isn't servant leadership more prevalent? Retrieved from <http://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/7207.html>
- Hunter, J. (2004). *The world's most powerful leadership principle: How to become a servant leader*. New York, NY: Crown.
- Locke, J. (1689/1949). *The second treatise of government and a letter concerning toleration*. New York, NY: MacMillan.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Chenwei, L., & Meuser, J. D. (2014). Servant leadership and serving culture: Influence on individual and unit performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(5), 1434-1452.
- Maslow, A. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.
- Maslow, A. (1965). Self-actualization and beyond. Conference on the Training of Counselors of Adults, Chatham, MA.

- Monroe, K. (2013). Servant leadership: A virtuous cycle of service. [Web log comment]. Retrieved from: <https://greenleaf.org/servant-leadership-a-virtuous-cycle-of-service/>
- Ndoye, A., Imig, S., & Parker, M. (2010). Empowerment, leadership, and teachers' intentions to stay in or leave the profession or their schools in North Carolina charter schools. *Journal of School Choice*, 4(2), 174-190.
- Oliverira, M., & Ferreira, J. (2012). How operability fosters innovation: The case for servant leadership. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(29), 8580-8608.
- Page, D., & Wong, T. (2000). *A conceptual framework for measuring servant-leadership*. In S.B.-S.K. Adjiboloss (Ed.), *The human factor in shaping the course of history and development*. Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield.
- Patterson, K. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model* (Doctoral Dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses Database. (UMI No. 3082719)
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods (3 ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rand, A. (1964). *The virtue of selfishness*. New York, NY: New American Library.
- Rand, A. (1966). *Capitalism: The unknown ideal*. New York, NY: New American Library.
- Russell, E. (2016). Servant leadership's cycle of benefit. *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice*, 3(1), 52-68.
- Russell, R., & Stone, A. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23(3/4), 145-157.
- Schwartz, P. (2015). *In defense of selfishness: Why the code of self-sacrifice is unjust and destructive*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press
- Sendjaya, S. (2015). *Personal and organizational excellence through servant leadership: Learning to serve, serving to lead, leading to transform*. New York, NY: Springer International.
- Smith, A. (1759/2010). *The theory of moral sentiments*. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing, LLC.
- Smith, A. (1776/2002). *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*. New York, NY: Bantam Classics.
- Spears, L. (2010). Servant leadership and Robert K. Greenleaf's legacy. In K. Patterson & D. van Dierendonck (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research* (pp. 11-24). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Stone, A., Russell, R., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(4), 349–361.
- Taft, J. (2012). *Stewardship: Lessons learned from the lost culture of Wall Street*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Ton, Z. (2014). *The good jobs strategy: How the smartest companies invest in employees to lower costs and boost profits*. New York, NY: Houghton.
- Turner, W. (2000). *The learning of love: A journey toward servant leadership*. Macon, GA: Smyth and Helwys.
- Vinod, S., & Sudhakar, B. (2011). Servant leadership: A unique art of leadership! *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 2(11), 456–467.
- Winston, B. (2003). Extending Patterson's servant leadership model: Explaining how leaders and followers interact in a circular model. *Regent University Servant Leadership Roundtable Regent University*.
- Winston, B. (2010). A place for qualitative research methods in the study of servant leadership. In Patterson, K., & van Dierendonck, D. (Ed.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Yoshida, D. T., Sendjaya, S., Hirst, G., & Cooper, B. (2014). Does servant leadership foster creativity and innovation? A multi-level mediation study of identification and prototypicality. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(7), 1395-1404.
- Young-Ritchie, C., Laschinger, H. S., & Wong, C. (2009). The effects of emotionally intelligent leadership behaviour on emergency staff nurses' workplace empowerment and organizational commitment. *Nursing leadership*, 22(1), 70-85.
- Zhang, X., & Bartol, K. (2010). Linking empowering leadership and employee creativity: The influence of psychological empowerment, intrinsic motivation, and creative process engagement. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(1), 107-128.



TURNER COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

COLUMBUS STATE UNIVERSITY

Master of Science in Organizational Leadership | MSOL

The Turner College of Business offers a Master of Science in Organizational Leadership (MSOL) which is a specialized degree preparing professionals for leadership and executive positions in private, public and non-profit organizations. Students in the MSOL program have the option of two focused tracks, Human Resource Management or Servant Leadership.

The MSOL is a 36-hour program, requiring a student to complete 12 graduate courses. Full-time students can complete the program in four semesters. The program can also be adapted for students who wish to pace themselves. All MSOL classes are taught in the evening. Students can enter the MSOL program in spring, summer or fall semesters and have a maximum of six years from the first term of enrollment to complete all MSOL degree requirements.

Please refer to <http://Bursar.ColumbusState.edu/fees.php> for current tuition and fees.

Whether you are a seasoned professional or just getting your start in the business world, this degree allows you the opportunity to become a more effective and successful leader for your organization.

The Human Resource Management track prepares professionals to develop and implement HR planning, recruiting, training, compensation, benefits, performance management and disciplinary systems in a legal and ethical framework. The track is aligned with the Society for Human Resource Management's HR Curriculum Guidebook and Templates. Graduates of this track will be academically prepared to pass the Professional and Senior Professional in Human Resources (PHR & SPHR) exams. The knowledge and skills acquired through this track are important to all leaders, because every leader manages human resources.

The Servant Leadership track prepares professionals to meet the leadership needs of their organization, by drawing on the wealth of resources situated here in Columbus, GA. Having been named the nation's first "Servant Leadership City", our business community is widely recognized for the number of practitioners, level of expertise, and overall commitment to servant leadership. Our community is the perfect place to study applicable case studies, learn from servant leadership practitioners, and discover opportunities for field experience. Servant Leadership is a philosophy and practice of leadership in which the leader is committed to the professional growth and development of the followers. Servant Leadership practitioners achieve results for their organization by giving priority attention to the needs and the development of those being led. Students analyze current trends and issues related to servant leadership while learning to build a culture of servant leadership in various organizational environments.



WORLD-CLASS GRADUATE EDUCATION

... with a personal touch



COLUMBUS STATE
UNIVERSITY

Accreditation

Make sure you're considered one in a million to employers.

The Turner College of Business's degree programs are professionally accredited through The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business. As an accredited member of AACSB international, our college offers business programs that achieve their distinction for high quality through an interdisciplinary curriculum providing students with a broad understanding of business and its role in society.

As an AACSB International-accredited school:

- We are recognized worldwide by top employers and other universities.
- Our graduates receive higher, more competitive salaries.
- The quality of our business programs is improved.
- We are able to hire and retain the best professors and researchers.
- Our students have high graduating GPAs and are likely to earn higher levels of education.
- Our business programs are challenging and will teach you the best skills that will give you a distinct advantage in the real world.

Admissions Requirements

All applicants seeking admission to one of the Turner College of Business graduate degree programs must submit the following:

- A graduate application, available online or in paper, with application fee.
- An official baccalaureate degree transcript from an accredited institution.
- Graduate Management Admission Test (GMAT) scores; students may also submit Graduate Record Exam (GRE) scores. Only scores within the past five years will be accepted.
 - **GMAT school code:** R64-XW-20
 - **GRE school code:** 5123
- Two recommendation letters from professional sources such as current or former employers, faculty, and business associates are required. Please use the recommendation form provided.
- A current resume.

To apply online, go to
www.ColumbusState.edu/admissions/grad.

MSOL Core Curriculum

Area 1, Program Core, Required hours: 15

The MSOL core is required of all candidates in the MSOL program, regardless of track. This core consists of 15 hours (five courses).

Course	Description	Credit
MSOL 6115	Organizational Behavior and Leadership	3
MSOL 6125	Negotiations and Conflict Resolution	3
MSOL 6135	Contemporary Economics and Finance for Leaders	3
MSOL 6145	Global Management	3
MSOL 6155	Strategic Leadership and Change Management	3

Human Resources Management concentration

Area 2, Concentration, Required hours: 15

Course	Description	Credit
MSHR 6116	Human Resources Management	3
MSHR 6126	Recruiting and Selection	3
MSHR 6136	Employee Development	3
MSHR 6146	Performance Management & Compensation	3
MSHR 6156	Labor Relations	3

Servant Leadership concentration

Area 2, Concentration, Require hours: 15

Course	Description	Credit
MSSL 6117	Foundations in Servant Leadership	3
MSSL 6127	Contemporary Issues in Servant Leadership	3
MSSL 6137	Coaching	3
MSSL 6147	Developing an Organizational Culture of Servant Leadership	3
MSSL 6157	Organizational Ethics & Values	3

Leader Development concentration

Area 2, Concentration, Require hours: 15

Course	Description	Credit
MSSL 6117	Foundations in Servant Leadership	3
MSSL 6127	Contemporary Issues in Servant Leadership	3
MSHR 6136	Employee Development	3
MSSL 6157	Organizational Ethics & Values	3
POLS 7177	National Security Policy	3

Electives

Area 3, Electives, Required hours: 6

All MSOL students must select six hours from a group of approved courses.