

Servant-Leadership: An Exploration of Essence and Fidelity

by

David A.T. Nagel

B.A., University of Northern British Columbia, 2001

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Faculty of Education – Dept. of Educational Psychology and Leadership
Studies

© David A.T. Nagel, 2012
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by
photocopy or other means, without the permission of the author.

Supervisory Committee

Servant-Leadership: An Exploration of Essence and Fidelity

by

David A.T. Nagel
B.A., University of Northern British Columbia, 2001

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Carolyn Crippen, Department of Educational Psychology and Leadership Studies

Supervisor

Dr. Susan Tasker, Department of Educational Psychology and Leadership Studies

Departmental Member

Abstract

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Carolyn Crippen, Department of Educational Psychology and Leadership Studies

Supervisor

Dr. Susan Tasker, Department of Educational Psychology and Leadership Studies

Departmental Member

Abstract

In 1970 Robert K. Greenleaf put forth a conceptualization of leadership aimed at re-invigorating a sense of belonging and responsibility in the disgruntled youth of those times. In his seminal work, *The Servant as Leader* (1991), he offers a rather revolutionary approach to leadership that focuses not only on the actions of the leader, but also on the relationship existing between leader and follower. Servant-leadership seeks to reposition leadership as a process of relationship marked by mutual influence.

The purpose of this qualitative study, by means of reflective analysis, was to explore the essence of servant-leadership according to Greenleaf's original work and to describe how that essence is reflected within the secondary literature extant to servant-leadership. *The Servant as Leader* (1991) and *On Becoming a Servant Leader* (1996) were used to discern the essence of Greenleaf's conceptualization, while secondary servant-leadership literature in the form of books, book chapters, and journal articles provided the context for understanding how Greenleaf's work has been represented.

Table of Contents

Supervisory Committee	ii
Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Acknowledgments	vi
Dedication	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Background	1
Problem Statement	3
Purpose Statement	5
Research Objectives	5
Research Questions	5
Definition of Terms	6
Chapter 2: Literature Review	7
What is Servant-Leadership According to Greenleaf?	7
What is Servant-Leadership According to the Secondary Literature?	16
Servant-leadership as a philosophy	16
Servant-leadership compared with transformational leadership	17
Servant-leadership as a portrayal of the new science.	18
Servant-leadership as a process.	21
Servant-leadership as service.	23
Servant-leadership as a way of being	25
Servant-Leadership as a Measurable Construct	29
Chapter 3: Research Method	35
Reflective Analysis	36
Dependability and Credibility	37
Role of the Researcher	38
Research Procedure Question 1	39
Data collection.	39
Data reduction and analysis.	40
Dependability and credibility	42
Research Procedure Question 2	42
Data collection.	43
Data reduction and analysis.	43
Dependability and credibility	45
Chapter 4: Findings	47
Question 1	47
An attitude of responsibility	47
Listening.	48
Awareness	49
Intuitive insight.	49
Foresight.	50
Creativity	50

Persuasion.....	51
Unlimited liability.....	51
Question 2.....	52
An attitude of responsibility.....	53
Listening.....	54
Awareness.....	56
Intuitive insight.....	57
Foresight.....	58
Creativity.....	59
Persuasion.....	61
Unlimited liability.....	61
Summation.....	62
Chapter 5: Discussion.....	64
Question 1.....	64
Limitations.....	65
Question 2.....	65
Limitations.....	72
Overall Thoughts.....	73
Conclusion.....	74
Recommendations and Next Steps.....	76
Recommendation 1: Engage in dialogue.....	76
Recommendation 2: Follow Van Dierendonck's lead.....	76
Recommendation 3: Explore varied contexts.....	76
Recommendation 4: Explore historical roots.....	77
Recommendation 5: Explore the concept of followership.....	77
Final Reflections.....	77
References.....	79

Acknowledgments

First and foremost I'd like to acknowledge my wife Avril and daughter Kaiya for their countless hours of support and understanding. In that vein I'd like to thank: Zach Camozzi, Rhianna Nagel, Pancho (Francisco) Varela, Grandma Nagel, Maria Nagel, David Nagel Sr., Alaya Boisvert, Andree Durand, and others who provided countless hours of valuable childcare.

Dr. Carolyn Crippen has been an undying mentor who has been nothing less than supportive and encouraging during this entire process. In addition to supporting this work she has been unprecedented in her guidance regarding my scholarship and academic career.

Dr. Susan Tasker has provided a valuable critical eye for the project, and has helped immensely in the logical structure and flow of the argument.

As some may know, without the quintessential assistance of departmental staff, none of this would have been possible. Many thanks to Stacey, Zoria, Gloria, Vivian, and to our former and current departmental chairs; Dr. John Walsh and Dr. John Anderson. Lastly I'd like to thank Fran Hunt-Jinnouchi (INAF) and Norah McRae (Co-op) for helping to launch my research trajectory at UVic.

Dedication

To Alden Tree Camozzi Nagel

Chapter 1: Introduction

Background

Some years ago this author witnessed the dramatic personal transformation of a young person who had participated in an experiential learning program. The person, whom the author has known for the majority of his life, emerged from the program as someone with a remarkable balance between her/his self and others. Upon recent reflection as I conclude the Master's portion of my graduate studies it became apparent that my interest in *leadership* (see definition p. 6) stemmed from having witnessed the personal growth of this young person.

My experiential connection to the topic of leadership began when working for a national youth leadership development organization called Katimavik. Katimavik fosters the growth of young people aged 17 to 21 through an experiential learning program based upon *service-learning* (see definition p. 6) pedagogy. Seven years later, I commenced graduate studies at the University of Victoria. By happenstance and kismet the first course offered and available to me was servant-leadership. The concept immediately spoke to my life experience to that date, and has been a focal point of my studies ever since.

The term *servant-leadership* emerged from the work of Robert K. Greenleaf in his seminal work entitled *The Servant as Leader* (1991). Greenleaf was concerned with the civil and institutional unrest of the 1960s, and was deeply concerned about the lack of responsibility that he perceived amongst the young (Beazley & Beggs, 2002). As a consultant, Greenleaf was asked often what could be done about the uneasy landscape. He decided to find out what the students of that day were

reading, which led him to discovering *The Journey to the East*, by Herman Hesse. It was from reading this book, and reflecting on the role of the main character Leo, that he discerned the true and great leader was servant first. He then went on, with the aid of his professional, spiritual, and life experience to put forth the concept of servant-leadership.

The servant-leadership concept is deeply rooted in relationships and how we choose to affect our environment vis à vis our connections and actions. As C. Crippen (personal communication, March 13th, 2011) is oft known to say, “it’s all about relationships”; a notion of relationships in line with what Wheatley (2006) describes as interconnectivity and mutual possibility. Inferred is a notion of relationship beyond an egocentric focus on individuals to an understanding of relationships that includes a synergy of ideas, intentions, intuition, and what Greenleaf (1991) refers to as “great dreams”.

In one of the most potent definitions of leadership to date, Rost (1991) defines leadership as “an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes” (p. 102). This definition of leadership closely connects to the servant-leadership concept; in that it is our actions and intentions that create the world in which we live. The servant-leader, as defined by Greenleaf (1991), “is servant first... It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead” (p. 15).

Problem Statement

The concept of servant-leadership is quite new, emerging within popular discourse only within the last 40 years. During the past three years I have, by means of reading, attending conferences, taking courses, and research sensed a lack of common understanding as to what servant-leadership is. Interpretation varies from servant-leadership as a subset of transformational leadership (Farling & Stone, 1999; Graham, 1991; Patterson, 2003), to servant-leadership as a philosophy of leadership (Frick, 1995; Polleys, 2002; Prosser, 2010), to servant-leadership as simply a fundamental way of being (Bordas, 1995; Keith, 2008; Spears, 1998). This seems problematic, for it leads us toward a fuzzy conceptualization of servant-leadership that hinders practice and application. Also of concern is that a fuzzy and ill-defined conceptualization of servant-leadership leads to a distortion for potential empirical testing.

In recent years, scholars have created no less than eleven measureable constructs of servant-leadership (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2002; Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Laub, 2003; Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008; Page & Wong, 2000; Patterson, 2003; Russell & Stone, 2002; Sendjaya, Sarros, & Santora, 2008; Spears, 1995; Van Dierendonck, 2011). Further, research and writing on servant-leadership has appeared in a potpourri of disciplines ranging from business and education to nursing and theology (Crippen, 2005; Laub, 2003; Neill & Saunders, 2008; Russell, 2003). Such a broad application of a concept in its infant stages has led to varying views as to what actually constitutes servant-leadership.

For example, Spears (1995) has identified listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, foresight, conceptualization, stewardship, the growth of others, and building community as ten essential characteristics of servant-leadership (pp. 4-7), while Farling, Stone, and Winston (1999) offer vision, influence, credibility, trust, and service (p. 51). Patterson (2003) suggests seven *virtuous constructs* being agapao love, humility, altruism, vision, trust, empowerment, and service (p. 2), while Laub (2003) envisions valuing people, developing people, building community, displaying authenticity, providing leadership, and sharing leadership (p. 3). One can see some minor similarities within these lists, but more evident is the wide scope of interpretation as to what servant-leadership actually is. Perhaps telling, is that only Spears (1995) acknowledges a direct connection to the original work of Robert K. Greenleaf.

To date, there has been only one attempt to create a synthesis of the many interpretations of servant-leadership (Van Dierendonck, 2011), though there is little mention of Greenleaf's conceptualization. Thus, it appears that a return to Greenleaf's (1991; 1996) original work will provide greater conceptual clarity, and promote a common conceptual framework. Greater conceptual clarity, based on Greenleaf's original conceptualization, can then provide a more accurate starting point from which dialogue and research can commence. A continued lack of common conceptual understanding of servant-leadership runs the risk of diluting the concept so much that it becomes insignificant. A return to Greenleaf's work is in the interest of those seeking to promote, to develop, to research, and to practice servant-leadership.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this qualitative study, by means of reflective analysis, was to explore the essence of servant-leadership according to Greenleaf's original work (1991, 1996a, 1996b, 1996c, 1996d, 1996e, 1996f, 1996g, 1996h, 1996j, 1996k, 1996m, 1996n, 1996o), and to describe how that essence is reflected within the secondary literature extant to servant-leadership. *The Servant as Leader* (1991) and *On Becoming a Servant Leader* (1996) were used to discern the essence of Greenleaf's conceptualization, while secondary servant-leadership literature in the form of books, book chapters, and journal articles provided the context for understanding how Greenleaf's work has been represented.

Research Objectives

The two objectives of this research study were (a) to propose an understanding of the conceptual essence of Greenleaf's (1991, 1996a, 1996b, 1996c, 1996d, 1996e, 1996f, 1996g, 1996h, 1996j, 1996k, 1996m, 1996n, 1996o) original work and (b) to explore the secondary literature extant to servant-leadership in order to describe how the concept as I have proposed is reflected.

Research Questions

Accordingly, this research study asked two questions:

- Question 1: What is Greenleaf's conceptualization of the nature and essence of servant-leadership as communicated in his 1991 work, and in his early essays collected in *On Becoming a Servant-Leader* (1996)?

- Question 2: How does the secondary literature extant to servant-leadership over the last 40 years reflect the essence of Greenleaf's conceptualization as I have discerned from Question 1?

Definition of Terms

The following terms and definitions are used for the purpose of this paper.

Concept. "A general idea derived or inferred from specific instances or occurrences" (Concept, 1997, p. 287).

Construct. "To create by systematically arranging ideas or terms; a concept, model, or schematic idea" (Construct, 1997, p. 298).

Essence. "The intrinsic or indispensable property that characterize or identify something" (Essence, 1997, p. 469).

Leadership. "An influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes" (Rost 1991, p.102).

Servant-leader. "The servant-leader is servant first... It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead" (Greenleaf, 1991, p. 15).

Service-learning. "Service-learning joins two complex concepts: community action, the 'service,' and efforts to learn from that action and connect what is learned to existing knowledge, the 'learning'" (Stanton, Giles, & Cruz, 1999, p. 2).

This chapter has outlined the background, problem and purpose statements, research objectives, and research questions for this study. In the next chapter I turn to a review of Greenleaf's works followed by a review of the secondary literature extant to servant-leadership.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter has been separated into two parts. The first describes servant-leadership according to Greenleaf's writings, while the second describes the secondary literature extant to servant-leadership. The secondary literature has been organized into seven sub-sections in order to present the vast amount of information in a coherent and understandable manner.

What is Servant-Leadership According to Greenleaf?

In perhaps the most frequently used passage for describing servant-leadership, Greenleaf (1991) suggests that:

The servant-leader is servant first – as Leo was portrayed. It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. He is sharply different from the person who is *leader* first, perhaps because of the need to assuage an unusual power drive or to acquire material possessions. For such it will be a later choice to serve – after leadership is established. 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.

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: do those served grow as persons; do they, *while being served*, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? *And,*

what is the effect on the least privileged in society; will he benefit, or, at least, will he not be further deprived? (p. 15)

Further, regarding the nature of the servant Greenleaf posits, “if one is servant, either leader or follower, one is always searching, listening, expecting that a better wheel for these times is in the making” (p. 11).

In his early essays Greenleaf often connects leadership to an Ethic of Strength, which he defines as “the ability, in the face of the practical issues of life, to choose the right aim and to pursue that aim responsibly over a long period of time” (Greenleaf, 1996e, p. 95). The passage illustrates the search of which Greenleaf speaks, and the lifelong journey that one must undertake in its practice. In an interview with DiStefano (Frick & Spears, 1996), Greenleaf suggests servant-leadership is “basically a question of the values that are held by a society” (p. 348), perhaps a reflection on a general sense of hopelessness amongst the young.

Greenleaf (1991) felt that the right course of action in response to the student unrest of his day was for enough leaders to “convert themselves into *affirmative builders* of a better society”. This view, for servants “to emerge as leaders”, or to “only follow servant-leaders” was not a popular one (p. 12). But for Greenleaf (1996j), constructive change, in contrast to the destructive sentiments of those days, required that individuals be willing to invest themselves in and to take “responsibility for leadership”, and to be willing to take the “bitter with the sweet, the dull and routine with the exciting and challenging” (p. 293). Central to the concept of servant-leadership is the notion that “the forces of good and evil in the world operate through the thoughts, attitudes, and actions of individual beings.

Societies, movements, and institutions are but the collection or focus of such individual initiatives” (Greenleaf, 1996o, p. 329).

A common theme to Greenleaf’s writing was the concern for the world “not that there are so many poorly equipped people in it but that the well-equipped people do so poorly” (Greenleaf, 1996e, p. 96). And further, “if a flaw in the world is to be remedied, to the servant the process of change starts *in here*, in the servant, not *out there*” (Greenleaf, 1991, p. 44). Ideas, movements, and change originate within the individual, and come into the world because of “originators, those who imagine and who take the risks of acting on an imagined idea” (Greenleaf, 1996g, p. 127). Greenleaf (1991) describes an essential problem of leadership as:

The real enemy is fuzzy thinking on the part of good, intelligent, vital people, and their failure to lead, and to follow servants as leaders. Too many settle for being critics and experts. There is too much intellectual wheel spinning, too much retreating into “research,” too little preparation for and willingness to undertake the hard and high risk task of building better institutions in an imperfect world, too little disposition to see “the problem” as residing *in here* and not *out there*. (p. 46)

What follows from a disposition of *in here* and *not out there* is a “sense of responsibility as an attitude, a feeling. It is an overriding point of view, the color of the glasses through which one sees the world, the frame of reference within which one’s philosophy of life evolves” (Greenleaf, 1996b, p. 42). The source for such an attitude is seen as “internal rather than external. Responsibility is not seen as an act

of conformity. Rather, it is the key to inner serenity. Responsibility is not a tested formula, a code, or a set of rules” (p. 42). Emergent is a sense of purpose that permeates and informs all of one’s actions, thoughts, and intentions.

For Greenleaf (1996j), an attitude of responsibility amongst the young seemed in short supply, for which he laid blame on universities that tended “to bias students toward becoming critics and experts and away from becoming responsible participants in society” (p. 289). Greenleaf (1991) quipped that “an education that is preponderantly abstract and analytical” and that “extended for so many so far into the adult years” robbed the young of “normal participation in society... when they were ready for it” (p. 47). It was his view that “our very best influence needs to be brought to bear on our potentially best young people in the formative years from sixteen to twenty-five when the crisis of identity is being met” (Greenleaf, 1996d, p. 80). The greatest priority was and still is “to develop young people as they come along to deal courageously and creatively with the future” (Greenleaf, 1996n, p. 320), fostering opportunities to practice serving and leading; two “intuition based concepts” in Greenleaf’s thinking (Greenleaf, 1991, p. 14).

Greenleaf (1991) describes intuition as “a feel for patterns” (p. 24). He envisions a leader who has a “*sense for the unknowable* and be able *to foresee the unforeseeable*” (p. 23), and suggests that such a quality “is partly what gives the leader his ‘lead’, what puts him out ahead and qualifies him to show the way” (p. 23). Acting on intuition is essential for a leader, but such behavior has the potential to be seen as impulsiveness by those who are highly rational (Greenleaf, 1996c). Greenleaf (1996c) cautions those practicing servant-leadership to “regard the

highly rational with a jaundiced eye”, though “since rational people are numerous and need to be taken into account, open, creative people need to learn to rationalize” (p. 71). For Greenleaf (1996m), “leaders must be creative; and creativity is largely discovery – a push into the uncharted and the unknown” (p. 315). He connects a leader’s capacity for creativity and intuition to the practical matter of decision making, for which an information gap “between the solid information in hand and what is needed” always exists. Hence, “the art of leadership rests, in part, on the ability to bridge that gap by intuition, that is, a judgment from the unconscious process” (Greenleaf, 1991, p. 24).

Connected to this intuitive component of decision making is the notion of foresight. Greenleaf (1996h) viewed foresight as “a facet of intuitive fertility” (p. 170), and part of “the ‘lead’ that a leader has” (Greenleaf, 1991, 27). When a leader “loses this lead and events start to force his hand, he is leader in name only. He is not leading; he is only reacting to events” (Greenleaf, 1996n, p. 319). For Greenleaf, “foresight means regarding the events of the instant moment and constantly comparing them with a series of projections made in the past and at the same time projecting future events” (Greenleaf, 1991, p. 27). Exercising foresight requires an interesting perception of time in which “past, present, and future are one organic unity” (Greenleaf, 1996n, p. 319). Greenleaf (1991) views “the ability to do this as the essential structural dynamic of leadership” (p. 27), which is related more broadly to a leader’s approach to knowledge.

For Greenleaf (1991), the use of foresight depends upon one's approach to knowledge and reality, requiring what he describes as a "sort of schizoid life" (p. 28), in which:

One is always at two levels of consciousness: one is in the real world – concerned, responsible, effective, value oriented. One is also detached, riding above it, seeing today's events and seeing oneself deeply involved in today's events, in the perspective of a long sweep of history and projected into the indefinite future. Such a split enables one better to foresee the unforeseeable. Also, from one level of consciousness, each of us acts resolutely from moment to moment on a set of assumptions that then govern his life. Simultaneously, from another level, the adequacy of these assumptions is examined, in action, with the aim of future revision and improvement. Such a view gives one the perspective that makes it possible for him to live and act in the real world with a clearer conscience. (p. 28)

Such an approach leads to an awareness that "means opening the doors of perception wide so as to take in more from sensory experience than people usually take in" (Greenleaf, 1996n, p. 322); an awareness that "is not a giver of solace – it is just the opposite. It is a disturber and an awakener. Able leaders are usually sharply awake and reasonably disturbed. They are not seekers after solace. They have their own inner serenity" (Greenleaf, 1991, p. 29).

This view of knowledge and understanding is "best described by words like perspective, enlargement, and insight", which eschews the notion that knowledge

and understanding lead toward certainty (Greenleaf, 1996b, p. 46). For servant-leadership, “the best knowledge is not certainty (whether about the present or future) but progressively sharper insights... the end result, given enough time, is that one will be known as wise” (Greenleaf, 1996n, p. 321). Such insight builds from an acceptance of doubt, something that Greenleaf (1991) refers to as an act of faith. In an oft-used quote from Dean Inge, faith is described as “the choice of the nobler hypothesis’. Not the noblest, one never knows what that is. But the *nobler*, the best one can see when the choice is made” (p. 16). The acknowledgment of uncertainty provides a “psychological self-insight that is the most dependable part of the true servant” (p. 16).

Inferred is an approach to knowledge that seeks true understanding, both of one’s internal and external environment. An understanding that requires true listening, illustrated well in the Saint Francis prayer, “grant that I may seek not so much to be understood as to understand” (Greenleaf, 1991, p. 19). Greenleaf (1996k) suggests that, “listeners learn about people in ways that modify – first the listener’s attitude, then his behavior toward others, and finally the attitudes and behavior of others” (p. 303). He admits “only a true natural servant automatically responds to any problem by listening *first*”, though believes one can seek to “become a *natural* servant through a long and arduous discipline of learning to listen” (Greenleaf, 1991, pp. 18-19). Greenleaf believed “true listening builds strength in other people” (p. 19), prefacing an attitude toward power in servant-leadership marked by the use of persuasion.

Greenleaf (1991), perhaps due to his Quaker beliefs, maintains “leadership by persuasion has the virtue of change by convincement rather than coercion” (p. 31). He felt that coercion was of little value, as it tended to destroy rather than build, and enacted a most serious abuse of power. He also cautioned against manipulation, which occurs when one is “guided into beliefs or actions by plausible rationalizations that they do not fully understand” (Greenleaf, 1996g, p. 138). For Greenleaf, it was only in persuasion that one could come to a voluntary acceptance and understanding of a situation. Persuasion is marked by an attitude that “accepts that one is persuaded only when one arrives at a belief or action through one’s own intuitive sense of the rightness of that action untrammelled by coercive pressure of any kind” (Greenleaf, 1996g, p. 136). It is a “difficult, time-consuming process”, that “demands one of the most enacting of human skills” (p. 129); a skill that relies on a commitment “to use one’s power affirmatively to serve, in the sense that those being served become wiser, freer, more autonomous, and more likely themselves to become servants” (Greenleaf, 1996h, p. 171).

The use of persuasion also stems from a genuine belief in and acceptance of others; an acceptance that “requires a tolerance of imperfection”, given that “there aren’t any perfect people” (Greenleaf, 1991, p. 22). Greenleaf (1996k) believes that “anybody can reach a goal through the efforts of other people if those people are all perfect... Yet even the imperfect people are capable of great dedication and heroism. They are, in fact, all we have” (p. 303). Great leaders are those who “have empathy and an unqualified acceptance of the persons of those who go with their leadership” (Greenleaf, 1991, p. 22). They seek not to empower those around them, but rather

to foster the conditions necessary for others to realize and experience their own empowerment.

This sentiment is illustrated well in a rarely cited aspect of servant-leadership relevant to social justice, about which Greenleaf (1991) believes:

... that *some* of today's privileged who will live into the twenty-first century will find it interesting *if* they can abandon their present notions of how they can best serve their less favored neighbor and wait and listen until the less favored find their own enlightenment, then define their needs in their own way and, finally, state clearly how they want to be served. The now-privileged who are natural servants may in this process get a fresh perspective on the priority of other's needs and thus they may again be able to serve by leading. (p. 36)

Compassion and love provide the foundation, rather than an arms length application of procedural justice. The servant-leader, in seeking to become a responsible builder, demonstrates their "own unlimited liability for a quite specific community-related group" (Greenleaf, 1991, p. 39). For Greenleaf, "as soon as one's liability for another is qualified *to any degree*, love is diminished by that much (p. 39). The rebuilding of institutions, and our belief in them, is reliant upon this notion of social justice.

This section has described servant-leadership according to Robert K. Greenleaf's conceptualization using some of his early essays. The following section describes the secondary literature extant to servant-leadership.

What is Servant-Leadership According to the Secondary Literature?

This section presents servant-leadership as described in the secondary literature. The information has been organized into seven sub-categories (philosophy, transformational leadership, new science, process, service, a way of being, and as a measurable construct) that reflect the various perspectives of those other than Robert K. Greenleaf.

Servant-leadership as a philosophy.

Starting from a broad perspective, some view servant-leadership as a philosophy; sometimes referred to as a grounding or humanistic philosophy of leadership (Frick, 1995; Polleys, 2002; Rasmussen, 1995). For many servant-leadership is more a philosophy or way of life (e.g., Frick, 1998; Jaworski, 2002; McCollum, 1995; Palmer, 1998; Prosser, 2010; Spears, 1995, 1998; Wheatley, 1999). In reference to servant-leadership as a philosophy, Beazley and Beggs (2002) suggest that, “each individual and every organization... will be different in the way it teaches and practices servant-leadership” (p. 56). Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) put forth that for Greenleaf, servant-leadership “described a new leadership philosophy, one that advocates the servant as leader” (p. 301).

Polleys (2002) suggests “servant-leadership cuts across the theories and provides a foundational philosophy for the theories that emphasizes principles congruent with human growth” (p.125). Freeman, Isaksen, and Dorval (2002) put forth that “servant-leadership is a moral imperative for the creativity practitioner” and conversely, “practitioners of servant-leadership must, by definition, be interested in creativity” (p. 257). Zohar (2002) believes that “servant-leadership

involves the essence of quantum thinking” (p. 112), positioning the concept in the realm of an emergent worldview.

Prosser (2010) puts forth the question in a recent essay as to whether or not servant-leadership is indeed a philosophy. The conclusion he reaches is that servant-leadership is a “fundamental way of being” (p. 32), and that as a philosophy, servant-leadership has “more to do with the general way people gain insight into service and leadership” (p. 10). Prosser also suggests – with an eye to the probable – that the majority of prominent writers on the subject refer to servant-leadership as a philosophy. This statement gives one pause to wonder as to the validity of such an appeal to the masses, for just because many agree on something does not make it true. Nonetheless, Prosser was attempting to encourage a dialogue as to whether servant-leadership is indeed a theory or philosophy. Such a discussion is beyond the scope of this thesis, though we will revisit the notion of servant-leadership as a theory, or measurable construct, in a later section.

Servant-leadership compared with transformational leadership.

Servant-leadership compared with transformational leadership provides less a description of the servant-leadership concept, but more of an attempt to position servant-leadership in the realm of leadership theory. The theory of transformational leadership originated from the work of James MacGregor Burns (1978), to be later refined and operationalized by Bernard Bass (1985). Transformational leadership is said to include: idealized influence (or charismatic influence), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Avolio, Waldman, & Yammarino, 1991).

In an attempt to categorize servant-leadership, many writers have compared the concept to transformational leadership (Farling, Stone, & Winston, 1999; Graham, 1991; Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008; Parolini, Patterson, & Winston, 2009; Patterson, 2003; Polleys, 2002; Sendjaya, Sarros, & Santora, 2008; Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2004; Van Dierendonck, 2011). Farling, Stone, and Winston (1999) have posited “that servant leaders are indeed transformational leaders” (p. 66). However, there is little evidence from within the literature to support such claims.

Stone, Russell, and Patterson (2004), though conceding there are many similarities, suggest the “tendency of the servant leader to focus on followers appears to be the primary factor that distinguishes servant leadership from transformational leadership” (p. 349), which tends toward an organizational focus. Liden et al. (2008) identify a cultivation of “servant leadership behaviours among followers” (p. 163) to be a major difference between the two concepts. Van Dierendonck (2011) goes further suggesting that “servant-leadership focuses on humility, authenticity, and interpersonal acceptance” (p. 8), which is similar to a moral focus of servant-leadership that is not present in transformational leadership (Graham, 1991; Parolini, Patterson, & Winston, 2009; Polleys, 2002).

Servant-leadership as a portrayal of the new science.

Servant-leadership is often linked with concepts of interconnectivity, systems theory, quantum science, and the new paradigm. Zohar (2002) suggests that “servant-leadership involves the essence of quantum thinking” (p. 112), a type of thinking referred to as the “brain’s spirit” (p. 120). Our role as co-creators of

existence and our responsibility to the creation of said existence is seen as foundational to servant-leadership (Gardner, 1998; Jaworski, 1998, 2002; Palmer, 1998; Senge, 1995; Smith, 1995; Wheatley, 1998; Zohar, 2002). For Jaworski (2002), “the subtlest domain of leadership – but perhaps the most vital – is recognizing and strengthening our innate capacity to sense and bring forth emerging futures” (p. 287). In quoting a conversation with physicist David Bohm, he explains, “we are connected through and operate within living fields of thought and perception” (p. 290). It is within these relationships or fields where servant-leadership operates.

Relationships are seen as the building blocks of life, not things (Senge, 1995; Smith, 1995). Jaworski (1998) described this in a way “that everything is connected to everything else and that relationship is the organizing principle of the universe” (p. 261). Wheatley (1998) adds that “organization is a process, not a structure” (p. 348) and for servant-leaders there is the “imperative to create one’s self as an exploration of newness and the need to reach out for relationship with others to create systems” (p. 348). This sense of and living in relationship means that one must “be aware that all human endeavor, including business, is a part of the larger and richer fabric of the whole universe” (Zohar, 2002, p. 120). At a level of practicing servant-leadership, a universal and relational awareness plays out via systems thinking.

Systems theory is “about understanding relationships – between people, processes, structures, belief systems and a host of other factors” (Sipe & Frick, 2009, p. 139), and about an “awareness of interdependency” (Senge, 1995, p. 225). The

servant-leader is concerned about systemic change; something that Kim (2004) believes requires one to operate at the level of mental models. Mental models represent “our deep beliefs about how the world works and how things ought to be”, while to “engage at this level means that we must take reflective actions” (p. 212). According to Sipe and Frick (2009), the servant-leader is a systems thinker; a characteristic that allows one to “see things whole” (p. 137). This sense of wholeness, interdependency, and attention to systemic change reflects a new paradigm that is associated with servant-leadership.

The new paradigm is often set in contrast to the old paradigm; one marked by rigidity, control, linear thought, and stasis (McGee-Cooper, 1998; Smith, 1995; Wheatley, 1998). Smith (1995) identifies three values synonymous within the old paradigm, which are the values of right-wrong, objectivism, and equilibrium (p. 203); while Wheatley (1998) compares the old paradigm with a metaphor of the machine. Conversely, the new paradigm is marked by infinite possibility and a tolerance for ambiguity (Smith, 1995), alongside an acceptance of change, flux, and a never-ending process (McGee-Cooper, 1998). Margaret Wheatley (1998) refers to the new paradigm as a story illustrating the tale of life (p. 344), in which “creative self-expression and embracing systems of relationships are the organizing energies” (p. 344). In the new paradigm there is an embedded accountability that springs forth from an awareness that we are all interconnected and co-creators of our reality (McGee-Cooper, 1998).

Servant-leadership as a process.

Servant-leadership as a process is often described as a journey (Page & Wong, 2000; Palmer, 1998; SanFacon & Spears, 2008; Sipe & Frick, 2009) or a path (Jaworski, 1998; Jones, 2002; Lad & Luechauer, 1998; Lopez, 1995) that individuals must embark upon in their own unique way. Sipe and Frick (2009) remark, “the *journey* is the key for those seekers known as Servant-Leaders” (p. 29). Jaworski (1998) describes a “difficult journey toward self-discovery and lifelong learning” (p. 259), while Palmer (1998) suggests an “inner journey” through which an individual comes to realize that “creation comes out of chaos” (p. 206). Jones (2002) illustrates the journey as “discovering our own voice” (p. 44), which leads one into a life of imagination and creativity. As an outcome of servant-leadership, SanFacon and Spears (2008) suggest, “somewhere along the journey, even though we have been enjoying comfort and material gain under the established order, we become willing to change that order to further a world that works for all” (p. 5).

Block (1998) proposes servant-leadership as an expression of enlightened citizenship, while Lad and Luechauer (1998) remark, “in many ways, servant-leadership is the conscious practice of the Golden Rule” (p. 67). Similarly, for Spears (1998) “servant-leadership is a long-term, transformational approach to life and work – in essence, a way of being – that has the potential for creating change throughout society” (p. 3). McCollum (1998) sees becoming a servant-leader as a “process of learning to balance our thoughts, feelings, and values with our actions. The act of seeking this balance, which requires self-awareness, courage, and independence, is the crucible in which servant-leadership forms” (p. 328). Frick

(1998) describes servant-leadership as a “process of inner growth” and puts forth, “servant-leadership is, first, about deep identity” (p. 354), while Kent Keith (2008), CEO of the Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership, echoes this in a cautionary note, that servant-leadership is neither about “self-sacrifice” nor “self-denial”, but rather about “self-fulfillment.”

The notion of change as an outcome of the journey is echoed often via the phrase “the process of change starts in here, in the servant, not out there” (Rieser, 1995, p. 56). The journey is very much a move toward greater individual and collective responsibility and accountability. Gardner (1998) suggests “a revolution is needed in how we relate to each other as people and how we relate to the whole of creation” (p. 116), while Palmer (1998) emphasizes a “revolution in the sphere of human consciousness” (p. 198). This change toward a heightened consciousness is connected somewhat to the notion of lifelong learning, which, according to Senge (1995) cannot occur without significant changes to our education process. McCollum (1995) sees this change as part of a continuum, in which “change is growth; growth is learning; learning is adaptation” (p. 255). Growth, learning, and adaptation can unfold only once an individual has embarked upon a specific path.

The path of servant-leadership offers no single framework or template ready for mimicry (Jones, 2002; Sipe & Frick, 2009). In quoting the Spanish poet Antonio Machado, Jones (2002) suggests “you make the path by walking” (p. 43). Jaworski (1998) alludes to a “path that reveals itself as we walk along. Following the path requires us to be fully awake, filled with a sense of wonder, acutely aware of everything occurring around us...” (p. 266). This “path to servant-leadership seems

(*sic*) to focus on the developing or deepening of new skills; those developed from other than the rational and that are relational in nature” (Lopez, 1995, p. 151). Spears (1998) stresses that this development is part of a “long-term, transformational approach to life and work” (p. 3), which Frick (2011) describes as a “becoming that never ends” (p. 6). For servant-leadership, we take the journey toward growth and learning along our own path, but we do so in chorus with others engaged in the process of expanded consciousness and understanding. This heightened awareness is often referred to as being in *service* to our higher *calling* or purpose.

Servant-leadership as service.

The notion of servant-leadership as service often refers to (a) the individual as a servant, (b) an individual’s calling or purpose, or (c) a broad description of the notion of service. The connecting of service to the individual as servant is perhaps due to Greenleaf’s (1991) most used passage, which describes the servant-leader as servant first. Sipe and Frick (2009) describe the concept of servant well, in that “when we act as a servant to others, we are concerned with the full-range of their knowledge, skills, emotional and behavioural dynamics” (p. 39). From this understanding, they illustrate a servant who *serves* by means of their presence and listening (p. 36). Rieser (1995) conceives of what he calls the “servant within, who is there to help to serve both you and me... the key to my relationship with myself, with other humans, and perhaps with creation” (p. 49). The idea or concept of servant refers not only to a desire or feeling to serve others, but also to a desire or feeling to be of service to something “greater than oneself” (Sipe & Frick, 2009, p.

30). Prosser (2010) identifies this as a “commitment from the dominant idea of serving one’s fellow human beings” (p. 32). The image of service being something larger than oneself is often present when picturing service as a calling.

Service as a calling – first popularized by Barbuto and Wheeler (2002) – has been described as being cognizant of one’s social responsibilities (Graham, 1991), as a “passionate lure to the highest level of fulfillment” (Sipe & Frick, 2009, p. 32), or as something that “involves a sense of interconnectedness between the internal self and the external world (Sendjaya, Sarros, & Santora, 2008, p. 408). SanFacon and Spears (2008) suggest, “we are called to serve all – ourselves, our loved ones, our neighbours, our tribe, our people, other peoples, future generations, other life forms, living systems, and even creation itself” (p. 5).

This seems rather daunting, but illustrates well the on-going, lifelong journey associated with one’s calling or purpose, that Bordas (1995) describes as beginning “with the desire to connect with the ‘greatest good,’ both within oneself and society” (p. 180). Jaworski (1998) goes so far as to say that it is “the responsibility of servant-leaders to discover and serve their own destiny and that of their organization” (p. 267), and that “we refuse the call because deep down we know that to cooperate with fate brings not only great personal power, but great personal responsibility as well” (p. 261). This perhaps sums up best the calling of the servant-leader, one that evokes and elicits great responsibility. For some, the responsibility is so great that the servant is viewed as “a servant of the vacuum, a servant of the manifold potentiality at the heart of existence” (Zohar, 2002, p. 112).

Margaret Wheatley (1999), internationally known for her work in organizational theory, paraphrases Greenleaf's (1991) words that "servant-leadership starts with a feeling", to which she adds "a desire to serve others that then becomes a commitment to move that desire into practice, to actually take on the great courageous task of serving others" (p. 5). Much like the sentiment described by Wheatley, Page and Wong (2000) position servant-leadership as an "attitude toward the responsibilities of leadership as much as it is a style of leadership" (p. 71). This notion of servant-leadership as an attitude or feeling seems quite common, leading us into a discussion of servant-leadership as a way of being.

Servant-leadership as a way of being.

A way of being is perhaps one of the most common descriptions used when communicating what servant-leadership is (Batten, 1998; Block, 1998; Bordas, 1995; DiStefano, 1995; Farling, Stone, & Winston, 1999; Ferch, 2004; Frick, 1998, 2011; Gardner, 1998; Jaworski, 1998, 2002; Jeffries, 1998; Jones, 2002; Keith, 2008; Lopez, 1995; McCollum, 1995, 1998; McGee-Cooper, 1998; Page & Wong, 2000; Palmer, 1998; Patterson, 2003; Prosser, 2010; Russell, 2001; SanFacon & Spears, 2008; Senge, 1995; Sipe & Frick, 2009; Spears, 1998; Wallace, 2007; Wheatley, 1999; Zohar, 2002). Some common aspects associated with this description are awareness (Jaworski, 2002; Jones, 2002; McGee-Cooper, 1998; SanFacon & Spears, 2008; Zohar, 2002), self-awareness (Jones, 2002; Keith, 2008; Lopez, 1995; Palmer, 1998), reflection (Block, 1998; SanFacon & Spears, 2008; Wheatley, 1999), openness (Batten, 1998; McCollum, 1995; Spears, 1998; Wheatley, 1999), listening (Frick, 2011; Jaworski, 2002; Jeffries, 1998), dialogue (Block, 1998; Ferch, 2004;

Lad & Luechauer, 1998; McGee-Cooper, 1998; SanFacon & Spears, 2008; Senge, 1995), living in the question (Block, 1998; Jones, 2002), an attitude of responsibility (Page & Wong, 2000; Patterson, 2003; Smith, 1995), an unqualified acceptance of others (McGee-Cooper, 1998; Russell, 2001; SanFacon & Spears, 2008; Sendjaya, Sarros, & Santora, 2008; Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2004), a worldview (Wallace, 2007), creativity (Jones, 2002; Wheatley, 1999), a disposition of the heart (Jones, 2002; Prosser, 2010), and presence (Frick, 2011; SanFacon & Spears, 2008; Sipe & Frick, 2009). Awareness, openness, listening, an unqualified acceptance of others, and dialogue seem to emerge throughout the literature as important topics relevant to the servant-leadership way of being.

Awareness is described by Frick (2011) as “the lifeblood of a leader’s ‘lead’” (p. 17), and is applicable to notions of self, other, environment, society, and life itself. Awareness is said to lead “to *presence*, the state of being fully available in the moment to one’s environment and to other people” (p. 18). It also involves a self-awareness that “includes knowledge of the impact that one’s words and deeds have on others” (Keith, 2008, p. 36), indicating an understanding of ourselves as co-creators in the universe (Zohar, 2002), or a deepening sense of what is unfolding around us in the universe (Jones, 2002). Awareness fosters an understanding of our inner and outer lives (McCollum, 1998), and is a manner of being that eschews dogma while embracing openness.

Openness is said to be one of the hallmarks of servant-leadership (McCollum, 1995). It is as much an approach to the world as it is an approach to examining and to questioning one’s beliefs on a perpetual basis. Openness is in one’s attitude

toward newness and creativity, and a welcoming of diversity and surprise (Wheatley, 1999). It's about opening ourselves to others (McCollum, 1998), and having the courage to keep our hearts open even with the risks involved (Wheatley, 1999). Gardner (1998) describes it as being "open in mind and body and heart" (p. 124). One is open to being in the process, open to transformation, and open to change (Sipe & Frick, 2009), while also keeping "an open and flexible mind", with the realization that an "open mind grows" and a "closed mind dies" (Batten, 1998, p. 48). McCollum (1995) considers openness as "listening from the other's perspective" (p. 255), an aspect perhaps most connected to servant-leadership.

Listening goes beyond conventional notions of merely hearing what others are saying, requiring that one is open to others and to self-reflection. Sipe and Frick (2009) describe listening as "getting in touch with one's inner voice and seeking to understand what one's body, mind, and spirit are communicating... It requires listening to oneself first and nurturing an emerging complexity of integration" (p. 58). Listening means first and foremost that one is willing to begin with questions (Keith, 2008), and that one is able to "ask questions in a spirit of open inquiry and wonder" (p. 19). Willingness to question allows one to live in ambiguity, to "express doubt and to live without answers" (Block, 1998, p. 93). Jaworski (1998) describes a "willingness to listen, yield, and respond to the inner voice that guides us toward our destiny" (p. 261). Listening provides access to our intuition, and is "also a key way through which leaders demonstrate respect and appreciation of others" (Russell, 2001, p. 80).

An unqualified acceptance of others for who they are (Lopez, 1995; Sendjaya, Sarros, & Santora, 2008) and an unconditional concern for others (Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2004) are achieved through the act of listening. McGee-Cooper (1998) extends this acceptance of others to an acceptance of self. Self-acceptance and an acceptance of others lead to a humility in which a person sees oneself from a realistic and forgiving perspective (Ferch, 2004). A way of being marked by acceptance allows for one to communicate in a model of dialogue.

Dialogue, according to Peter Senge offers some interesting insights into the nature of communication, suggesting the servant-leader enters into conversation in the *spirit* of dialogue. Senge (1995) puts forth “the original meaning of the word ‘dia-logos’ was meaning moves through or flow of meaning”, which he contrasts with the word discussion, meaning literally “to heave one’s views at the other” (p. 226). Many describe the practice of servant-leadership as engaging in dialogue (Block, 1998; Ferch, 2004; Jeffries, 1998; Lad & Luechauer, 1998; McGee-Cooper, 1998). For the servant-leader “dialogue requires that I reveal my logic and hold up my assumptions and beliefs, rather than my arguments, for public scrutiny” (McCollum, 1998, p. 338). Ferch (2004) suggests that “in meaningful dialogue the servant as leader submits to a higher perspective, one that can be pivotal to the development of the self in relation to others” (p. 235). Dialogue as an aspect of the servant-leadership way of being depends upon the practicing of awareness, openness, listening, and an acceptance of others.

The preceding descriptions of the secondary literature extant servant-leadership speak to a variety of perspectives related to the concept. The next

section provides a reflection on the perspectives of those who view servant-leadership as a theory of leadership that lends itself to the creation of measurable constructs.

Servant-Leadership as a Measurable Construct

There are no less than eleven different constructs created by different authors seeking to measure servant-leadership; many of whom lambast the servant-leadership literature for an anecdotal and philosophical focus that lacks empirically validated and testable constructs (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Farling, Stone, & Winston, 1999; Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008; Page & Wong, 2000; Russell & Stone, 2002; Sendjaya, 2003; Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002; Sendjaya, Sarros, & Santora, 2008; Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2004; Van Dierendonck, 2011; Wallace, 2007; Washington, Sutton, & Field, 2006).

According to this camp, the lack of empirical research on servant-leadership is explained by the fact that there is no agreed upon theoretical framework for use in creating a definition of the concept (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Farling, Stone, & Winston, 1999; Page & Wong, 2000; Wallace, 2007; Van Dierendonck, 2011). Avolio, Walumba, and Weber (2009) caution the “measurement of servant leadership is problematic” as a result of “problems with its definition” (p. 437). In describing the literature on servant-leadership Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) state, “most papers have stand-alone qualities, but the work to date has not evolved, with seemingly more differentiation than integration in the literature” (p. 303). As we will see, there have been many attempts to create a measurable construct of the concept, despite an acknowledged lack of definition or conceptual foundation.

The first attempt to describe servant-leadership was put forth by Spears (1995), which Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) refer to as “the closest representation of an articulated framework for what characterizes servant leadership” (p. 302). Spears (1995) identified ten servant-leader characteristics as; listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and community building. Page and Wong (2000), in an extensive survey of general leadership theory, created a construct for measuring servant-leadership around the characteristics of; integrity, humility, servanthood, caring for others, empowering others, developing others, visioning, goal setting, leading, modeling, team building, and shared decision-making. They make it clear that they were careful to build upon the earlier framework developed by Spears, in an effort to “strip servant-leadership of its mystery and reduce it to quantifiable key components” (p. 88).

Around the same time as Page and Wong, Barbuto and Wheeler (2002) offered a construct that added the dimension of *calling* to Spears’ ten characteristics, which they view as “fundamental to servant leadership and consistent with Greenleaf’s original message” (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006, p. 303). Following their work identifying eleven characteristics, Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) performed a factor analysis, which found altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship as being “conceptually and empirically distinct” (p. 318). The preceding authors made attempts to build from Spears’ (1995) work, though other constructs of servant-leadership seem to be less connected to his pioneering efforts.

Russell and Stone (2002) differentiate between what they call functional attributes (vision, honesty, integrity, trust, service, modeling, pioneering, appreciation of others, and empowerment) and accompanying attributes (communication, credibility, competence, stewardship, visibility, influence, persuasion, listening, encouragement, teaching, and delegation). In response, authors have commented that there is a lack of understanding as to what constitutes either a functional or accompanying attribute (Van Dierendonck, 2011). Farling, Stone, and Winston (1999), preceding the work of Russell and Stone, provide a somewhat similar list, suggesting servant-leadership contains the variables of “vision, influence, credibility, trust, and service” (p. 51).

Patterson (2003) and Laub (2003) offer constructs emerging from PhD dissertation work. Patterson (2003) identifies seven virtuous constructs as: agapao love, humility, altruism, vision, trust, empowerment, and service. Laub (2003) created the Organizational Leadership Assessment model from his dissertation work on servant-leadership, in which he describes a servant-leadership as: valuing people, developing people, building community, displaying authenticity, providing leadership, and sharing leadership.

Liden et al. (2008) return to a definition of the construct based on Spears’ ten characteristics, in which they identify nine dimensions of servant-leadership as: emotional healing, creating value for the community, conceptual skills, empowering, helping subordinates grow and succeed, putting subordinates first, behaving ethically, relationship, and servanthood. Their use of the term *subordinates* in lieu of *followers* would lead many servant-leadership scholars to give pause. Nonetheless,

their work does identify “the relationships that form between leaders and followers as central to servant leadership” (p. 162).

Sendjaya et al. (2008) claim to have developed a holistic construct of servant-leadership, identified by six dimensions that are: voluntary subordination, authentic self, covenantal relationship, responsible morality, transcendental spirituality, and transforming influence. However, the holistic nature of their framework is not clear given their assertion that servant-leadership originates in the teachings of Jesus Christ; discounting the conceptualization according to Robert K. Greenleaf (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002). Further, the dimension of voluntary subordination, as with Liden et al.’s use of the term subordinates above, would give some servant-leadership scholars pause (Keith, 2008).

Clearly, there is a vast and wide array of dimensions, attributes, characteristics that are believed to represent a measureable construct of servant-leadership. Van Dierendonck (2011) attempts to provide clarity to the subject by differentiating between “antecedents, behaviors, mediating processes, and outcomes” (p. 27). His analysis provides six key servant-leader characteristics as: empowering and developing people, humility, authenticity, interpersonal acceptance, providing direction, and stewardship. Time will tell as to the degree to which his synthesis and analysis are agreed upon amongst servant-leadership scholars, though it seems that his theoretical framework provides a good foundation.

Given the necessity for the advancement of an acknowledged definition or conceptual foundation, much disparity and lack of consensus still exists. Patterson

(2003) raises the question as to whether servant-leadership “is indeed a viable theory, a subset of another theory such as transformational leadership, or just merely a conceptual idea” (p. 1). Polleys (2002) also ponders the theoretical foundations of servant-leadership and concludes; “development of a theory of servant-leadership is probably not plausible” (p. 125), though servant-leadership as “a foundational philosophy for the theories that emphasize principles congruent with human growth” (p. 125) is more likely.

DiStefano (1995) posits the lack of consensus regarding a measurable construct of servant-leadership is a result of the unique nature of the servant-leader journey for each individual. Beazley and Beggs (2002) echo this sentiment stating, “no precise formula guides its implementation. Its expression is always an individual experience based on the person’s unique set of skills or talents” (p. 56). Frick (1998) cautions that any attempt to fix certain characteristics or attributes to servant-leadership runs the risk of reducing it to an easily applied formula; thus bypassing the lifelong inner journey that one embarks on toward an understanding and practice of the concept.

As illustrated in the secondary literature extant to servant-leadership, there is a wide scope of perceptions regarding the foundations of the concept. Perhaps, as more thought is given to understanding the conceptual foundations of servant-leadership, an agreed upon theoretical framework may one day be possible (Polleys, 2002). The lack of a common understanding regarding what constitutes servant-leadership, as either a concept or as a measurable construct, indicates that a turn to the work of Robert K. Greenleaf may be prudent. It may be that current

interpretations of servant-leadership have managed to drift away from the intent of his original message, making the case for at least an exploration of the idea.

This chapter has reviewed the literature in two steps. The first was to describe the literature according to Greenleaf, while the second was to describe the secondary literature according to the perspective of those other than Robert K. Greenleaf. The next chapter presents the method used for this study.

Chapter 3: Research Method

The method for this study is informed by a qualitative approach to research that is concerned with context and process (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Qualitative inquiry seeks to find meaning in experience, and recognizes that all knowing and forms of inquiry are interpretive (Creswell, 2009; Giarelli & Chambliss, 1988; Noblit & Hare, 1988; Shank, 2006). Sherman and Webb (1988) suggest that, “qualitative inquiry seeks possibilities in experience... or relationships among events” (p. 6). Relationships and possibilities emerge as themes, perspectives, or concepts, all of which serve as metaphors for qualitative inquiry (Noblit & Hare, 1988).

Qualitative research can be seen as a continuous process to define and redefine the problem (Sherman & Webb, 1988). A research study is said to merit a qualitative approach when little is known or understood about a concept or phenomenon (Creswell, 2009). Qualitative research “embraces new ways of looking at the world” (Shank, 2006, p. 10), with the goals of “insight, enlightenment, and illumination” (p. 14) in mind as desired outcomes. However, a qualitative approach to research sometimes faces challenges, captured well in a description of qualitative research as:

A form of social and human science research that does not have firm guidelines or specific procedures and is evolving and changing constantly. This complicates telling others how one plans to conduct a study and how others might judge it when the study is done.

(Creswell, 1998, p. 17)

There are many approaches available for a researcher to study an individual or group of individuals. The researcher looks for the “essential, invariant structure (or essence) or the central underlying meaning of the experience” (Creswell, 1998, p. 52), attempting to gain insight into how individuals construct and interpret reality (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975; Creswell, 2009; Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). She or he does this by “relying on intuition, imagination, and universal structures to obtain a picture of the experience” (Creswell, 1998, p. 52). Furthermore, according to Creswell, Hanson, Plano Clark, and Morale (2007), qualitative approaches are appropriate to generate the level of data detail and description for five types of research questions, the fourth of which is “essence questions” focusing on one phenomena (p. 239).

Reflective Analysis

According to Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007), analysis for qualitative research can utilize procedures of reflective analysis, described as “a process in which the researcher relies primarily on intuition and judgment in order to portray or evaluate the phenomenon being studied” (p. 472). Reflective analysis usually “involves a decision by the researcher to rely on their own intuition and personal judgment to analyze the data rather than on technical procedures involving an explicit category classification system” (p. 472). This is consistent with a more general approach in qualitative research in which “standards are largely related to the researcher’s interpretation” (Creswell, 1998, p. 207).

In a reflective analysis “the researcher carefully examines and then re-examines all the data that have been collected. As this process continues, certain

features of the phenomenon are likely to become salient” (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007, p. 473). In a similar fashion, Creswell (1998) describes a process in which one “reflects on his or her own description and uses imaginative variation or structural description, seeking all possible meanings and divergent perspectives, varying the frames of reference about the phenomenon, and constructing a description of how the phenomenon was experienced” (p. 150). Following this iterative process “the researcher then constructs an overall description of the meaning and the essence of the experience” (p. 150), and does so by means of “an ongoing process involving continual reflection” (Creswell, 2009, p. 184).

In a general description of potential levels of analysis (to be taken in a non-linear sense), Creswell (2009) suggests that the researcher (a) organizes and prepares the data for analysis, (b) reads through all the data in order to obtain a general sense, (c) with a sense of the whole begins to cluster similar topics, (d) shapes clusters into general descriptions or themes, (e) advances how the description and themes will be represented in the qualitative narrative, and (f) makes an interpretation or meaning of the data (pp. 185-189).

Dependability and Credibility

Qualitative researchers tend to speak of quantitative concepts like reliability and validity in terms of dependability and transferability (Shank, 2006). For qualitative researchers, “verification and standards are largely related to the researcher’s interpretation” (Creswell, 1998, p. 207). Shank (2006) suggests, “the key strategy for ensuring dependability is an audit trail. With an audit trail, there is a clear and constant path between the collection of the data and its use” (p. 114).

Shank also refers to transferability suggesting, “the primary tool for establishing transferability is the use of adequate and detailed description in laying out all the relevant details of the research process” (p. 115).

Credibility is described as an aspect of qualitative research method that enhances the trustworthiness of a study (Denzin, 1994; Guba, 1981). Janesick (1994), in discussing the credibility of a study states, “qualitative research has to do with description and explanation, and whether or not a given explanation fits a given description” (p. 216). A researcher can establish the credibility of a study by means of a prolonged exposure to a phenomenon, triangulation of sources, peer debriefing, and clarifying the bias of an author (Creswell, 2009; Guba, 1981).

Role of the Researcher

According to Creswell (2009) it is common practice for a qualitative researcher to “explicitly identify reflexively their biases, values, and personal background, such as gender, history, culture, and socioeconomic status, that may shape their interpretations formed during a study” (p. 177). The idea behind doing so is the belief that the purposeful and interpretive nature of qualitative inquiry tacitly embeds the researcher within the research.

Therefore, I am a white male in my thirties, married with two children and currently living in subsidized housing. I grew up not of privilege, though felt neither the horrid affects of starvation nor wanting. As the eldest of five I have been thrust into roles of responsibility for the bulk of my life. My scholarly and leisure based pursuits have been self-financed via a myriad of jobs ranging from truck driver to camp counselor to housepainter to youth leader to bartender to tree-planter. It has

been an eclectic life to date, marked by variety and flux. I am a graduate student in Leadership Studies at the University of Victoria, and have presented at two international conferences on the topic of servant-leadership. I am the sole researcher and interpreter for this research study and have no vested interest in servant-leadership, other than the belief that there is something inherently good about the concept.

Research Procedure Question 1

The first objective of the study was to propose an understanding of the conceptual essence of Greenleaf's (1991, 1996a, 1996b, 1996c, 1996d, 1996e, 1996f, 1996g, 1996h, 1996j, 1996k, 1996m, 1996n, 1996o) original work. Thus follows a description of the research procedure seeking an answer to: What is Greenleaf's conceptualization of the nature and essence of servant-leadership as communicated in his 1991 work, and in his early essays collected in *On Becoming a Servant-Leader* (1996)?

Data collection.

The research began with collecting and organizing data located in *The Servant as Leader* (Greenleaf, 1991) and a collection of early Greenleaf essays in *On Becoming a Servant-leader* (Frick & Spears, 1996). These works do not represent the entirety of Greenleaf's writing, though were chosen because of the clarity with which they spoke directly to servant-leadership. *The Servant as Leader* is the most widely used and disseminated work on servant-leadership, while the collection of essays in *On Becoming a Servant-Leader* reflect some of Greenleaf's thoughts and ideas written before *The Servant as Leader*. These works provide a depiction of

Greenleaf's writing that is both broad and deep, reflecting the many layers present in his thinking. The essays collected in *On Becoming a Servant-Leader* originate at different points in time before the publication of *The Servant as Leader*, illustrating a progression of and continuity to Greenleaf's thought. Such a variety of sources contribute to a triangulation of data collection that is important in validating qualitative research procedures (Creswell, 2009; Guba, 1981).

Data reduction and analysis.

The collected data were read through in order to obtain what Creswell (2009) refers to as a "general sense of the information and to reflect on its overall meaning" (p. 185). This process of reading through the data was repeated in order to ensure a general sense or feeling for the meaning of the text. I then identified important passages within the texts, and condensed *The Servant as Leader* down to about 10 pages from 40 pages, and condensed *On Becoming a Servant-leader* down from over 300 pages to about 40 pages. A passage was deemed as important if it spoke directly to the concept of servant-leadership, rather than something tangential and loosely connected. This was accomplished by means of intuitive judgement and the sensing of patterns from within the text, which is consistent with the procedure of reflective analysis.

Once I had collected my data from the original text, I then re-commenced a process of reading and re-reading without making notes, in order to once again obtain a general sense and appreciation for the wholeness of the text. After the fifth reading, I began to underline passages that seemed important or that I was interpreting as emerging patterns from within the text. I then began to create a list

of terms from the text on a separate piece of paper. I would revisit this list before subsequent readings in order to check that I was indeed sensing a pattern or to discern that an item was not as prominent as I had initially interpreted. It is important to note, that anywhere from one to three days would pass between each reading. This was done in an attempt to allow the substance of the text to penetrate my subconscious and to allow time for the intuitive process of understanding to occur.

The process of reflective analysis recurred close to 15 times, at which point I was comfortable that I had exhausted my interpretive capacities. Topics were grouped into similar categories, with each remaining true to the language found within the original text. Some topics were subsumed into others, such as the topic of self-awareness that was interpreted to belong to a broader category that was named awareness. Each repetition provided new insight and illuminated topics that had yet to emerge. The process stopped when I was no longer discovering new topics, at which point I set out to create descriptions that could be presented in a narrative. The process is somewhat described by the analogy of peeling back the onion, by which researchers move “deeper and deeper into understanding the data... and making an interpretation of the larger meaning of the data” (Creswell, 2009, p. 183).

I ended up with eight essential elements of the phenomenon according to the textual data. Over the period of about a week I would visit and revisit the list to see if anything felt out of place. Eventually I became comfortable with the list as it stood, and then set out to find examples from within the text that could expand a

description of each element. These descriptions would then provide the basis for which the essence could be used for an exploration of the secondary literature.

Dependability and credibility.

Several means were taken to ensure dependability and credibility in the research procedure and product for question one. First, multiple sources of information were used with an aim toward triangulating the data collection process. Second, peer reviewers familiar with servant-leadership were consulted during the process of discerning the meaning and essence of Greenleaf's work. Third, Dr. Carolyn Crippen, an expert in the field of servant-leadership, provided guidance and critique at various intervals during the reflective process. Fourth, the researcher's exposure to and immersion in the subject of servant-leadership lasted over the course of several years, providing a prolonged exposure to the topic of study. Lastly, the essence of servant-leadership as I had interpreted from Greenleaf's work was presented to a group of peers at an international leadership conference, allowing opportunity for public discourse and scrutiny.

Research Procedure Question 2

The second objective of the study was to explore the secondary literature extant to servant-leadership and to describe how the essence of Greenleaf's conceptualization, as I have proposed, is reflected. Thus follows a description of the research procedure seeking an answer to: How does the secondary literature extant to servant-leadership over the last 40 years reflect the essence of Greenleaf's conceptualization as I have discerned from Question 1?

Data collection.

The secondary literature for this research project was collected using library databases for article and book retrieval, Google web search engines, Google Scholar, servant-leadership website scanning, and reverse reference checking for major works in the field. Either *servant-leader* or *servant-leadership* was used as a search engine term, while journals specific to popular fields of application in business, nursing, and education were visually scanned manually for content. Some 120 articles were initially found on the topic, coupled with approximately another 50 chapters and books on the subject – a process that spanned the course of nearly three years.

Articles from scholarly journals and chapters from entire books on servant leadership were deemed as acceptable. Similar to the reverse reference check was the use of a *times cited* feature of Google Scholar, which helped to determine prominent works in the field. In some cases papers from peer reviewed conference proceedings were admitted, while on-line articles and popular press were not deemed as suitable for this project. Literature that spoke directly to servant-leadership was chosen, while works with tangential or loose connections to servant-leadership were not.

Data reduction and analysis.

The analysis of the data for the second research question took place in two stages. First, I sought to gain an understanding of the secondary literature extant to servant-leadership and to organize it a manner that was useful for analysis and exploration. Second, I sought to explore the secondary literature for representation

of the eight essential elements of servant-leadership, as I had discerned from Greenleaf's work in answer to question one.

Following the collection of secondary literature and the identification of prominent works, I engaged in an initial reading to develop a sense of and to immerse myself into the literature. After a first reading, I re-read the collected literature and began to transcribe important passages that spoke directly and clearly to servant-leadership, ending up with approximately 50 pages of notes. I then read and re-read through these notes somewhere in the neighbourhood of five times, once again seeking to discern a general sense of the larger context.

After many readings and reflective iterations, I began to organize the secondary literature into similar topics or clusters, with an aim to assist both the reader and myself in navigating the information. I did this by keeping a running list of topics that I would refer to, adjust, and confer with during the reflective process. In the end, seven clusters emerged, which supported the grouping of like topics and subjects. The purpose for doing this was for literary device and to provide a structured and organized framework from which a reflective analysis exploring representation of the essential elements could commence. Following the organization and reduction of the secondary literature, I proceeded to use reflective analysis deductively. That is my eight essences, as discerned from Greenleaf's work in answer to question one, became my theoretical lens through which I read the reduced secondary literature.

At this point in the process, I read through the reduced secondary literature looking for representation of Greenleaf's essence of servant-leadership as I had

discerned. I read and re-read the condensed secondary literature approximately five times to gain a sense of its meaning and context. Once I felt familiar with and connected to the secondary literature I then began to read through the 50 pages of notes exploring the text for representation of the eight essential elements as I had identified in question one.

I created a mental map on flipchart paper consisting of each essential element, to which I added examples from the secondary literature as they were discovered. I repeated this process approximately 10 times until no new representation emerged. This process spanned the course of close to one month, with roughly 2 to 3 days interspersed between readings to allow for the intuitive process. During the later stages of this iterative process I would look more intentionally for representation of elements for which I had yet to find many examples of. This was done to ensure that my findings for representation were not the results of my own biased perceptions, and to ensure that I was exploring the secondary literature for each of the eight essential elements equally.

Dependability and credibility.

Several strategies were employed to ensure dependability and credibility for the research procedure and product relative to question two. First, secondary literature was collected over the course of three years, providing a prolonged immersion and exposure to the topic. Second, over the course of those three years, peers and experts on servant-leadership were consulted for advice as to prominent literature that was important to the study of servant-leadership. Third, Dr. Carolyn Crippen provided guidance and feedback during the processes of organizing the

secondary literature and for the reflective analysis seeking reflection of the essential elements within said literature. Fourth, my wife who has become well versed in the subject of servant-leadership, provided many an evening discussion and debate over the mental mapping of and organizing of the secondary literature. And lastly, the continual process of reflective analysis allowed for the constant checking and questioning of meaning as it developed and emerged.

This chapter has described the qualitative method used for this study by means of reflective analysis, and has provided a detailed description of the research procedures for question one and question two. The next chapter presents the finding for this study.

Chapter 4: Findings

This chapter has been divided into two sections. The first of which describes the findings for question one, followed by a second describing the findings for question two. The findings for question one present the essence of Greenleaf's conceptualization of servant-leadership as I have discerned, while question two presents an exploration of the secondary literature seeking to describe how the essence as I have discerned is reflected.

Question 1

- What is Greenleaf's conceptualization of the nature and essence of servant-leadership as communicated in his 1991 work, and in his early essays collected in *On Becoming a Servant-Leader* (1996)?

An in-depth exploration of Greenleaf's (1991) original essay *The Servant as Leader* and Greenleaf's (1996a, 1996b, 1996c, 1996d, 1996e, 1996f, 1996g, 1996h, 1996j, 1996k, 1996m, 1996n, 1996o) early essays found in *On Becoming a Servant Leader* revealed eight essential elements of the servant-leadership concept. The eight essential elements as I have identified and interpreted by means of reflective analysis are: an attitude of responsibility, listening, awareness, intuitive insight, foresight, creativity, persuasion, and unlimited liability.

An attitude of responsibility.

An attitude of responsibility is the foundation upon which the philosophy of servant-leadership rests. It is an antecedent for building better communities, institutions, and societies. One no longer views oneself as separate from the world, but rather as connected to and in relation with it. Greenleaf's (1991) response to

the turmoil of the 1960s was to insist that individuals angry about the status quo seek to become “affirmative builders of society” (p. 44). One must view the problems and successes of the world as residing *in here* and not *out there*. An attitude of responsibility emerges from an internal seeking rather than external obligations (Greenleaf, 1996b, p. 42). Common to Greenleaf’s writings is the notion that societies, systems, and communities are created because of individuals who act on ideas and *great dreams*. An attitude of responsibility means that “a person think, speak, and act as if personally accountable to all who may be affected by his or her thoughts, words, and deeds” (p. 41). It provides the backbone for a holistic conceptualization of service, and allows one to practice compassion, empathy, and healing.

Listening.

Listening is the key to openness and understanding. It infers standard notions of communication between individuals, but includes ideas like self-reflection, contemplation, meditation, attentiveness, and silence. Greenleaf (1991) was quite forward in suggesting that, “only a true servant responds... by listening first” (p. 18). Listening is described as a discipline, that when practiced could be learned, helping a non-servant become a servant (p. 19). Common to servant-leadership verbiage is the St. Francis prayer “grant that I may not seek so much to be understood as to understand” (p. 19). For Greenleaf, “the search is the thing” (Greenleaf, 1996a, p. 33), and listening provides the starting point for one who is on the searching path. If listening is absent (in its holistic sense) not much of substantive import can proceed.

Awareness.

Awareness offers an approach to knowledge and knowing that straddles the conscious and unconscious mind. Greenleaf (1991) describes these two levels of consciousness as allowing one to be in the *real world* while at the same time being *detached* from it. To be aware requires that “each of us act resolutely on a set of assumptions while at the same time questioning these assumptions” (p. 28).

Awareness includes an openness and acceptance of uncertainty, coupled with the willingness to accept that some of our most cherished *illusions* may be wrong. In a rare judgemental tone Greenleaf suggests that, “dogmatic people in the present, are usually dogmatic about the future – and wrong” (Greenleaf, 1996d, p. 77). The Socratic adage that “the unexamined life is not worth living” is oft connected to the notion of awareness (p. 34). One’s ability to straddle the line between conviction and doubt is instrumental if one desires to maintain a searching approach to knowing and understanding.

Intuitive insight.

Intuitive insight refers to thinking and decision-making processes that rest apart from conventional rational thought. Greenleaf viewed intuitive insight as “the essential artistry in one’s [sic] leadership” (Greenleaf, 1996f, p. 113). The source of information or knowledge accessed for intuitive insight originates from what Greenleaf (1996a) refers to as “below the waterline” (p. 34), or rather from the subconscious. To access this information one is encouraged “to withdraw from the analytical search and allow the unconscious resources to deliver a range of choices” (Greenleaf, 1996h, p. 170). Intuition is seen as a “feel for patterns”, and “the person

who is better at this than most is likely to emerge the leader” (Greenleaf, 1991, p. 24). Intuitive insight requires a certain kind of faith, illustrated by the oft-cited Dean Inge quote that “‘Faith is the choice of the nobler hypothesis.’ Not the noblest, one never really knows what that is” (p. 16).

Foresight.

Foresight might be described as the analytical process of servant-leadership. It is often referred to as the “lead that a leader has,” and that once this lead is gone the person is a leader only in name (Greenleaf, 1991, p. 27). Foresight requires that one conceive of “*now* as a moving concept in which past, present moment, and future are one organic unity” (p. 26). This entails that one be able to disassociate with conventional clock time understanding, and to position oneself as a fluid and evolving participant in life. The leader who can view *now* in its qualitative and contextual sense will be more likely than most to anticipate the future. For Greenleaf, if one can develop foresight “the end result, given enough time, is that one will be known as wise” (Greenleaf, 1996n, p. 321).

Creativity.

Creativity, the process of bridging the conscious and unconscious mind, has been referred to as “the essential structural dynamic of leadership” (Greenleaf, 1991, p. 27). Creativity requires the desire and courage to go out ahead and show the way. It is poignant that Greenleaf devoted so many words to Albert Camus’ final published lecture, entitled *Create Dangerously* (p. 13). The creative impulse acts upon intuitive insight, thus one bears the risk of being wrong. Creativity is one of the most important skills necessary for envisioning and building a better tomorrow,

and must be fostered with vigor and purpose amongst the young. Creativity emerges from one's openness to knowing and unfettered commitment to the search. It is the great leap into the unknown.

Persuasion.

Persuasion might be viewed as the active component of the servant-leadership philosophy. It is the moment at which one seeks to influence others toward a vision or goal. Persuasion is an important element of the philosophy of servant-leadership, insisting one be aware of and a student of issues relevant to power. Greenleaf (1991) saw that "leadership by persuasion has the virtue of change by conviction" (p. 31). Persuasion is said to be when one "arrives at a feeling of rightness about a belief or action through one's own intuitive sense" (Greenleaf, 1996g, p. 139). It is perhaps the most troubling of qualities for individuals working and interacting within traditional institutions, which tend to promote quick decision processes steeped in coercion and manipulation. True persuasion requires time, and is perhaps a goal better to be strived for with knowledge that it might never be obtained. Consensual decision processes support a move toward persuasion.

Unlimited liability.

Unlimited liability is perhaps the ultimate goal of the servant-leadership philosophy. It envisions a world that has moved away from a reliance on justice based notions of ethics toward an ethics of care. Unlimited liability relates to the concept of *love*, and requires that one carry an attitude of responsibility. Greenleaf (1991) believed that "as soon as one's liability for another is qualified to any degree,

love is diminished by that much” (p. 39). Love is viewed as to be in dialogue, a dialogue that seeks understanding and promotes acceptance. Unlimited liability and an attitude of responsibility are the bookends that foster compassion, empathy, healing, and growth. For Greenleaf, “all that is needed to rebuild community... is for enough servant-leaders to show the way... by each servant-leader showing his own unlimited liability for a quite specific community-related group” (p. 40). Unlimited liability must be present in order to make things truly whole.

Taken in concert these eight essential elements provide insight into the origins of the servant-leadership concept by reflecting some of Greenleaf’s original writings on the subject. As described above in the research procedures section, the findings were the result of several years of prolonged exploration using multiple works as sources of information (Creswell, 2009; Guba, 1981). Peer review and expert critique provided checks and balances during the process of developing the findings, while the final product was subject to public discourse and scrutiny at an international leadership conference. These steps allowed me to proceed to the second research question with a confidence in the trustworthiness of the findings.

Question 2

- How does the secondary literature extant to servant-leadership over the last 40 years reflect the essence of Greenleaf’s conceptualization as I have discerned from Question 1?

Once the essential conceptual elements had been discerned from Greenleaf’s work, I was able to explore how those elements were reflected within the secondary

literature extant to servant-leadership. The following section presents each element with a description of the findings based upon the secondary literature.

An attitude of responsibility.

An attitude of responsibility was reflected within the secondary literature in various forms. Page and Wong (2000) refer to “an attitude toward the responsibility of leadership as much as it is a style of leadership” (p. 70). Rieser (1995) speaks of the tendency in servant-leadership for individuals to take responsibility for problems that may arise, something that SanFacon and Spears (2008) extend to a thought process that always takes into account the effects that one’s “actions will have on individual people, families, and the larger families of the community and the world” (p. 151). McGee-Cooper (1998) calls this an “ultimate accountability”, in which one acknowledges “our participation in the bigger picture” (p. 78). Such an orientation, according to Palmer (1998), requires that one “take special responsibility for what’s going on inside his or her own self, inside his or her consciousness” (p. 200).

This broad and all encompassing attitude of responsibility is reflected in the belief that we are the responsible co-creators of our reality (Palmer, 1998; Smith, 1995; Zohar, 2002). It is believed that because we are responsible for the choices we make and the creations we pursue, we must be willing to “take risks and to assume ownership” (Smith, 1995, p. 206). Palmer (1998) believes that “we share responsibility for creating the external world by projecting either a spirit of light or a spirit of shadow on that which is other than us” (p. 200). This leads to what Zohar (2002) views as a “sense of engagement and responsibility, a sense of ‘I have to’” (p.

120), connecting to what some view as a calling or sense of purpose (Bordas, 1995; Jaworski, 1998; Sipe & Frick, 2009).

An attitude of responsibility is reflected in the notion that one is called “to discover and serve their own destiny”; something that Jaworski (1998) suggests brings “great personal responsibility” (p. 261). Sipe and Frick (2009) describe this call to responsibility as an invitation to participate in something larger than oneself, which Bordas (1995) sees as a personal purpose that “begins with the desire to connect with the ‘greatest good’, both within oneself and society” (p. 180). This connection to and responsibility for the greater good then leads one to what Barbuto and Wheeler (2006), Graham (1991), and Patterson (2003) describe as a call to serve. SanFacon and Spears (2008) view this as a calling to “serve all – ourselves, our loved ones, our neighbor, our tribe, our people, other peoples, future generations, other life forms, living systems, and even creation itself” (p. 5). The above represents quite a list that reflects well the extent to which an attitude of responsibility is believed to permeate all aspects of our lives, in thought and action.

Listening.

Listening is reflected in a manner that represented by openness, understanding, and reflection. McCollum (1995) describes an openness to the perspectives of others, while Peck (1995) believes that to really listen, one must be willing “to empty themselves... to give up expectations” leading to an increased level of consciousness (p. 94). The servant-leader always listens first with an open mind and flexible mind (Batten, 1998; Lopez, 1995; Spears, 1995). An open and flexible orientation to others gradually develops into attentiveness of one’s surroundings

(Jeffries, 1998). McCollum (1995) refers to an openness couched in observation that originates from the heart, seeking to truly understand the reality of another.

Ferch (2004) suggests “only one who is a servant is able to approach people first by listening and trying to understand, rather than by trying to problem solve or lead” (p. 232). True listening, he says, has the capacity for building “strength in other people” (p. 232), something that some feel is accomplished by the mere presence that intense and attentive listening creates (Frick, 2011; Gardner, 1998). It is in listening that “servant leaders seek to understand and empathize with others in order to identify and clarify the will of their group” (Washington, Sutton, & Field, 2006, p. 702). Listening requires the “willingness to supplement – and transcend – personal ego with an interest in and desire to understand others” (Sipe & Frick, 2009, p. 58). In seeking to understand beyond one’s own perceptions, one must “learn to listen, ask questions, express doubt, and live without answers” (Block, 1998). Something Jaworski (1998) extends to “a willingness to listen, yield, and respond to the inner voice that guides us toward our destiny” (p. 261).

Cory (1998) suggests listening to our inner voice is necessary so that we may be cognizant of our responsibility for what we are and what we create. Bordas (1995) believes that such a “self-insight can only be born in silence – we must withdraw into the deeper well of ourselves” (p. 185). Sipe and Frick (2009) describe the necessity for “self-reflection; that is, getting in touch with one’s inner voice and seeking to understand what one’s body, mind, and spirit are communicating... it requires listening to oneself first” (p. 58). It is through this act of self-reflection, or listening to oneself, that we can begin to engage in a “process of learning to balance

our thoughts, feelings, and values with our actions”, a balance that is viewed as a “crucible of servant-leadership” (p. 328). Frick (2011) refers to a spiritual journey when one listens with the “mind, senses, heart, and spirit” (p. 16), while Wheatley (1999) urges “we must take time to reflect”, suggesting to do so is a “revolutionary act” (p. 3) in these troubled times.

Awareness.

Awareness is reflected as an acknowledgement of the interconnected nature of our co-created reality, in which “a servant-leader cultivates heightened awareness, allowing him to see connections between history, people, events, possibilities, and deep intuition” (Sipe & Frick, 2009, p. 137). Such awareness requires an understanding of the relationship between “people, processes, structures, belief systems, and a host of other factors” (p. 139). Jaworski (1998) describes a shift in our understanding from an atomized view of things to a notion “that everything is connected to everything else and that relationship is the organizing principle of the universe. Instead of seeing the universe as mechanistic, fixed, and determined, we begin to see it as open, dynamic, and alive” (p. 261).

Gardner (1998) refers to “interrelatedness” and a “deep internal awareness of the whole” (p. 117), which are fundamental realizations for what Senge (1995) believes are the foundational building blocks of organizations, such that “our institutions might be in deeper harmony with our emerging understanding of the physical universe and a more positive force in our increasingly interdependent world” (p. 225). Smith (1995) sees a change in awareness that “involves seeing and embracing the power of relationships.... the relationship one has with oneself; that

one has with others; that occur between teams, areas, departments, and divisions within organizations; and that occur among organizations within society” (p. 213).

Such an orientation is connected to an awareness that “we participate in creating the future, not by trying to impose our will on it, but by deepening our collective understanding of what wants to emerge in the world, and then having the courage to do what is required” (Jaworski, 1998, p. 266). One’s courage is bolstered by the belief that “external reality does not impinge upon us as a prison or as an ultimate constraint” (Palmer, 1998, p. 199). Instead, an awareness emerges that we are the co-creators of our existence (Zohar, 2002), requiring that one is comfortable with and able to live with a large amount of uncertainty (Jones, 2002; Spears, 1995).

This uncertainty is described as “living in the question”, cultivating a capacity to “let go of what we believe *ought* to be happening, and in doing so we will discover a deepening awareness of what is already trying to happen naturally in our life” (p. 42). Sipe and Frick (2009) suggest “a Servant-Leader is not comfortable with complexity because he has figured out all the answers, but because he can live with the remaining questions and trusts that it is possible to *live into* new answers” (p. 140).

Intuitive insight.

Intuitive insight is reflected as a feel for patterns, a sense of the unknown, and as an important aspect of decision making. Intuition, when viewed as a feel for patterns, allows one to gain a sense for and to access the unknown and the unseen (Bordas, 1995; Rieser, 1995). Rieser (1995) purports that “there has been serious neglect of the intuitive and spontaneous side of our nature” (p. 58). To which Sipe

and Frick (2009) assert, “one of Greenleaf’s major contributions to business thought was explaining the importance of reflection and intuition” (p. 9). They go on to suggest “knowing how to access intuition is a prerequisite for developing foresight, and for that matter, fully understanding Servant Leadership” (p. 106). SanFacon and Spears (2008) and VanDierendonck (2011) agree that intuitive insight is an important skill for developing foresight. Bordas (1995) puts forth that “intuition is independent of our reasoning process. It is the ability to discern knowledge from within ourselves” (p. 182), though “to develop intuition, we must learn to trust our hunches, perceptions, and feelings” (p. 189).

The ability to trust our intuitive hunches and to act on them gives us the capacity to “bridge the gaps” in conscious decision making (Bordas, 1995, p. 354). Something Jaworski (1998) views as “our ability to ‘intuit the gap’ between what conscious rational thought tells us and what we need to know, between what is and what can be” (p. 266). Sipe and Frick (2009) see this aspect of decision making as most problematic for some, as it “requires taking time away from the matter to gain perspective and to draw upon the wisdom of intuition” (p. 9). McCollum (1998) suggests the intuitive aspect of decision making “requires an awareness and understanding of our inner life” (p. 328). Some feel that intuition is the entrance to understanding our calling (Jeffries, 1995), while others view it as an essential skill for the servant-leader (Frick, 1998).

Foresight.

Bordas (1995) describes “foresight as a central ethic of leadership... grounded in an understanding that the “past, present moment and the future are

one organic unity” (p. 186), while Lopez (1995) views the practice of foresight as being able to “see the way and to point to it” (p. 155). For Keith (2008), “exercising foresight can do more than prepare us for the future – it can help us create the future that we desire the most” (p. 55). Similarly, Kim (2004) asserts, “if we are to exercise foresight, we need to continually expand our awareness and perception, to take in more than we might if we kept the focus of our attention too narrow and strictly logical” (p. 208). He goes on to say that foresight, in relation to mental models, requires “us to surface, suspend, and test our deepest beliefs or theories about the world” (p. 212).

Sipe & Frick (2009) suggest foresight “goes beyond... mostly analytical tools, taking advantage of resources in the head, heart, and gut to access the intuitive mind... the trick is to focus the brain’s pattern-generating capacity so it becomes a useful tool for insight” (p. 111). They also propose foresight as a “more focused application of creativity” (p. 122), and an essential “part of the deep identity of a Servant-Leader” (p. 129). Foresight is viewed by many as an integral component of the servant-leader’s capacity for decision making (Frick, 1998; Keith, 2008; SanFacon & Spears, 2008; Spears, 1995; VanDierendonck, 2011). Kim (2004) contends, “the failure to lead with foresight is a ethical failure because where there is no vision, our people really do perish” (p. 214).

Creativity.

Creativity is reflected as emerging from chaos, from within questions, and as an embrace of newness. Rieser (1995) claims, “it was Greenleaf’s conviction that the modern world has stifled the creativity of its leaders in the straitjacket of the

rational and analytical” (p. 51). Freeman, Isaksen, and Dorval (2002) suggest, “an understanding of creativity is essential to the servant-leader” (p. 257), while Sipe and Frick (2009) see creativity as an integral “part of the deep identity of a Servant-Leader” (p. 122). Creativity emerges from conditions of chaos; something Palmer (1998) believes should be fostered and supported. Smith (1995) puts forth that “there are no tried and true blueprints that will definitively show us the way, or show us how to act once we are there” (p. 206). Jaworski (1998) believes that a creative capacity is one of the most fundamental components of servant-leadership.

This capacity for creativity is reflected in a willingness to accept uncertainty and to seek out and live within questions. Jones (2002) suggests if a question or problem exists, and we approach it by “inquiring into what the answer might feel or look like, and being curious about its possibilities, it will lead us to things we could not have planned with the strategic part of our mind” (p. 41). Such an immersion into uncertainty provides what Jones refers to as an “experience of being *lost*”, during which time the “imaginative, sensing, feeling heart comes most alive” (p. 42). Wheatley (1999) describes this as a search for newness, and argues, “part of the job description of a servant leader... is that we have to be those who welcome newness” (p. 5). She points to an “imperative to create oneself as an exploration of newness and the need to reach out for relationship with others to create systems” (Wheatley, 1998, p. 341). This reflects a “story about life that has creativity and connectedness as its essential themes” (p. 345).

Persuasion.

Persuasion is reflected by the approach that a leader takes to power and influence (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Russell & Stone, 2002; Spears, 1995; VanDierendonck, 2011). In servant-leadership persuasion is the preferred method of influence reflecting a specific attitude toward the use of power (Sipe & Frick, 2009). Servant leaders are those who “use power ethically” and who are thus “builders of community” (Lopez, 1995, p. 152). McCollum (1998) describes an “ethical basis that serves the feeling of rightness that separates persuasion from manipulation” (p. 336). In the use of persuasion servant-leaders forgo the act of control, seeking instead to allow others the opportunity for growth and empowerment (Lopez, 1995), which connects to McCollum’s (1998) description of mentoring as a form of persuasion used by servant-leaders, “in the sense of helping someone learn how to ‘be’ rather than what to ‘do’” (p. 336). In referring to the words of Robert Bly, McCollum describes mentoring as “a vertical process – one in which young members of a society learn how to ‘be’ in that society” (p. 337).

Unlimited liability.

Unlimited liability is reflected in servant-leaders who “take care that other’s highest priority needs are being met” (Sipe & Frick, 2009, p. 40). An unlimited concern for others is reflected in providing opportunities for individuals to meet their highest priority needs, and to “help them get a feeling of what mature growth involves and assume some responsibility for their own growth” (p. 41). The unlimited liability expressed by servant-leaders (Lopez, 1995) contains within it a “strong sense of mutuality” (Rieser, 1995, p. 49), in which “more care is shown for

people than the organization's bottom line" (Patterson, 2003, p. 3). Wheatley (1999) describes the "work of being a servant-leader... to be courageous enough to keep your heart open" (p. 6).

Unlimited liability in this regard is referred to as unconditional love (McGee-Cooper, 1998; Sipe & Frick, 2009; Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2004), a love that "leads to serving the best interest of others" (Patterson, 2003, p. 3). Gardner (1998) describes this as "being fully present, being open in mind and body and heart, listening unconditionally" (p. 124). An unconditional concern is what calls the servant-leader to care for and appreciate others (SanFacon & Spears, 2008; Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2004). An "appreciation of others by servant leaders reflects fundamental personal values that esteem and honor people" (Russell, 2001, p. 80), emulated by those who "demonstrate a level of caring and appreciation that unconditionally affirms others – whoever they are, whatever their circumstances, allowing each person to feel understood and appreciated" (Sipe & Frick, 2009, p. 53). VanDierendonck (2011) suggests this level of unconditional concern and acceptance "includes the perspective taking element of empathy" (p. 7), and "the outcome of acceptance and empathy is that we will not reject the other and will therefore be practicing 'unlimited liability'" (Lopez, 1995, p. 153).

Summation.

Thus concludes the representation of findings for Question 2, for which a variety of strategies were used to ensure dependability and credibility. First, secondary literature was collected over the course of three years, providing a prolonged immersion and exposure to the topic. Second, Dr. Carolyn Crippen

provided guidance and feedback during the processes of organizing the secondary literature and for the reflective analysis seeking reflection of the essential elements within said literature. And lastly, a continual process of reflective analysis allowed for the constant checking and questioning of meaning as it developed and emerged, supported by consultations amongst peers familiar with servant-leadership.

This chapter has presented the findings relevant to the two research questions for this study. The next chapter provides a discussion, conclusion, some recommendations, and a final reflection.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The final chapter begins with a discussion of the findings for question one and question two respectively. The implications for the findings of this study are that it discerns the essence of Greenleaf's work, which no scholar or practitioner has admitted to doing yet. It also acknowledges and supports some of the more prominent works in the field, particularly the work of Spears (1995) and of Sipe and Frick (2009). The essence as I have discerned is also intended to spark dialogue and to turn the gaze of our attention back to what Greenleaf was trying to communicate some 40 years ago.

Question 1

- What is Greenleaf's conceptualization of the nature and essence of servant-leadership as communicated in his 1991 work, and in his early essays collected in *On Becoming a Servant-Leader* (1996)?

The reason for asking the first question was in response to a discord that I sensed amongst those seeking to understand servant-leadership. This sense of discord called me to turn my attention to Greenleaf's original words, with the intention to explore his message, which would then perhaps allow me to understand the wide range of perspectives on servant-leadership that others had written about. In that sense the findings for question one represent how I have interpreted Greenleaf, and the essence of what he was trying to say. I don't feel as though the eight essential elements (an attitude of responsibility, listening, awareness, intuitive insight, foresight, creativity, persuasion, unlimited liability), as I have discerned, represent "my list" that is now set to compete with others. In

response to question one, the eight essential elements present the findings of an exploration seeking to provide clarity to a concept. I believed, perhaps intuitively, that the discord I felt could be alleviated some by returning to the thoughts of Robert K. Greenleaf. This conceptual foundation then provided me with the lens through which I could view and make sense of the perspectives of others.

Limitations.

The essence of Greenleaf's work as I have discerned was done to the best of my abilities, as fallible and prodigious as they may be. It would have been most prudent to have been able to sit down with Greenleaf, in order to engage in true dialogue. In written words we only have interpretations and approximations of our experience. To sit in dialogue with Greenleaf would have clearly enhanced understanding. I say this because topics common to servant-leadership such as flux, flow, change, chaos, and doubt can be hard to pin down. Interpreting and reflecting on these can be difficult, thus a final limitation is that I was not able to converse with more "experts" in the field. I was fortunate to work with Dr. Carolyn Crippen, one of the foremost authorities on servant-leadership in the world, but time and tough economic times did not allow for meetings with other giants in the field such as Larry C. Spears, Shan Ferch, Don Frick, Ann McGee-Cooper, Peter Senge, and Margaret Wheatley.

Question 2

- How does the secondary literature extant to servant-leadership over the last 40 years reflect the essence of Greenleaf's conceptualization as I have discerned from Question 1?

Once I had discerned the essential elements of Greenleaf's conceptualization, I was then able to explore the secondary literature to see how said essence was reflected. I found that the elements of listening, an attitude of responsibility, awareness, and an unlimited liability were well represented, while intuitive insight, foresight, creativity, and persuasion were present but often in a more indirect manner.

The element of listening was represented in the notions of openness to others, understanding, and reflection. By far this element was most prevalent, though more emphasis was given to the perceived act of listening, rather than a deep commitment to understanding others and to engaging in personal reflection to understand oneself. This is somewhat surprising given Greenleaf's (1991) habitual use of the phrase "grant that I may seek not so much to be understood as to understand" (p. 19). A potential reason for this is that in the modern organization time is in short supply, so that moments of deep listening and reflection become what Wheatley (1999) refers to as revolutionary acts. Most modern organizations, and the research they fund, seek not revolution but stable and predictable environments. To truly listen, and engage in dialogue, means that one must be open to change and willing to step into a world of uncertainty.

There was an aspect of openness to uncertainty though that was reflected in secondary literature around the element of awareness. Awareness was represented in many ways that connect to the iceberg analogy Greenleaf (1991; 1996d) often used to illustrate our sense of knowledge for both "below" and "above" the waterline. Descriptions within the secondary literature such as interconnectivity,

interrelatedness, relationship, uncertainty, co-creation, and the emergent nature of things reflected the element of awareness as Greenleaf spoke of it.

The representation of these notions though drops off if one narrows their gaze to the literature seeking to create measurable constructs of servant-leadership. Of those presenting lists of servant-leader measures, only Spears (1995) and Barbuto and Wheeler (2002) make mention of awareness as an essential component. Perhaps again this speaks to an inclination towards predictability and stability that many in organizational environments seek not to stray from. In speaking of institutions though, Greenleaf's (1991) response to the unrest of the 1960s was that institutions needed to expand their perceptions of knowledge and to support new trends in conduct that were emerging.

Greenleaf (1991), in describing these emerging trends spoke much of the great responsibility that individuals would need to take on. The essential element of an attitude of responsibility was represented well in a variety of ways, as authors spoke to accountability, a calling, a purpose, service, and a sense that we are all responsible for the co-creation of our reality. Some attached this attitude of responsibility to the notion of trust (Farling, Stone, and Winston, 1999; Patterson, 2003; Russell & Stone, 2002), while others spoke of authenticity and integrity (Laub, 2003; Page & Wong, 2000; Russell & Stone, 2002). Spears (1995) spoke of responsibility as a commitment to the growth of others, somewhat akin to what Sendjaya et al. (2008) refer to as responsible morality.

It was through various interpretations of responsibility that the notion of service emerged in the literature. The innate feeling, through a sense of purpose or

calling (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2002; Sipe & Frick, 2009), that one was responsible for others reflects well Greenleaf's (1991) urging of individuals to become affirmative builders of society and to view any problem they encounter as residing "in here" and "not out there".

This aspect of responsibility, leading to the desire to serve, couples well with the essential element of an unlimited liability. I found good representation within the secondary literature grounded in descriptions such as unconditional love, acceptance, empathy, and care. An orientation toward unlimited liability also supported the desire for individuals to serve others, and provided some direction for what the appropriate means to do so might be. Many described unlimited liability as unconditional love (McGee-Cooper, 1998; Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2004), while others uncomfortable with such fuzzy notions preferred descriptors such as acceptance and empathy (Sipe & Frick, 2009; VanDierendonck, 2011).

It seems a commonly accepted aspect of servant-leadership, within all the writings, is the act of caring. Greenleaf (1991) went so far as to say that the moment unlimited liability is diminished love is also by the same degree, which gives critics the basis for deriding servant-leadership as being soft. It comes across strongly though within the literature that servant-leadership puts people first, and through the growth and strength of individuals the organization will flourish (Patterson, 2003; Sipe & Frick, 2009; Spears, 1995; VanDierendonck, 2011).

A somewhat surprising lack of representation for the essential element of foresight was found. I would have expected, given Greenleaf's (1991) belief that foresight is the lead that a leader has and that failure to use foresight could be

viewed as an ethical failure, there would have been more who made reference to foresight (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2002; Keith, 2008; Sipe & Frick, 2009; Spears, 1995; VanDierendonck, 2011). It could be that the element of foresight is incorporated into other descriptions of servant-leadership. For example, some refer to vision (Farling, Stone, & Winston, 1999; Page & Wong, 2000; Patterson, 2003) as a component of servant-leadership, which could easily be construed as foresight. What's missing though is an orientation to time in which Greenleaf (1991) describes the past, present, and future as one organic unity, which was only touched on by some (Bordas, 1995; Sipe & Frick, 2009).

Connected to foresight is intuitive insight, which was reflected in only some of the literature as a feel for patterns, a sense for the unknown, and as an important aspect of decision making; even though it is referred to as an integral component of servant-leadership (Greenleaf, 2001; Sipe & Frick, 2009). Perhaps Rieser's (1995) statement that "there has been a serious neglect of the intuitive and spontaneous side of our nature" (p. 58) is worth noting. Greenleaf (1996f) had even positioned intuitive insight as "the essential artistry in one's leadership" (p. 113).

Intuitive insight, reflected by some as a sense for the unknown (McCollum, 1998; Jaworski, 1998) or as a feel for patterns (Bordas, 1995; Rieser, 1995), may inflict waves of panic and anxiety for those more comfortable with the supposed predictability of linear rational thought. Though Greenleaf, in describing a leader's decision making process, suggests intuition and being able to act upon it is the distinguishing factor for the effective leader. It is possible, that the notion of

intuition is embedded within the essence of awareness (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2002; Spears, 1995) or even foresight for that matter.

Similar to intuition the essential element of creativity is rather absent from the secondary literature, especially within the literature seeking to create lists of measurable constructs. Russell and Stone (2002) refer to pioneering which could be loosely connected to creativity, though lacking is Greenleaf's embracing of and leaping into the unknown. Creativity is reflected in some of the secondary literature as an embrace of newness, of chaos, and of living in the question.

Most authors, save for Sipe and Frick (2009), who make reference to creativity do so from a worldview that embraces the new science of quantum mechanics (Jaworski, 1998; Jones, 2002; Smith, 1995; Wheatley, 1998, 1999). Senge (1995) and Kim (2002) provide a clue as to why this may be the case, as both promote and foster new approaches to organizing, in which systems theory and learning organizations are of fashion. The old style of organizing, represented in much of the literature, lacks an embrace of newness and creativity that permeates all facets of life (Smith, 1995; Wheatley, 1998). Creativity perhaps requires more attention, given Greenleaf's (1991) reference to creativity as "the essential structural dynamic of leadership" (p. 27).

Lastly, the essential element of persuasion is reflected within the secondary literature in terms of power, influence, and mentoring. Some refer to persuasion as the preferred method of influence in an organization (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Russell & Stone, 2002), while others focus more on one's approach to the issue of power (Sipe & Frick, 2009; Spears, 1995). Persuasion was reflected as a form of

mentoring (McCollum, 1995; Lopez, 1995), supporting Greenleaf's (1991) belief that the number one priority of a society should be to prepare young people for positions of leadership.

Persuasion could be present in what some refer to as a belief in the capacities and deficiencies of others (Sipe & Frick, 2009; Smith, 1995). In this regard, what seems like a dearth of reference to persuasion could simply be that the essential elements of unlimited liability and an attitude of responsibility infer the ethical use of power that Greenleaf described in persuasion. The omission of persuasion for some may be due to the constricting and limited view that modern organizations have of time, and its apparent lacking. True persuasion takes time, and ultimately manifests in an organizational context as consensual decision making; though again, the perception of limited amounts of time constrains and restricts attempts for its implementation.

In all there is reasonable representation within the secondary literature extant to servant-leadership of the eight essential elements as I have discerned from Greenleaf's writing. For the most part though the essential elements are represented in piece-meal, with smatterings of one element here and another somewhere else. This holds true both within the so-called anecdotal literature and within the literature seeking to create measurable constructs of servant-leadership. This perhaps indicates, given that my interpretations are valid, that a return to Greenleaf's original work has been prudent.

That said, the list of ten characteristics created by Spears (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship,

commitment to the growth of others, and building community) is still the closest representation to Greenleaf's conceptualization of servant-leadership as I have discerned. What's missing though, is a focus on unlimited liability and an attitude of responsibility, which I believe are necessary conditions for the developing of stewardship, commitment to others, empathy, healing, and building community. Also, it is possible that my interpretation of intuitive insight and creativity is merely another way of expressing conceptualization and awareness, though I believe, in discerning Greenleaf's work, that intuition and creativity deserve a place unto themselves.

Finally, if one desires to embark on an exploration of servant-leadership, and wishes to go beyond *The Servant as Leader* (1991) and the essays collected in *On Becoming a Servant Leader* (1996), I would recommend *The Seven Pillars of Servant Leadership: Practicing the Wisdom of Leading by Serving*, by Sipe and Frick (2009). In my estimation these authors represent most truly without any pretense the essence of Greenleaf's conceptualization. A prolonged exposure to the writings of Robert K. Greenleaf leads me to believe that Sipe and Frick, along with other giants such as Larry C. Spears, George SanFacon, Shan Ferch, Parker Palmer, Carolyn Crippen, Joseph Jaworski, Ann McGee-Cooper, Peter Senge, and Margaret Wheatley seem to somehow get what Greenleaf was trying to say. There are of course others, but for some intuitive reason these individuals simply stand out.

Limitations.

The process for discerning how the essential elements are reflected within the secondary literature was a solo affair, and though I had the privilege of peer

review and expert feedback along the way, the product is based on my interpretations alone. A group approach to this type of study may provide interesting results, though the time and financial constraints for this process would not have allowed for such a lengthy endeavour. It is also impossible to collect all the secondary literature on the subject, thus there is the possibility that an important piece of work was missed. This limitation was addressed though by consulting with others to identify and ensure that important works were included. Lastly, most literature originates from a corporate context where means exist to fund research, leaving out many potentially valuable perspectives of community and non-profit organizations.

Overall Thoughts

It seems that servant-leadership represents first and foremost a way of being in the world, or a worldview that shapes and informs one's interactions with the world. This notion of a deep inner quality is evident within the so-called anecdotal writings on the subject, but seems rather absent within works seeking to create measurable constructs of the servant-leadership concept. This may be due to a cautionary note from many writers that problems with defining servant-leadership could stem from a lack of solid conceptual foundation (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Farling, Stone, & Winston, 1999; Page & Wong, 2000).

Much of the servant-leadership literature though is not aimed at creating a standardized, cookie-cutter type framework for understanding servant-leadership. It seems that most writers have taken the essence of what the servant-leadership concept means to them, and have applied it to stories and descriptions of their own

realities (Ferch, 2004; Jones, 2002; Lopez 1995). Thus many of the writers describing servant-leadership speak to the concept in a way that is relevant to their own perspectives, perhaps indicating loudly that servant-leadership is indeed a way of being that blossoms into an infinite array of representations.

Many writers have commented that servant-leadership is an individual path that weaves through a complex web of relationships and systems (Jaworski, 1998; Jones, 2002; Sipe & Frick, 2009). The potential for differentiation in characterized or behavioral outcomes is immense, and grows larger in the absence of an agreed upon and thoroughly considered conceptual foundation. More problematic to the search for standardization is the inevitable difference that emerges given a variety of institutional, societal, cultural, and community contexts.

The relational aspects of servant-leadership speak to a view of leadership that promotes mutual understanding and a sense of responsibility for creating rather than impeding or destroying. This view of leadership plants the seeds for the promotion of the greater good, or of the common good, as some prefer to describe (Bordas, 1995). I believe this was one of Greenleaf's greatest goals, something I like to refer to as a sort of "applied humanity" blueprint or moral praxis for the new ages.

Conclusion

For three years I have been immersed in the topic of servant-leadership, during which time I sensed a discord as to how it was perceived. I noticed this most apparently within the literature seeking to create measurable constructs of servant-leadership, which seemed to indicate a problem with its conceptualization. I thus

ventured forth to explore this problem, first by discerning an essence of servant-leadership from Greenleaf's writing using reflective analysis. Through this process I interpreted eight essential elements, which were: an attitude of responsibility, listening, awareness, intuitive insight, foresight, creativity, persuasion, and unlimited liability.

I then explored the secondary literature extant to servant-leadership, seeking to describe how Greenleaf's conceptualization, as I had discerned, was represented. I found representation of each element in various forms, though finding a piece of work that reflected all eight proved difficult. However, I did find that Larry Spears, a recognized pioneer in servant-leadership, came closest to reflecting all eight elements as I had discerned. This is perhaps no surprise given Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) belief that Spears, out of all those seeking to present lists of servant-leadership, comes closest to the original writings of Greenleaf.

That is until 2009, when Sipe and Frick put together a book called *The Seven Pillars of Servant Leadership: Practicing the Wisdom of Leading by Serving*. I found that this book most aptly reflected the essential elements of Greenleaf's writing as I had discerned, and it manages to do so from a perspective of corporate organization. Was their work the result of a leap of faith on their part? Was it their willingness to follow their intuition and to push into uncharted waters? Whatever the impetus and source of inspiration, Sipe and Frick acted with foresight to produce a recommended reading for any student seeking to explore and understand the concept of servant-leadership.

Recommendations and Next Steps

The following five recommendations stem from the research findings and are meant to suggest possible directions for future research.

Recommendation 1: Engage in dialogue.

A dialogue about Greenleaf's original work seems appropriate given the acknowledged lack of conceptual foundations that could lead toward an agreed upon understanding. Such a dialogue could help to focus efforts in seeking to discern descriptions of behaviours, attributes, or characteristics that one may emulate when adopting a servant-leadership worldview. It could also turn attention back to the original works of Greenleaf providing an anchor for the creation of shared meaning and dialogue.

Recommendation 2: Follow Van Dierendonck's lead.

Van Dierendonck (2011) suggests differentiating between "antecedents, behaviours, mediating processes, and outcomes" (p. 27) as an approach to the study of servant-leadership. Such an approach can provide an organized research structure for moving toward an understanding of the servant-leadership concept.

Recommendation 3: Explore varied contexts.

Much of the work to date on servant-leadership exists in the realm of business and organizational theory. Expanding the horizons of inquiry to include settings such as community, family, relationship, sport, art, and so forth, may lead toward a more holistic and accurate representation of the servant-leadership concept. The fact the much research and study originates from the business realm needs to be considered as a bias of sorts and has yet to be addressed.

Recommendation 4: Explore historical roots.

Greenleaf, an acknowledged Quaker, points to a melding of Protestant and eastern religious worldviews that contributed to his conception of servant-leadership. He credits reading Hesse's *Journey to the East* as a source of inspiration for *The Servant as Leader*, and hints at other influences in some of his writings. Greenleaf alludes to many great thinkers such as Paulo Freire, Kurt Lewin, Albert Camus, Aldous Huxley, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Alfred Korzybski, and Erik Erikson to name just a few. An exploration of these thinkers and others may help to create an even richer understanding of the breadth and depth of servant-leadership.

Recommendation 5: Explore the concept of followership.

Greenleaf spoke of a continuum inherent in servant-leadership in which one moved between leading and following. The concept of followership is quite new but may provide insight and a deeper understanding of servant-leadership. It may be that the leadership-followership continuum is related in some manner to the relationship between servant and leader. This could be a valuable contribution to the study of servant-leadership, leading toward a broader understanding of influence processes that are synonymous with leadership.

Final Reflections

It seems necessary, if the servant-leadership concept is to flourish and grow, that practitioners and scholars revisit Greenleaf's message. I am sure that each individual who reads Greenleaf's original work will have a different and unique perspective of servant-leadership. Thus, I believe that a dialogue concerning the essence of the concept is important, before any further dissolution of its substance

occurs. I hope my interpretation offering eight essential elements of Greenleaf's (1991, 1996a, 1996b, 1996c, 1996d, 1996e, 1996f, 1996g, 1996h, 1996j, 1996k, 1996m, 1996n, 1996o) work encourages such a dialogue.

It seems to me that for Robert K. Greenleaf it was the promotion of the greater good that lay at the heart of his immense contribution. The difficulty for most is that he chose to neither dictate nor prescribe, but to rather share some insights that had occurred to him along his own life-long seeking journey; a journey in which he marveled at the mystery and wonder of the world, something that he hoped to persuade others to do as well.

References

- Avolio, B.J., Waldman, D., & Yammarino, F. (1991). Leading in the 1990s: The four Is of transformational leadership. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 15*(4), 9-16.
- Avolio, B.J., Walumba, F.O., & Weber, T.J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*, 421-429.
- Barbuto, J.E., & Wheeler, D.W. (2002). Becoming a servant leader: Do you have what it takes? *NebGuide G02-1481-A*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, Nebraska Cooperative Extension.
- Barbuto, J.E., & Wheeler, D.W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group and Organization Management, 31*(3), 300-326.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Batten, J. (1998). Servant-leadership: A passion to serve. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 38-53). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Beazley, H., & Beggs, J. (2002). Teaching servant-leadership. In L.C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the twenty-first century* (pp. 53-63). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Block, P. (1998). From leadership to citizenship. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 87-95). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson A & B.
- Bogdan, R., & Taylor, S.J. (1975). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: A phenomenological approach to the social sciences*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Bordas, J. (1995). Power and passion: Finding personal purpose. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on Leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers* (pp. 179-193). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Concept. (1997). *Nelson Canadian Dictionary of the English Language: An Encyclopedic Reference* (trade ed., p. 287). Scarborough, Ontario: ITP Nelson.
- Construct. (1997). *Nelson Canadian Dictionary of the English Language: An Encyclopedic Reference* (trade ed., p. 298). Scarborough, Ontario: ITP Nelson.
- Creswell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Creswell, J.W., Hanson, W.E., Plano Clark, V.L., & Morales, A. (2007). Qualitative research design: Selection and implementation. *The Counselling Psychologist*, 35(2), 236-264.
- Crippen, C. (2005). The democratic school: First to serve, then to lead. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 47, 1-17.

- Denzin, N.K. (1994). The art of politics and interpretation. In N.K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 500-515). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- DiStefano, J.J. (1995). Tracing the vision and impact of Robert K. Greenleaf. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on Leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers* (pp. 61-78). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Essence. (1997). *Nelson Canadian Dictionary of the English Language: An Encyclopedic Reference* (trade ed., p. 469). Scarborough, Ontario: ITP Nelson.
- Farling, M.L., Stone, A.G., & Winston, B.E. (1999). Servant leadership: Setting the stage for empirical research. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1(2), 49-72.
- Ferch, S.R. (2004). Servant-leadership, forgiveness, and social justice. In L.C. Spears, & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Practicing servant-leadership: Succeeding through trust, bravery, and forgiveness* (pp. 225-239). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Freeman, T.L., Isaksen, S.G., & Dorval, K.B. (2002). Servant-leadership and creativity. In L.C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the twenty-first century*, (pp. 257-267). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Frick, D.M. (1995). Pyramids, circles, and gardens: Stories of implementing servant-leadership. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on Leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers* (pp. 257-281). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Frick, D.M., & Spears, L.C. (1996). *On becoming a servant leader*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

- Frick, D.M. (1998). Afterward: Understanding Robert K. Greenleaf and servant-leadership. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 353-358). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Frick, D.M (2011). *Greenleaf and servant-leader listening*. Westfield, IN: The Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership.
- Gall, M.D., Gall, J.P., & Borg, W.R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.
- Gardner, J.J. (1998). Quiet presence: The holy ground of leadership. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 116-125). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Giarelli, J.M., & Chambliss, J.J. (1988). Philosophy of education as qualitative inquiry. In R.R. Sherman, & R.B. Webb (Eds.), *Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods* (pp. 30-43). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Graham, J.W. (1991). Servant-leadership in organizations: Inspirational and moral. *Leadership Quarterly*, 2(2), 105-119.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1991). *The servant as leader*. Westfield, IN: The Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1996a). The search. In D.M. Frick, & L.C. Spears (Eds.), *On becoming a servant leader* (pp. 31-40). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Inc.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1996b). The requirements of responsibility. In D.M. Frick, & L.C. Spears (Eds.), *On becoming a servant leader* (pp. 41-52). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Inc.

- Greenleaf, R.K. (1996c). The practice of openness. In D.M. Frick, & L.C. Spears (Eds.), *On becoming a servant leader* (pp. 65-72). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Inc.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1996d). The future is now. In D.M. Frick, & L.C. Spears (Eds.), *On becoming a servant leader* (pp. 73-80). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Inc.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1996e). Purpose and laughter. In D.M. Frick, & L.C. Spears (Eds.), *On becoming a servant leader* (pp. 91-98). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Inc.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1996f). Business ethics and manipulation. In D.M. Frick, & L.C. Spears (Eds.), *On becoming a servant leader* (pp. 109-126). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Inc.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1996g). Coercion, manipulation, and persuasion: Reflections on a strategy for change. In D.M. Frick, & L.C. Spears (Eds.), *On becoming a servant leader* (pp. 127-148). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Inc.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1996h). Building the ethic of strength in business. In D.M. Frick, & L.C. Spears (Eds.), *On becoming a servant leader* (pp. 163-176). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Inc.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1996j). The crisis of leadership. In D.M. Frick, & L.C. Spears (Eds.), *On becoming a servant leader* (pp. 287-297). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Inc.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1996k). The strategies of a leader. In D.M. Frick, & L.C. Spears (Eds.), *On becoming a servant leader* (pp. 299-311). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Inc.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1996m). Leadership and the unknown. In D.M. Frick, & L.C. Spears (Eds.), *On becoming a servant leader* (pp. 313-316). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Inc.

- Greenleaf, R.K. (1996n). Leadership and foresight. In D.M. Frick, & L.C. Spears (Eds.), *On becoming a servant leader* (pp. 317-326). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Inc.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1996o). The individual as leader. In D.M. Frick, & L.C. Spears (Eds.), *On becoming a servant leader* (pp. 327-338). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Inc.
- Guba, E.G. (1981). ERIC/ECTJ Annual review paper: Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *Educational Communication and Technology*, 29(2), 75-91.
- Janesick, V.J. (1994). The dance of qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 209-219). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Jaworski, J. (1998). Destiny and the leader. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 258-267). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Jaworski, J. (2002). Synchronicity and servant-leadership. In L.C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the twenty-first century* (pp. 287-293). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Jeffries, E. (1998). Work as a calling. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 29-37). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Jones, M. (2002). Servant-leadership and the imaginative life. In L.C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the twenty-first century* (pp. 35-45). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Keith, K.M. (2008). *The case for servant leadership*. Westfield, IN: The Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership.
- Kim, D.H. (2004). Foresight as the central ethic of leadership. In L.C. Spears, & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Practicing servant-leadership: Succeeding through trust, bravery, and forgiveness* (pp. 201-224). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lad, L.J., & Luechauer, D. (1998). On the path to servant-leadership. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 54-67). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Laub, J. (2003). From paternalism to the servant organization: Expanding the organizational leadership assessment (OLA) model. *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable Proceedings*. Retrieved from http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/home.cfm
- Liden, R.C., Wayne, S.J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), 161-177.
- Lopez, I.O. (1995). Becoming a servant-leader: The personal development path. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on Leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers* (pp. 149-160). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- McCollum, J. (1995). Chaos, complexity, and servant-leadership. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on Leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers* (pp. 241-256). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- McCollum, J.N. (1998). The inside-out proposition: Finding (and keeping) our balance in contemporary organizations. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 326-339). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- McGee Cooper, A. (1998). Accountability as covenant: The taproot of servant-leadership. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 77-84). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Neill, M.W., & Saunders, N.S. (2008). Servant leadership: Enhancing quality of care and staff satisfaction. *The Journal of Nursing Studies*, 38(9), 395-400.
- Noblit, G.W., & Hare, R.D. (1988). *Meta-ethnography: Synthesizing qualitative studies*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Page, D., & Wong, P.T.P. (2000). A conceptual framework for measuring servant leadership. In S. Adjibolooso (Ed.), *The human factor in shaping the course of history and development* (pp. 69-110). Washington, DC: American University Press.
- Palmer, P.J. (1998). Leading from within. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 197-208). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Parolini, J., Patterson, K., & Winston, B. (2009). Distinguishing between transformational and servant leadership. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 30(3), 274-291.

- Patterson, K. (2003). Servant leadership: A theoretical model. *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable Proceedings*. Retrieved from http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/home.cfm
- Polleys, M.S. (2002). One university's response to the anti-leadership vaccine: Developing servant leaders. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8(3), 117-130.
- Prosser, S. (2010). *Servant leadership: More philosophy, less theory*. Westfield, IN: The Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership.
- Rasmussen, T. (1995). Creating a culture of servant-leadership: A real life story. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on Leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers* (pp. 282-297). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Rieser, C. (1995). Claiming servant-leadership as your heritage. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on Leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers* (pp. 49-60). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Rost, J.C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Russell, R.F. (2001). The role of values in servant leadership. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 22(2), 76-83.
- Russell, R.F. (2003). A practical theology of servant leadership. *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable Proceedings*. Retrieved from http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/home.cfm

- Russell, R.F., & Stone, A.G. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 23(3), 145-157.
- SanFacon, G., & Spears, L.C. (2008). *Holistic Servant-leadership*. Indianapolis, IN: The Spears Center for Servant Leadership.
- Sendjaya, S. (2003). Development and validation of servant leadership behaviour scale. *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*, Retrieved from https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/home.cfm
- Sendjaya, S., & Sarros, J.C. (2002). Servant leadership: Its origin, development, and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 9(2), 57-64.
- Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J.C., & Santora, J.C. (2008). Defining and measuring servant leadership behaviour in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(2), 402-424.
- 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: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Shank, G.D. (2006). *Qualitative research: A personal skills approach* (2nd Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Sherman, R.R., & Webb, R.B. (1988). Qualitative research in education: A focus. In R.R. Sherman, & R.B. Webb (Eds.), *Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods* (pp. 2-21). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.

- Sipe, J.W., & Frick, D.M. (2009). *Seven pillars of servant-leadership: Practicing the wisdom of leading by serving*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Smith, R.W. (1995). Servant-leadership: A pathway to the emerging territory. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on Leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers* (pp. 198-213). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Spears, L.C. (1995). Introduction: 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: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Spears, L.C. (1998). Introduction: Tracing the growing impact of servant-leadership. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 1-12). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Stanton, T.K., Giles, D.E., & Cruz, N.I. (1999). *Service-learning: A movements pioneers reflect on its origins, practice, and future*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Stone, A.G., Russell, R.F., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 25(4), 349-361.
- Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1228-1261.
- Wallace, J.R. (2007). Servant leadership: A worldview perspective. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2(2), 114-132.

- Washington, R.R., Sutton, C.D., & Field, H.S. (2006). Individual differences in servant leadership: The roles of values and personality. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 27(8), 700-716.
- Wheatley, M.J. (1998). What is our work? In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 340-351). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Wheatley, M.J. (1999). Servant-leadership and community leadership in the 21st century. *Keynote address, The Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership Annual Conference, June 1999*, retrieved from <http://www.margaretwheatley.com/articles/servantleader.html>
- Wheatley, M. (2006). *Leadership and the new science: Discovering order in a chaotic world*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Zohar, D. (2002). Servant-leadership and rewiring the corporate brain. In L.C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the twenty-first century* (pp. 111-121). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.