

Servant Leadership: A Road to High Performance

Natashaa Kaul¹

¹Indira School of Business Studies, Tathwad, Pune, India

Abstract

Servant leadership is one of the most talked about yet least critically examined leadership philosophies. This paper aims at providing evidence to examine servant leadership theory which seems to have posed to take its place as another popular leadership theory appealing to emotions but holding little weight among those who seek empirical evidence that it is a viable and applicable theory of leadership. If servant leadership is to truly flourish as a viable theory of leadership, there must be more empirical research conducted and alternate personification examples of successful implementation. Although there is still room for objective, deductively driven, quantitative, methodological research of servant leadership, other more “interesting” historical troves still exist, as well as biographical accounts of past and present servant leaders among us, and from whom there is much we can learn. Leadership in the 21st-century is more than ever a complex matrix of practices, which vary by geography, organizational level, and individual circumstances. To succeed in the shifting business landscape of the 21st-century, leaders must rethink their historical views and cultivate a new configuration of attitudes and abilities.

Keywords

servant leadership; organizational needs; commitment to growth; leadership theories; job satisfaction

1. Introduction

Leadership has been and continues to be a topic of profound interest in the management literature. The need for leadership is perennial – especially in our modern, complex societies. In today's thinking about effective, productive, and enduring organizations, we can reorganize, restructure, or reengineer our organization to be more effective but it will not be successful for very long, unless change is first built on the preeminence of human resources. People and process will always be more important than tasks and organizational structure in accomplishing goals and productivity. Effective systems and processes are only effective if the people whom they make work are effective. Highly motivated and well-trained human resources provide the only assurance that any organization will be effective in accomplishing its goals. Leaders motivate followers through investing in them and empowering them to do their best. Groups and institutions need leaders to ensure that goals are fulfilled, the people are inspired to work towards those goals and sanctions are applied to those that may want to stymie the realisation of the common good. There is the well-known acknowledgement of varying leadership styles that may be appropriate in different situations – the democratic, the laissez-faire and the authoritarian leaders. Looking at the state of our industry with an eye toward improving what we do and how we do it, I believe we are suffering from a deficit of effective leadership and have been for a long time. I see it at all levels of the industry, from dealers to manufacturers and our trade associations; far too many of our organizations are over managed and not effectively led. We need leaders who lead with purpose, values, and integrity; leaders who build enduring organizations, motivate their employees to provide superior customer service, and create long-term value for shareholders.

While there is no universal definition of leadership, there is agreement on the fact that leadership is the most over analyzed, thoroughly dissected, and utterly-but-terribly confusing topic in business. From trait to behavioral theories, none completely explain the variety of leaders and the nature of their leadership interactions. Much has been written about organizational leadership and management. Often, a leader

is recognized as one who emerges to guide a group of individuals through times of relative calm or times of chaos and hopelessness, inspiring those that follow them to persevere in the face of adversity or to rally together in order to accomplish a shared goal. Leadership, or the aspiration to lead, is undeniably one of the most highly respected human qualities. However, as a concept, leadership is extremely abstract, represented by a vast quantity of diverse ideals and theories. Likewise, developing a concrete definition of a specific theory of leadership can prove to be an extremely challenging task. More recent research has focused on charismatic and transformational theories of leadership. Many of us believe that great leaders are charismatic, have a commanding presence, are visionary and educated at elite schools. Almost all of the leaders of the high-performing companies hardly have these traits. The focus of leadership needs to be shifted from process and outcome to people and the future. The new challenge for management and leadership education is threefold: (a) How to develop workers and unleash their creative potentials, (b) How to create a positive workplace that will attract and retain talented knowledge workers, and (c) How to reinforce innovations and risk-taking to adapt to an uncertain future. New competencies are required to develop and manage the social/emotional/spiritual capital. New types of leaders are needed to create new futures. At present in every organization, huge amounts of valuable resources are wasted each day because of human problems. Many CEO's spend most of their time "putting out fires." Jack Welch (2001) concludes that leadership is 75 percent about people, and 25 percent about everything else. Yet, the most common weakness among leaders and managers is their inability to work with people.

There are two main constructs of servant leadership which are (1) Ethical behavior and (2) Concern for subordinates (Ehrhart, 2004). Contee-Borders (2003) argue that servant leaders are dedicated towards growth and welfare of people. Altruism, simplicity and consciousness are the key characteristics of a servant leader (Johnson, 2001). A servant leader has a moral differentiation from a transformational leader by an altruistic service against following high priority needs (Parolini, 2007). Organization learning is conducive to employee's growth and performance (Morales et al., 2008). Just look at your own organization and ask: How many people are suffering at the hands of incompetent, unethical and abusive leaders? How many workers are burnt-out or disengaged? What many managers are frustrated by their inability to motivate employees? What is the total cost of toxic emotions at the work place (Frost, 2003)? How much financial and human resources are being squandered due to mismanagement?

Let us admit we are facing a leadership crisis, which will only deepen unless some fundamental change is made in today's turbulent times. Great leaders don't reach the height of success without facing their share of minor challenges and major crises. In fact, most outstanding leaders would say that working through difficulties made them even better. A truly great leader will rise to the top in troubling times, when difficult decisions are made and decisive action must be taken. A new leadership is needed: leadership that is not trendy and transient, but a leadership that is rooted in our most ethical and moral teaching; leadership that works because it is based on how people need to be treated, motivated and led. There is an urgent need to do some soul searching and hard thinking regarding how to best train leadership for the next generation. A consensus is emerging among management educators and gurus that the "hard" skills of information technology and management science are not enough. We need some kind of "soft" skills so that leaders and managers know how to work with people and manage change. Though servant leadership has been written about and practiced by several business magnates, in the past few years it has not been studied in a systematic manner. At first blush, you may think a servant leader literally takes on the role of a servant and envision a long-suffering manager wearily going about his job with no spark or power whatsoever. Charismatic leadership seems sexier, but it's a breeding ground for narcissism. The best leadership metaphor that fits is "servant leadership" and a large number of individuals or corporations are not familiar with this. Robert Greenleaf gave birth to the paradoxical term servant-leadership and was brought into the mainstream back in 1970 in an essay. Servant leadership is an emerging model of leadership characterized by its emphasis on strong follower-centric, altruistic, moral/ethical, and spiritual values (Smith et al., 2004). In contrast to leaders who see people merely as units of production or expendable resources in a profit and loss statement, servant leaders empower followers to grow healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, and more likely themselves to become servants. Moreover, unlike

transformational leadership whose primary concern is performance beyond expectations the sine qua non of servant leadership is followers' holistic development. So, servant leaders employ relational power that facilitates post-conventional moral reasoning and spiritual considerations in others (Pekerti and Sendjaya, 2010). In the tough and tumble business world, even the term "servant leader" sounds like an oxymoron. Many CEOs are afraid that they would be perceived as weak and indecisive, if they think and behave like a humble servant.

There is a number of studies of leadership styles; transformational and servant leadership are the most prominent among them (Dvir et al., 2002; Ehrhart, 2004; Whetstone, 2002). Kriger and Simon (2005) suggest that there are over 10,000 studies on leadership, yet in a power hungry world the concept Servant Leadership is seeping into the walls of universities, foundations, churches, non-profit institutions, businesses and the corporate world causing drastic changes. In the past 25 years we have seen a dramatic increase of women in the workplace, a growing ethnic and racial diversity and a desire to see the workplace serve as a learning environment for personal growth and fulfillment and can take us beyond original ideas. Servant-leadership has influenced many noted writers, thinkers, and leaders. Max DePree, former chairman of the Herman Miller Company and author of *Leadership Is an Art and Leadership Jazz*, has said, "The servanthood of leadership needs to be felt, understood, believed, and practiced." These changes, among others, have prompted a reexamination of the effectiveness of the traditional leadership model of power and authority. The traditional model has held prominence since the beginning of time, and our history is written around the use and abuse of leadership power. There is a growing call for new leadership thinking and a new vision of organizations that place service to others over self-interest and self-promotion. Servant-leadership incorporates the ideals of empowerment, total quality, team building, and participatory management, and the service ethic into a leadership philosophy. This model of leadership emphasizes increased service to others; a holistic approach to work; promoting a sense of community; and the sharing of power in decision making. Servant-leaders must be value- and character-driven people who are performance and process oriented. There are two main constructs of servant leadership which are (1) Ethical behavior and (2) Concern for subordinates (Ehrhart, 2004). Contee-Borders (2003) argue that servant leaders are dedicated towards growth and welfare of people. Altruism, simplicity and consciousness are the key characteristics of a servant leader (Johnson, 2001). A servant leader has a moral differentiation from a transformational leader by an altruistic service against following high priority needs (Parolini, 2007). Organization learning is conducive to employee's growth and performance (Morales et al., 2008)

2. History of Servant Leadership

Since history influences one's thinking, it is imperative that the historical influences of servant leadership at the time of its conception be discussed (Marius & Page, 2002). The subjugation of one individual by another—servant and master—has demeaned society throughout human history. The idea that the relationship itself, *servanthood*, could, in some manner, be the foundation for a form of leadership would be deemed by most as utter fantasy. Throughout the ages and throughout the world, people have wrestled with how to best get along with each other and evolve together. Although Greenleaf is credited with conceptualizing servant leadership, he was not the first to speak about service. In the 4th century B.C, Chanakya wrote in his book, *Arthashastra*: "The king (leader) shall consider as good, not what pleases himself but what pleases his subjects (followers). The king (leader) is a paid servant and enjoys the resources of the state together with the people." Most notably passages documented from Lao-Tzu who lived in China 570 B.C. Lao-Tzu was a Chinese philosopher who was deeply influential, his teachings of servant hood were aligned with rescuing society from moral decay (Servant Leadership, 2010). An additional historical example of servant hood is Jesus' teachings to his disciples in the New Testament Book of Mark; He instructed his disciples that "whoever wishes to be ruler over others must first be servant s themselves" (Mark New International Version). The book of John is a wonderful example of the ultimate Leader being a servant first. After an exhausting day of roving dusty roads by foot and preaching the Gospel, Jesus himself, removed the sandals from his disciples then washed their feet before cleansing his own (John New

International Version). Four decades ago, the tumultuous sixties birthed the concept of servant leadership and brought this unique leadership style to the forefront. The forefather of servant leadership was a popular essayist and management researcher, Robert Greenleaf. Greenleaf was perplexed by the Cultural Revolution and became inquisitive to why the youth of America were so defiant. His in-depth research concluded the nucleus of the mutinous movement derived from America's Institutions inability to adequately serve others. In early 1970, Robert Greenleaf wrote an essay targeting poor leadership as the impetus for the uprising of the sixties. His composition promoted old theories as a new application to leadership; he expanded on the idea of service to others and coined the phrase servant leadership. His writings became influential and attracted interests of corporate executives. Greenleaf (1991), an AT&T executive, implemented servant leadership principles to ensure his employee's highest-priority needs were being served. The results of his innovative engagement strategies were astonishing. He continued to publish several more essays measuring his theory against despots and cynics. Actively immersed in leadership research, Greenleaf (1991) examined the authority of hierarchy structures controlling organizations. His findings were the driving force to write two more essays targeting power within power structures, executive leadership and board of trustees (Greenleaf, 1991).

3. Foundation of Servant Leadership

Servant Leadership is created on a foundation of love and compassion, where power and authority are used to benefit the whole of an organization, encouraging individuals to grow and achieve autonomy. Servanthood by itself does not make one a leader. One needs to blend a servant's heart with leadership skills.

"Tears shed for self are tears of weakness, but tears shed for others are a sign of strength" (Myra & Shelley, 2005, p. 237). Many choose to be service oriented leaders versus self-governing dictators. This is attributed to spiritual character. The deep character growth process involves putting God first in every area of life. The fundamental concept of servant leadership is placing others before self; this is a natural process and characteristic. Moral leadership appears to be the foundation to servant-leadership. Servant-leadership should become more common in the 21st century as organizations abandon the traditional command-and-control structure and favor a more open, democratic management approach.

Servant Leaders care about the people that work for them, other person's agendas come before their own and commitment to service comes first. Considering today's narcissistic society, the notion of placing ego's aside and serving others before addressing self interest defies logic. Servant leaders are active pursuers of meaningful professional growth. Devoted servant leadership begins with a conscious effort to establish intimate relationships with the organizations followers. Intimacy has to do with understanding, with believing, and with practice. It has to do with the relationship of one's work (DePree, 1989). Supervisors who understand people develop insight, a cornerstone in constructing training programs which serve needs and achieve success. Failure is inevitable when people with influence cannot identify weaknesses and promptly adapt. Leaders who only understand policy and procedure can never foster intimacy. Intimacy is the critical component when developing organizational structures and models for achievement. Max DePree (1989), list three key elements in the art of working together; how to deal with change, how to deal with conflict, and how to reach our potential (p. 59). Methods to successfully face the challenges these elements propose can be linked directly to intimacy of the workforce. Servant leaders understand when employees become aligned with the organizations compass, followers become easier to coach which transcends performance to a higher standard. Intimacy and relationships are the oil that keeps friction down and permits smooth operation within the organization. Servant leaders have a keen understanding of human character and embrace a nurturing teaching style that builds self-esteem. Serving leaders understand institutional objectives are best met when both the needs of the people and the organization are achieved together, and seldom are these two goals equal (DePree, 1992). Successful leaders recognize teamwork always multiplies effectiveness and momentum is a leader's best friend.

4. Need for Servant Leadership

Although simple in concept, Servant Leadership flips our idea about conventional leadership: it's about serving others to lead effectively, rather than leading so others can serve us. Servant leadership is one of the best ways to empower others to achieve greater levels of skill and ability, which eventually develops them into better and more productive future leaders. Ken Blanchard, who put Leadership Training on the map, defines servant leaders as "humble people who don't think less of themselves, they just think about themselves less. They don't deny their power; they just realize it passes through them, not from them (Blanchard, 2007, p. 263). A fundamental principle supporting servant leadership is to gain in-depth knowledge of followers. Effective leaders recognize it takes sincere effort and compassion to reach someone's heart and you must touch their heart before you ask them for a hand (Maxwell, 1998). Leaders must win people over before they enlist their support. Fostering cooperation through deepening relations between leaders and followers is a positive stride towards ascending out of economic abyss. Servant Leaders stay in the background in order to have an overall view of the organization. From this vantage point, they have the flexibility to step away to see a larger picture or to step in to become more completely involved. Either way, it is from this position that Servant Leaders are able to recognize energies, ideas, and influences.

The impact of servant leadership on these organizations may be increased employee satisfaction and retention, increases in productivity and sales, and more stability for the organization. The need for effective leaders, those who adopt servant leader principles will more effectively and efficiently serve their organization and her employees. Servant leaders have a better understanding of the attitudinal and motivational demands that followers need. Leaders who address unmet psychological needs engineer positive emotions. Transcending group perceptions of organizational justice leads to increased productivity (Maxwell, 1998). Consequently, there is a trend in servant leadership organizations to train supervisors with learning and implementing effective justice principles (Skarkicki & Latham, 1996). Human resource systems function by utilizing human capital, establishing an organizational mission to employ servant-type behavior characteristics in future leaders solidifies the core values of servant leadership based institutions (Delery & Doty, 1996).

Can we implement positive management without positive leaders? What kind of leadership is most suitable to implement a strengths-based and meaning-centered paradigm? What kind of training prepares managers to balance humanistic concerns with the bottom line? The servant leadership (SL) approach has much to recommend. Furthermore, a number of leading writers in business management have endorsed servant leadership; these include Peter Drucker, Peter Block, Sheila Murray Bethel, Jim Kouzes, Barry Posner, James Autry, Warren Bennis, John Maxwell, Ken Blanchard, Max DePree, Bill Pollard, John Bogle, John Carver, Joe Batten and Dennis Romig.

These servant leaders are people-centric, value service to others and believe they have a duty of stewardship. Nearly all are humble and passionate operators who are deeply involved in the details of the business. Most have long tenures in their organizations. They have not forgotten what it was like to be a line employee. They believe that every employee should be treated with respect and have the opportunity to do meaningful work. They are led by example, live the "Golden Rule," and understand that good intentions are not enough — behaviors count. These leaders serve the organization and its multiple stakeholders. They are servant leaders.

SL practices participative leadership (McMahon, 1976) and shares some of the characteristics of transformational leadership (Bass, 1998; Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2003). According to Bass (2000), SL is "close to the transformational components of inspiration and individualized consideration" (p. 33). SL is also similar to steward leadership (Block, 1993), because both models emphasize the need to replace self-interest with service to others as the basis for using power. Thus, Theory S incorporates various relationship-oriented leadership practices (Stogdill & Coons, 1957; Yukl, 2002).

SL is opposed to the command-and-control type of autocratic leadership. There is now a clear consensus among modern management theorists (Avolio, 1999; Bennis, 1990; Hammer & Champy, 1993; Rinzier & Ray, 1993; Senge, 1990) that autocratic leadership needs to be replaced by leadership that empowers workers. In today's environment, command-and-control leadership no longer works,

because leaders must earn people's respect and trust. In short, SL has been distorted and devalued by different people for various reasons. SL is basically paradoxical (Rinehart, 1998 Wong,2004) –the weak shall be strong, the last shall be first,leading through serving, winning through losing, and gaining through giving away. Such upside-down- leadership cannot b e understood simply through human logic or rational thinking. One needs to approach SL from humanistic, spiritual and collectivist perspectives. One needs to move beyond self interest to consider the big picture.

Servant leaders are free to be flexible and situational (Blanchard & Hodges, 2003; Wong, 2003), because they are no longer imprisoned by their own need for power and pride. They are willing to employ different kinds of legitimate power to facilitate worker development and accomplish organizational goals (Bass, 1998; Hersey, Blanchard, & Natemeyer, 2001). However, servant leaders can and will dismiss workers whose performance and attitude negatively affect other workers in spite of repeated intervention efforts. Jack Kahl and Tom Donelan (2004) have made a strong case that servant leaders are not “sweet” and "weak". Page and Wong (2000) proposed a conceptual model of servant leadership with servanthood at the heart of the model. They also developed an instrument that measured both the characteristics and the process of SL. The instrument was developed purely based on a prior conceptual analysis.

Later, Wong and Page (2003) developed an opponent-process model of servant leadership and a revised Servant Leadership Profile based on empirical research. The significant contribution of the opponent-process model is that it explicitly identifies autocratic leadership as antithetic to the practice of servant leadership. In other words, it is not possible to be a servant leader, when one is motivated by power and pride.

5. Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a problematic term because it is individual, personal, and subjective and thus cannot really be objectively measured. We can define job satisfaction as a "feeling" of contentment or pleasure in the work we do, and at the conditions under which we practice our professions. Institutions headed by servant leaders are much more likely to be thoughtful and understanding of the individual wants and capabilities of every employee. Job satisfaction forms the final construct for consideration. Curry, Wakefield, Price, and Mueller (1986) found no relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction. However, many researchers have identified a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Bedeian&Armenakis, 1981; Cetin, 2006; Fletcher & Williams, 1996; Porter & Steers, 1973; and Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970). In their investigation of the causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, Vandenberg and Lance (1992, Authors of “Examining the Causal Order of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment”) found that organizational commitment causes job satisfaction. Conversely, Caykoylu, Ergi and Havlovic (2007) found job satisfaction as the main variable in determining the level of organizational commitment. Additionally, Caykoylu et al. also reported job satisfaction as a mediating variable between other independent variables and organizational commitment.

Studies have shown that various factors influence job satisfaction. Thompson (2002) stated that research has discovered, “that job factors such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, possibility of advancement, and salary have a relationship with job satisfaction” (p. 40). Hagedorn (2000)similarly stated, “when a worker feels a high level of achievement, isintensely involved, and is appropriately compensated by recognition, responsibility, and salary, job satisfaction is enhanced and job dissatisfaction is decreased” (p. 8). Studies have demonstrated a relationship between the preferred leadership style of administrators in educational settings and employee job satisfaction (Bowden 2002; Christopher, 2001; Hull, 2004; Martino, 2003; Thompson, 2001).

Is being a servant leader just about being nice for the sake of niceness? No, it works. Researchers Huselid and Becker (n.d.) studied over 1,500 firms from various industries by applying data from the U.S. Department of Labor, concluding servant /leadership practices improve employee retention,

increase productivity and elevate the company's market value \$78,000 per employee (as cited in Blanchard, 2007). The theory supporting servant leadership is researched extensively but effectiveness of application requires continual exploration. To highlight the process through which servant leaders successfully help follower needs, we draw on justice literature (Greenleaf, 1991). Organizational justice is "the study of people's perceptions of fairness in organizations" (Organizational justice, 2010). In 2008, Mayer, Bardes, Piccolo (2008), attentive to servant leadership theoretical work, presented a study to connect a gap between servant leadership and follower needs. Absent from research examining the relationship between these two factors is Job Satisfaction. To analyze occupational fulfillment; Mayer, Bardes, Piccolo (2008), conducted a survey study linking follower need and job satisfaction through measuring organizational justice. The theoretical model linked servant leadership to justice perceptions, which in turn related to need satisfaction, and ultimately eventuated into job satisfaction. To support the model, previous theoretical and empirical work linking servant leadership to needs satisfactions and justice perceptions were extracted (Greenleaf, 1991). In addition, Mayer, Bardes, Piccolo (2008), adopted a multiple needs model of justice (Cropanzano & Byrne, 2000) to coalesce perceptions. Although organizational justice can be classified into four distinct dimensions, as mentioned in Adams (1965), recent research specifies measuring the overall justice construct provides better validity. Modern Justice research indicates measuring dimensions independently may skew evaluations, therefore making holistic judgment more salient (Ambrose & Arnaud, 2005). Using a likert scale servant leadership behavior was assessed.

6. The advantages of Servant Leadership

The concept of 'servant' is laden with symbolism that infers a state of being under the will of others or of giving selflessly. Servant leadership has evolved into one of the speediest growing trends in leadership and management circles. Servant leadership bases its main purpose as "changing the culture of leadership to make the maximum quantity of positive change". Why is the philosophy of servant leadership becoming so popular? Why are so many major companies adopting these guidelines for their business? The advantages of servant leadership are too countless to add. Servant leaders are attentive to the growth and development of those they work with, including partners, employees, and customers. Servant leadership bases its main purpose as changing the culture of leadership to create the maximum amount of positive change. What is it that makes servant leadership so popular? Why are so many major corporations adopting these principles for their business? The main advantage of SL is that it is flexible. Whether you are a charismatic intuitive leader or a down-to-earth methodological type of leader, you can always benefit from practicing servant leadership. No leader can be effective in a culturally diverse workplace by adopting only one leadership style.

The servant leader attempts to build groups that magnify strengths and compensate for inadequacies. The purpose is to make the best overall chance for success. Folks need to know that they matter to the company they are working for and they increase the value of the final picture. Another major advantage is that it aims at curbing the widespread evil of abuse of power. The superiority of SL over autocratic leadership has been well documented (Farling, Stone, & Winston, 1999; Laub, 2003; Page & Wong, 2000; Russell & Stone, 2002; Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002). SL prevents and reduces all kinds of problems directly related to command-and-control leadership.

Re-engineering, restructuring, downsizing, merger and hostile take-over strikes fear in the hearts of employees whose jobs are directly affected. Often leaders simply shuffle workers around as pawns on a chess board without ever considering how these changes might impact their lives and performance. Servant leaders can help navigate troubled waters and make inevitable changes less stressful for the employees.

Evidence is accumulating that servant leadership is good for business. Studies by Dennis Romig (2001) with thousands of employees have demonstrated that when the practices of servant leadership are implemented through leadership training in a business, performance has improved by 15 - 20% and work group productivity by 20 - 50%. This means an increase in profitability.

Fortune magazine's annual rankings of the best 100 corporations to work for show that companies that practice SL consistently rank within the top 10 (e.g., Southwest Airlines, Synovus Financial

Corporation, TD Industries, and Container Stores). Many other successful businesses, such as the Toro Company and The Men's Wearhouse, are also known for being led by servant leaders.

7. The Best Practices in Servant Leadership

So becoming a servant leader sounds pretty straightforward so far but, as with most things, it's far easier to talk the talk than to walk the walk. SL is deceptively simple, yet it is probably the most profound and difficult type of leadership. The main reason for the difficulty is that it is not based on a set of skills – it requires a fundamental change of attitude and some kind of inner transformation.

All the exercises in team-building will not make you a team person, if you are an egotistic person at heart. Egos die hard. Pride will not easily let go of its prisoners. That is why there are so few servant leaders. SL training challenges our basic attitudes and motivations. It demands a new orientation towards the self and people.

The following represents a preliminary set of best practices that may help cultivate the five major characteristics of SL. This is primarily a summary of what others have proposed (Blanchard & Hodges, 2003; Maxwell, 2005; Spears & Lawrence, 2004). The important thing emphasized here is that these best practices must be aligned with each other in order to realize the full benefits of SL.

8. Conclusions

It is high time to develop a new paradigm of leadership training. All the exercises on team-building and strength-finding will not work without the right kind of leadership. The spirit of the leader as a servant may be just what is needed to implement a strengths-based paradigm.

"The Leader of the Future" from the Drucker Foundation, edited by Frances Hesselbein, Marshall Goldsmith and Richard Beckhard (1997), rejected the command-and-control approach; they advocated the importance of learning from the grass roots and leading with a shared vision and a spirit of collaboration. They believed that the challenge facing future leaders is to serve as role models with core values and inspire a diverse work group for long-term common good. In "The Leaders of the Future II", Hesselblein and Goldsmith (2006) reinforce the same themes and emphasize the need for new ideas for leadership training in the post-9/11 world.

McCrimmon (2006) advocates a new kind of leadership to create the future. Such new leadership is not tied to official positions or roles; rather, it is an informal act which can be performed by all employees. Thus, every worker can show leadership by suggesting new products, better services and more efficient processes. Toyota and Sony are shining examples of this type of bottom-up leadership.

SL is not new, because it was practiced and taught by Jesus more than 2000 years ago, but it is new and revolutionary in today's competitive consumer society. Potentially, SL can transform leadership, the workplace and society. Just pause and think what will happen to your organization when CEOs and managers really practice SL as characterized by the following:

The world is full of leaders with huge egos and a great deal of leadership abilities. These leaders may do more harm than good, if they are primarily motivated by selfish ambitions.

What we need most are servant leaders with exceptional abilities blended with hearts full of humility and love. More importantly, we need leaders whose behavior is consistent with their being: they do what they truly are and they are what they truly do. Such leaders can make this world a better place and restore people's hope in the future.

The world has become more complicated, and dynamic times require dynamic driven leaders. Servant leadership can manifest positive change in organizations, contrasting traditional autonomous leadership methods. When followers recognize leaders place value on individuals, followers are more likely to perform at a higher level (Braham, 1999). Research supports contemporary servant leadership philosophies perform above the norm in all types of private organizations. It does not take any stretch of imagination to conclude that only servant leadership can fit in a corporation devoted to serving others. "I am convinced," writes William Turner as chairman of the Executive Committee of Synovus Financial Corporation, "that servant leadership will be the way to manage in the future, not only

because it brings personal fulfillment to everyone in the organization, including the boss, but also because it can deal with change quickly and effectively” (Turner, 2000).

References

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 267 – 299
- Ambrose, M. L., & Arnaud, A. (2005). *Distributive and procedural justice: Construct distinctiveness, construct interdependence, and overall justice*, (Ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Blanchard, K. (2007). *Leading at a higher level*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Bass, B. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7, 18-40.
- Bedeian, A. G., & Armenakis, A. A. (1981). A path-analytic study of consequences of role conflict and ambiguity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24, 417-28.
- Bennis, W. (1990). *Why leaders can't lead*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Blanchard, K., & Hodges, P. (2003). *The servant leader: Transforming your heart, head, hands & habits*. Nashville, TN: J. Countryman.
- Bowden, A. G. (2002). *Collaborative leadership in middle schools and teacher job satisfaction: A search for relationships*. Dissertation Abstracts International, 63 (03), 822. (UMI No. 3045935)
- Braham, J. (1999). The spiritual side, *Industry Week*, 48-56.
- Caykoylu, S., Egri, C.P., & Havlovic, S. (2007). *Organizational commitment across different employee groups*. *The Business Review*, Cambridge, 8 (1), 191-197.
- Cetin, M. O. (2006). *The relationship between job satisfaction, occupational and organizational commitment of academics*. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, Cambridge, 8(1), 78-88.
- Christopher, S. L. (2001). *The relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction among directors of Christian education and their senior pastors in the Lutheran church Missouri Synod*. Dissertation Abstracts International 62(03), 964. (UMI No. 3009193)
- Contee-Borders, A.K.(2003). *A case study defining servant leadership in the workplace*, Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI No. 3069348.
- Cropanzano, R., & Byrne, Z. S. (2000). *Workplace justice and the dilemma of organizational citizenship*. (Eds.). London: Routledge.
- Curry, J. P., Wakefield, D. P., Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1986). On the causal ordering of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29(4), 847-58.

- DePree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an art*. New York, NY: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, Inc.
- DePree M. (1992). *Leadership jazz*. New York, NY: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, Inc.
- Delery, J. E., & Doty, D. H. (1996). Models of theorizing in strategic human resource management: Tests of universalistic, contingency, and configurational performance predictions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 802 – 835.
- Dvir, T., Eden, E., Avolio, B.J., Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: a field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4):735–44.
- Farling, M. L., Stone, A. G., & Winston, B. E. (1999). Servant leadership: Setting the stage for empirical research. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6, 49-72.
- Fletcher, C., & Williams, R. (1996). Performance management, job satisfaction and rganizational commitment. *British Journal of Management*, 7(2), 169-179.
- Frost, P. J. (2003). *Toxic emotions at work: How compassionate managers handle pain and conflict*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K., (1991). *The servant leader*. Westfield, IN: The Robert K. Greenleaf Center
- Hammer, M., & Champy, J. (1993). *Reengineering the corporation*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Hagedorn, L. S. (Ed.). (2000). *What contributes to job satisfaction among faculty and staff?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Natemeyer, W. E. (2001). Situational leadership and power. In W. E. Natemeyer & J. T. McMahon (Eds.), *Classics of Organizational Behavior* (3rd ed.) (pp. 321-329). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Hesselbein, F., & Goldsmith, M. (2006). *The leader of the future 2: Visions, strategies, and practices for the new era*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hull, D. R. (2004). Relationships between personality and job satisfaction in professional academic advisors. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(02), 428. (UMI No. 3123571)
- Johnson, C. (2001). *Meeting the Ethical Challenges of Leadership*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA
- Kahl, J., & Donelan, T. (2004). *Leading from the heart: Choosing to be a servant leader*. Westlake, OH: Kahl & Associates.
- Kruger, M P, & Simon M A (2004). Leadership Networks: beyond the single leader paradigm. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 77. Retrieved August 16, 2013 from Academic Search Elite
- Laub, J. (2003). From paternalism to the servant organization: Expanding the organizational leadership assessment (OLA) model. Paper presented at the Servant Leadership Roundtable at Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA, on Oct. 16, 2003.
- Martino, A. M. (2003). Leadership style, teacher empowerment, and job satisfaction in public elementary schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(09), 3151. (UMI No. 3104415)

- Maxwell, J.C. (1998). *The 21 irrefutable laws of leadership*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Inc.
- Maxwell, J. C. (2005). *The 360 degree leader: Developing your influence from anywhere in the organization*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson
- Mayer, D. M., Bardes, M., & Piccolo, R. F.(2008). Do servant-leaders help satisfy follower Needs? An organizational justice perspective. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 17(2), 180-197.
- Morales, V., Montes, F., Jover, A.(2008). The Effects of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Performance through Knowledge and Innovation. *British Journal of Management*, 19: 299–319
- Myra, H., & Shelley, M. (2005). *The leadership secrets of billy graham*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- McCrimmon, M. (2006). *Burn! Leadership myths in flames*. Toronto, ON & London, UK: Self Renewal Group.
- McMahon, J. T. (1976). Participative and power equalized organizational systems. *Human relations*, 29, 203-214.
- Organizational justice. (2010, March 1). In Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. Retrieved August 12, 2013, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Organizational_justice
- Parolini, J.L.(2007). Investigating the distinctions between transformational and servant leadership, doctoral dissertation thesis, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Pekerti, A. A. & Sendjaya, S. (2010). Exploring servant leadership across cultures: comparative study in Australia and Indonesia. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 21, No. 5, 754–780.
- Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1973). Organizational, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 151-76.
- Rinzler, A., & Ray, M. (Eds.) (1993). *The new paradigm in business: Emerging strategies for leadership and organizational change*. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher.
- Rinehart, S. T. (1998). *Upside down: The paradox of servant leadership*. Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress.
- Rizzo, R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 150–163.
- Romig, D. A. (2001). *Side by side leadership*. Marietta, GA: Bard Press
- Russell, R. F., & Stone, A. G. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 23, 145-157.
- Sendjaya, S., & Sarros, J. C. (2002). Servant leadership: Its origin, development, and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 9, 57-64.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York: Doubleday.

Servant leadership. (2010, February 28). In Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. Retrieved August

12, 2013, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Servant_leadership

Skarlicki, D. P., & Latham, G. P. (1997). Leadership training in organizational justice to increase citizenship behavior within a labor union: A replication. *Personnel Psychology* 50,617 – 634.

Smith, B. N., Montagno, R. V. &Kuzmenko, T. N. (2004). Transformational and Servant Leadership: Content and Contextual Comparisons. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 10, 80–92.

Spears, L. C., & Lawrence, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Practicing servant-leadership: Succeeding through trust, bravery, and forgiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Stogdill, R. M., & Coons, A. E. (Eds.). (1957). *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research.

Stone, A. G., Russell, R. F., & Patterson, K. (2003). Transformational versus servant leadership – A difference in leader focus. Paper presented at the Servant Leadership Roundtable at Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA, on Oct.16, 2003.

Thompson, C. (2001). The effects of perceived leadership style on the job satisfaction of mid-level student affairs administrators in institutions of higher education. *Dissertation Abstracts International* ,61(12), 4701. (UMI No. 9998006)

Thompson, R. S. (2002). The perception of servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction in a church-related college. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64 (08), 2738.(UMI No. 3103013)

Turner, W. B. (2000). *Learning of love: A journey toward servant leadership*. Macon, GA: Smyth &Helwys.

Wong, P. T. P. (2003). An opponent-process model of servant leadership and a typology of leadership styles. Paper presented at the Servant Leadership Roundtable at Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA, on Oct.16, 2003.

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

Whetstone, J.T.(2002). Personalize and moral leadership: the servant leader with transforming vision. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 11(4): 385–392

Wong, P. T. P. (2004). The paradox of servant leader ship. *Leadership Link*, Spring, 3-5. Leadership Research Center, Ohio State University.

AUTHORS

First Author – Natashaa Kaul.Ms. Natashaa Kaul is an Asst. Professor at Indira School of Business Studies and also a doctoral student at Nirma University of Science and Technology.Her research areas are social program evaluation, personal development and organizational performance.

E-mail: natashaakaul@gmail.com