International Leadership Journal

Fall 2020
VOLUME 12, ISSUE 3
A refereed, online journal published thrice yearly by TST, Inc.

IN THIS ISSUE

ARTICLES

PRACTICE

THOUGHT PIECE

BOOK REVIEW

International Leadership Journal

Contents

Volume 12, Issue 3, Fall 2020

From the Editor

October 2020

Welcome to the 37th issue of the *International Leadership Journal,* an online, peer-reviewed journal. I—and perhaps most of us—did not imagine in March that the COVID-19 pandemic would still be a continuing source of frustration and challenge for leaders of organizations around the globe so many months later. I hope that you all are safe and healthy and will remain so.

This issue contains three articles, a practice piece, a thought piece, and a book review. In the first article, Knights outlines three relevant considerations to aid the progression of research on CEO narcissism that have been largely ignored and/or underarticulated. He suggests that future research focus on conceptualization issues, the need to both identify and create an awareness of related personality traits, and the importance of acknowledging complications within the various environments that precipitate narcissistic behavior.

Kariuki's study explored the trivariate relationship between self-efficacy, leader–member exchange (LMX), and leadership effectiveness using open-ended interviews to elicit the key traits of a sample of supervisors and subordinate staff. He found that individuals high in self-efficacy are seen to be high in LMX quality, resulting in effective leadership.

Tirmizi and Tirmizi endeavored to answer the question of whether servant leadership is universally relevant across cultures and sectors. Their comparative empirical study examined the relevance of servant leadership in Jordan, Pakistan, the Caribbean region (Barbados, Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago), and the United States and in six work domains. Their findings indicate that there are important differences and similarities in the perceived relevance of servant leadership in those countries and work contexts.

In his practice piece, Mahon sought to extract the important aspects of servant leadership research and provide practitioners and organizations with a framework for practicing it. Three meta-analyses included in the article make a strong case for servant leadership.

In his thought piece, Sarsar explores the explosion of authoritarian and populist leaders and how they often miss the mark when it comes to humane leadership. He notes that more liberal-oriented leaders, such as New Zealand's Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern, tend to be authentic, transformative, and motivated by a vision larger than themselves. He urges the world to reimagine its future and put forward leaders who are authentic, with abilities to communicate and act effectively with meaning and purpose.

Finally, Shah offers a review of Former National Security Advisor John Bolton's 2020 memoir *The Room Where It Happened: A White House Memoir*. The book explores the vastly different dynamics between President Trump and his advisors and those of previous administrations and educates the reader on foreign policy issues over the past 30 years. Shah notes that Bolton does a good job explaining those complex foreign entanglements as well as leadership decisions during this administration.

Please spread the word about *ILJ* to interested academics and practitioners and remember to visit http://internationalleadershipjournal.com. Also, feel free to propose a topic and be a guest editor of a special issue by contacting me at jcsantora1@gmail.com.

Joseph C. Santora, EdD
Editor

ARTICLES

Researching Narcissistic CEOs: Three Considerations for Improving Theory and Research*

Alexander R. Knights
Roger Williams University

In the wake of corporate scandals, largely attributed to executive excess and irresponsibility, interest in CEO narcissism has surfaced within organizational research as a truly relevant issue related to these transgressions. The purpose of this article is to outline three relevant considerations that are pertinent to the progression of this burgeoning research stream but have been largely ignored and/or underarticulated. These considerations are related to: (a) conceptualization issues, (b) the need to both identify and create an awareness of related personality traits, and (c) the importance of acknowledging complications within the various environments that precipitate narcissistic behavior. Overall, the three conceptual and empirical considerations presented herein are meant to appreciate current progress but guide future efforts.

Key words: CEO narcissism, chief executive officers, executive personality, narcissism, strategic leadership research

As the recent wave of corporate scandals provide continuing evidence of the deleterious effects of organizational leaders who thrive on exploitation, opportunism, and greed, academic research on narcissistic CEOs abounds (Amernic & Craig, 2010; Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007, 2011; Craig & Amernic, 2011; Engelen et al., 2013; Gerstner et al., 2013; O'Reilly et al., 2014; Patel & Cooper, 2014; Perri, 2013; Peterson et al., 2012; Resick et al., 2009; Rijsenbilt & Commandeur, 2013; Wales et al., 2013; Zhu & Chen, 2014). *Narcissism* describes individuals who possess an intense desire to maintain a positive self-view, underlying their continual need for social validation and tendency to pursue self-enhancement opportunities (Pincus & Roche, 2011). Given narcissists' predilection for such behaviors, scholars have attempted to uncover the role that this disposition among CEOs plays in observing potentially destructive behaviors and adverse strategic and organizational outcomes. For instance, as narcissists are "frequently in error but never in doubt" (Hogan, 2007, 125), Chatterjee and

*To cite this article: Knights, A. R. (2020). Researching narcissistic CEOs: Three considerations for improving theory and research. *International Leadership Journal, 12*(3), 3–15.

Hambrick (2007) found that narcissistic CEOs were more likely to engage in dynamic and ostentatious strategic initiatives. Likewise, Rijsenbilt and Commandeur (2013) found that narcissistic CEOs were more likely to be accused of intentionally misrepresenting financial statements.

Indeed, existing research demonstrates that narcissism has significant, potentially destructive, implications for executives and the firms they lead. As I illustrate below, unless scholars begin to acknowledge and directly confront issues in the literature, researchers risk developing an incomplete and biased understanding of narcissism in the executive suite and its impact on organizations. Worse still, the potential for aiding practitioners who are involved in the selection of such individuals may likely go unrealized. The three considerations presented below are meant to appreciate current progress but guide future efforts. My hope is that these considerations will help in the development of a more cumulative stream of research on CEO narcissism that has a meaningful impact on practice.

Three Important Considerations for CEO Narcissism Researchers

Consideration #1

Narcissism may be conceptualized and examined in studies as two distinct forms—grandiose *and* vulnerable *narcissism.*

The first, and perhaps most pressing, consideration that CEO narcissism researchers should take into account is directly related to the conceptualization of narcissism. The existing conception of narcissism in the organizational sciences characterizes executives who are naturally exhibitionistic and socially charming, have grandiose self-views, and have an unremitting need to publicly demonstrate, maintain, and reinforce their self-perceived importance (Miller & Campbell, 2008; Miller et al., 2010). Implicit in this conceptualization is a view of narcissism as a single, unified concept. This perspective, however, is inconsistent with those found in more established literatures on narcissism, namely the social, personality, and clinical psychology literatures. These inconsistencies go beyond differences in terms and labels across disciplines. Instead, they point to potential confusion surrounding the nature of narcissism among organizational researchers.

In these related literatures, researchers have empirically identified two heterogeneous conceptualizations of narcissism: grandiose and vulnerable narcissism (Gabbard, 1989; Kay, 2008; Miller & Campbell, 2008; Miller et al., 2010; Russ et al., 2008; Wink, 1991). Of the two conceptualizations, Campbell et al. (2011) and others have suggested that grandiose narcissism is conceptually closer to the narcissism currently being studied among CEOs (Engelen et al., 2013; Gerstner et al., 2013). Both conceptualizations converge on narcissists' explicit display of grandiosity and expressions of exhibitionism, arrogance, entitlement, exploitation, aggression, and dominance (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007, 2011; Miller & Campbell, 2008; Miller et al., 2010; Patel & Cooper, 2014; Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010; Pincus & Roche, 2011; Wink, 1991). Vulnerable narcissists, conversely, are conceptualized as displaying a more defensive and insecure grandiosity, masking their underlying feelings of low self-esteem, inadequacy, hypersensitivity, anxiety, negative affect, and shame (Miller & Campbell, 2008; Miller et al., 2010; Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010; Pincus & Roche, 2011; Wink, 1991).

There is ample evidence of the important differences between grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. For example, in research exploring their relationship with other personality traits, grandiose narcissism was shown to be positively related to extroversion and negatively related to neuroticism (Miller & Campbell, 2008; Miller et al., 2009; 2011; Paulhus & Williams, 2002), while vulnerable narcissism was positively related to neuroticism and negatively related to extroversion (Hendin & Cheek, 1997; Miller et al., 2008; 2010). Within the interpersonal domain, there are notable differences between the two forms of narcissism as well (Besser & Priel, 2010; Dickinson & Pincus, 2003). For example, Besser and Priel (2010) found that when interactions resulted in negative feedback, grandiose narcissists were only likely to respond with aggression when said feedback was indicative of achievement failure (e.g., being passed over for a promotion at work). Such responses enable grandiose narcissists to satisfy their unrelenting need to protect and enhance their inflated sense of self. On the contrary, Besser and Priel also found that vulnerable narcissists became hostile only when negative feedback was in the form of intimate rejection (e.g., being humiliated and betrayed by a close social connection) due to their phobia of diminishment and rejection (Dickinson & Pincus, 2003).

Indeed, grandiose and vulnerable narcissism are two vastly different, but equally important, manifestations of this construct. One suggestion for dealing with the CEO narcissism conceptualization issue is to expand the current conceptualization to include both grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. In line with this, there is some evidence that organizational scholars are beginning to acknowledge that two types of narcissism exist (Campbell et al., 2011; O'Reilly et al., 2014). For example, in their review of narcissism in organizations, Campbell et al. (2011) not only acknowledge the existence of two types of narcissism, but also encourage future research to separate and test both forms to reduce confusion surrounding the constructs. Yet, even in these limited instances of organizational research recognizing that narcissism is not a single unified concept, the focus has remained limited to grandiose narcissism.

My general point here is certainly not to pit vulnerable narcissism against grandiose narcissism. Instead, I suggest that the current approach of either solely testing narcissism as if there were only one conceptualization, or mentioning both grandiose and vulnerable narcissism but focusing exclusively on grandiose narcissism, does little in the way of improving our overall understanding of narcissism. Researchers should begin to formally conceptualize and explore both forms simultaneously to improve our conceptual understanding. It is only then that we may develop a cohesive and valid literature on narcissism in organizations.

Consideration #2

Narcissism and closely related personality traits may have shared variance, which should be accounted for in studies.

The efficacy of the CEO narcissism construct should be uniquely defined relative to other related constructs to better delineate unique differences. Thus, another important consideration for future CEO narcissism research is the need to control for closely related personality traits (namely, Machiavellianism and psychopathy; Paulhus & Williams, 2002).This consideration is necessary because in conjunction with narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopathy are unique constructs (Paulhus & Williams, 2002); they often share variance, which makes it difficult to ascertain their individual contributions to pathological leadership (Jonason et al., 2009; Lee & Ashton, 2005). Moreover, like narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopathy have been shown to be prevalent in organizational contexts, particularly among senior-level executives (Amernic & Craig, 2010; Boddy, 2010; Boddy et al., 2010; Galperin et al., 2011).

Indeed, these three personality traits are discernable even to the layperson (Rauthmann & Kolar, 2013). Grandiose narcissists are often described as ego-centric self-enhancers, while psychopaths and Machiavellians are respectively known as affectless, thrill-seekers, and unempathetic manipulators. However, there is sufficient evidence that these constructs are interrelated, suggesting their propensity to co-occur in individuals (Paulhus & Williams, 2002; O'Boyle et al., 2012). For one, research has shown that the intercorrelations between these constructs are typically positive and range from .25 to .50 (Paulhus & Williams, 2002; Paulhus et al., 2001). McHoskey (1995) also found that subjects' Machiavellianism and narcissism scores were significantly correlated based on their maladaptive tendency to exploit others. In Paulhus and Williams' (2002) study, higher narcissism scores were also prevalent among psychopaths, as individuals high in either trait tend to engage in self-enhancement (e.g., overestimating their intelligence).

Overall, the overlap between narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy is both apparent and significant. It ultimately points toward the importance of teasing out the redundant variance that may be attributable to the latter two traits in studies of CEO narcissism. That is, to truly demonstrate CEO narcissism's unique contribution to important outcomes, researchers need to include Machiavellianism and psychopathy in future studies. In this way, future research can account for the overlap among the constructs (Jonason et al., 2012) in hopes of identifying either spurious effects or narcissism's "pure" contribution to the outcome of interest. As

Paulhus and Williams (2002), Jonason et al. (2012), and others have found, when these traits are studied in concert within a single study, their distinctive contributions become most apparent.

The benefits of including Machiavellianism and psychopathy in future studies are twofold. First, considering that all three traits not only overlap but are also common to organizational executives (Amernic & Craig, 2010; Boddy, 2010; Boddy et al., 2010; Galperin et al., 2011), the inclusion of Machiavellianism and psychopathy in CEO narcissism studies would determine whether observed effects are truly produced by narcissism or the shared relationship between the three concepts and relevant outcomes. Second, absent any spurious relations, the inclusion of other dark triad constructs in CEO narcissism studies is beneficial as it will help to identify the distinct contribution of narcissism to relevant organizational outcomes. In turn, any recommendations for organizational decision-makers that stem from CEO narcissism research will be more accurate and precise regarding selection and promotion initiatives.

Consideration #3

Narcissistic CEOs have complex relationships with their environments that should be accounted for in studies.

Despite the longstanding portrayal of narcissists as being uniformly oblivious and impervious to their environment (Dickinson & Pincus, 2003), recent evidence suggests that this view may be oversimplified and in need of modification (Nevicka et al., 2011; Wallace & Baumeister, 2002). In its place, a more complex contingency perspective is gaining increasing traction in the narcissism literature (Wallace & Baumeister, 2002). Accordingly, another consideration that needs to be accounted for in future research is a theory that accounts for narcissistic CEOs' complex relationship with different types of environments and how this affects success versus failure.

Researchers have long held the view that chronic self-preoccupation is a fundamental aspect of narcissism (Emmons, 1987; Raskin & Terry, 1988). Implicit in this perspective, however, has been the assumption that narcissists possess either a limited capacity or an unwillingness to focus on their external environment. Even today, this assumption continues to shape many people's thinking. Pincus and his colleagues (Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010; Pincus & Roche, 2011) found that when the average person hears the term "narcissist," it immediately conjures a traditional image of arrogant, self-absorbed individuals who are so obsessed with their own omnipotence that they are unaware of and unconcerned with others. This image is perhaps further reinforced by some psychologists' and psychiatrists' continued description of grandiose narcissists using the term "oblivious narcissists," ultimately portraying what they believe to be individuals who are disconnected with and unmoved by issues in the environment (Betan & Westen, 2009; Dickinson & Pincus, 2003; Gabbard, 1989, 1998).

Yet, there are reasons to believe that both types of narcissists are not only attentive to their environment, but interacting with it. As Kernberg (1986) notes, narcissists must stay attuned to their immediate environment given their heavy reliance on social actors' praise to feed their narcissistic supply. In line with this reasoning, consistent findings have shown that grandiose narcissists are motivated to perform only when they anticipate their outcomes will be observed by a large, evaluative audience and success would socially demonstrate their unique abilities (Engelen et al., 2013; Gerstner et al., 2013; Wallace & Baumeister, 2002). Likewise, owning to their low self-confidence in social settings, but enduring need for social admiration (Rose, 2002; Wink, 1991), vulnerable narcissists are equally likely to prefer select environments.

Considering this support, it is surprising that organizational researchers frequently overlook the role of the industry environment in their explorations of the relationship between CEO narcissism and organizational outcomes (for an exception to this, see Engelen et al., 2013). This conclusion is drawn from the consistent sampling of CEOs in prior research from a limited number of industry environments, such as the computer software and hardware (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007, 2011; Peterson et al., 2012), high-technology (Engelen et al., 2013; O'Reilly et al., 2014; Wales et al., 2013), pharmaceutical (Gerstner et al., 2013), and manufacturing industries (Patel & Cooper, 2014). However, there are two problems with this approach. First, because scholars are restricting their focus to narcissists in similar settings, it makes it difficult to theorize and test for the relevance of the industry environment in facilitating narcissistic effects (i.e. neutralizing the role of the industry). Moreover, in light of the preceding support for the importance of the environment to both types of narcissists, scholars are likely misattributing some industry effects to CEOs' narcissistic personalities (i.e., masking the role of the industry).

To deal with this issue, I propose that future research sample both types of narcissists (grandiose and vulnerable) from a variety of organizations (e.g., for-profit and nonprofit) and industry environments (e.g., manufacturing, public administration, and retail), comparing the noted differences across these settings. It is likely that several interesting differences may immediately emerge as the two types of narcissists interact with dissimilar contexts. For example, whereas Engelen et al. (2013) found that grandiose narcissists can lead firms to positive performance in environments characterized by ambiguity and dynamic changes, it is likely that the neurotic tendencies of vulnerable narcissists may cause them to falter in such environments. On the contrary, it is also likely that fortunes may reverse for both types of narcissists in stable, less complex settings. Ultimately, exploring some of the possible intersections between narcissists and the industry environment will allow for more precise predictions and findings regarding the complex effects that narcissists have on important organizational outcomes (Engelen et al., 2013; Wallace & Baumeister, 2002). More importantly, with a deeper understanding of those settings that are more and less advantageous to narcissistic executives, organizational decision-makers will be better positioned to make good decisions with regard to CEO selections.

Conclusion

As the number of narcissistic CEOs continues to proliferate, examining their effects on organizations has increased in saliency. Researchers have thus explored the relationship between CEO narcissism and a myriad of important organizational outcomes. With increasing research attention, however, several conceptual and measurement considerations have emerged. In this article, I have attempted to outline three such considerations that have previously been overlooked but should be taken in to account as CEO narcissism research advances. My hope is that the considerations offered here will prove useful to researchers attempting to further our understanding of narcissism in the executive suite.

References

Amernic, J. H., & Craig, R. J. (2010). Accounting as a facilitator of extreme narcissism. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *96*(1), 79–93.

Besser, A., & Priel, B. (2010). Grandiose narcissism versus vulnerable narcissism in threatening situations: Emotional reactions to achievement failure and interpersonal rejection. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *29*(8), 874–902.

Betan, E. J., & Westen, D. (2009). Countertransference and personality pathology: Development and clinical application of the Countertransference Questionnaire. In R. A. Levy & J. S. Ablon (Eds.), *Handbook of evidence-based psychodynamic psychotherapy* (pp. 179–198). Humana Press.

Boddy, C. R. (2010). Corporate psychopaths and organizational type. *Journal of Public Affairs*, *10*(4), 300–312.

Boddy, C. R., Ladyshewsky, R. K., & Galvin, P. (2010). The influence of corporate psychopaths on corporate social responsibility and organizational commitment to employees. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *97*(1), 1–19.

Campbell, W. K., Hoffman, B. J., Campbell, S. M., & Marchisio, G. (2011). Narcissism in organizational contexts. *Human Resource Management Review*, *21*(4), 268–284.

Chatterjee, A., & Hambrick, D. C. (2007). It's all about me: Narcissistic chief executive officers and their effects on company strategy and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *52*(3), 351–386.

Chatterjee, A., & Hambrick, D. C. (2011). Executive personality, capability cues, and risk taking: How narcissistic CEOs react to their successes and stumbles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *56*(2), 202–237.

Craig, R., & Amernic, J. (2011). Detecting linguistic traces of destructive narcissism at-a-distance in a CEO's letter to shareholders. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *101*(4), 563–575.

Dickinson, K. A., & Pincus, A. L. (2003). Interpersonal analysis of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *17*(3), 188–207.

Emmons, R. A. (1987). Narcissism: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *52*(1), 11–17.

Engelen, A., Neumann, C., & Schmidt, S. (2013). Should entrepreneurially oriented firms have narcissistic CEOs? *Journal of Management*, *42*(3), 698–721.

Gabbard, G. O. (1989). Two subtypes of narcissistic personality disorder. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, *53*(6), 527–532.

Gabbard, G. O. (1998). Transference and countertransference in the treatment of narcissistic patients. In E. Ronningstam (Ed.), *Disorders of narcissism: Diagnostic, clinical, and empirical implications* (pp. 125–145). American Psychiatric Press.

Galperin, B. L., Bennett, R. J., & Aquino, K. (2011). Status differentiation and the protean self: A social-cognitive model of unethical behavior in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *98*(3), 407–424.

Gerstner, W. C., König, A., Enders, A., & Hambrick, D. C. (2013). CEO narcissism, audience engagement, and organizational adoption of technological discontinuities. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *58*(2), 257–291.

Hendin, H. M., & Cheek, J. M. (1997). Assessing hypersensitive narcissism: A reexamination of Murray's Narcism Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *31*(4), 588–599.

Hogan, R. (2007). *Personality and the fate of organizations.* Lawrence Erlbaum.

Jonason, P. K., Li, N. P., Webster, G. D., & Schmitt, D. P. (2009). The dark triad: Facilitating a short-term mating strategy in men. *European Journal of Personality*, *23*(1), 5–18.

Jonason, P. K., Slomski, S., & Partyka, J. (2012). The dark triad at work: How toxic employees get their way. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *52*(3), 449–453.

Kay, J. (2008). Toward a clinically more useful model for diagnosing narcissistic personality disorder. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *165*(11), 1379–1382.

Kernberg, O. F. (1986). Narcissistic personality disorder. In A. A. Cooper, A. J. Frances, & M. H. Sachs (Eds.), *The personality disorders and neuroses* (Vol. 1, pp. 219–231). Basic Books.

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2005). Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and narcissism in the five-factor model and the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *38*(7), 1571–1582.

McHoskey, J. W. (1995). Narcissism and Machiavellianism. *Psychological Reports*, *77*(3), 755–759.

Miller, J. D., & Campbell, W. K. (2008). Comparing clinical and social-personality conceptualizations of narcissism. *Journal of Personality*, *76*(3), 449–476.

Miller, J. D., Dir, A., Gentile, B., Wilson, L., Pryor, L. R., & Campbell, W. K. (2010). Searching for a vulnerable dark triad: Comparing factor 2 psychopathy, vulnerable narcissism, and borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Personality*, *78*(5), 1529–1564.

Miller, J. D., Gaughan, E. T., Pryor, L. R., Kamen, C., & Campbell, W. K. (2009). Is research using the narcissistic personality inventory relevant for understanding narcissistic personality disorder? *Journal of Research in Personality*, *43*(3), 482–488.

Miller, J. D., Hoffman, B. J., Campbell, W. K., & Pilkonis, P. A. (2008). An examination of the factor structure of DSM-IV Narcissistic Personality Disorder Criteria: One or two factors? *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, *49*(2), 141-145.

Miller, J. D., Hoffman, B. J., Gaughan, E. T., Gentile, B., Maples, J., & Keith Campbell, W. (2011). Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism: A nomological network analysis. *Journal of Personality*, *79*(5), 1013–1042.

Nevicka, B., De Hoogh, A. H., Van Vianen, A. E., Beersma, B., & McIlwain, D. (2011). All I need is a stage to shine: Narcissists' leader emergence and performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*(5), 910–925.

O'Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., & McDaniel, M. A. (2012). A meta-analysis of the dark triad and work behavior: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *97*(3), 557–579.

O'Reilly, C. A., III, Doerr, B., Caldwell, D. F., & Chatman, J. A. (2014). Narcissistic CEOs and executive compensation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *25*(2), 218–231.

Patel, P. C., & Cooper, D. (2014). The harder they fall, the faster they rise: Approach and avoidance focus in narcissistic CEOs. *Strategic Management Journal*, *35*(10), 1528–1540.

Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *36*(6), 556–563.

Paulhus, D. L., Williams, K., & Harms, P. (2001, February). *Shedding light on the dark triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy* [Paper presentation]. Society for Personality and Social Psychology 2nd Annual Meeting, San Antonio, TX, USA.

Perri, F. S. (2013). Visionaries or false prophets. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *29*(3), 331–350.

Peterson, S. J., Galvin, B. M., & Lange, D. (2012). CEO servant leadership: Exploring executive characteristics and firm performance. *Personnel Psychology*, *65*(3), 565–596.

Pincus, A. L., & Lukowitsky, M. R. (2010). Pathological narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *6*, 421–446.

Pincus, A. L., & Roche, M. J. (2011). Narcissistic grandiosity and narcissistic vulnerability. In W. K. Campbell & J. D. Miller (Eds.), *The handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments* (pp. 31–40). John Wiley & Sons.

Raskin, R. N., & Terry, H. (1988) A principal components analysis of the narcissistic personality inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*(5), 890–902.

Rauthmann, J. F., & Kolar, G. P. (2013). The perceived attractiveness and traits of the dark triad: Narcissists are perceived as hot, Machiavellians and psychopaths not. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *54*(5), 582–586.

Resick, C. J., Whitman, D. S., Weingarden, S. M., & Hiller, N. J. (2009). The bright-side and the dark-side of CEO personality: Examining core self-evaluations, narcissism, transformational leadership, and strategic influence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(6), 1365–1381.

Rijsenbilt, A., & Commandeur, H. (2013). Narcissus enters the courtroom: CEO narcissism and fraud. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *117*(2), 413–429.

Rose, P. (2002). The happy and unhappy faces of narcissism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *33*(3), 379–391.

Russ, E., Shedler, J., Bradley, R., & Westen, D. (2008). Refining the construct of narcissistic personality disorder: Diagnostic criteria and subtypes. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *165*(11), 1473–1481.

Wales, W. J., Patel, P. C., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2013). In pursuit of greatness: CEO narcissism, entrepreneurial orientation, and firm performance variance. *Journal of Management Studies*, *50*(6), 1041–1069.

Wallace, H. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2002). The performance of narcissists rises and falls with perceived opportunity for glory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*(5), 819-834.

Wink, P. (1991). Two faces of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *61*(4), 590–597.

Zhu, D. H., & Chen, G. (2014). Narcissism, director selection, and risk-taking spending. *Strategic Management Journal*, *36*(13), 2075–2098.

Alexander R. Knights, PhD, is an assistant professor in the area of management in the Gabelli School of Business at Roger Williams University. He received his PhD Organizational Behavior and Leadership from the School of Management at Binghamton University. He studies leaders, the leadership process, and their social construction. He can be reached at aknights@rwu.edu.

The Effect of Self-Efficacy on Leader–Member Exchange (LMX) Formation in Leadership Effectiveness*

Josphat K. Kariuki
Pan Africa Christian University

A trivariate relationship between self-efficacy, leader–member exchange (LMX), and leadership effectiveness was established by eliciting the key traits of some supervisors and subordinate staff through open-ended interviews. A literature review verifies that self-efficacy is central to leadership. Associated concepts such as self-awareness, self-motivation, internal and external loci of control, and emotional intelligence are also investigated in this research. Their relationship with LMX behaviors and interactions between the leader and the followers are mapped. Individuals high in self-efficacy are seen to be high in LMX quality, resulting in effective leadership. This article contributes to the existing leadership knowledge with the finding that leaders and followers high in self-efficacy have high-quality LMX, and therefore, a more effective leadership process between them.

Key words: leadership, LMX, locus of control, motivation, self-efficacy

This study seeks to contribute to the impact of self-efficacy in the formation of high-quality or low-quality leader–member exchange (LMX), which, in turn, affects leadership effectiveness (Northouse, 2016). The self-efficacy and leader–member exchange theories are used as the underpinning theories for this research. Self-efficacy is one of the self-leadership concepts that helps leaders (and followers) to honestly self-monitor themselves and identify what they can and cannot do (Bandura, 1997). These concepts can be strategically used to empower leaders to effectively lead employees or followers within the diversity and globalization of current organizations. Northouse points out that "high-quality leader–member exchanges produced less employee turnover, more positive performance evaluations, higher frequency promotions . . . [and] greater participation" (141). Since self-efficacy aspects like personal characteristics and personality are part of in-group and out-group formations, it is thought that high self-efficacy can lead to high-quality LMX, and therefore effective leadership, due to mutual communication and trust between leaders and members.

*To cite this article: Kariuki, J. K. (2020). The effect of self-efficacy on leader–member exchange (LMX) formation in leadership effectiveness. *International Leadership Journal, 12*(3), 16–37.

Similar studies include Richter et al. (2012), on creative self-efficacy in contextual teams; Luthans and Peterson (2002), on the role of employee's and manager's self-efficacy in their relationship and employee engagement in an organization; Hodges (2018), on the effect of instructors' self-efficacy in teaching, especially in technology-based platforms; and Sears and Holmvall (2010), on the influence of emotional intelligence on LMX.

Theoretical Framework

Self-efficacy affects several critical areas of life, such as intellectual development, parenting, and health-promotive behavior, among others (Bandura, 1997). As organizations wrestle with strategies for maintaining a competitive edge and survival, effective leadership is required. Moss and Barbuto (2010) describe *leadership effectiveness* as "effectively managing employees through communication styles" (157). In a stricter sense, I would replace "managing employees" with "leading employees," since *managing* and *leading* have different implications, though both are important. Self-efficacy is thought to be a core contributor to such leadership, considering that globalization and cultural diversity calls for a more inclusive leader with high emotional intelligence (Daft, 2011). Organizational leaders can tap into the wealth of different capabilities within their employees by focusing on their diverse belief systems (self-efficacy) through processes like self-awareness, self-regulation, self-monitoring, self-motivation, and emotional intelligence (EI), which makes their leadership more effective (Bryant & Kazan, 2013; Goleman, 2013). Neck and Houghton (2006) view self-efficacy as the main conduit that self-leadership uses to influence how individuals perform, which is why I chose to focus on it in this study. A hypothetical assumption is that self-efficacy will be reflected in the relationships it creates between leaders and followers, so that LMX becomes a mediating factor through which self-efficacy influences leadership. Path–goal theory, though not investigated in this study, reinforces the need to study how the self-efficacy of the leader and follower affects leader–follower exchanges and leadership. The theory considers leaders' behaviors as well as followers' characteristics, which relate to their respective selfefficacies. House and Mitchell (1974) express *path–goal theory* as "how the leader influences the subordinates' perceptions of their work goals, personal goals and paths to goal attainment" (81). The influence is based on the perception of followers about their abilities to achieve goals, which resonates with the implication of self-efficacy, the belief in their capability to achieve something. Further, the theory requires that leaders motivate followers to achieve their goals by making the path toward their achievement clearer (Northouse, 2016), yet the motivation works better when the leader–follower relationship is conducive. As expected by the theory, leaders will more easily remove obstacles and offer support to those close to them (*in-group*) than those at a far relational distance (*out-group*), hence the need to understand the LMX relations and interactions of the team.

Research Question

The following research question was formulated to frame this study.

> *How does self-efficacy influence leader–member exchanges and, consequently, organization's leadership effectiveness, and how do these relate to other self-efficacy, LMX, and leadership effectiveness literature?*

Those at both the supervisory/leadership level and subordinate/follower level were interviewed to reduce a hierarchy bias. This helps to gain perceptions of self-efficacy and LMX from both leaders and members. To elicit information from the participants, interview questions were formulated.

Literature Review

Self-Efficacy in Leadership

According to Bandura (1997), *self-efficacy* refers to the "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations" (3). This serves to guide oneself on ways of enhancing human efficiency, so that both the leaders' and followers' capabilities are leveraged. Hoyle (2010) argues that self-efficacy includes our ability to use these capabilities or "competencies in specific domains and situations" (316). The process can be broken down into two parts: identifying the capabilities and practicing the use of the capabilities. The action part of it is based on the extent to which people feel that they can achieve the appropriate outcomes (Bandura, 1997). Bandura (2015) posits that self-efficacy "is the foundation of human aspirations, motivation, and accomplishments" (5). If leaders can delve into identifying individual's capabilities in their organizations and then create an environment in which each member thrives in the execution of their abilities, this would be a catalyst for effective leadership and higher performance. According to contingency theory, most situations will be different than those earlier experienced, and leaders and followers might need a different solution than one used previously. Leaders need to have the capability to "diagnose both leadership style and organizational situation" (Daft, 2011, 61). In all situations, Daft argues, the leader should endeavor to create favorable quality leader–member relations. Leader–member relations are gauged by the group atmosphere and the attitudes of the members to the leader and their acceptance of the leader. Trust, confidence, and respect of the leader by the followers result in good leader–member relations, while lack of these lead to poor leader–member relations. The self-efficacy beliefs can be constructed from mastery experiences, in which one masters the things necessary for success, probably by studying formally or by learning through "leader's personal crucible experiences" (Thomas, 2008, 185). Bennis (2009) advises that true understanding is achieved by reflecting on one's experiences, an aspect considered by Goleman (2013) to be part of EI. Vicarious experiences, in which one observes other people succeed and believes he or she can also succeed, calls for role modeling within the organization. Vicarious experiences require leaders be clear about their values and beliefs (self-efficacy) and clearly express them to others as good role models (Northouse, 2016). This is common with charismatic and transformative leaders. It is worth noting that followers have certain expectations of their leaders (Oginde, 2011) and are likely to emulate those expected behaviors. *Social persuasion* is where one is verbally convinced by others about his or her capabilities, as is the case with the use of charisma to ignite the "followers' energy and commitment, producing results above and beyond the call of duty" (Daft, 2011, 322). *Physiological and emotional states* are a person's states of stress, anger, happiness, etc., at a particular time. The description of leadership preferred in this study is that of a process, looking at leaders and followers as equally important within that process (Chaleff, 2009). How leaders perceive their self-efficacy determines how much they initiate, intensify, and persist in leadership behaviors (Paglis & Green, 2002). In an earlier study, Phillips and Bedeian (1994) investigated relational attributes of leaders and followers as well as how they influenced leader–follower interactions. Specifically, their research confirmed that "follower extraversion will be positively related to leader–member exchange level" (992) since extroverts proactively approach leaders in a quest for more challenging tasks and support than the introverts. Further research may need to be conducted on who and why is easier to influence between introverts and extroverts. Key self-efficacy components that influence the relationship between leaders and followers are explored below, including locus of control, self-awareness, and self-motivation.

Locus of Control

Rotter (1966) points out that individuals who attribute occurrence of events to external factors have external locus of control while those who believe in their ability to influence what happens to them have internal locus of control. Highly efficacious leaders and followers are likely to make an effort to make a positive change in a challenging situation than blame the situation. Individuals who possess internal locus of control believe in their capability to control what happens to them in their lives and perceive that their initiatives are the main cause of their success (Phillips & Bedeian, 1994). They are therefore motivated to initiate dialogues such as work assignments and schedules than simply complying with their leader's initiatives. This is the mechanism through which internal locus of control leads to high-quality LMX. This indicates that the dyad relationship between leaders and followers will be high quality since the leaders can do more for the followers than formally contracted to do and followers can do more for the leaders and organization than they are contracted to do. Those who possess external locus of control do not see themselves as leaders (Padilla et al., 2007), and therefore have low self-efficacy. The impact of this is that such individuals may not be willing to take responsibility in their workplace, tainting their relationships with their leaders.

Self-Awareness

Self-awareness relates to individuals' ability to understand themselves, their strengths and their weaknesses, or the "dark side personality dimensions" (Padilla et al., 2007, 177). That entails leaders' behaviors that hurt their relationships with coworkers (LMX), which affects team performance. Such dark side dimensions are tabulated by Hogan and Benson (2009) and include being mischievous, skeptical, and lazy. Self-awareness exposes the areas one can capitalize on to better one's leadership as well as areas to improve on. Perhaps the issues of moral leadership behavior can be more easily solved if the pressure to uphold ethics could come from the inside of a leader than from outside.

Self-awareness and EI are intertwined, and one is essential for the other. Goleman (2013) defines *self-awareness* as "having a deep understanding of one's emotions, strengths, weaknesses, needs, and drives" ("Self-awareness," para. 1). Emotionally intelligent people are capable of understanding their emotions or feelings, how they affect them, and how they affect others. As a result of being self-aware, people are able to realistically evaluate themselves and ask for help where it is needed, rather than struggling with what they cannot achieve besides sustained efforts that lead to "apprehension, apathy, or despair" (Bandura, 1997, 1).

Drucker (2008) posits that "managing yourself requires taking responsibility for relationships" (38). The EI components suggested by Goleman (2013) revolve around managing oneself and managing relationships with others (empathy and social skills). Empathetic leaders consider the feelings of their followers, and mutually empathetic followers consider the feelings of the leaders, laying very fertile ground for high-quality LMX formations. Yukl (2010) extends the definition of *self-awareness* to include the moods and emotions of a person, how the two evolve, how they change with time, and how they affect him or her and that person's relationship with others. Emotionally mature people will possess personality traits such as self-monitoring (Oginde, 2011), which is likely to enhance their relationships with others. This is a useful ability in today's organizations with huge cultural diversity, given that some actions may be offensive to one culture and acceptable in another. To establish good LMXs with members of different cultures, leaders need to be sensitive about other people's cultures vis-a-vis their own, balancing their ethnocentrism with that of others, also known as *ethnorelativism* (Daft, 2011).

Self-Motivation

Self-motivation "is the ability to stay focused, enthused, and motivated about one's own goals" (Bryant & Kazan, 2013, 22). Turbulent times separate efficacious people and inefficacious people: The former remain focused and maintain their enthusiasm and motivation, while the latter lose their focus, enthusiasm, and motivation. Goleman (2013) considers motivation to be one of the three self-management skills (the others being self-awareness and self-regulation). It has been observed that "efficacy beliefs play a key role in the self-regulation of motivation" (Bandura, 1997, 6). It is common to find efficacious people who use self-talk to motivate themselves even in difficult situations. They can use this self-motivation and EI to convert undesired states like anger into desirable outcomes.

Leader–Member Exchange in Leadership

Most of the current theories of leadership, such as authentic leadership, transformational leadership, and servant leadership, deal with the effect that leaders' behaviors have on followers' motivation, task attitudes, and outcomes. LMX theory deals with the dyadic relationship between leaders and members, and the effects it has on the followers, team, and organization in critical aspects of leadership such as trust and respect (Bauer & Erdogan, 2015). It does not consider leaders' and followers' traits in isolation, but the interactions between them (Northouse, 2016). LMX theory asserts that it is the leaders' responsibility to cultivate healthy relationships between them and their followers through the establishment of high-quality leader–follower interactions (Nevarez et al., 2013). Sheard et al. (2009) reiterate the "process" aspect of leadership and note that "it is not a linear, one-way event but rather a series of interactive events" (2). Intuitively, followership is also a process between followers and leaders. The expectation that those in authority are the ones who possess leadership is negated by Davids et al. (2019) in their observation that "leadership is not authority" (6). Therefore, followers also determine effectiveness of the LMXs between them and their leaders. LMX theory is practically seen in operation when leaders have some members being closer to them than others. It may appear like a natural occurrence, but the theory suggests that the groupings can be used constructively to the benefit of the organization. Miner (2015) points out that leadership problems would be fewer when the relationship entails informal assistants instead of ordinary members (meaning they do extra work), in-groups instead of out-groups, and high-quality instead of low-quality relationships. Optimized use of LMX theory would target moving members from ordinary to assistants or co-leaders, out-group to in-group members, and low-quality to high-quality relationships. Northouse (2016) explains that members who are willing to do more than they are contracted to do in their job, engage more with leaders, and support leaders more form in-group membership. In return, they get more rewards in form of promotions and incentives. Members who only do what they are contracted to do for the agreed pay form out-group membership. The groupings could be one of the sources of organizational politics as identified by Daft (2010), since the in-group and out-group members may disagree on some goals.

Since high LMXs greatly influence goal attainment and thus leadership effectiveness, understanding the features of members who exhibit high LMX would help in shifting low-quality LMX members to high-quality LMX members. Some of the features of high-quality LMX members, as identified by Miner (2015), are discussed here. They initiate things, which can be seen as informal leadership. Chaleff (2009) refers to such members as courageous followers. Unlike others who may seek to maintain status quo, high LMX members take risks to bring change. They are keen on adding value to the assignments they work on, as opposed to carrying out tasks for the sake of completion. Working closely with leaders and building networks, they are proactive in seeking opportunities in which to grow, which aids their self-development. This also ensures that they do not become obsolete and remain resourceful to leaders. A big plus for leaders is that they promote their leaders, which makes leadership easier and more effective.

Self-efficacy attributes, such as extroversion, influence LMX quality (Bauer & Erdogan, 2015). Bauer and Erdogan (2015) further argue that leaders' locus of control, self-efficacy, and optimism also positively affect the quality of exchanges between leaders and members. It can be investigated with a positive expectation whether employees' locus of control would affect the relationship in the same way. The similarity in leader–follower EI, liking, and attitudes are found to increase the quality of their exchanges (Miner, 2015). Leaders and followers with high self-efficacy have high self-confidence in their jobs and uphold strong LMX relationships.

Gestures of affection, regarded as one of the efficacy-activated processes by Bandura (1997), are said to contribute to the growth of the relationships between leaders and members, enhancing the collaboration and cooperation between them (Sears & Holmvall, 2010). The affective process, which is shaped by a positive self-concept (an aspect of self-efficacy), greatly affects the development of LMXs. This is so because efficacious people have *empathy,* explained by Goleman (2013) as the thoughtfulness in considering the feelings of others. Empathy tightens LMX and affects leadership in three critical ways. First, today's leadership is largely based on teams, the members of which will present different viewpoints, yet the team needs to disagree to agree. The leader should view conflicts in the team as constructive, not as a threat (Daft, 2010). Conflicts are expected on a team in which in-groups and out-groups exist. An empathetic leader will accommodate both groups affectionately. Second, globalization has introduced cross-cultural existence in organizations, and leaders should accommodate all cultures, even those different from their own. Dialogues within such platforms are easy to misunderstand, and leaders should hear the unsaid—reading and interpreting the emotions expressed by others. Finally, empathy helps connect leaders and employees that helps retain the employees and their unique talents. When facing an industry with stiff competition, it is paramount for an organization to avoid training and then losing their human resources to the competitors.

More research shows that high-quality LMX helps in the formation of employees' attitudes as well as affective commitment (Byun et al., 2017), which is thought to lay a conducive environment for leadership. We can therefore change the attitudes of employees to be more committed to the organization by first strengthening LMX relationships. A key determinant of LMX formation is mutual trust between leaders and members. While it takes great effort to build trust, it is unfortunately very easy to lose it. Minor unethical behavior, such as slight favoritism, can result in the loss of trust in a leader by those who feel sidelined. The competence of leaders affects their effectiveness, but Byun et al. found that a leader with low competence can circumvent it by strengthening LMXs to maximize members' competencies. Thomas (2008) supports this argument and posits that "leaders don't become leaders on talent alone" (230) but can identify and tap them from their employees who possess them. The same applies to competencies. One way of encouraging employees to use their competencies to leaders' advantage could be delegating some decision-making duties to them. They feel entrusted with the organization and thus get closer to the leader, resulting to higher quality LMX.

Leader–Member Expectations as a Basis of LMX Formation

Xu et al. (2012) relate LMX formation to supervisors' expectations of subordinates and subordinates' expectations of supervisors. Supervisors expect subordinates to be capable and competent in their tasks, which means they can work effectively to achieve the expected outcomes. Leaders test their followers' capabilities and competencies by giving them work assignments to see if they can complete them (Mahalinga Shiva & Suar, 2010). According to Miner (2015), leaders prefer members who are dependable and collaborative in their relationships—members who can be relied on. Graen et al. (2006) posit that employers are looking for employees who can handle team challenges by demonstrating team skills. The subordinates work hard to prove their worthiness by finishing the tasks. If they demonstrate capability and competence as expected, supervisors form high-quality LMX with subordinates. Leaders may award subordinates with more resources, autonomy, and recognition. Subordinates, on the other hand, expect the supervisors to be understanding or empathetic so that they can "feel" what they experience in the workplace. They also expect supervisors to provide them with opportunities that will help them to learn and develop, so as to ensure career growth, as well as to be friendly rather than abusive. Xu et al. argue that abusive treatment of subordinates by supervisors would lead to poor LMX. This would cause supervisors to deny subordinates some resources, and, in return, the subordinates may decrease their efforts to serve those supervisors. This incapacitates leadership effectiveness. When expectations from both leaders and followers converge and tasks are completed, high-quality LMX is developed (Yang et al., 2016). What follows is high levels of mutual trust, respect, loyalty, as well as follower commitment, which enhances leadership effectiveness.

LMX Influence on Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is a process in which charismatic and visionary leaders change and transform people by tapping into their motives, emotions, values, ethics, and standards. Such leaders shift the focus of followers from self-centeredness of needs to collective aspirations (Goethals et al., 2004). It requires high-quality LMX for leaders to effectively influence followers to change. One of the roles of transformational leaders is to ensure moral development of followers and raise followers' values to where they are operating with fairness and justice (Northouse, 2016).

Further necessity for the use of LMX in transformational leadership can be drawn from the transformational factors cited by Dugan (2017). First, the *idealized influence* involves a convergence of leaders' behaviors and followers' perception of those behaviors as worthy of respect and emulation. Leaders serve as role models, act in an altruistic manner, and demonstrate ethical behavior that followers can emulate. One's behavior is a reflection of one's personality, and who you are determines how you lead (Hogan & Benson, 2009). Second, *inspirational motivation,* which is the ability of the leader to ignite followers to achieve beyond the expectations of the leader and the organization, requires that both leaders and followers have a common shared vision. To genuinely (not through coercion) operate using a shared vision calls for a healthy leader–member relationship. Third, *intellectual stimulation* is a technique used by leaders to engage followers in constructively questioning the leadership process to identify areas for improvement. Kouzes and Posner (2012) view the aspect of leaders challenging the process as one of the keys to exemplary or effective leadership. For leaders to involve followers in such a risky task, the relationship between them should be at the mature relationship phase of LMX formation. The fourth factor is *individualized consideration.* Transformational leadership is based on the individual needs of followers rather than the general needs of an organization. This is the principle of *leader–member exchange theory,* a two-way exchange communication between the leader and the member. In this relationship, “the leader demonstrates active listening, delegates responsibility, and creates learning opportunities that contribute to the growth and development of followers” (Dugan, 2017, 185). Oginde (2011) considers this active listening to be part of EI, which, by extension, is part of self-efficacy.

Method

To effectively respond to the research question, a qualitative approach was preferred over a quantitative approach for several reasons. First, the main interest here is the quality of the relationship between self-efficacy and LMX rather than the numerical measure and quantification of the variables. Second, much is known about self-efficacy and LMX, but in isolation from each other, thus the need to deepen the understanding of the mediation between the two variables in enhancing leadership practice.

This research used open-ended questions in an interview format for data collection to gain wider and clearer feedback from participants that other methods such as observation, documentary evidence, and questionnaires would be less effective in gathering. Corresponding follow-up questions further helped to clarify any ambiguous responses. The target participants were chosen from a spectrum of top management to subordinates for effective sampling. They are all employees of a five-star hotel in Nairobi, Kenya, with a couple of years’ tenure, which suggests that the supervisors and subordinates know each other to a good degree.

To achieve saturation, two supervisors from different functional units/ departments (marketing and food service) and three subordinates from the same two departments were sampled to broaden the contextual coverage. The supervisors were noted to work closely together and often exchange departments (especially those working in the various restaurants), thus an interview with a few was believed to be a reliable representation of the rest. A greater number of participants would have been interviewed but, unfortunately, some targeted participants were afraid of being accused by senior management of disclosing information that could be leaked to competitors.

In analyzing the responses, the related responses were grouped together in themes such as behavior, awareness, and motivation that are closely related to self-efficacy. This will inform the different strategies to promote the use of self-efficacy concepts in enhancing organizational leadership effectiveness. The outcome is a set of suggested self-efficacy-based strategies for improving leadership in organizations to cope with contemporary issues affecting leadership.

Results

Two supervisors from two different departments of the hotel were interviewed using predefined open questions. The questions and their responses are shown in Table 1 on the next page.

Table 1: Interview With Supervisors of Different Departments

Question	Supervisor 1 Response	Supervisor 2 Response
Which of your work capabilities do you consider impactful in the success of your organization?	Collaboration with other departments, learning from them, and proactive personal development	Perceives himself as a leader, sets own high targets, self-motivated
Self-Efficacy/ LMX Aspect Derived	**Teamwork, personal development, extroversion**	**Cognized-goals motivation, internal locus of control**
What do you consider as the major source of your job motivation?	Personal targets, feedback	Passion for his job, support from superiors, recognition, being listened to
Self-Efficacy/ LMX Aspect Derived	**Cognized-goals motivation, internal locus of control**	**Intrinsic motivation, listening and recognition**
Besides your contract's assigned duties, what other duties do you volunteer to do?	Volunteers to train her team and serve her clients beyond contractual terms	Meets staff for recognition, works extra hours, volunteers to support other departments
Self-Efficacy/ LMX Aspect Derived	**Out-roles besides in-roles (high-quality LMX)**	**Out-roles (high-quality LMX)**
At a personal level, how do you handle emerging challenges you face in your job?	Listens to clients, dialogues with top management	Analyzes them, learns from them, empathizes with the affected member
Self-Efficacy/ LMX Aspect Derived	**Active listening, agreeableness**	**EI, high self-efficacy**
If you had a chance to hire new employees, what requirements would you consider from them?	Minimum supervision and hardworking, experience and qualification come below these	Dependable, team player, adaptable
Self-Efficacy/ LMX Aspect Derived	**Dependability and conscientiousness, internal locus of control**	**Dependability, agreeableness, teamwork**
Which behaviors and actions of your employees or colleague supervisor(s) do you find motivating to you in your workplace?	Teamwork, reliability, assertive subordinates, recognition of efforts by peers and superiors, being listened to	Teamwork, being involved in decision-making
Self-Efficacy/ LMX Aspect Derived	**Teamwork, dependability, assertiveness, recognition, listening**	**Teamwork, participation**

At their leadership levels, the two supervisors possess common qualities relating to self-efficacy and LMX, which positively affect their leadership effectiveness. Self-efficacy aspects common to both leaders include internal locus of control, which is described by Rotter (1966) as a key trait for highly efficacious people; cognized-goals motivation and intrinsic motivation, which Bandura (1997) views as major motivational forms for such people; dependability, which Miner (2015) considers to be one of the expectations by leaders for workers to complete tasks without supervision; listening and teamwork, which are components of EI (Oginde, 2011); and agreeableness.

On the other hand, the leaders are noted to have high-quality LMX, characterized by active listening, which is supported by Dugan (2017), who asserts that individualized consideration in LMX formation requires that a "leader demonstrates active listening" (185), and Goleman (2013), who considers it as an important social skill aspect of EI. The high-quality LMX is also characterized by performance of out-roles and volunteering beyond the call of duty, as well as teamwork. The high self-efficacy and corresponding high-quality LMX for both leaders suggests a positive correlation as a response to the research question: "How does self-efficacy influence leader–member exchanges?"

Three subordinates from the same departments of the hotel were also interviewed. The questions and their responses are shown in Table 2 on the next page.

Table 2: Interview With Subordinates of Same Department

Question	Subordinate 1 Response	Subordinate 2 Response	Subordinate 3 Response
Which of your work capabilities do you consider impactful in the success of your organization?	Self-confidence, ease of interacting with superiors and colleagues, asking for clarity when uncertain	Confidence	Confidence in handling clients (although intonation did not reflect this)
Self-Efficacy/LMX Aspect Derived	**Self-confidence, extroversion, high-quality LMX, EI**	**Confidence**	**Low self-efficacy**
What do you consider as the major sources of your job motivation?	Medical benefits, free transport, prestige of working in five-star hotel, remuneration	Medical benefits but not salary, which she perceived as small	Teamwork, career path development, and medical benefits
Self-Efficacy/LMX Aspect Derived	**Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation**	**No intrinsic motivation, only extrinsic**	**Extrinsic motivation**
Besides your contract's assigned duties, what other duties do you volunteer to do?	Proactive, adaptable, takes out-role duties	Stands in for others only if reciprocated	Not excited to take up extra roles
Self-Efficacy/LMX Aspect Derived	**Agreeableness, adaptability, internal locus of control (High-quality LMX)**	**Low-quality LMX**	**Low-quality LMX**
At a personal level, how do you handle emerging challenges you face in your job?	Solves challenges directly and then notifies her superiors	Follows protocol, so does not solve problems directly	Often forwards challenges to superiors to solve
Self-Efficacy/LMX Aspect Derived	**Internal locus of control, affection, high self-efficacy**	**External locus of control**	**External locus of control**
How would you judge the equality of employees' treatment by the management?	No bias; if any arises, it is well explained such as preference to nursing mothers	She perceives bias or favoritism expressed in the form of greetings	Some leaders show favoritism based on friendship
Self-Efficacy/LMX Aspect Derived	**In-group and out-group formation with management**	**Low-quality LMX**	**Low-quality LMX**
Which behaviors and actions of supervisor(s) or colleague employees do you find motivating to you in your workplace?	Teamwork, caring spirit, being listened to	Teamwork, honesty, and reliability of colleagues	Teamwork, being listened to
Self-Efficacy/LMX Aspect Derived	**Teamwork, caring, listening**	**Teamwork, dependability**	**Teamwork, listening**

It is noted that Subordinate 1 has both high self-efficacy and high-quality LMX, as opposed to Subordinates 2 and 3, who are relatively low in both self-efficacy and LMX. In her responses and in line with her verbal and nonverbal expressions, Subordinate 1 portrays self-efficacy characteristics such as self-confidence, self-awareness, intrinsic motivation, and EI. As noted in the literature review, Goleman (2013) made a similar observation that self-aware people have self-confidence and know when to ask for help. He associates self-awareness with EI. Paglis and Green (2002) also argue that self-confidence relates to internal locus of control, as noted for Subordinate 1. Extroversion would be regarded as more of an LMX determinant than a self-efficacy determinant, following the research by Phillips and Bedeian (1994), which identifies extroversion as an interpersonal (hence relational) factor. Other behaviors and actions relating to Subordinate 1's high-quality LMX include working beyond contractual terms, taking initiative, being adaptable, and having teamwork skills. In-group and out-group formations here are well managed, so they do not affect her. Northouse (2016) recommends that a leader should target strengthening their LMX quality with all members.

The low-quality LMX for Subordinates 2 and 3 could be attributed to their low-self efficacy. Their motivation was largely extrinsic, rather than intrinsic, and they exhibit an external locus of control. Low-quality LMX is seen in their reluctance to take extra roles unless reciprocated and their perception of favoritism in leadership. Their self-view as being confident and team players could not be confirmed by their expressions.

Conclusion

This study sought to establish how self-efficacy influences leader–member exchanges and, consequently, organizational leadership effectiveness and how these relate to other self-efficacy, LMX, and leadership effectiveness literature. Supervisors 1 and 2 and Subordinate 1, who exhibited high self-efficacy characterized by internal locus of control, self-awareness, self-confidence, self-development, interpersonal skills (implication of teamwork), cognized-goals motivation, appreciation of feedback, assertiveness, job passion, empathy, EI, initiative, affection, and caring, are the same ones who exhibited high-quality LMX characterized by extroversion, listening, involvement, reliability and dependability, recognition, and working beyond the call of duty. Self-efficacy is found to positively correlate with LMX quality. Similarly, Subordinates 2 and 3 demonstrated low self-efficacy through low self-confidence, external locus of control, and external than internal motivation. Their behaviors and perceptions revealed low-quality LMX in the form of clear perception of in-group and out-groups. They felt recognition was not as much as it should be and were hesitant to respond to the question of working beyond the call of duty. Subordinate 1, though at a follower's level, demonstrated significant traits and abilities similar to the two supervisors interviewed, which connotes that the high self-efficacy and the subsequent high-quality LMX led to more effective leadership, going by the definition of leadership as a process of influence between the leader and the follower. The findings are in line with the literature review's trends: high self-efficacy positively correlates with high LMX, and similarly, low self-efficacy positively correlates with low LMX as consistently verified in the study. Given the positive impact of high LMX on leadership effectiveness as elicited from the literature review, and the finding from this study that high self-efficacy leads to high LMX, we can intuitively deduce that strengthening the self-efficacy of employees would create more effective leadership.

Limitations and Further Research

The limitations of this study are that the gender representation was biased with more women than men, and the sample was relatively small. The hotel's staff is culturally diverse, and further research can be done to ascertain the impact of culture on its leadership. Further research considering a wider range of environmental and situational contexts would also reinforce the use of self-efficacy strategies in leadership.

References

Bandura, A. (Ed.). (1997). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. Cambridge University Press.

Bandura, A. (2015). *Moral disengagement: How people do harm and live with themselves*. Worth.

Bauer, T. N., & Erdogan, B. (Eds.). (2015). *The Oxford handbook of leader–member exchange.* Oxford University Press.

Bennis, W. (2009). *On becoming a leader*. Basic Books.

Bryant, A., & Kazan, A. (2013). *Self-leadership: How to become a more successful, efficient, and effective leader from the inside out.* McGraw-Hill.

Byun, G., Dai, Y., Lee, S., & Kang, S. (2017). Leader trust, competence, LMX, and member performance: A moderated mediation framework. *Psychological Reports, 120*(6), 1137–1159.

Chaleff, I. (2009). *The courageous follower: Standing up to and for our leaders* (3rd ed.). Berrett-Koehler.

Daft, R. L. (2010). *Organization theory and design* (10th ed.). South-Western, Cengage Learning.

Daft, R. L. (2011). *Leadership* (5th ed.). South-Western, Cengage Learning.

Davids, B., Carney, B. M., & Getz, I. (2019). *Leadership without ego: How to stop managing and start leading*. Springer International, Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-00323-4

Drucker, P. F. (2008). *Managing oneself* (1st ed.). Harvard Business School.

Dugan, J. P. (2017). *Leadership theory: Cultivating critical perspectives*. Jossey-Bass.

Goethals, G. R., Sorenson, G. J., & Burns, J. M. (2004). *Encyclopedia of leadership*. Sage.

Goleman, D. (2013). *What makes a leader: Why emotional intelligence matters*. More Than Sound.

Graen, G. B., Hui, C., & Taylor, E. A. (2006). Experience-based learning about LMX leadership and fairness in project teams: A dyadic approach. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 5*(4), 448–460.

Hodges, C. B. (Ed.). (2018). *Self-efficacy in instructional technology contexts*. Springer International.

Hogan, R., & Benson, M. J. (2009). Personality, leadership, and globalization: Linking personality to global organizational effectiveness. In W. H. Mobley, Y. Wang, & M. Li (Eds.), *Advances in global leadership* (Vol. 5, pp. 11–34). Emerald Group.

House, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. (1974). Path–goal theory of leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Business, 4*(3), 81–98.

Hoyle, R. H. (Ed.). (2010). *Handbook of personality and self-regulation*. Blackwell.

Kouzes, J., & Possner, B. Z. (2012). *The leadership challenge workbook* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Luthans, F., & Peterson, S. J. (2002). Employee engagement and manager self-efficacy. *Journal of Management Development, 21*(5), 376–387.

Mahalinga Shiva, M. S. A., & Suar, D. (2010). Leadership, LMX, commitment and NGO effectiveness: Transformational leadership, leader–member exchange, organizational commitment, organizational effectiveness and programme outcomes in non-governmental organizations. *International Journal of Rural Management, 6*(1), 117–150.

Miner, J. B. (2015). *Organizational behavior 1: Essential theories of motivation and leadership*. Routledge.

Moss, J. A., & Barbuto, J. E., Jr. (2010). Testing the relationship between interpersonal political skills, altruism, leadership success and effectiveness: A multi-level model. *Journal of Behavioral & Applied Management, 11*(2), 155–174.

Neck, C. P., & Houghton, J. D. (2006). Two decades of self-leadership theory and research: Past developments, present trends, and future possibilities. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*(4), 270–295.

Nevarez, C., Wood, J. L., & Penrose, R. (2013). *Leadership theory and the community college: Applying theory to practice*. Stylus.

Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (7th ed.). Sage.

Oginde, D. (2011). Follower expectations of a leader: Most admired leader behaviors. *International Leadership Journal, 3*(2), 87–108.

Padilla, A., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2007). The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 176–194.

Paglis, L. L., & Green, S. G. (2002). Leadership self-efficacy and managers' motivation for leading change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(2), 215–235.

Phillips, A. S., & Bedeian, A. G. (1994). Leader–follower exchange: The role of personal and interpersonal attributes. *The Academy of Management Journal, 37*(4), 990–1001.

Richter, A. W., Hirst, G., Van-Knippenberg, D., & Baer, M. (2012). Creative self-efficacy and individual creativity in team contexts: Cross-level interactions with team informational resources. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(6), 1282–1290.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectations for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, 80*(1), 1–28.

Sears, G. J., & Holmvall, C. M. (2010). The joint influence of supervisor and subordinate emotional intelligence on leader–member exchange. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 25*(4), 593–605.

Sheard, G., Kakabadse, A., & Kakabadse, N. (2009). *Leadership teams: Developing and sustaining high performance*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Thomas, R. J. (2008). *Crucibles of leadership: How to learn from experience to become a great leader*. Harvard Business School.

Xu, E., Huang, X., Lam, C. K., & Miao, Q. (2012). Abusive supervision and work behaviors: The mediating role of LMX. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*(4), 531–543.

Yang, C., Ding, C. G., & Lo, K. W. (2016). Ethical leadership and multidimensional organizational citizenship behaviors: The mediating effects of self-efficacy, respect, and leader–member exchange. *Group and Organization Management, 41*(3), 343–374.

Yukl, G. A. (2010). *Leadership in organizations*. Pearson Prentice Hall.

Josphat Kamau Kariuki is a PhD in Organizational Leadership candidate at the Pan Africa Christian University in Nairobi, Kenya. He holds a master's degree in information systems engineering from Sunderland University and a bachelor's degree in education (science) from Kenyatta University. He currently serves as an International President Team member for NeoLife International. His passion is transformational leadership, which he is currently practicing in Kenya. He can be reached at josphat.kariuki@students.pacuniversity.ac.ke or jkariukicuea@gmail.com.

Is Servant Leadership Universally Relevant? A Study Across Cultures and Sectors*

S. Aqeel Tirmizi
Antioch University

S. Noor Tirmizi
Daira Ltd., London, United Kingdom

Through its emphasis on service, empathy, empowerment, and humility, servant leadership is placed uniquely and prominently in the leadership theory landscape. Theoretical and empirical works during the last 20 years have moved the field of servant leadership forward in important ways. However, our understanding of servant leadership's cross-cultural relevance remains limited. In fact, according to a recent extensive review, only a handful of comparative cross-cultural studies of servant leadership exist. Additionally, our systematic understanding of servant leadership's relevance to specific work domains (private, public, political, religious, nonprofit, and community settings) is even more limited. This comparative empirical study contributes to these gaps by examining the relevance of servant leadership across four countries and six specific work domains. Specifically, we examined the relevance of servant leadership in Jordan, Pakistan, the Caribbean region (Barbados, Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago), and the United States based on survey responses from 454 respondents. Our findings indicate that there are important differences as well as similarities in the perceived relevance of servant leadership in those countries and work contexts.

Key words: cross-cultural leadership, leadership development, leadership across sectors, leadership and work domains, servant leadership

> *"What counts in life is not the mere fact that we have lived. It is what difference we have made to the lives of others that will determine the significance of the life we lead."*
> *—Nelson Mandela (2002, para. 4)*

Through its emphasis on service, empathy, empowerment, and humility, servant leadership is placed uniquely and prominently in the leadership theory landscape. The concept of "servant leadership" was first introduced in 1970 by Greenleaf, initially as an essay and then expanded into a book, *The Servant as Leader: A Journey Into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness* (1977). Greenleaf, inspired by the protagonist of Herman Hesse's fictional *Journey to the East*, defined a *servant leader* as an individual who was primarily motivated to serve and

---

*To cite this article: Tirmizi, S. A., & Tirmizi, S. N. (2020). Is servant leadership universally relevant? A study across cultures and sectors. *International Leadership Journal, 12*(3), 38–63.

took on the mantle of leadership as a means to the end of service. In this view, servant leaders treat their followers as collaborators, using persuasion (rather than coercion or appeals to their own authority) to motivate followers to action. This selfless leadership mode should elevate followers, enabling their personal growth and the development of their autonomy (Greenleaf, 1977).

While Greenleaf's description was eloquent, intuitive, and inspiring, it was not a detailed or rigorous definition or model of servant leadership, and the concept would require further elaboration before it could be explored and tested empirically. One of the first serious attempts at this elaboration was undertaken by Spears, who had worked with Greenleaf extensively at his Center for Servant Leadership in Indianapolis, Indiana. Spears (1995) developed Greenleaf's concept into a definition of a *servant leader* as one who possesses or displays 10 characteristics/behaviors: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment, and building community. While this was an important step in the clarification of servant leadership, it did not constitute a fully developed model, as Spears did not distinguish between the intrapersonal aspects, interpersonal aspects, and outcomes of servant leadership, and the concept therefore could not be operationalized for empirical testing (van Dierendonck, 2011). Empirically testable models of servant leadership would only emerge in the late 1990s and early 2000s, several decades after Greenleaf's introduction of the concept. Since then, the study of servant leadership has advanced significantly on both the theoretical and empirical fronts.

Servant leadership is now an important theoretical voice and an emerging area of practice. However, a better understanding of servant leadership's universal relevance is needed through more comparative cross-cultural studies. In fact, in their recent extensive review, which covered a 20-year period and included 285 articles, Eva et al. (2019) found only 12 comparative cross-cultural empirical studies (based on samples from multiple countries) of servant leadership. Additionally, existing cross-cultural research has not holistically examined the relevance of service leadership within specific work contexts and domains (e.g., private, community, nonprofit, and political). The purpose of the current study is to first address this cross-cultural gap in servant leadership research by examining its relevance in four different countries. Second, the study intends to holistically examine the relevance of servant leadership across multiple work domains including public, private, political, nonprofit, religious, and community settings.

Origins and Evolution of Servant Leadership Studies

To provide context for the development of the servant leadership concept, a summary of the evolution of the broader leadership studies field is important. Based on a bibliometric mapping analysis and use of CiteSpace to examine more than 187,000 documents published between 1990 and 2017, Zhu et al. (2019) segment the evolution of leadership studies into four distinct phases, which are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Evolution of Leadership Studies

Phase	Central Focus	Emerging Areas
1990–1996	Power, influence, and politics	Transformational and charismatic styles
1997–2003	Transformational and charismatic styles	Leader–member exchange, leadership in teams
2004–2010	Ethical leadership and authentic leadership	Leaders' emotions, abusive supervision, shared leadership, leadership development
2011–2017	Values-based leadership, authentic leadership, and servant leadership	Followership, emotion in leadership

The first phase was dominated by a "realpolitik" conception of leadership as an exercise in power, with a focus on transactional leadership styles. By 1997, focus had shifted to transformational and charismatic leadership styles with their related impact on follower and organizational outcomes. By the mid-2000s, values-based leadership styles emerged, including ethical and authentic leadership concepts. From this analysis, servant leadership rose primarily to the fore in the fourth phase, from 2011 to 2017. While servant leadership has been increasingly emphasized, it is still not a dominant model in the leadership literature; one review of 864 articles in the top 10 leadership journals from 2000 to 2013 found that the six most dominant ‘focal’ theories mentioned were transformational leadership, charismatic leadership, strategic leadership, leadership and diversity, participative / shared leadership, and the trait approach (Meuser et al., 2016).

The shift in focus to values-based leadership styles from 2004 onward was prompted both by the realization that a leader could be transformative and charismatic without meeting ideal normative standards, and by various corporate governance scandals, such as Enron (Hoch et al., 2018). For a recent relevant example on both counts, consider WeWork and its eccentric cofounder, Adam Neumann. We are at the end of a decade that has had encouraging growth in values-based leadership theories, including servant leadership.

Following servant leadership’s introduction by Greenleaf (1970) and elaboration by Spears (1995), the field has grown steadily. Eva et al. (2019) reviewed 285 articles on the subject published since 1998 and distinguish three overlapping phases in the evolution of the literature:

- a conceptual development phase, building on the works of both Greenleaf and Spears;
- a measurement phase, focused on defining measures of servant leadership and empirically testing the relationship between servant leadership and various outcomes; and
- a model development phase, an ongoing process of moving beyond simple tests to sophisticated research designs, which includes analysis of servant leadership’s antecedents and mediating factors.

Since the focus of the current study is not on measurement, we only briefly review the measurement evolution of servant leadership for contextual purposes. The initial 10-characteristic description of servant leadership proposed by Spears (1995) was followed by various attempts at more sophisticated conceptual analysis. Laub (1999) developed one of the first measures of servant leadership by distinguishing between six clusters of servant leadership characteristics. From 2000 onward, several potential characteristics of servant leadership were identified, with a review by van Dierendonck (2011) finding 44 distinct characteristics across the literature. Since then, the conceptualization and measurement of servant leadership has gone through further refinement, and Eva et al. (2019) report a total of 16 measures of servant leadership. Based on their review, Eva et al. (2019) recommend three measures by van Dierendock and Nuijten (2011), Liden et al. (2015), and Sendjaya et al. (2019) for future research and practice. Their recommendation is based on a rigorous process of measure construction and validation. However, it is important to note that the authors of these recommended measures were also a part of the Eva et al. (2019) review.

Alternatively, the evolution of the field can be analyzed in terms of the proportion of papers focused primarily on conceptual or empirical work on servant leadership. Prior to 2008, the majority of papers were conceptual, while the majority of work since then has been empirical (Eva et al., 2019). While the research included in the review by Eva et al. (2019) was conducted in 39 countries, the majority of the studies (44%) focused on North America and China. In addition, only 12 studies drew samples from multiple countries, and the authors go on to recommend that as an area of future research.

Servant Leadership as an Interdisciplinary Concept

Like other topics in the field of leadership studies, servant leadership is a deeply interdisciplinary concept. While servant leadership features most heavily in the management and organizational psychology literatures, it also appears in top health care, education, and hospitality journals (Eva et al., 2019). Servant leadership is also heavily linked to the fields of virtue ethics and spiritual practice/theology. One of the most cited early models of servant leadership takes a virtue ethics approach, defining *servant leadership* in terms of virtues (personality traits linked to ethical behavior): love, humility, altruism, vision, trust, empowerment, and service (Patterson, 2003). Additionally, parts of the servant leadership literature draw on the vocabulary of spiritual practice and theology, including terms like *God, soul,* and *spirit* (Shekari & Nikoorparvar, 2012). Indeed, many of the historical examples of model servant leaders are either religious founders (e.g., Jesus Christ) or activists whose work was rooted in a spiritual tradition (e.g., Martin Luther King Jr, Mother Teresa, and Mahatma Gandhi; Barnabas & Clifford, 2012). Other relevant disciplines include evolutionary biology;

van Vugt et al. (2008) describe how we have inherited an "evolved leadership psychology" (182) from our history of living in small, egalitarian communities with informal leadership structures, generating a preference for traits like integrity, prosociality, humility, decisiveness, intelligence, and vision. The first three of these traits are commonly linked with servant leadership. Additionally, the strong leader–follower dyadic relationship that characterizes servant leadership may help fill an evolved need for kinship and belonging, which is often neglected by the social arrangements of modernity (Eva et al., 2019).

Critiques of Servant Leadership

Servant leadership has been criticized on a few different fronts. It is appropriate to briefly outline some of the major critiques to conclude our overview of servant leadership's origins and evolution. According to some, servant leadership has assumed a context-free perspective of leadership in terms of power relations and realities. Liu (2019), through her intersectional critique, reports that the power dynamics of age, race, gender, and class significantly affect the acceptance and exercise of servant leadership. She notes that "the findings demonstrate the ways servant leadership is necessarily embedded in wider power structures that shape who gets to be a 'servant leader' and who remains merely a 'servant'" (Liu, 2019, 1099). In her deconstruction of servant leadership from a feminist lens, Reynolds (2014) argues that despite the increased studies of servant leadership over the last couple of decades, only a handful of peer-reviewed publications focused on gender as a main theme or used a feminist perspective. In an earlier critique, Eicher-Catt (2005) argues that servant leadership possesses dominant masculine nuances anchored in religious and patriarchal ideology. In addition, as noted above, there is a dearth of comparative work in cross-cultural studies of servant leadership (Eva et al., 2019). It is obviously important to consider these perspectives as the evolution and development of servant leadership theory continues.

Culture, Work Context and Servant Leadership

While servant leadership was developed by Greenleaf within a Western, and specifically, American context, he intended it to be a universal archetype to which all leaders could aspire. Nonetheless, anecdotal evidence and limited research suggests that non-Western audiences may be less receptive to the servant leader concept on the grounds that it is a Western concept, developed by the West, for the West (Winston & Ryan, 2008). However, Winston and Ryan (2008) offer two compelling arguments for servant leadership as a global concept applicable outside of Western contexts. First, evidence from the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) research program (House et al., 2004) indicates that a "humane" leadership orientation is accepted across all 62 countries studied; this humane orientation construct is broadly in line with the servant leader model. Second, concepts similar or related to servant leadership appear in diverse value traditions, including African (Ubuntu, Harambee), East Asian (Taoist, Confucianist), Mediterranean (Jewish), and Indian (Hindu) traditions (Winston & Ryan, 2008).

Following Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's (1961) foundational work on values and culture, values-based frameworks form a popular and well-established approach to examining national cultures and their impact on a variety of phenomena, including the nature of work, organizational dynamics, and leadership practices. Hofstede (1984), S. H. Schwartz (1999), and Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997) have all put forward influential values-based frameworks over the past few decades. These works were followed by a massive cross-national study of values and leadership under the umbrella of the GLOBE program (House et al., 2004).

A detailed discussion and comparison of these frameworks is beyond the scope of this study. However, the cultural dimension of power distance is discussed here. This cultural dimension was selected due to its wide use and validity established through both Hofstede's (1984) and GLOBE's (House et al., 2004) work and its particular relevance to leadership. As Kirkman et al. (2009) observe, the concept of power distance is found in most cultural value frameworks. Among other works, Kirkman et al. (2009) refer to Schwartz's (1992) values framework, which incorporates high power distance as "hierarchy" and low power distance as "egalitarianism."

Power distance (PD) deals with distribution of power and its acceptance in a society. In high PD societies, an unequal distribution of power is commonly accepted, while in low PD societies, a more equal and equitable distribution of power is preferred (Hofstede, 1984; House et al., 2004). While the GLOBE project did not include data from Jordan, its findings from other Arab nations indicate that Arab culture is high PD in its orientation (Hofstede, 1984). Similarly, Pakistan is considered a high PD country (Nazim & Wajidi, 2016). In contrast, the United States and the Caribbean are overall low PD countries (Purwanto, 2018; Punnett & Greenidge, 2009).

Hannay (2009) suggests that effective servant leadership requires a specific cultural context. She argues that PD must be low because effective servant leadership requires significant participation from employees, who must feel free to provide honest feedback to leaders; this is inhibited in cultures with entrenched inequalities and rigid hierarchies. Based on these arguments, we expect servant leadership to be more relevant in low PD countries (see Hypothesis 1). While servant leadership is arguably applicable outside of the West, it may not be necessarily universally applicable. Following their review of servant leadership, Parris and Peachey (2013) note that "these cross-cultural studies, along with studies conducted in different countries, imply that servant leadership might be practiced across a variety of cultures, but culture-specific perceptions of servant leadership exist based on socialization and national context" (387). This theme of servant leadership's overall cross-cultural relevance is explored in Research Questions 1 and 2 below.

In general, there is limited empirical research available on the relevance of servant leadership to specific industrial and organizational contexts—what we have labeled as the "work domains" of private, public, political, religious, nonprofit, and grassroots/community settings. The limited extant literature suggests that servant leadership may perceived to be more relevant to social sector organizations (nonprofit, public, community, and religious entities). For instance, Anderson (2005) reports a strong relationship between servant leadership and teachers' job satisfaction and retention in a religious educational entity. Similarly, G. Schwarz et al. (2016) demonstrate a positive relationship between servant leadership and performance in a Chinese public sector entity. Based on these findings, we can expect servant leadership to be more relevant in the social and public sectors, as indicated in Hypothesis 2. In an earlier review of servant leadership, Parris and Peachey (2013) only found one and two servant leadership studies that represented the nonprofit and public sectors, respectively. Eva et al.'s (2019) review confirmed this dearth of understanding regarding the relevance of servant leadership across different work domains. They also identified the need for further research by posing the following question: "Does servant leadership have a different level of success depending on the type of organization (i.e., bureaucratic, organic, mechanistic, entrepreneurial, non-for-profit, volunteer)?" (128). These themes are explored in this study through Research Questions 2 to 4.

The above discussion indicates that while culture and work context play an important role in servant leadership's relevance, understanding, and practice, the nature of that role needs further examination. These inquiry themes are articulated in the exploratory questions below. Following approaches similar to those of Mittal and Dorfman (2012) and Carroll and Patterson (2016), we used the two hypotheses and four exploratory research questions below to guide this study. Specifically, the two hypotheses were formed in relation to the more established research related to PD and servant leadership, and the remaining themes of interest were incorporated into the research questions.

Hypothesis 1: Servant leadership will be perceived to be more relevant in the United States and the Caribbean region than in Pakistan and Jordan.
Hypothesis 2: Servant leadership will be perceived to be more relevant in nonprofit, religious, public, and community work contexts than in private and political contexts.

Additionally, this study also explores four research questions to gain insight about the relevance of servant leadership across four cultures and six different work domains—private, public, political, religious, nonprofit, and community settings. Research Questions 1 and 2 focus on the overall relevance of servant leadership in different cultures and work domains. Following Parris and Peachey's (2013) observation that "it remains to be discovered if there are in fact demographic characteristics that are related to servant leadership" (388), Research Questions 3 and 4 focus on respondents' gender and experience—

demographic factors that were used as control variables in the study.

Research Question 1: *How relevant is servant leadership across different cultures?*

Research Question 2: *Are there differences in relevance of servant leadership across different work domains?*

Research Question 3: *What role, if any, does the respondent's gender play in determining servant leadership's relevance across cultures and different work domains?*

Research Question 4: *What role, if any, does the respondent's work experience (length of tenure) play in determining servant leadership's relevance across cultures and different work domains?*

Method

The study was based on a quantitative survey, which included a description of servant leadership that drew upon dominant works in the field. Following the study introduction, the respondents were invited to review the description of servant leadership and answer a series of questions pertaining to its relevance in different work domains (e.g., nonprofit, private, and political). Participation in the survey was voluntary. The surveys were administered in English with the help of in-country research assistants. A minimum of three years of work experience was required to participate in the survey. Part of the survey data was collected using SurveyMonkey. In some cases, for parts of the Caribbean region and Pakistan, printed survey instruments were administered to accommodate for absent or weak Internet access. In those cases, the in-country research assistant uploaded the information to SurveyMonkey.

Sample and Data

The survey was administered to more than 550 individuals in four countries: Jordan, Pakistan, the Caribbean region (Barbados, Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago, described as a single "country" for the purpose of brevity throughout this study), and the United States. These countries (other than the United States) were chosen because there is either limited (Pakistan) or no (Jordan and Caribbean region) empirical work on servant leadership in these contexts to date. In addition, our ability to form successful research collaborations influenced this selection. A total of 454 respondents provided surveys that were complete and usable (Jordan, N = 101; Pakistan, N = 126; Caribbean region, N = 102; United States, N = 125). The age of participants ranged from 20+ years to 60+ years. About 40% of the respondents were between the age of 30 and 40 years. The range of education included high school or its equivalent to graduate degrees. The gender split was about 48% women and 52% men. The respondents represented all the major societal sectors including public, private, and nonprofit sectors.

Control Variables and Analytical Procedures

The control variables included participants' gender, age, education, organizational tenure, and sectoral experience. Age information was collected in blocks of 20 to 30 years, 30 to 40 years, and upward to 60 to 70 years. Women were coded as 1, and men were coded as 2. The main analytical procedures included analysis of variance (ANOVA), Tukey's HSD post-hoc test, and cross-tabulations. ANOVA was performed to determine if differences existed across countries in perceptions of the relevance of servant leadership. Tukey's HSD test results were used to understand the nature of differences across the four countries. Cross-tabulations were used to examine the relevance of servant leadership within and between countries across all the focal work domains, namely, private, public, political, religious, nonprofit, and community settings.

Results and Findings

The results of the one-way ANOVA appear in Table 2 on the next page. The ANOVA results indicated that there was a statistically significant difference among the servant leadership relevance scores across the four countries at $F(3, 450) = 5.5$, $p < .001$.

Table 2: ANOVA Servant Leadership Across Cultures

	SS	*df*	*MS*	*F*	Sig.
Between Groups	9.694	3	3.231	5.544	.001
Within Groups	262.290	450	.583		
Total	271.983				

The results of the post-hoc comparison using Tukey's HSD test results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Tukey's HSD Test Comparing Servant Leadership Across Cultures

(I) Country	(J) Country	*M* Difference (I - J)	*SE*	Sig.
Caribbean	Jordan	0.13848	0.10171	0.568
	Pakistan	0.25117	0.10167	0.066
	United States	-0.12159	0.10187	0.631
Jordan	Caribbean	-0.13848	0.10717	0.568
	Pakistan	0.11268	0.10197	0.687
	United States	-0.26008	0.10216	0.054
Pakistan	Caribbean	-0.25117	0.10169	0.066
	Jordan	-0.11268	0.10197	0.687
	United States	-0.37276	0.09638	0.001
United States	Caribbean	0.12159	0.10187	0.631
	Jordan	0.26008	0.10216	0.054
	Pakistan	0.37276	0.09638	0.001

As shown in Table 3, Tukey's HSD test indicated that the mean difference (0.37266) for the United States and Pakistan was significant at $p < 0.05$, indicating differences in perceptions of servant leadership. The mean difference (0.26008) for the United States and Jordan was also significant at $p < 0.1$, suggesting there are differences in how servant leadership is perceived in these two countries. The HSD test also showed a difference in mean scores (0.25117) for the Caribbean region and Pakistan, which was significant at $p < .1$. This overall pattern of results was similar to the more detailed comparison reported below. In terms of Hypothesis 1, servant leadership will be perceived to be more relevant in the United States and the Caribbean region than in Pakistan and Jordan. There was a strong and clear support for the difference between Pakistan and the United States and Jordan and the United States. However, there were no significant differences between Jordan and the Caribbean region. Considering the ANOVA, Tukey's test, and the mean results together, Hypothesis 1 was partially supported. These results also show servant leadership's overall relevance across cultures in relation to Research Question 1.

Tables 4, 5, and 6 report the relevance of leadership across the four countries and six work domains namely, private, public, political, religious, nonprofit, and community settings. The analytical procedure for these comparisons is based on cross-tabulations. The original survey scale ranged from 1 to 4 (1 = not relevant, 2 = somewhat relevant, 3 = relevant, 4 = highly relevant). To facilitate more meaningful comparison across counties and work domains, the data was dichotomized into two categories: responses of 1 and 2 were classified as less relevant, while responses of 3 and 4 were classified as more relevant.

Table 4 includes the overall percentage results of all the respondents for the four countries. The first column indicates the six work domains or context and the remaining columns list the percentage of respondents per country who rated the relevance of servant leadership as less relevant or more relevant. The results in this table primarily respond to Hypothesis 2 and Research Questions 1 and 2.

Table 4: Relevance of Servant Leadership Across Nations and Sectors

	Caribbean Region (*N* = 102)		**Jordan (N = 101)**		**Pakistan (N = 126)**		**United States (N = 125)**	
Leadership Within (Relevance)	**Less (%)**	**More (%)**	**Less (%)**	**More (%)**	**Less (%)**	**More (%)**	**Less (%)**	**More (%)**
Political Context	37.3	62.7	41.6	58.4	50.8	49.2	46.4	53.6
Public Context	43.1	56.9	43.6	56.4	46.0	54.0	47.2	52.8
Private Context	54.9	45.1	53.5	46.5	55.6	44.4	56.8	43.2
Nonprofit Context	32.4	67.6	43.6	56.4	44.4	55.6	20.0	80.0
Religious Context	21.6	78.4	37.6	62.4	38.9	61.1	10.4	89.6
Community Context	31.4	68.6	33.7	66.3	38.9	61.1	16.8	83.2

The U.S. respondents show the strongest relevance of servant leadership for nonprofit, religious, and community sectors (over 80% in all three cases). The Caribbean region respondents also see servant leadership as more relevant in these sectors, but the scores are not as high as those of the U.S. respondents. The respondents from all four countries see servant leadership as less relevant for the private sector. However, the percentage in all cases is not very high and hovers in the 55% range. This pattern of responses is reversed for public work context where a simple majority of respondents in all the four countries (about 53% to 57%) see servant leadership as more relevant. In terms of Hypothesis 2, that servant leadership will be perceived to be more relevant in nonprofit, religious, public, and community contexts than in private and political contexts, the above results support it to a large extent. The ratings for more relevant were particularly strong for the U.S. and Caribbean respondents, providing further support for Hypothesis 1.

Table 5 on the next page offers a breakdown of responses in terms of gender and responds to Research Question 3. It was important to examine gender perspectives as women represent roughly 48% of the overall sample. There are a number of interesting aspects that stand out in this comparison. In Jordan, 78% of the women perceived servant leadership to be more relevant compared to only 54% of the men. In the Caribbean region, 74% of the women perceived servant leadership to be more relevant in comparison to 61.5% of the men in that region. In the United States, 92.3% of the men rated servant leadership to be more relevant in the community arena compared to about 74.6% of the women. Finally, women in Jordan perceive servant leadership to be more relevant in the political and public contexts than do the men. In all other cases, there is no noteworthy difference between men and women in terms of how they rated the relevance of servant leadership.

Table 5: Relevance of Servant Leadership by Gender

	Caribbean Region (*N* = 102)		**Jordan (*N* = 101)**		**Pakistan (*N* = 126)**		**United States (*N* = 125)**	
Leadership Within (Relevance)	**Less (%)**	**More (%)**	**Less (%)**	**More (%)**	**Less (%)**	**More (%)**	**Less (%)**	**More (%)**
Political Context								
Women	38.0	62.0	37.3	62.7	42.9	57.1	50.0	50.0
Men	36.5	63.6	46.0	54.0	53.3	46.7	42.3	57.7
Public Context								
Women	40.0	60.0	37.3	62.7	31.4	68.6	45.8	54.2
Men	46.2	53.8	50.0	50.0	51.1	48.9	50.0	50.0
Private Context								
Women	54.0	46.0	51.0	49.0	48,6	51.4	56.9	43.1
Men	55.8	44.2	57.8	42.2	57.7	42.3	57.7	42.3
Nonprofit Context								
Women	26.0	74.0	45.1	54.1	34.3	65.7	19.4	80.6
Men	38.5	61.5	42.0	58.0	47.8	52.2	21.2	78.8
Religious Context								
Women	20.0	80.0	37.3	62.7	34.3	65.7	13.9	86.1
Men	23.1	76.9	38.0	62.0	40.0	60.0	5.8	98.2
Community Context								
Women	28.0	72.0	21.6	78.4	34.3	65.7	23.6	76.4
Men	34.6	65.4	46.0	54.0	40.0	60.0	7.7	92.3

Table 6 on the next page includes the results of respondents' experience and how they perceived the relevance of leadership in response to Research Question 4. Experience was divided into three categories: young professionals (1 to 5 years), mid-level professionals (more than 5 to 10 years), and senior professionals (more than 10 years).

Table 6: Relevance of Servant Leadership by Length of Work Experience

	Caribbean Region (*N* = 102)		**Jordan (*N* = 101)**		**Pakistan (*N* = 126)**		**United States (*N* = 125)**	
Leadership Within (Relevance)	**Less (%)**	**More (%)**	**Less (%)**	**More (%)**	**Less (%)**	**More (%)**	**Less (%)**	**More (%)**
Political Context								
1–5 Years	52.2	47.8	30.3	69.7	50.0	50.0	52.3	47.7
5–10 Years	33.3	66.7	36.0	64.0	63.2	36.8	29.2	70.8
>10 Years	28.6	71.4	53.6	46.5	41.2	58.8	50.9	49.1
Public Context								
1–5 Years	69.6	30.4	27.3	72.7	36.1	63.9	50.0	50.0
5–10 Years	36.4	63.6	36.0	64.0	50.0	50.0	33.3	66.7
>10 Years	31.0	69.0	60.5	39.5	49.0	51.0	52.7	47.3
Private Context								
1–5 Years	60.9	39.1	39.4	60.6	41.7	58.3	61.4	38.6
5–10 Years	51.5	48.5	52.0	48.0	57.9	42.1	41.7	58.3
>10 Years	52.4	47.6	65.5	34.9	62.7	37.3	61.8	38.2
Nonprofit Context								
1–5 Years	43.6	56.4	39.4	60.6	41.7	58.3	18.2	81.8
5–10 Years	36.4	63.6	56.0	44.0	47.4	52.6	16.7	83.3
>10 Years	19.0	81.0	39.5	60.5	43.1	56.9	23.6	76.4
Religious Context								
1–5 Years	26.3	73.9	45.5	54.5	25.0	75.0	15.9	84.1
5–10 Years	24.2	75.8	36.0	64.0	55.3	44.7	0	100
>10 Years	14.3	85.7	32.6	67.4	35.3	64.7	10.9	89.1
Community Context								
1–5 Years	52.2	47.8	42.4	57.6	38.9	61.1	20.5	79.5
5–10 Years	27.2	72.7	32.0	68.0	42.1	57.9	8.3	91.7
>10 Years	21.4	78.6	27.9	72.1	35.3	64.7	18.2	81.8

A majority of the mid-career and senior professionals in the Caribbean region perceive servant leadership to be more relevant across all the work domains except the private sector. The young professionals, with the exception of the religious and nonprofit arenas, perceived servant leadership as less relevant. In fact, the difference in percentage for less and more relevance is small for the nonprofit sector.

There were several differences in how Jordanians with different levels of experience ranked the relevance of servant leadership. For instance, young and mid-career professionals rated servant leadership as more relevant for the political and public work domains than the senior professionals. On the other hand, senior and mid-career professionals ranked servant leadership as more relevant to the community and religious contexts. While the young professionals also ranked this preference similarly, their percentage response was lower than that of their senior counterparts.

Young and senior professionals in Pakistan rated servant leadership as more relevant in the community and religious work contexts, which was not the case for their mid-career counterparts. The U.S. respondents rated servant leadership as highly relevant in the nonprofit, religious, and community work sectors. The other intriguing result is that a clear majority of the mid-career professionals in the United States saw servant leadership as more relevant in the public and political contexts, which was opposite of their younger and more senior counterparts.

Discussion

The study showed that there are some important differences in how respondents in four different countries see servant leadership. The differences were most significant between Pakistan and the United States. Considering the cultural orientation of these countries in terms of PD and other dimensions of culture, this finding is not surprising. Specifically, the United States is low PD, whereas Pakistan is considered high PD. Overall, Pakistani respondents rated servant leadership as less relevant in two work contexts (private and political) and only about 55 to 60% saw it as more relevant in the religious, community, public, and nonprofit contexts. The findings of this research are consistent with some of the previous research studies on servant leadership in Pakistan. For instance**,** Choudhary et al. (2013), in their comparative study with data from the private sector, found that transformational leadership was perceived to be more effective than servant leadership in Pakistan.

The overall results for Jordan, also a high PD country, were partially in line with expectations. Based on previous conceptions of Jordanian society, Sabri (2012) observes that

> in Jordanian public organizations, family and friendship obligations take precedence over all others. There is a high tendency for Jordanian managers to lean towards prestigious positions, being very title oriented. Decisions are mostly centralized in the hands of persons upper management. (504)

However, her own research revealed that the PD scores for Jordan were lower than in some of the previous works. This may represent an important trend that needs further attention and exploration. The change may be attributable to the changing composition of Jordanian societal demographics. For instance, the Jordanian population has significantly changed with the arrival of refugees from Palestine and Iraq over the last few decades, and the country is also experiencing what has been labeled as the "youth bulge." Specifically, about 70% of Jordanians are under the age of 30 (Milton-Edwards, 2018).

The findings also raise the question that if the conception and operationalization of servant leadership is informed by interdisciplinarity, shouldn't we expect it to be more universally relevant? That is not the case in our findings. When we revisit some of the disciplinary anchors, however, they may explain some of the result patterns. For instance, the grounding of servant leadership in approaches that draw on the theological (Shekari & Nikoorparvar, 2012) and virtue anchors (Patterson, 2003) may create perceptions of higher relevance for the social sector (including the religious work domain) but not the private or political sectors. A further explanation of differences in (and lack of) relevance of servant leadership (e.g., to the private sector) may go back to some of the critiques of servant leadership we noted above. For instance, Reynolds (2014) argues that servant leadership lacks appropriate gender integration in its present conceptualization. Due to this lack of gender integration and respondents' own gendered lenses, the servant leadership characteristics of listening, empathy, and care may be seen as more "feminine" and therefore not fully fit the more "masculine" prototype of leadership, indicating that it would be less relevant to some sectors, especially the private sector.

In general, the relevance scores for servant leadership across four countries and six work domains did not differ extensively from the scores separated by gender (see Tables 4 and 5). There were some interesting differences within countries on how men and women perceive the relevance of leadership in particular sectors. Men and women in both Jordan and Pakistan saw the relevance of servant leadership differently in the political and public sectors. While men's scores were almost split, the majority of women saw servant leadership as more relevant to these sectors. This observation is somewhat in line with women attempting to become more visible, for example in the political domain, in these countries.

As discussed above, there were several within-country differences in how respondents perceived the relevance of servant leadership to different work domains based on their experience. For instance, a clear majority of young professionals in Jordan saw servant leadership as more relevant to the public, political, and private work domains. This is a significant finding that speaks to the aspirations of the new generation that is about to enter the leadership cadre in Jordan. This finding may also be explained through the desire for the more humane-oriented leadership that was expressed in the region through the Arab Spring and continues to linger.

Implications and Future Research

In terms of the *so what* question regarding our study, we see the following implications for servant leadership research and practice. An important finding of our study is that a simple majority of respondents across all four countries rated servant leadership as less relevant for the for-profit sector. This finding deserves careful attention considering the servant leadership theory, from the lens and vision of Greenleaf (1977) and later refinements by Spears (1995) and several others, is positioned as an approach that can be particularly helpful in the for-profit sector and encourage it to become more socially responsible. One reason for this is that servant leadership seems strong on the humanistic front with central dimensions of healing, value for the community (Liden et al. 2015), authentic self, transforming influence (Sendjaya et al. 2018), humility, and authenticity (van Dierendonck et al., 2017), and not so strong on dimensions of vision, strategy, direction, and change associated with effective leadership practice—especially in the private sector.

In terms of future research, servant leadership may benefit from including a clearer emphasis on and conceptualization of dimensions that capture the elements of vision, strategy, and direction along with its continuing stress on the humanistic elements. Other areas of future research that are important based on our findings include: (a) more work domain-specific studies, (b) more gender integration in servant leadership research, (c) research on the role of experience and perceptions of leadership, and (d) more comparative cross-cultural studies.

Our research has some potentially important implications for servant leadership development and practice. As discussed above, most of the respondents across all four countries emphasized the importance of servant leadership across the social sector (nonprofit, religious, and community work domains). This finding demonstrates a clear need to concentrate on servant leadership competencies in hiring, training, coaching, and leadership development in these work domains. In relation to leadership practice, leaders operating within and across cultural boundaries need to understand the impact of cross-cultural differences on what is seen as relevant and effective leadership. Kirkman et al. (2009) note that "to be effective in managing a culturally diverse workforce, leaders need to understand how individually held cultural value orientations affect reactions to leadership" (744). Specifically, in relation to servant leadership approaches, leaders need to take into account the PD orientation of the individuals, teams, and social systems in navigating their leadership practice.

Limitations

This research study was primarily etic in nature and did not allow for exploration of deeper meanings behind the similarities and differences between cohorts and countries. While respondents in four countries provided their assessment of servant leadership's relevance across countries and contexts, the description of leadership they were given was based on a leadership conceptualization primarily articulated through Western leadership literature. Etic approaches offer advantages in comparative research but have the disadvantage of levying an outside perspective. Punnet et al. (2017) note that "we need to know how people in under-researched places view the constructs of interest; otherwise, researchers impose a particular view, developed elsewhere" (3).

For comparative purposes, we have largely treated our national samples as heterogenous and representative of national culture or multiple nation states, in the case of the Caribbean region. This assumption may not fully hold and would need further investigation. For instance, Pakistan, with a population greater than 200 million, has four major provinces plus northern areas, all with distinct languages and subcultures. Similarly, Punnett and Greenidge (2009) note that "the Caribbean is a region of variety and contrast, and there is substantial variation across the countries of the region" (65). Therefore, the results of this study should be interpreted cautiously and may not be generalized for all populations within the studied countries.

Conclusion

Servant leadership theory continues to hold significant potential for improving leadership practice universally, and it is therefore important to examine and understand its relevance using a global lens. As Mittal and Dorfman (2012) note, "servant leadership is anchored in the human drive to bond with others and contribute to the betterment of the society" (55). This dual focus makes it appealing and inspiring. The overall pattern of our findings suggests that servant leadership does have a universal appeal. However, our research in this study confirms that its relevance is nuanced and culturally and contextually dependent.

We believe that our study offers several important contributions toward understanding and further exploring the relevance of servant leadership. It adds to the empirical work on servant leadership outside the dominant U.S.-based studies and makes a very important addition to cross-country comparison work—as only 12 such studies exist, according to Eva et al. (2019). The study allows work domain-specific understanding of servant leadership within and across countries, and thereby gives voice to followers, practitioners, and professionals.

Future servant leadership research, and cross-cultural leadership research in general, will benefit from a combination of emic-etic approaches. In particular, cyclical approaches such as the emic-etic-emic approach proposed by Punnett et al. (2017) may be especially helpful: "We believe that using emic approaches to develop etic ones, and exploring etic results through further emic research, provides a holistic look at research questions in under-researched areas" (4). While such approaches may not always be feasible in large multi-country studies, smaller studies may certainly find this approach helpful.

We believe that van Dierendonck's (2011) observation remains relevant as we consider the present and future of servant leadership universally: "In view of current demand for more ethical, people-centered management, servant leadership theory may very well be what organizations need now" (1228). While our findings highlight a nuanced and context-based relevance of servant leadership, we also imagine a world where societal aspirations for humane leadership approaches may grow, as we saw some signs of such a shift in our findings from Jordan. Finally, as the world navigates the emotional, social, and economic stresses brought by the COVID-19 pandemic, servant leadership and similar approaches may provide the listening, empathy, and sense of care that individuals, communities, organizations, and nations are craving.

References

Anderson, K. P. (2005). *A correlational analysis of servant leadership and job satisfaction in a religious educational organization* (Publication No. 3162292) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Phoenix]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Barnabas, A., & Clifford, P. S. (2012). Mahatma Gandhi—An Indian model of servant leadership. *International Journal of Leadership Studies, 7*(2), 132–150.

Carroll, B. C., & Patterson, K. (2014). Servant leadership: A cross cultural study between India and the United States. *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice*, *1*(1), 16–45.

Choudhary, A. I., Akhtar, S. A., & Zaheer, A. (2013). Impact of transformational and servant leadership on organizational performance: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *116*(2), 433–440.

Eicher-Catt, D. (2005). The myth of servant-leadership: A feminist perspective. *Women and Language*, *28*(1), 17–25.

Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systemic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly, 30*(1), 111–132.

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

Hannay, M. (2009). The cross-cultural leader: The application of servant leadership theory in the international context. *Journal of International Business and Cultural Studies*, *1*, 1–12.

Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, J. H., & Wu, D. (2018). Do ethical, authentic, and servant leadership explain variance above and beyond transformational leadership? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, *44*(2), 501–529.

Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Abridged Ed.). Sage.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M. Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Leadership, culture, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies.* Sage.

Kirkman, B. L., Chen, G., Farh, J. L., Chen, Z. X., & Lowe, K. B. (2009). Individual power distance orientation and follower reactions to transformational leaders: A cross-level, cross-cultural examination. *Academy of Management Journal, 52*(4), 744–764.

Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. (1961). *Variations in value orientations.* Row, Peterson.

Laub, J. A. (1999). *Assessing the servant organization: Development of the servant organizational leadership (SOLA) instrument* (Publication No. 9921922) [Doctoral dissertation, Regent University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Meuser, J. D., Hu, J., Wu, J., & Liao, C. (2015). Servant leadership: Validation of a short form of the SL-28. *The Leadership Quarterly, 26*(2), 254–269.

Liu, H. (2019). Just the servant: An intersectional critique of servant leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *156*(4), 1099–1112.

Mandela, N. (2002). *Address by Nelson Mandela during the 90th birthday celebration of Mr. Walter Sisulu.* http://www.mandela.gov.za/mandela_speeches/2002/020518_sisulu.htm

Meuser, J. D., Gardner, W. L., Dinh, J. E., Hu, J., Liden, R. C., & Lord, R. G. (2016). A network analysis of leadership theory: The infancy of integration. *Journal of Management, 42*(5), 1374–1403.

Milton-Edwards, B. (2018, June 6). *Marginalized youth: Toward an inclusive Jordan.* Brookings Doha Center. https://www.brookings.edu/research/marginalized-youth-toward-an-inclusive-jordan/

Mittal, R., & Dorfman, P. W. (2012). Servant leadership across cultures. *Journal of World Business, 47*(4), 555–570.

Nazim, Z., & Wajidi, M. A. (2016). Updated national culture of Pakistan—Revisiting Hofstede. *New Horizons (1992-4399)*, *10*(1), 69–94.

Parris, D. L., & Peachey, J. W. (2013). A systematic literature review of servant leadership theory in organizational contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics, 113*(3), 377–393.

Patterson, K. A. (2003, August). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model* [Paper presentation]. Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Regent University.

Punnett, B. J., Ford, D., Galperin, B. L., & Lituchy, T. (2017). The emic-etic-emic research cycle. *AIB Insights, 17*(1), 3–6.

Punnett, B. J., & Greenidge, D. (2009). Cultural mythology and global leadership in the Caribbean islands. In E. H. Kessler & D, J. Wong-MingJi (Eds.), *Cultural mythology and global leadership* (pp. 65–78). Edward Elgar.

Purwanto, E. (2018). Moderation effects of power distance on the relationship between job characteristics, leadership empowerment, employee participation and job satisfaction: A conceptual framework. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal, 17*(1), 1–9.

Reynolds, K. (2014). Servant-leadership: A feminist perspective. *The International Journal of Servant-Leadership, 10*(1), 35–63.

Sabri, H. A. (2012). Re-examination of Hofstede's work value orientations on perceived leadership styles in Jordan. *International Journal of Commerce and Management, 22*(3), 202–218.

Schwarz, G., Newman, A., Cooper, B., & Eva, N. (2016). Servant leadership and follower job performance: The mediating effect of public service motivation. *Public Administration, 94*(4), 1025–1041.

Schwartz, S. H. (1999). A theory of cultural values and some implications for work. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 48*(1), 23–47

Sendjaya, S., Eva, N., Butar, I. B., Robin, M., & Castles, S. (2019). SLBS-6: Validation of a short form of the Servant Leadership Behavior Scale. *Journal of Business Ethics, 156*(4), 941–956.

Shekari, H., & Nikooparvar, M. Z. (2012). Promoting leadership effectiveness in organizations: A case study on the involved factors of servant leadership. *International Journal of Business Administration, 3*(1), 54–65.

Spears, L. C. (1995). *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers.* John Wiley.

Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1997). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business*. Nicholas Brealey International.

van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management, 37*(4), 1228–1261.

van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The Servant Leadership Survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 26*(3), 249–267.

van Dierendonck, D., Sousa, M., Gunnarsdóttir, S., Bobbio, A., Hakanen, J., Verdorfer, A. P., Duyan, E. C., & Raquel Rodriguez-Carvajal. (2017). The cross-cultural invariance of the servant leadership survey: A comparative study across eight countries. *Administrative Sciences, 7*(2), 8.

van Vugt, M., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2008). Leadership, followership, and evolution: Some lessons from the past. *American Psychologist*, *63*(3), 182–196.

Winston, B. E., & Ryan, B. (2008). Servant leadership as a humane orientation: Using the GLOBE study construct of humane orientation to show that servant leadership is more global than Western. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, *3*(2), 212–222.

Zhu, J., Song, L. J., Zhu, L., & Johnson, R. E. (2019). Visualizing the landscape and evolution of leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly, 30*(2), 215–232.

S. Aqeel Tirmizi, PhD, is currently a professor of leadership, management, and service at Antioch University's Graduate School of Leadership and Change. His research and teaching focus on responsible leadership, cross-cultural leadership, well-being, and social innovation. Dr. Tirmizi has developed and published multiple models of leadership and has worked with leaders and senior managers from the private, public, and nonprofit sectors. Dr. Tirmizi holds a PhD in Management from the State University of New York–Binghamton and an MA in International Administration from the School for International Training. He can be reached at atirmizi@antioch.edu.

S. Noor Tirmizi, PhD, has more than 25 years of extensive experience in social science research using quantitative and qualitative approaches. His current research and consulting interests focus on resilience, community development, and leadership. Dr. Tirmizi has conducted large research projects both in national and international settings. He is currently working on a multi-country research initiative focused on issues of resilience for the Asian Development Bank. He has in-depth expertise in research design, instrument development, statistical analysis and reporting. Dr. Tirmizi holds a PhD in Sociology and an MS in Economics from Iowa State University. He can be reached at snoor.tirmizi@gmail.com.

PRACTICE

Reviewing the Servant Leadership Literature: Pertinent Practices for Practitioners[*]

Daryl Mahon
Outcomes Matter, Greystones, Wicklow, Ireland

Servant leadership (SL) offers service to others as its priority. Creating better organizations and communities is one of the key differences between this leadership approach and other approaches. Historically, SL has been an elusive construct. Some proponents have suggested that Greenleaf's (1970) initial definition was not robust enough to conceptualize and operationalize this leadership approach. In recent years, we have seen attempts to redefine and propose SL models. However, several servant leadership models have appeared in the extant literature without any added value for practitioners or organizations. This practice piece seeks to extract the important aspects of SL research and provide practitioners and organizations with a framework for practicing it. Three meta-analyses included in the article make a strong case for servant leadership.

Key words: benefits, outcomes, practice, servant leadership

Over the last few decades, failures by organizational leaders have caused adverse consequences to society due to unethical decision-making practices. Such decisions often have negative personal and socioeconomic effects on many people at both personal and organizational levels. Political, social, and business agendas often contribute to such failings. For example, the Great Recession of 2008 had serious ramifications for many people because of the lack of leadership and the mismanagement of public finances. Today, we face a leadership crisis. Adopting a servant leadership (SL) philosophy could reduce our crisis.

SL has received less attention than other leadership theories because we lack an understanding of its conceptual approach. For example, SL may be considered counterintuitive for some based on its paradoxical underpinnings: serving to lead. However, this leadership approach is driven by high moral and ethical standards and focuses on individual followers' and societal needs. This desire to serve first and put the interests of others ahead of one's own is a unique aspect of SL (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Graham, 1995; Hoch et al., 2018; Stone et al., 2004;

[*]To cite this article: Mahon, D. (2020). Reviewing the servant leadership literature: Pertinent practices for practitioners. *International Leadership Journal, 12*(3), 64–79.

van Dierendonck, 2011). It may offer us more legitimate leaders and more satisfied followers. Parris and Peachey (2013) conclude that SL is capable of working successfully, helps organizational effectiveness, and improves employee well-being. Banks et al.'s (2018) and Hoch et al.'s (2018) meta-analyses found that SL has incremental predictive validity over transactional leadership. Lee et al (2020) extended these findings to include authentic and ethical leadership approaches. Thus, three meta-analyses provide evidence that SL is an evidence-based approach with better outcomes than other leadership models.

A Brief History of Servant Leadership

The concept of serving leaders can be found in antiquity. Throughout the millennia, individuals have stood in servitude and inspired followers by meeting their societal and personal needs. We even see an example of servant leadership clearly in the Gospel of Matthew. Jesus said, "if any of you want to be first, he must be the very last, and servant of all" (as cited in Blanchard & Hodges, 2005, 3). Influential historical figures such as Martin Luther King Jr. and Mother Teresa can also be viewed as servant leaders.

First coined by Greenleaf (1970), the term *servant leadership* (SL) describes a philosophical approach to leading. It has re-emerged in the last decade with a renewed interest by scholars and practitioners alike. For Greenleaf (1970),

> 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. . . . The best test, and difficult to administer is this: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, *while being served,* become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, and more likely themselves to become servants? *And,* what is the effect on the least privileged in society; will they benefit, or, at least, not be further deprived?" (7)

However, Greenleaf (1970) did not formally conceptualize or operationalize this construct, causing researchers to question its empirical foundations. Moreover, SL has no agreed-upon definition. According to McCarren et al. (2016), "since the research into this leadership philosophy is in its early stages, the field is lacking consistency and consensus in the definition, measurement, and application of the construct" (14). Winston and Fields (2015) add there is still little consensus about a clear definition of SL and how it works.

While this may be problematic from a research and academic perspective, it allows practitioners opportunities to become servant leaders. For Polleys (2002), SL definitions are vague to make it applicable to a wider audience. For example, Eva et al. (2019) found that SL spans areas such as education, nursing, tourism, youth work, and big business.

Theoretical Models of Servant Leadership (SL)

Due to the conceptual limitations in Greenleaf's (1970) initial writings, researchers investigated SL from an academic perspective, giving rise to various SL models (e.g., Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Farling et al., 1999; Graham, 1995; Jennings & Stahl-Wert, 2003; Keith, 2008; Laub, 1999; Liden et al., 2008; Page & Wong, 2000; Patterson, 2003; Reed et al., 2011; Sendjaya et al., 2008; Sipe & Frick, 2009; Spears, 1995; van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011). According to Irving (2005), most of these works are theoretical in nature. In addition, the SL literature (from the early 1990s through 2003) focuses on identifying themes to operationalize this construct. Anderson and Sun (2017) suggest that "studies that have developed measures for servant leadership have elicited 43 overlapping dimensions. . . . [which] can be synthesized into 12 more conceptually distinct dimensions" (81). SL's multidimensionality and characteristics may be problematic for academics and practitioners who seek to distill the pertinent aspects of SL. Some of the more prominent SL models include Eva et al. (2019), who identified 16 SL models with scales in the extant literature, and Spears (1995), who distilled 10 characteristics of SL based on Greenleaf's (1970, 1972, 1974, 1977) work.

According to Focht and Ponton (2015), the Spears (1995) model is the most cited and well-respected. Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) contend that Spears' work provides "the closest representation of an articulated framework for what characterizes servant leadership" (302). Van Dierendonck (2011) suggests that "although we intuitively understand these characteristics, they have never been accurately operationalized, making a valid and reliable study based on these characteristics difficult, thereby hindering empirical research" (1232).

Laub (1999) conducted empirical research on SL and developed the Servant Organizational Leadership Assessment (SOLA), which measures six aspects of servant leadership: (a) valuing people, (b) developing people, (c) building community, (d) displaying authenticity, (e) providing leadership, and (f) sharing leadership. Like Spears' (1995) model, the SOLA was largely based on Greenleaf's (1970, 1972, 1974, 1977) writings, and the criteria used to validate this framework was based on job satisfaction. Rude (2004) found that when the positive aspects of SL are in place, and power and pride are not present, subordinates reported better job satisfaction.

Ehrhart (2004) put forward a seven-characteristic model with the Servant Leadership Scale to measure SL. The model includes (a) forming relationships with subordinates, (b) empowering subordinates, (c) helping subordinates grow and succeed, (d) behaving ethically, (e) putting subordinates first, (f) having conceptual skills, and (g) creating value for those outside the organization. Ehrhart used organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as the criteria for this study. Walumbwa et al. (2010) used Ehrhart's model to measure SL and found a positive relationship between servant leadership and OCB. According to Liden (2013), "Ehrhart found that servant leadership explained variance in team organizational citizenship behaviors. . . . His research demonstrated that servant leader behaviors were related to organizational justice (fairness in decisions made regarding employees), which in turn led employees to reciprocate by engaging in organizational citizenship behaviors" (para. 1).

Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) advanced a model with five factors for SL—altruistic calling, wisdom, emotional healing, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship—and a corresponding assessment for measuring SL (the Servant Leadership Questionnaire). This research initially began with Spears' (1995) 10 characteristics. The researchers then added calling (desire to serve) to the list. These 11 characteristics were distilled to five factors and operationalized in this way. Greenleaf's (1970, 1972, 1974, 1977) original works are reflected in this model. Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) used extra work duties, employee satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness as criteria.

Liden et al. (2008) developed the Servant Leadership Scale (SLS) to measure seven dimensional models: (a) emotional healing, (b) creating value for the community, (c) conceptual skills, (d) empowering, (e) helping subordinates grow and succeed, (f) putting subordinates first, and (g) behaving ethically. The authors incorporated the work of Barbuto and Wheeler (2006), Page and Wong (2000), and Spears and Lawrence (2002) into their work. Liden et al. (2008) used community citizenship behaviors, in-role performance, and organizational commitment as criteria. According to Liden (2013), Liden et al. (2008) "developed a more comprehensive and psychometrically sound model" of SL than in other studies (para. 3).

Sendjaya et al. (2008) developed the Servant Leadership Behaviour Scale to measure six dimensions of SL: (a) voluntary subordination, (b) authentic self, (c) covenantal relationships, (d) responsible morality, (e) transcendental spirituality, and (f) transforming influence, then added morality and spirituality into this model. Accordingly, Sendjaya et al (2008) argue that they extended current models of servant leadership because

> the idiosyncratic attributes of servant leadership go beyond the willingness to serve others. That is, the intent to serve others does not naturally emerge in leaders, nor does it happen in a vacuum. Instead, serving others is driven by the leaders' spiritual insights and humility. Equally important is that both the ends and means of the acts of serving are exercised in accordance with moral and ethical principles. Therefore, spirituality and morality-ethics are the sine qua non of servant leadership, and are included in the Servant Leadership Behaviour Scale. (410)

Although there is a divergence from a theoretical perspective within these models, the spirit of SL holds that it is priority of the desire to serve others. This spirit informs the practices of those who act in a SL role. Van Dierendonck (2011) argues that servant leaders set themselves apart from other types of leaders by focusing on the psychological needs of followers. Sendjaya (2015) extends this point, adding that servant leaders will focus first on followers' needs, then on organizational needs, and lastly, on their own needs.

Servant Leadership Operationalized

To move from theory to practice, it is necessary to examine the SL construct from several perspectives by asking three questions. First, what is it that the leader does to operationalize SL? Second, what are the benefits to those that are served by SL? Finally, what are the organizational outcomes and the mechanisms by which these aims are achieved? For Green et al. (2016), "the empirical research to date . . . generally shows positive relationships between servant leadership and three types of outcomes (leader, follower and organizational)" (88).

Most organizations are structured as a hierarchical system led by a chief executive. Ebener and O'Connell (2010) suggest that servant leaders change the structure of the hierarchy by inverting its design. Blanchard (2001) and Coetzer et al. (2017) believe that it is essential for the pyramid to be right side up when it comes to mission, values, and vision. However, when implementing organizational goals, servant leaders turn the pyramid upside down.

Some ambiguity exists in the literature regarding what or whose needs are the first priority of service when fulfilling organizational goals. Sendjaya et al. (2008) contend that it is followers' needs first, organizational needs second, and leaders' needs last. This view aligns with that of Stone et al. (2004), who assert that "organizational goals will be achieved on a long-term basis only by first facilitating the growth, development, and general well-being of the individuals who comprise the organization" (355). For Lubin (2001), the servant leader's first responsibilities are relationships and people, and those relationships take precedence over the task and product. Servant leaders trust their followers to take actions that are in the best interest of the organization, even though the leaders do not primarily focus on organizational objectives. This does not suggest that organizational goals are not integral, nor does it assume that policy and governance structures are not in place. It prioritizes the needs of key stakeholders and does not focus primarily on personal and financial gain.

According to Greenleaf (1970), servant leaders are servants first, leaders second; he notes that "they make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served" (3). Servant leaders transcend individual self-interest; they subordinate their egos and need for authoritarian power. They help others grow professionally and personally (Ebener & O'Connell, 2010). Page and Wong (2000) present an opponent process model of SL with authoritarian hierarchy and egotistical pride as obstacles to implementing SL. Servant leaders show concern for and interest in others; they encourage others to fulfill their career goals, delegate important work responsibilities, and emphasize the importance of "giving back" to the community (Liden et al., 2008). Servant leaders rely on one-on-one communication to better understand the abilities, needs, desires, goals, and potential of followers to bring the best out in them (Chinomona et al., 2013; Eva et al., 2019).

The first priority of SL theory and servant leaders is employee empowerment and development (Greenleaf, 1977; Parris & Peachey, 2013). Liden et al. (2008) and Winston and Fields (2015) call it the distinctive focus of SL. Empowering subordinates was a consistent factor found in the SL models discussed by Page and Wong (2000), Russell (2000), and Liden et al. (2008). Buchen (1998) explains that follower empowerment in SL occurs when leaders subdue or eliminate their egos and embrace the notion of *primus inter pares* (first among equals); followers become collaborators and are more likely to become servant leaders themselves.

According to Miller et al. (2001), work environments structured to empower are designed for follower access to "information, support, and resources necessary to accomplish work, as well as those that provide opportunities for growth and development of knowledge and skills" (1881). Van Winkle et al. (2014) found that employees "perceptions of being empowered will increase as supervisors' servant leadership behaviors increase" (70). Conger and Kanungo (1988) suggest that psychological empowerment results in both initiation and persistence of subordinates' task behavior. Servant leaders inspire followers by modeling SL behaviors (Van Winkle et al., 2014; see also Bandura, 1977, on social learning theory).

Followers who "witness their leader displaying strong ethical standards, promotion and empowerment of others, and service to the community. In turn, followers model these values and behaviors by helping others, including peers, customers, and community members" (Hunter et al., 2013, 320). Servant leaders ignite a cycle of service by modeling servant behaviors, which is then mirrored through coworker helping behaviors, high-quality customer service, and improved work engagement by employees (Hunter et al., 2013). McCarren et al. (2016) add "it is our philosophy that a formal position of authority is not necessary to be a servant leader" (44). For Greenleaf (1977), the best test of a servant leader is whether followers are more likely to become servant leaders themselves. Melchar and Bosco (2010) found that "mid-level managers who report to servant leaders will exhibit above-average levels of servant-leader characteristics themselves" (79). For them, "these mid-level managers exhibit behaviors to their followers that are consistent with those of the high-level leaders of their organizations" (83), thus validating Greenleaf's (1977) proposition.

Empirical Organizational Outcomes

Psychological safety (PS) is defined by Edmondson (1999) as "a shared belief held by members of a team that the team is safe for interpersonal risk taking" (350). PS plays a mediating role in servant leadership (Chughtai, 2016; Yan & Xaio, 2016). When employees feel safe and leaders do not use coercive power, those best informed about frontline activities can challenge the status quo and engender innovative and creative ideas to improve organizational effectiveness. It does not matter who initiated the ideas.

SL can be beneficial at the organizational level (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Erhart, 2004; Liden et al., 2008) by engaging employees in multiple ways. For example, *work engagement,* defined by Schaufeli et al. (2002) as a "positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption," is an integral part of employee satisfaction and motivation and necessary for productivity (74). Using Linden et al.'s (2008) Servant Leadership Questionnaire, De Clercq et al. (2014) note that "a leadership style in which individual growth and development are goals in and of themselves, instead of necessarily being tied to organizational objectives, can be instrumental for increasing the level of work engagement among followers" (201). SL has also been positively correlated with individual employee performance. Otero-Neira et al. (2016) measured the relationship between SL and performance, using Ehrhart's (2004) Servant Leadership Scale. They found "that supervisor's servant leadership was directly and positively related to organization member performance" (870).

Discussion

Many people and organizations do not practice SL because it is poorly defined and slightly too complicated for the average practitioner or organization. To incorporate SL into the wider leadership context, Eva et al. (2019) suggest that the following definition should be used.

> Servant leadership is an (1) other-oriented approach to leadership (2) manifested through one-on-one prioritizing of follower individual needs and interests, (3) and outward reorienting of their concern for self towards concern for others within the organization and the larger community. (114)

The servant leader is obliged to act as a steward of followers, resources, and the organization. This is, of course, an abstract definition without a concrete list of characteristics. While this may cause trouble for some, it allows for a wider interpretation and the use of more SL models. Eva et al. (2019) suggest this allows for different understandings of SL. Lee et al. (2020) state that the predictive validity of SL benefits an organization. While organizations should select servant leaders from influential positions, servant leaders can emerge from any position or organization. Cultures of trust, fairness, and high-quality relationships should be cultivated to enable the outcomes of SL to be transmitted to follower outcomes. Thus, practitioners and organizations seeking to practice and institute SL should select an SL model that fits their worldview; accounts for issues of motivation, mode, and mindset; and practices and promotes fairness, trust, and quality relationships.

Conclusion

Servant leadership is a highly value-laden leadership theory that extends beyond traditional leadership theories. It has many substantive outcomes at the individual, group, and organizational levels. Its highest priority is providing service to key stakeholders. This practice piece has defined and explored the main SL models; distilled the outcomes of SL at the individual and organizational levels, and proposed SL as an evidence-based leadership philosophy. Moreover, it sought to move SL from the abstract to the practical by operationalizing it. Finally, it is hoped that by shedding another light on SL, practitioners can benefit from adopting it within their organizations.

References

Anderson, M. H., & Sun, P. Y. T. (2017). Reviewing leadership styles: Overlaps and the need for a new "full-range" theory. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 19*(1), 76–96. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12082

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. General Learning Press.

Banks, G. C., Gooty, J., Ross, R. L., Williams, C. E., Harrington, N. T. (2018). Construct redundancy in leader behaviors: A review and agenda for the future. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1), 236–251. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.12.005

Barbuto, J. E., Jr., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(3), 300–326. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601106287091

Blanchard, K. (2001). Servant leadership revisited. In *The sixth annual worldwide lessons in leadership series: The new leadership challenge: Teaming principles with practices in a time of change* (Participant workbook, pp. 212–216). Wyncom. https://new.svdpusa.org/Portals/1/Servant-Leadership%20Revisited.pdf

Blanchard, K., & Hodges, H. (2005, April). Lead. *The Christian Management Report*. http://www.studyinglifelongfaith.com/uploads/5/2/4/6/5246709/lead_-_ken_blanchard.pdf

Buchen, I. H. (1998). Servant leadership: A model for future faculty and future institutions. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 5*(1), 25–34.

Chinomona, R., Mashiloane, M., & Pooe, D. (2013). The influence of servant leadership on employee trust in a leader and commitment to the organization. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 4*(14), 405–414. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/1712/adcad2ec2706c1b58c2e799334d48c2bf820.pdf

Chughtai, A. A. (2016). Servant leadership and follower outcomes: Mediating effects of organizational identification and psychological safety. *The Journal of Psychology*, *150*(7), 866–880. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2016.1170657

Coetzer, M. F., Bussin, M., & Geldenhuys, M. (2017). The functions of a servant leader. *Administrative Sciences, 7*(1), 1–32. https://ideas.repec.org/a/gam/jadmsc/v7y2017i1p5-d91406.html

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *The Academy of Management Review, 13*(3), 471–482. https://doi.org/10.2307/258093

De Clercq, D., Bouckenooghe, D., Raja, U., & Matsyborska, G. (2014). Servant leadership and work engagement: The contingency effects of leader–follower social capital. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 25*(2), 183–212. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21185

Ebener, D. R., & O'Connell, D. J. (2010). How might servant leadership work? *Nonprofit Management and Leadership,* 20, 315–335. https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.256

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *44*(2), 350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 57*(1), 61–94. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.tb02484.x

Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *30*(1), 111–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.07.004

Farling, M. L., Stone, A. G., & Winston, B. E. (1999). Servant leadership: Setting the stage for empirical research. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 6*(1/2), 50–72.

Focht, A., & Ponton, M. (2015). Identifying primary characteristics of servant leadership: Delphi study. *International Journal of Leadership Studies, 9*(1), 44–61.

Graham, J. W. (1995). Leadership, moral development, and citizenship behavior. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 5*(1), 43–54. https://doi.org/10.2307/3857271

Green, M. T., Rodriguez, R. A., Wheeler, C. A., & Baggerly-Hinojosa, B. (2016). Servant leadership: A quantitative review of instruments and related findings. *Servant Leadership: Theory and Practice, 2*(2), 76–96. https://csuepress.columbusstate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1022&context=sltp

Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as a leader*. Robert K. Greenleaf Publishing Center.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1972). *The institution as servant*. Robert K. Greenleaf Publishing Center.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1974). *Trustees as servants*. Robert K. Greenleaf Publishing Center.

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

Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, J. H., & Wu, D. (2018). Do ethical, authentic, and servant leadership explain variance above and beyond transformational leadership? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management, 44*(2), 501–529. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316665461

Hunter, E. M., Neubert, M. J., Perry, S. J., Witt, L. A., Penney, L. M., & Weinberger, E. (2013). Servant leaders inspire servant followers: Antecedents and outcomes for employees and the organization. *The Leadership Quarterly, 24*(2), 316–331. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.12.001

Irving, J. A. (2005). *Servant leadership and the effectiveness of teams* (Publication No. 3173207) [Doctoral dissertation, Regent University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Jennings, K. R., & Stahl-Wert, J. (2003). The serving leader: Five powerful actions that will transform your team, your business, and your community (1st ed.). Berrett-Koehler.

Keith, K. M. (2008). *The key practices of servant leadership*. Faith Formation Learning Exchange. https://faithformationlearningexchange.net/uploads/5/2/4/6/5246709/thekeypracticesofservant-leaders.pdf

Laub, J. A. (1999). *Assessing the servant organization: Development of the servant organizational leadership (SOLA) instrument* (Publication No. 9921922) [Doctoral dissertation, Regent University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Lee, A., Lyubovnikova, J., Tian, A. W., & Knight, C. (2020). Servant leadership: A meta-analytic examination of incremental contribution, moderation, and mediation. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 93*(1), 1–44. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12265

Liden, R. C. (2013). *Scientific research on servant leadership.* Greenleaf Centre (Asia) for Servant Leadership. http://www.greenleafasia.org/scientific-research-on-servant-leadership.html

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006

Lubin, K. A. (2001). *Visionary leader behaviors and their congruency with servant leadership characteristics* (Publication No. 3022943) [Doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

McCarren, H. S., Lewis-Smith, J., Belton, L., Yanovsky, B., Robinson, J., & Osatuke, K. (2016). Creation of a multi-rater feedback assessment for the development of servant leaders at the Veterans Health Administration. *Servant Leadership: Theory and Practice, 3*(1), 12–51. https://csuepress.columbusstate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1008&context=sltp

Melchar, D. E., & Bosco, S. M. (2010). Achieving high organization performance through servant leadership. *The Journal of Business Inquiry, 9*(1), 74–84.

Miller, P. A., Goddard, P., & Spence Laschinger, H. K. (2001). Evaluating physical therapists' perception of empowerment using Kanter's theory of structural power in organizations. *Journal of the American Physical Therapy Association*, *81*(12), 1880–1888.

Otero-Neira, C., Varela-Neira, C., & Bande, B. (2016). Supervisory servant leadership and employee's work role performance: A multilevel mediation model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 37*(7), 860–881. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-11-2014-0230

Page, D., & Wong, P. T. P. (2000). A conceptual framework for measuring servant leadership. In S. B.-S. K, Adjibolosoo (Ed.), *The human factor in shaping the course of history and development* (pp. 69–110). University Press of America.

Parris, D. L., & Peachey, J. W. (2013). A systematic literature review of servant leadership theory in organizational contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics, 113*(3), 377–393. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1322-6

Patterson, K. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model* (Publication No. 3082719) [Doctoral dissertation, Regent University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Polleys, M. S. (2002). One university's response to the anti-leadership vaccine: Developing servant leaders. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *8*(3), 117–130. https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190200800310

Reed, L., Vidavir-Cohen, D., & Colwell, S. R. (2011). A new scale to measure executive servant leadership: Development, analysis, and implications for research. *Journal of Business Ethics, 101,* 415–434 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0729-1

Rude, W. J. (2004). *The connection between servant leadership and burnout* (Publication No. MR15212) [Doctoral dissertation, Trinity Western University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Russell, R. F. (2000). *Exploring the values and attributes of servant leaders* (Publication No. 9999498) [Doctoral dissertation, Regent University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 3,* 71–92.

Sendjaya, S. (2015). *Personal and organizational excellence through servant leadership: Learning to serve, serving to lead, leading to transform.* Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-16196-9

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. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2007.00761.x

Sipe, J. W., & Frick, D. M. (2009). *Seven pillars of servant leadership: Practicing the wisdom of leading by serving*. Paulist Press.

Spears, L. C. (1995). *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant leadership influenced today's top management thinkers*. Wiley & Sons.

Spears, L. C., & Lawrence, M. (Eds.). (2002). *Focus on leadership: Servant leadership for the 21st century*. John Wiley & Sons.

Stone, A. G., Russell, R., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 25*(3/4), 349–361.

van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, *37*(4), 1228–1261. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310380462

van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The Servant Leadership Survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 26*(3), 249–267.

Van Winkle, B., Allen, S., DeVore, D., & Winston, B. (2014). The relationship between the servant leadership behaviors of immediate supervisors and followers' perceptions of being empowered in the context of small business. *The Journal of Leadership Education, 13*(3), 70–82. http://doi.org/10.12806/V13/I3/RF5

Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnell, C. A., & Oke, A. (2010). Servant leadership, procedural justice climate, service climate, employee attitudes, and organizational citizenship behavior: A cross-level investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(3), 517–529. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018867

Winston, B., & Fields, D. (2015). Seeking and measuring the essential behaviors of servant leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 36*(4), 413–434. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-10-2013-0135

Yan, A., & Xiao, Y. (2016). Servant leadership and employee voice behavior: A cross-level investigation in China. *SpringerPlus*, *5*(1), 1595. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40064-016-3264-4

Daryl Mahon, who holds a BA in Counselling and Psychotherapy and an MA in Leadership and Management, is currently undertaking a Doctor of Social Science degree. Having worked across the helping professions for over a decade as a frontline practitioner and supervisor, as well as in leadership positions, he became interested in servant leadership as a practitioner and academic after researching it for his master's thesis. Mr. Mahon lectures across the health, social care, and counselling arenas, in addition to running a training and consultation company. He has published in other areas related to substance use and counselling. Much of his research and practice interests relate to how we can improve outcomes in diverse areas, to make individuals' lives better and improve society as a whole. Mr. Mahon can be reached at outcomesmatter1@gmail.com.

THOUGHT PIECE

In Search of Authentic Leaders*

Saliba Sarsar
Monmouth University

Values embody beliefs, commitments, and practices that nourish individual and collective life with meaning and purpose. The values we communicate to others and the way we apply them reveal a lot about us and what we hold dear. Leaders at all levels of society and our human family have a serious responsibility as they model values and affect the hearts and minds of those around them, near and far.

As we start the third decade of the 21st century, we witness more authoritarians asserting themselves and more populists with illiberal tendencies having a substantial influence in established and in fledgling democracies. In China—a digital authoritarian state under the direction of the Chinese Communist Party—the government is tightening its grip on its citizens, particularly the Uyghurs and other Muslim minorities who are detained in camps and subjected to re-education. Other authoritarians are suppressing dissent, including individuals and groups they consider potential opponents, as in Vladimir Putin's Russia, Nicolás Maduro's Venezuela, Jimmy Morales's Guatemala, Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman's Saudi Arabia, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's Turkey, Viktor Orbán's Hungary, and Rodrigo Duterte's Philippines. As for populism, there are various expression of it in Narendra Modi's India, Donald J. Trump's United States, Joko Widodo's Indonesia, and Jair Bolsonaro's Brazil.

Authoritarian leaders tend to be rigid in their ideas, ethnocentric, and prejudiced. They are usually antagonistic, fearing the intentions of others but also instilling fear in others and capitalizing on it in order to have their way. Their own needs come above all else. When faced with a human tragedy, they show little to no compassion toward others. Moreover, authoritarian leaders more often than not

*To cite this article: Sarsar, S. (2020). In search of authentic leaders. *International Leadership Journal, 12(*3), 80–84.

reject or have a weak commitment to democratic rules; they deny the legitimacy of political opponents; tolerate or encourage violence; and are ready to curtail the civil liberties of opponents, including the media (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018).

Similarly, scholars have described populist leaders as being “antielitist” and “antipluralist.” Populists claim that “they alone represent the people” and “political competitors are essentially illegitimate” (Müller, 2016, 103). Nai and Martinez i Coma’s (2019) analysis, which is in general agreement with many other studies, found that while populists score lower on agreeableness, emotional stability, and conscientiousness, they score higher on extraversion, narcissism, psychopathy, and Machiavellianism.

What is instructive about the behavior of authoritarian and nationalist populist leaders is that they often miss the mark, particularly when it comes to humane politics. Authoritarians, emphasizing strong central power and limited political freedoms, on the one hand, and populists, insisting on complete or increased state sovereignty and expressing antipathy toward pluralism, on the other, neither promote inclusive citizenship and equality nor efficiently and effectively practice responsible leadership to facilitate global coordination and collaboration (some have combined authoritarianism and populism as “authoritarian populism”; see Crewe & Sanders, 2020; Rohac et al., 2018). As Harari (2020) writes about the COVID-19 pandemic, “over the past few years, irresponsible politicians have deliberately undermined trust in science, in public authorities, and in international cooperation. As a result, we are now facing this crisis bereft of global leaders who can inspire, organize, and finance a coordinated global response” (“A Leaderless World” section).

In contrast to authoritarians and populists, we find more liberal-oriented leaders who are authentic and transformative. They empower and give voice to their communities and others. They are motivated by a vision larger than themselves. Their guidance comes from their innermost drive and lived experience, and they seek to contribute to freedom, justice, and peace for all. Their strength flows not from the motivation for personal greatness but more so from the potential inherent in their communities. They are good listeners as well as receptive to change and to discarding biases and old habits. They are collaborative in nature, enabling them to be catalysts as they involve others and arrive at consensus or agreement. They are affiliative, empathetic toward others, and responsive to the reality and needs of their communities, not only theirs. They do not take trust for granted but earn it. While they understand the past, they embrace a broad and inclusive perspective as well as a long-term, forward looking outlook. But where do we find such authentic world leaders today?

New Zealand's Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern exhibits several traits of authentic leadership. Lux (2020) describes her as "open, honest and effective" in the title of his article. When the terrorist attack on the Muslim community took place in Christchurch in March 2018, she visited the site with a headscarf on and gave a heartwarming hug to a mosque-goer. Afterward, she said of the victims, "they are us." At a press conference, she added, "New Zealand has been chosen because it was safe, because it was no place for hatred or racism. Because we represent diversity, kindness, compassion, home for those who share our values. Refuge for those who need it" (Devaney , 2020, "Responding to the Christchurch shootings" section). In a similar fashion, when the COVID-19 pandemic started less than a year later, Ardern "acted swiftly, while effectively communicating the thinking behind those actions to New Zealand's five million citizens" (Devaney, 2020, para. 1).

At a time when communities, countries, and the world are facing substantial challenges and risks (e.g., food insecurity, deforestation, energy dependence, gender inequality, a global pandemic, global warming/climate change, habitat destruction, international conflict, nuclear holocaust, racism, and resource depletion), the need for authentic, transformative leadership is urgent. Yet, authoritarian and populist leaders are turning more nationalistic, preferring to advance their personal, parochial, or state interests instead of the common good, at home and beyond. The world—our world—must reimagine its future and put forward leaders who are authentic, with abilities to communicate and act effectively with meaning and purpose.

Questions for the ILJ Practitioner Community

1. Why are authoritarians and populists on the rise in politics today?
2. Why is there an authenticity deficit in politics today?
3. What traits do you see in some coworkers and supervisors that lead you to think of them as "authoritarian" or "populist"?
4. What traits do you see in some coworkers and supervisors that lead you to call them "authentic"?
5. How do we engender authentic qualities in ourselves and others?
6. What must individuals, organizations, institutions, and countries do to promote authenticity and positive collaboration in support of building a better future for all?

References

Crewe, I., & Sanders, D. (Eds.). (2020). *Authoritarian populism and liberal democracy*. Palgrave MacMillan.

Devaney, S. (2020, June 9). 7 defining characteristics of Jacinda Ardern's leadership style. *Vogue.* https://www.vogue.co.uk/news/article/jacinda-ardern-leadership-style

Harari, Y. N. (2020, March 30). In the battle against coronavirus, the world lacks leadership. *Time*. https://time.com/5803225/yuval-noah-harari-coronavirus-humanity-leadership/

Levitsky, S., & Ziblatt, D. (2018). *How democracies die*. Broadway Books.

Lux, A. A. (2020, May 26). Open, honest and effective: What makes Jacinda Ardern an authentic leader. *The Conversation.* https://theconversation.com/open-honest-and-effective-what-makes-jacinda-ardern-an-authentic-leader-132513

Müller, J.-W. (2016). *What is populism?* University of Pennsylvania Press.

Nai, A., & Martinez i Coma, F. (2019). The personality of populists: Provocateurs, charismatic leaders, or drunken dinner guests. *Journal of West European Politics, 42*(7), 1337–1367. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01402382.2019.1599570

Rohac, D., Kennedy, L., & Singh, V. (2018, May 10). *Drivers of authoritarian populism in the United States: A primer.* Center for American Progress & American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. https://www.aei.org/research-products/report/drivers-of-authoritarian-populism-in-the-united-states-a-primer/

Saliba Sarsar, PhD, is a professor of political science at Monmouth University. His most recent books include *Peacebuilding in Israeli-Palestinian Relations* (2020) and *Jerusalem: The Home in Our Hearts* (2018). In 2020, he guest-edited a special issue of the *Journal of South Asian and Middle Eastern Studies*, focusing on “Israel, Palestine, and the Challenge of Peace.” He is coeditor of *Democracy in Crisis Around the World* (2020) and *Continuity and Change in Political Culture: Israel and Beyond* (2020). He can be reached at sarsar@monmouth.edu.

BOOK REVIEW

***The Room Where It Happened: A White House Memoir* (2020)[*]**

By John Bolton, Former National Security Advisor of the United States

Published by Simon & Schuster

Cost: $16.99; Pages: 578

Reviewed by Sanket S. Shah, West Shore Community College

John Bolton's foreign policy background, Republican party bona fides, and signature white mustache has become something of a legend in Washington, DC. Bolton made news in 2005 when he was tapped by then-U.S. President George W. Bush as ambassador to the United Nations. Bolton ruffled many feathers with his abrasive attitude and staunchly critical view of international organizations that he perceived to undermine American foreign policy and authority. After serving in this capacity for only around a year and a half, Bolton resigned at the end of 2006. It seemed almost inevitable that current President Donald J. Trump would find a way to add Bolton to his circle of advisors, given the similarities between Bolton's and Trump's views of international relations. From April 2018 to September 2019, Bolton served as the 27th national security advisor of the United States.

In keeping with the trend of being a former-Trump-advisor-turned-author, Bolton released his 578-page account of his time serving under Trump this year. *The Room Where It Happened* differs from post-Trump tomes published by Bolton's former colleagues in that Bolton seeks to offer an in-depth look at Trump's leadership and decision-making process. Although it is at once a predictable attempt to distance himself from the Trump presidency he once longed to serve, Bolton is successful in providing an illuminating account of Trump's dealings and leadership style with China, Turkey, South Korea, North Korea, Saudi Arabia, Israel, and Iran—just to name a few.

---

[*]To cite this article: Shah, S. S. (2020). Review of the book *The room where it happened: A White House memoir,* by J. Bolton. *International Leadership Journal, 12*(3), 85–90.

"Confusion and Disorder"—International Leadership and the President's Cabinet

Who the president of the United States selects to join the Cabinet is one of the most important decisions a president can make, especially at the beginning of the administration. In addition to providing critical insights on matters the president may not know, the selection of the Cabinet members is also a good early indicator of the president's leadership style. When it came to leadership, Bolton aligns himself with "Adam Smith on economics, Edmund Burke on society, *The Federalist Papers* on government, and a merger of Dean Acheson and John Foster Dulles on national security" (9). Bolton cites the works of men with profound and deep ideologies on the nature of human governance and American leadership for the world. But did newly elected President Trump share these views?

Bolton initially cites various Cabinet appointments as evidence that Trump lacked a clear leadership strategy early on—a clear departure from Bolton's own preferences of appointing deeply rooted and experienced Republican policy thinkers. Bolton laments Trump's first round of Cabinet selections as being composed not of subject matter experts but of those who were most loyal to him and people he liked as a result. Bolton points to the appointments of Michael Flynn as national security advisor and Rex Tillerson as secretary of state. Both positions are critical to any president's ability to lead on global policy and security issues. It seemed as though everyone was aware of Flynn's considerable conflicts of interests with foreign governments. Former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger had expressed concern to Bolton regarding Flynn's appointment, saying "he will be gone within a year" (10). Kissinger was correct. Tillerson's appointment was also troubling to Bolton. Tillerson was the former CEO of ExxonMobil and had considerable ties to Russian President Vladimir Putin, who is always of concern to American interests. Tillerson ended up serving a little more than one year as secretary of state.

For Bolton, Trump's "confusion and disorder" Cabinet did not reflect the best people to advise and counsel a president who tended to be guided more by his own intuition and less by mastery of domestic and international policy (14). As a result, Trump's potential to lead internationally may have been severely hamstrung from the outset of his presidency, as evidenced by the revolving door of national security advisors to serve the Trump administration in just one term: Michael Flynn, Keith Kellogg, H. R. McMaster, John Bolton, Charles Kupperman, and current advisor Robert O'Brien.

Intuition Over Foundational Foreign Policy and Theory—Trump's Leadership and Dealings with World Leaders

Bolton represents a partisan, right-leaning view of the United States' role in foreign affairs and global leadership. His view is rooted in existing foundational principles that have existed within the Republican Party for decades: always strengthen the U.S. military, enforce military might on noncompliant foreign states (including rogue actors and terrorist organizations), and refrain from joining disadvantageous global agreements (which typically means that the United States should not enter into agreements at all). Bolton and Trump are generally aligned with these principles. However, whereas Bolton derives his foreign policy leadership from decades of study and being a Washington insider, Trump relies (as he himself has repeated) on his intuition and gut instincts.

Bolton and Trump agreed about backing out of the Iran nuclear deal and the Paris Agreement on climate—but for different reasons. Bolton did not feel either brought the United States closer to its goals, permitted foreign states to be let off the hook, and ultimately only served the interests of politicians. Trump's reasons for backing out was based less on foundational ideology regarding America's role in foreign agreements, but more on his instinct and gut feelings that he just did not like them. Up to a point, this was fine with Bolton—as the end result of backing out of those deals is what Bolton was seeking from a Trump presidency anyway. But what about other areas of presidential leadership on the global stage?

Throughout his book, Bolton laments Trump's use of flailing intuition and unpredictable knee-jerk responses (often on the social media platform Twitter) when it came to leading on a global scale. This leadership style would later be a contributing factor for why Bolton left his national security advisor role in

September 2019. An earlier example of this revolves around Trump's leadership and negotiations with North Korean President Kim Jong Un.

Bolton agreed with Trump's leadership tactic of reminding North Korea (and to a greater extent, the world) of the United States' tremendous military might. This was done famously when Trump announced his intention to bring "fire and fury" to North Korea should they continue making violent threats. However, Bolton disagreed with the president's decision to meet with Kim Jong Un in June 2018 at the Singapore Summit. Bolton writes that such a meeting (a) emboldens foreign leaders to continue making threats, (b) would be used as a propaganda tool by North Korea and other foreign media, and (c) would accomplish absolutely nothing.

In recounting the facts of this meeting, Bolton highlights two observations of the president's foreign leadership style: (a) Trump sees no problem in making open threats against foreign leaders as a bargaining chip, much like foreign states do to the United States, and (b) Trump is still willing to meet with foreign enemies. Bolton and the reader are left to wonder: why? Why did Trump threaten to destroy North Korea in 2017 only to meet with Kim Jong Un in 2018? We now know that the meeting was not very fruitful and has not stopped North Korea's global agitations. Foreign policy thinkers knew this on all sides in 2018, but the president—relying on his gut instincts—met with Kim Jong Un nonetheless. This question of "why" is a running theme throughout Bolton's book, as he highlights the president's intuitive leadership and questionable strategic moves regarding issues involving Iran, Russia, Ukraine, China, Afghanistan, Venezuela, and Europe.

Conclusion

It is clear that Bolton (much like other former advisors turned bestselling authors) wanted to work within the Trump administration. It is also clear that, like many other former advisors, Bolton was perplexed by Trump's leadership and decision making. Bolton was drawn to the allure of Trump's "America First" approach to foreign policy, but like a lot of people who meet their heroes—he was let down.

Bolton's views on foreign policy and leadership are rooted in known conservative, right-wing Republican foundations. This is nothing new. Bolton would have gladly served any Republican president. What is new, however, is that the president Bolton served from 2018 to 2019 did not subscribe to his foundational principles on international policy decision making. Foreign leaders, whether they be hostile or friendly toward American policy, are coming from deep-rooted and ingrained ideologies that have existed in their countries for decades. They have known what they seek for many generations. According to Bolton, Trump's Twitter rhetoric and instinctive reactionary leadership style was not enough to move American interests meaningfully abroad or have foreign leaders comply with preferred American policies. Like many former Trump advisors, Bolton knew that foreign enemies and states were only interested in agitation and solving global problems in a manner advantageous to the United States required more than off-the-cuff reactions and tough Twitter talk.

Toward the end of the book, it becomes clear that Bolton prefers international leadership and decision making to follow a strategic known course. While he agreed with much of Trump's late-night Twitter foreign policy musings, the now 71-year-old Bolton reminiscences about a time when America's foreign policy and leadership aligned with his familiar foreign policy experience, which took him decades to craft. Ultimately, Trump's unique and unpredictable international leadership actions led Bolton to resign as national security advisor in September 2019.

Whether you agree or disagree with Bolton or Trump's politics, *The Room Where It Happened* is an easy read that does a fine job of explaining complex foreign entanglements and leadership decisions during the Trump presidency. If one were to collect all the books written by former Trump administration officials (past, present, and future), it is worth noting that Bolton's book differs from the others in that he continues to educate the reader on foreign policy issues that occurred not just during Trump's presidency, but also over the last 30 years. However, it is this expert historical knowledge that ultimately leads Bolton to the similar realization of other former advisors: the international leadership style of the current president defies convention, experts have little chance to make an impression on this administration, and the United States' current status regarding international leadership and foreign policy hangs in a very delicate and perilous balance.

Sanket Shah earned his BA from Montclair State University, his JD from Nova Southeastern University, and his MS in Management from Thomas Edison State University. Mr. Shah is a licensed attorney in New Jersey; Florida; and Washington, DC. He has compliance and legal experience in both the public and private sectors and is currently a banking compliance professional and volunteer English tutor. He is also an adjunct instructor in business law at West Shore Community College. He can be reached at SanketShahEsq@Gmail.com.