Olivet Nazarene University
Digital Commons @ Olivet

Ed.D. Dissertations | School of Graduate and Continuing Studies

5-2015

An Analysis of Education and Experience in Pastoral Leadership Development

Justin L. Hayes
Olivet Nazarene University, revjlhayes@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.olivet.edu/edd_diss

Part of the Christian Denominations and Sects Commons, Christianity Commons, and the Educational Leadership Commons

Recommended Citation
Hayes, Justin L., "An Analysis of Education and Experience in Pastoral Leadership Development" (2015). *Ed.D. Dissertations*. 78.
https://digitalcommons.olivet.edu/edd_diss/78

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Graduate and Continuing Studies at Digital Commons @ Olivet. It has been accepted for inclusion in Ed.D. Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Olivet. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@olivet.edu.

AN ANALYSIS OF EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE IN PASTORAL LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

by

Justin L. Hayes

Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of

Olivet Nazarene University

School of Graduate and Continuing Studies

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

the Degree of

Doctor of Education

in

Ethical Leadership

May 2015

218154

AN ANALYSIS OF EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE IN PASTORAL LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

By

Justin L. Hayes

Dissertation

Dissertation Adviser	4/18/15 Date
Dissertation Reader	4-18-15 Date
Dissertation Coordinator	4-18-15 Date
Program Director	4-18-15 Date
Vice President for Academic Affairs	4-18-15 Date

© 2015

Justin L. Hayes

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful for the support I received from my colleagues serving the Church of the Nazarene. Dr. Daniel Copp endorsed this study giving it credibility within the denomination. The ministers serving the Kentucky District Church of the Nazarene regularly offered encouragement throughout this endeavor.

The faculty and staff of the Olivet Nazarene University Doctor of Education in Ethical Leadership program challenged me to become an effective leader in all areas of life. I am especially grateful to Dr. Leon Blanchette, advisor, and Dr. Stephen Lowe, reader, for their outstanding guidance through the dissertation process. Truly, I would have never finished without them.

I deeply love and appreciate the members of Cohort VI. I consider it a blessing to have spent three years of my life journeying with such dynamic people.

I am especially thankful to the people of Frankfort First Church of the Nazarene. They supported their pastor through this season of growth and development. I pray their investment in me is amazingly fruitful.

I must thank my family. The hospitality of my in-laws, Jan and Mike Couture, enabled the timely completion of this program. To my wife, Heather, and our children Samantha, Rachel, Natalie, Tommy, and Alison, thank you for giving so much for this project. I am humbled by your willingness to sacrifice for me. I love you all more deeply than you can know.

Finally, I thank the Lord Jesus Christ without whom I can do very little.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my daughter Natalie Rose. I decided to enter this program after your passing because you inspired me to live the best life possible. While we cannot be together, your inspiration motivated me to finish this study with excellence and gladness. I love and miss you more than I can say. Some day we will be together again. See you soon.

ABSTRACT

This study analyzed the relationships between education and servant leadership behaviors and between experience and servant leadership behaviors. The goal was to determine whether education or experience served as the stronger predictor of servant leadership behaviors among Nazarene pastors. Several linear regressions were calculated using data submitted by 37 Nazarene pastors serving in the United States and Canada from a demographic survey designed by the researcher and the Servant Leadership Questionnaire. This study showed participating Nazarene pastors rate strongly in servant leadership behaviors, but no predictive relationships between education and servant leadership, between total years (full time and part time) of ministry experience and servant leadership, and between full time ministry experience and servant leadership were found. Similarly, additional multiple regressions showed no combination of these factors predicted servant leadership behaviors among Nazarene pastors. The researcher concluded Nazarene pastors serving in the United States and Canada likely possess strong ratings in servant leadership behaviors, but education and experience were not strong predictors of those behaviors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	3
	Background	3
	Research Questions	12
	Description of Terms	12
	Significance of the Study	15
	Process to Accomplish	18
	Summary	21
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	23
	Introduction	23
	History of Leadership	23
	Servant Leadership	35
	Conclusions	82
	Summary	84
III.	METHODOLOGY	86
	Introduction	86
	Research Design	88
	Population	90
	Data Collection	92

Analytical Methods 96

Limitations 99

Summary 101

IV. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS 103

Introduction 103

Findings 104

Conclusions 122

Implications and Recommendations 125

REFERENCES 132

APPENDIXES

A. Pastor's Survey 148

B. Revised SLQ 150

C. Letter of Recommendation from Dr. Daniel Copp 153

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Major Models of Servant Leadership 38

2. Major Research Instruments of Servant Leadership 44

3. Stages of Constructive-Development Theory 65

4. Nazarene Pastors Servant Leadership Scores 105

5. Relationship Between Education and Servant Leadership 107

6. Relationship Between Years of Ministry Experience and Servant Leadership 110

7. Relationship Between Years of Full Time Ministry Experience and Servant Leadership 113

8. Relationship Between Education, Years of Ministry Experience, and Servant Leadership 117

9. Relationship Between Education, Years of Full Time Ministry Experience, & Servant Leadership 120

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Developing pastors into effective servant leaders is a major concern for the Church. The concern is rooted in the importance of pastors in fulfilling the Church's mission. Hybels (2002) suggested pastoral leadership is the determining factor in how effectively the Church will fulfill its redemptive mission in the future. Reiland (2011) similarly believed a local church's potential to fulfill its mission rests in a pastor's ability to influence and develop its members. Simply stated, churches rely on their pastors to lead. The role of the pastor in the missional activity of the local church creates the concern for leadership development.

Pastors within the Church of the Nazarene are critical to the mission of their local churches. Nazarene pastors are given oversight of a local congregation according to the 2009-2013 Manual Church of the Nazarene (Church of the Nazarene, 2009). Pastors are the presiding officers of local Nazarene churches, but the role is much more than administrative (Church of the Nazarene, 2009). Pastors serve as the primary teachers and theologians of local churches responsible for molding members into committed followers of Jesus (Bredfelt, 2006). Pastors provide care and support to church members during difficult times empathizing with members' pain, being available during times of crisis, and listening intently to members' concerns (Greenleaf, 2002). Pastors fill a priestly role in sacramental worship leading their congregations into the presence of God through the rituals of the church and the administration of the sacraments. Simultaneously, they

present to God faithful communities shaped and united by the Gospel message (Chan, 2006). Nazarene pastors communicate the visionary direction of their congregations articulating what they believe "God called them to do" (Malphurs, 1999, p.18). Pastors are critical to the mission of the local Nazarene church. These churches need their pastors to be effective servant leaders.

The reliance on pastors creates the need to understand factors that contribute to continual leadership development (McKenna, Yost, & Boyd, 2007). The Church of the Nazarene depends on two major factors to form its pastors into servant leaders: education and experience. Candidates for ordination are required to complete a prescribed course of study designed to introduce ministry candidates to competencies critical to pastoral leadership. Following ordination, pastors are strongly encouraged to foster perpetual leadership development by embracing the discipline of life-long learning through continuing education (Course of Study Advisory Committee, 2006). Education is a major factor the Church of the Nazarene depends on to continually develop its pastors into servant leaders.

Experience is the other major factor relied upon by the Church of the Nazarene for leadership development. Candidates are required to complete a minimum of three consecutive years of ministry experience in a formal role recognized by the denomination prior to applying for ordination (Church of the Nazarene, 2009). After ordination, leadership development continues as pastors learn from the many scenarios they encounter throughout the course of a vocational ministry career (Bandura, 1971; McCauley, Ruderman, Ohlott, & Morrow, 1994). Nazarene pastors are expected to continually develop strong servant leadership behaviors through experience.

Statement of the Problem

The problem concerns the relationship between servant leadership behaviors and developmental factors among Nazarene pastors. Despite the Church of the Nazarene's reliance on education and experience for leadership development, we have insufficient knowledge about which factor is a stronger predictor of servant leadership behaviors. A pastor's education level, years of ministry experience, or a combination of both may possibly be the strongest predictor.

The problem stems from limited understanding about the relationship between developmental factors and leadership behaviors (Chan & Drasgow, 2001). This limitation exists because researchers have typically focused on the relationship between leadership theories and behaviors expected to be associated with those theories (Toor & Ofori, 2008). Similarly, pastoral leadership researchers tend to emphasize the end results of development such as effectiveness, behavior, and resiliency rather than the factors that contribute to continual development (McKenna et al., 2007).

The purpose of this study was to analyze the relationship between education and servant leadership between experience and servant leadership behaviors. The goal was to determine whether education or experience is a stronger predictor of servant leadership behaviors among Nazarene pastors.

Background

Servant leadership is a specific paradigm that originated with the writings of Greenleaf (2002). Greenleaf described servant leadership this way:

> 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 difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant – first to make sure that other people's needs are being served. The best test, and difficult to administer, is: do those being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society: will they benefit, or at least, not be further deprived? (para. 1, 2)

This paradigm is follower focused. The servant leader seeks first to meet the needs of the follower and will even place the good of the follower above personal interests (Hale & Fields, 2007). Once those needs are met, the servant leader consciously chooses to influence the follower. Part of that influence is intended to develop the follower into meeting the needs of others through servant leadership behaviors (Bugenhagen, 2006).

Servant leadership functions with a substantial ethical focus (Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010). Although other leadership paradigms include ethical components, servant leadership is unique because it is concerned for the success of all stakeholders within the organization. The leader acts in the best interest of all followers reducing the possibility of manipulation and coercion that results from leaders acting according to self-interest (Walumbwa et al.).

Greenleaf's (2002) description of servant leadership is complex. This complexity has led to multiple interpretations and an inconsistent set of defining characteristics in the literature (Van Dierendonck, 2011). Various researchers have posited lists of servant leadership characteristics (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008; Sendjaya, Sarros, & Santora, 2008; Spears, 2002). The one defining feature that unites these lists under the servant leadership theory is the leader intentionally putting the

needs of followers above his own and influencing followers to meet the needs of others ideally through servant leadership behaviors (Greenleaf).

Beginning with the various lists, Liden et al. (2008) verified seven measurable servant leadership behaviors while designing and validating the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ). The first behavior, emotional healing, involves sensitivity toward the concerns of others. The second behavior is creating value for the community and requires a "conscious, genuine concern for the community" (p. 162). Conceptual skills, the third behavior, are where the leader possesses sufficient knowledge about the organization to support effectively followers in achieving stated goals. The fourth behavior, empowering, is where the leader encourages followers to solve problems, make decisions, and complete tasks. Helping subordinates grow and succeed is the fifth behavior and involves the leader providing support and mentoring so the follower can develop ideally into a servant leader. The sixth behavior is putting subordinates first, which is intentionally prioritizing the needs of followers and communicating that priority to followers and peers. Behaving ethically is the final servant leadership behavior. This behavior requires the leader to carry on open, fair, and honest interaction with others (Liden et al.).

Education in Pastoral Leadership Development

Preparing pastors for leadership through formal education is an ancient practice. Catechetical schools were founded during the first few centuries of the Christian movement. These schools provided basic instruction concerning the Christian faith leading to baptism, but also served as hubs for theological reflection and ministerial training. Ancient luminaries such as Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Athanasius were

trained for ministry in the catechetical school of Alexandria (Irvin & Sunquist, 2007). During the Middle Ages, monasteries became the centers of theological academia preparing men such as Thomas Aquinas and Bernard of Clairvaux for Christian ministry. Cathedral schools and universities later supplanted monasteries as centers for theological training (Gonzalez, 1984). The founding of seminaries began during the Reformation era by the Roman Catholic Church for the sole purpose of training clergymen in response to the Protestant movement. Eventually, Protestant churches followed the Catholic precedent and founded seminaries specifically to train ministers (Gonzalez, 1985).

Formal education is still a significant resource in forming pastors for leadership. Education was the most frequently reported single event that influenced leadership development among pastors in a study by McKenna et al. (2007). Dowson and McInerney (2005) found pastors and parishioners of the Australian Church of Christ were generally satisfied with how effectively pastors developed ministerial competencies through formal theological education. Several leading Protestant denominations require formal education as part of the ordination process. Many of these denominations require at least a master's degree (Union Theological Seminary in the City of New York, 2013). Formal education remains a major factor in developing pastoral leaders.

The Church of the Nazarene requires formal education as a requirement for ordination because the denomination believes "a call to ministry is a call to prepare" (Church of the Nazarene, 2005, p.9). Nazarene requirements consist of both general and theological education. General education is intended to create a deeper understanding of the context in which the ministry candidate will serve. Theological education is intended to shape the candidate's character, form the candidate spiritually, and introduce the

candidate to the vast collection of knowledge within the Christian tradition (Church of the Nazarene).

Nazarene pastoral education is structured to meet four basic elements: content, competency, character and context (Church of the Nazarene, 2009). Content includes biblical knowledge, Christian theology, history of the Church and its mission, Wesleyan distinctives, and Nazarene history and polity. Competency familiarizes candidates with practical activities of ministry such as oral and written communication, management and leadership, church finances, analytical thinking, and pastoral care and counseling. The transformation of the candidate through personal growth, ethics, spirituality, and relationships is addressed in the character element. Context introduces the ministry candidate to social sciences like anthropology and sociology, cross cultural communication, and Christian mission. Nazarene educational requirements are comprehensive. The denomination believes all of this is necessary for a person to develop into an effective pastoral leader (Church of the Nazarene).

Candidates for ordination in the Church of the Nazarene have several options for completing their formal education. The option preferred by the denomination to prepare candidates for ministry is to complete an undergraduate degree at one of the Nazarene liberal arts colleges or universities and then attend Nazarene Theological Seminary (Course of Study Advisory Committee, 2006). This option involves the highest quality of instruction within the denomination, but also considerable financial and time investments. Candidates may also attend institutes of higher education not associated with the Church of the Nazarene to complete their formal education. If this option is pursued, courses taken must be consistent with the four elements of Nazarene pastoral education (Church

of the Nazarene, 2009). This option provides high quality instruction comparable to the Nazarene institutions, but emphasizes few if any distinct Nazarene issues and involves high time and financial investments.

Candidates who have difficulty with the time and financial investments associated with attending a traditional institute of higher education may complete their requirements through "alternative training methods" (Course of Study Advisory Committee, 2006, p. 4). The criterion for an alternative training method is the Regional Course of Study Advisory Committee must validate the program (Church of the Nazarene, 2005). In the United States and Canada, the modular training program is the primary validated option. The program consists of 24 modules designed by the denomination and consistent with the four elements of Nazarene pastoral education (Church of the Nazarene, 2009). The modular program is applied in district training centers and online through two Nazarene institutions of higher education by qualified instructors (USA/Canada Regional Office Church of the Nazarene, 2013). The advantages of the modular program are lower time and financial investments. The disadvantages are generally lower qualifications for the instructors and reduced academic rigor. Candidates preparing for ordination in the Church of the Nazarene have several options for completing their educational requirements.

Following ordination, Nazarene pastors are expected to embrace the discipline of life-long learning to ensure their further development. The denomination believes, "Not only is lifelong learning necessary to understand developments within the wider church and the surrounding society, but it is also foundational to increased personal growth, thus preventing stagnation in the spiritual, mental, and skill development of the individual"

(Church of the Nazarene, 2005). Nazarene pastors are required to complete two continuing education units per year to facilitate life-long learning and are empowered to decide for themselves how they will practice the discipline (Church of the Nazarene). One continuing education unit is 10 contact hours of additional coursework, seminars, conferences, classes, or substantial readings (Course of Study Advisory Committee, 2006). Many pastors choose to complete their continuing education requirements by pursuing graduate and post-graduate studies.

Experience in Pastoral Leadership Development

A review of the literature indicates that experience is a contributing factor to leadership development. Bandura (1971) described a rudimentary process for learning from experiences where behavior patterns are reinforced by the consequences of actions. In this process, prospective leaders respond to the various situations they encounter. These responses may result in either positive or negative consequences. The responses that lead to positive consequences are reinforced in the prospective leaders behavior patterns and likely repeated in similar situations. The responses that lead to negative consequences are eventually discarded and different responses are tried in similar situations. This process of learning from experience occurs throughout a leader's lifetime (Bluck & Glück, 2004).

Developing leaders may encounter several different types of experiences over the course of a career. Critical events such as challenging situations, positive or negative relationships, and opportunities for personal evaluation and growth are categories of experiences shown to contribute to a person developing leadership behaviors (Kempster, 2006). Previous leadership roles have been shown to be strong predictors of future

leadership effectiveness suggesting such opportunities are developmental experiences (Atwater, Dionne, Avolio, Camobreco, & Lau, 1999). The different types of experiences that contribute to leadership development can be positive or negative. Cope and Watts (2000) pointed out that negative events can be challenging because of a high level of emotional investment but still lead to positive leadership behaviors. A leader may encounter many different scenarios that contribute to their development (McCauley et al., 1994).

Significant relationships such as parents, mentors, and role models are another category of experience shown to influence a leader's development (McKenna et al., 2007; Toor & Ofori, 2008; Zacharatos, Barling, & Kelloway, 2000). This is because, as Bandura (1971) noted, a leader's response to a situation is rarely random but usually based on behavior modeled by another person. Bandura suggested as part of his social learning theory most behavior people display is learned from modeling. This occurs for three reasons: safety, efficiency, and complexity. Safety is a reason for learning from modeled behavior because consequences for responding to a situation can be dangerous to all involved. Dangerous consequences are minimized when possible responses to a situation are based on established examples. Modeling is an efficient way of learning because one can quickly refer to a behavioral example in the event of an unsuccessful response rather than responding randomly or enter a period of trial and error. Complex behaviors such as language and communication or cultural norms and mores are usually learned from modeled examples (Bandura). Behavior modeled by significant relationships is a major experience that contributes to leadership development.

Research has also shown that experience influences pastoral leadership development. McKenna et al. (2007) interviewed 100 pastors about factors they believed contributed to their development as leaders. Over 82% of all responses were experiences from the ministerial careers of the participating pastors. McKenna et al. organized these career experiences into three main categories; transitions, leading in the trenches, and when other people matter. Transitions was the category that involved major single events that changed the trajectory of the pastor's ministry. Leading in the trenches, which was the largest category, involved the challenges of day-to-day leadership in a ministerial context. When other people matter was the category related to experiences with specific other people such as those in need, family, role models, and others' sets of values. The remaining 18% of responses consisted of early formational experiences like conversion, call to ministry, and participating in formal education (McKenna et al.). Experience is an influential factor in pastors developing into servant leaders.

Nazarene pastors are expected to develop as leaders through experience. Candidates for ordination are expected to complete a minimum of three consecutive years of formal ministry (Church of the Nazarene, 2009). Many candidates complete more than three years before they are ordained especially if a portion of the ministry experience is part time. In such cases, the candidate will be required to complete more than three years because part time assignments are given less weight due to their more limited involvement in the local church ministry than full time assignments (Church of the Nazarene). Following ordination, pastors continue developing as leaders by learning from the wide range of scenarios encountered during a ministerial career (Bandura, 1971;

McCauley et al., 1994). Experience is a contributing factor to pastors developing as leaders.

Research Questions

This research project was designed and implemented to answer the following research questions:

1. How do Nazarene pastors rate in servant leadership behaviors?
2. What is the relationship between a Nazarene pastor's education level and rating in servant leadership behaviors?
3. What is the relationship between a Nazarene pastor's total number of years of ministry experience (full time and part time) and rating in servant leadership behaviors?
4. What is the relationship between the percentage of a Nazarene pastor's full time ministry experience and rating in servant leadership behaviors?

Description of Terms

The following definitions provide clarity for important terms used throughout this research project:

Church of the Nazarene. The Church of the Nazarene is "a global Christian denomination in the Wesleyan-Arminian theological tradition with historical roots in John Wesley's Methodist revival and the American holiness movement of the late 19th century" (Rowell, 2010, p. 8). For the purposes of this research project, the term Nazarene used throughout refers to the Church of the Nazarene.

Education. This term refers to formal education used to prepare pastors for church leadership. Pastors preparing for ordination are required to complete a prescribed course

of study validated by the regional Course of Study Advisory Committee (Course of Study Advisory Committee, 2006). The course of study can be completed through the denomination's modular program or as part of an academic degree program from an institution of higher education. Many ordained pastors complete academic degrees of various levels as part of their continuing education requirements (Church of the Nazarene, 2005). In this research project, this term refers to all levels of completed formal education, both prior to and after ordination, that contribute to leadership development.

Experience. This term refers to the collection of life events that develop a person into a leader. Over the course of a lifetime, a leader encounters a wide range of events that contribute to the development of leadership behaviors (McCauley et al., 1994). For pastoral leaders, many of those events are likely to occur during a pastor's career, but events outside of a ministerial context such as a prior career, conversion, call to ministry and significant relationships have also been shown to contribute to pastoral leadership development (McKenna et al., 2007). This research project recognizes the substantial influence of events outside a ministerial context on pastoral leadership development, but emphasizes events specific to a pastor's career because of its design. This project was designed to analyze the relationship between a pastor's years of ministry experience and servant leadership behaviors. Terms such as ministry experience, ministerial experience, vocational experience, and pastoral experience all refer to the collection of developmental events that occur during a pastor's career.

The Church of the Nazarene includes ministerial experience as a requirement for ordination. Candidates are required to complete a minimum of three consecutive years of ministry experience in order to be ordained (Church of the Nazarene, 2009).

Ordination. Ordination is the ritual where a candidate is confirmed and empowered by his denomination to practice Christian ministry. The Church of the Nazarene recognizes two orders of ordained ministers: the elder and the deacon (Church of the Nazarene, 2009). For the purpose of this research project ordination refers exclusively to ordained elders. The distinctive feature of this order is a specific call to preach. As a result, elders are the only ordained Nazarene ministers permitted to serve as pastors of local congregations (Church of the Nazarene).

Pastor. A pastor is a vocational minister elected by the local church membership charged with oversight of all church functions (Church of the Nazarene, 2009). For the purposes of this research project, this term refers only to ministers assigned to lead or senior pastoral roles and does not include assistant, associate, or specialist pastoral assignments.

Servant leadership. This term refers to a specific leadership paradigm originating in the writings of Robert K. Greenleaf (Northouse, 2013). The distinguishing feature of this paradigm is the leader prioritizing the needs of the follower over personal interests so that the follower can grow and develop ideally into a servant leader (Greenleaf, 2002).

Servant leadership behaviors. This phrase refers to a collection of behaviors associated with the servant leadership paradigm. There is no single absolute list of servant leadership behaviors due to the various interpretations of Greenleaf's writings (Van Dierendonck, 2011). As a result, many researchers have compiled potential lists of

behaviors (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Liden et al., 2008; Sendjaya et al., 2008; Spears, 2002). For the purpose of this research project, servant leadership behaviors refer to the seven measurable behaviors of the SLQ. These behaviors are emotional healing, creating value for the community, conceptual skills, empowering, helping subordinates grow and succeed, putting subordinates first, and behaving ethically (Liden et al.).

Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ). The SLQ is a validated instrument designed by Liden et al. (2008) to measure how strongly a leader exhibits seven servant leadership behaviors.

Significance of the Study

The findings from this research project could benefit five parties: the USA/Canada Region of the Church of the Nazarene, district superintendents and church boards, local congregations, future researchers, and the researcher. The USA/Canada Region of the Church of the Nazarene has invested heavily in educational opportunities for pastors. The denomination maintains 11 institutions of higher education in the United States and Canada (International Board of Education, 2011). One of the main principles in establishing these schools was to provide churches with strong pastoral leaders (General Board of the Church of the Nazarene, 1952). A ministry candidate can complete the course of study for ordination at any of these schools. A practicing pastor can pursue graduate studies at most and doctoral studies at some of these schools. In addition to these formal institutions, many Nazarene districts within the USA/Canada Region maintain smaller training centers where ministry candidates can complete ordination requirements and practicing pastors can fulfill continuing education credits through the

denomination's modular training program (USA/Canada Regional Office Church of the Nazarene, 2013).

The Church of the Nazarene's investment in education in the USA/Canada Region is substantial. The findings from this research project could assist Nazarene leaders in making policy decisions regarding its educational investment. The course of study for ordination could be revised to reflect this project's findings and emphasize factors found to be stronger predictors of servant leadership behaviors. Ministry degree programs in the denominations institutes of higher education could be redesigned to include more field based learning opportunities or higher academic standards depending on this projects findings. In the end, the USA/Canada Region of the Church of the Nazarene will be better equipped to produce servant leaders through its educational endeavors.

District superintendents and church boards could be better equipped to more effectively fill pastoral vacancies. Vacancies are filled when a candidate receives a two-thirds majority vote of the church's membership upon the recommendation of the local church board and the district superintendent (Church of the Nazarene, 2009). The findings of this research project could assist district superintendents and church boards in the recommendation process by providing a framework to better analyze a pastoral candidate's potential for needed servant leadership behaviors. Each congregation is unique with different leadership needs. District superintendents and church boards could evaluate the needs of the local congregation and identify pastoral candidates who possess the combination of education and experience that serve as the strongest predictor of the needed leadership behavior.

Local congregations could benefit because their pastors would more strongly exhibit servant leadership behaviors. The defining feature of servant leadership is the leader puts the needs of the follower above personal concerns so that the follower can grow and develop (Greenleaf, 2002). Churches will benefit because they could more effectively fulfill the mission of the Church to produce disciples of Jesus Christ. Individual members of the local church will be influenced to grow as Christians and will be equipped to influence others to do likewise. The expanding number of people who prioritize the needs of others over personal issues may reduce church conflict and create a stronger church community.

Future researchers interested in the areas of servant leadership and pastoral leadership develop could benefit from the findings of this research project. Findings would contribute to the collective knowledge of these issues, but could also generate more exploratory research if predictive relationships between developmental factors and servant leadership behaviors were identified. Experimental research could potentially be conducted to determine if education and experience caused certain servant leadership behaviors. In the area of pastoral leadership development, similar research projects could be conducted in other denominations or theological traditions to see if the findings from this project could be generalized beyond the Church of the Nazarene. The findings of this project could potentially create opportunities for future research.

The researcher has a personal interest in the findings of this project. The researcher currently serves as a Nazarene pastor and is interested in developing stronger servant leadership behaviors. Results could assist the researcher in gaining personal insight about his developmental experiences and identify areas for future growth.

Process to Accomplish

The intention of this research project was to determine if predictive relationships existed between formal education, ministry experience, and servant leadership behaviors. Quantitative research methodology was used to answer the research questions.

Population and Sample

The population consisted of all ordained Nazarene pastors assigned to local congregations in the United States and Canada. At the time of writing, the population numbered 3,869 (Laura K. Lance, personal communication, February 4, 2013).

A sample of 350 members of the population was selected using random sampling. When the sample is random, every member of the population has an equal and independent chance of participating in the research project (Salkind, 2012). This sampling method was chosen because the population is relatively small and accessible (Leedy & Ormrod, 2013). The sample was selected using the name and contact information of every member of the population provided by the Global Ministry Center of the Church of the Nazarene. The provided names were assigned a number, one through 3,869, which were input into an online randomizer. The first 350 pastors on the list output by the randomizer served as the research sample.

The pastors selected for this research project were emailed an information packet inviting them to participate. This packet included details about the research project, instructions for the pastor, instructions for members of the church board of the congregation the pastor served, and a letter of recommendation from the director of global clergy development of the Church of the Nazarene. The pastors were asked to complete a short online survey. The members of the church boards were asked to rate

their pastors on the SLQ, which was also administered online. Pastors and board members were given 45 days to complete the surveys. Follow-up emails were sent every 15 days to remind the selected pastors to participate in this study.

Research Instruments

This research project used two research instruments. The first was a survey designed by the researcher for participating pastors. The second was the SLQ.

The participating pastors completed a survey designed by the researcher online through the internet service Survey Monkey. The survey gathered data about the participating pastors highest level of education, total number of years of vocational ministry, and total number of years of full time vocational ministry. In order for level of education to have numeric value, the levels were assigned numbers on an ordinal scale, which ranged from one to six with Nazarene course of study being one and doctoral degree being six. The survey also collected basic demographic information such as age, age of conversion, nation currently serving in, gender, and ethnicity. This data was not required to answer the research questions, but was collected to provide additional information that could be useful when interpreting the research findings.

The members of the church boards were asked to rate their pastors on the SLQ administered online using Survey Monkey. The SLQ is a validated research instrument designed to measure seven servant leadership behaviors. Leaders are rated by their followers on this instrument and a minimum of two raters was required for each pastor. The scores from the raters were averaged to determine the leader's SLQ ratings. The SLQ consists of 28 seven-point Likert type items ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Scores on the SLQ range from four to 28 representing how strongly the leader

exhibits each servant leadership behavior (Liden et al., 2008). The SLQ was designed to test leaders and managers in all disciplines, but for the purpose of this research project was slightly modified with the permission of the author. The term pastor replaced the term manager on the 28 items for clarity.

Data Analysis

Data from the SLQ were analyzed using descriptive statistics to answer the first research question. The question, *How do Nazarene pastors rate as servant leaders*, was answered by analyzing the central tendency and variability of the distribution of each servant leadership behavior. Data collected from the SLQ to answer the first research question also served as the dependent variable for the second, third, and fourth research questions.

The final three research questions, which concerned the relationships between a pastor's education level, years of vocational ministry experience, the percentage of years of full time ministry, and servant leadership behaviors, were answered by analyzing data collected from the SLQ and the pastors' survey using a linear regression. This statistical method is a relationship oriented research tool intended to demonstrate whether an independent variable is a strong predictor for the dependent variable (Robson, 2011). Servant leadership behavior ratings from the SLQ were the dependent variables for this study and were measured on an ordinal scale from 4 to 28 for each behavior. Highest level of education, total years of vocational ministry experience, and percentage of full time vocational ministry experience data collected from the pastors' survey were the independent variables. Highest level of education was measured on an ordinal scale from one to six. Total years of vocational ministry experience and the percentage of full time

vocational ministry experience were measured on ratio scales. All statistics were analyzed using SPSS software.

Summary

Developing pastors into servant leaders is a major concern for the Church because of the role they play in fulfilling the Church's mission. The significance of pastors in fulfilling the Church's mission creates the need to understand factors that contribute to continual leadership development (McKenna et al., 2007). Education and experience are the two primary factors the Church of the Nazarene relies upon to develop its pastors into servant leaders. Despite the Church of the Nazarene's reliance on these two factors, we have insufficient knowledge about which factor is a stronger predictor of servant leadership behaviors. It is possible a pastor's education level, years of ministry experience, or a combination of both is the strongest predictor.

The purpose of this research project is to analyze the relationship between these two developmental factors and servant leadership behaviors in order to determine whether education or experience is a stronger predictor of servant leadership behaviors among Nazarene pastors. Findings from this project could assist Nazarene leaders in decision making about pastoral educational programs. Findings could also assist district superintendents and church boards when filling pastoral vacancies because they could have a better understanding of a candidate's potential for certain servant leadership behaviors. Local churches could benefit from their pastors exhibiting servant leadership behaviors because servant leaders prioritize the needs of followers over personal desires so that followers grow and develop (Greenleaf, 2002).

Issues related to the development of servant leadership behaviors among pastors are investigated further in the next chapter. A review of relevant literature such as research into servant leadership, pastoral leadership, and leadership development is completed to provide deeper understanding of involved issues and context for the research project.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The development of pastors into servant leaders is an ongoing concern for the Church of the Nazarene. In order to develop effectively men and women into servant leaders, one must first possess a broad understanding of the servant leadership paradigm. The broad understanding begins with an awareness of the many issues associated with servant leadership. Servant leadership issues include the paradigm's place in the history of leadership theory, the creation of multiple models and research instruments to define and measure servant leadership behaviors, the effectiveness of applying servant leadership in various cultural and organizational contexts, and servant leadership developmental factors especially education and experience. This chapter provides an extensive review of the literature related to servant leadership and ends with conclusions gained about the role of education and experience in developing Nazarene pastors into effective servant leaders.

History of Leadership

Leadership is a universal construct appearing in all human societies and impacting every human being (Bass, 1997). Despite its universal application, the quality is largely misunderstood because a single, clear, all encompassing definition of leadership remains elusive (Burns, 2012). The missing comprehensive definition, however, has not been a deterrent to social scientific investigation into leadership. Over the past century and half,

the academic environment has demonstrated a persistent desire to explain thoroughly the quality resulting in the generation of as many as 850 different definitions of leadership (Benis & Nanus, 1997) and more relevantly the proposal of several distinct leadership paradigms (Northouse, 2012).

Galton and Trait-based Leadership

Serious reflection on leadership began in the late nineteenth century with the writings of Galton. Galton (1869) argued that extraordinary abilities are the result of genetic formation; people are born with their abilities. Drawing heavily from Darwinian thought, Galton believed these abilities manifest themselves throughout a person's life, but are most identifiable during times of competition ultimately distinguishing the extraordinary from the ordinary. Because such abilities are intrinsic components of a person's nature, the expression of abilities are not limited by situations, and extraordinary people will be elevated above their peers regardless of circumstances. Galton said, "I believe…that, if the "eminent" men of any period, had been changelings when babies, a very fair proportion of those who survived and retained their health up to fifty years of age, would… have equally risen to eminence" (p. 38). In Galton's view, the extraordinary will always be extraordinary.

The application of Galton (1869) to the field of leadership served as the foundation for a paradigm known as trait-based leadership. Trait-based leadership is the belief that leadership is a single extraordinary ability possessed by a select few. According to this view, a small section of the populace inherits the leadership quality from previous generations and possesses the ability to lead from birth. Leaders are therefore born rather than made. These natural born leaders will effectively influence

other people in all situations because of the immutability of leadership. A natural born leader will always lead and rise to a position of dominance in any situation (Northouse, 2012; Zaccaro, 2007).

Leader Centered Paradigms of the 1950's and 1960's

Trait-based leadership was the dominant paradigm from the time Galton originally published his views in the late 1860's until the middle decades of the twentieth century when Stogdill (1948) and Mann (1959) provided considerable opposition to the belief that leadership was a single heritable and immutable characteristic possessed by a fortunate few (Zaccaro, 2007). Stogdill conducted an extensive review of leadership literature and found that many different qualities were positively associated with leader effectiveness directly challenging the notion that leadership was a single identifiable characteristic. Mann argued against the idea of leadership being immutable citing a lack of scientific support for individual leaders showing consistent effectiveness in different groups. As a result, paradigms developed during the 1950's and 1960's that maintained the leader centered focus of trait-based leadership, but shifted away from the idea of a single quality to more diverse leadership characteristics and leadership in differing situations.

Three-skill approach.

Katz (1955) proposed a paradigm known as the three-skill approach and argued that leadership was not a single innate characteristic, but was instead comprised of three learnable skills: technical skill, human skill, and conceptual skill. Technical skills are specialized competencies needed for completing planned objectives and include industry specific knowledge of necessary tools, techniques, and analytical methods. Human skills

are relationship-based abilities necessary to work effectively within a group of people whether the group members are subordinates, peers, or superiors. Finally, conceptual skills are cognitive abilities used to generate new ideas or to reframe problems and challenges into solvable constructs. For Katz, leaders learn these abilities, which distances the three-skill approach from the natural-born leader of trait-based leadership.

Leaders must possess all three skills in Katz's (1955) model, but the need of each skill was dependent on the level of leadership within the organization. Supervisors, the lowest level of leadership in Katz model, were expected to maintain strong technical skills, but did not require strong conceptual skills. Supervisors were the front line leaders and predominately influenced their subordinates with technical training and operational direction. Middle managers were expected to maintain strong technical and conceptual skills because they provided technical expertise and served as the conduit of information from top management to the lower echelons of the organization. Top management did not require strong technical skills because they were not directly involved with production, but needed strong conceptual skills because they developed the ideas that provided direction and cohesion for the entire organization. All three levels needed effective human skills because interaction with other people was a feature of leadership in all scenarios.

The Managerial Grid.

In the early 1960's Blake and Mouton (1972) developed a model of leadership that assessed the balance between a leader's concern for production and concern for people. Concern for production refers to a leaders interest in achieving organizational goals. Concern for people is the leader's attention to the needs of the people in the

organization working to achieve those goals. This approach focused on leadership behavior and was much different from the singular characteristic of trait-based leadership and the learnable skills of Katz's (1955) model.

Blake and Mouton (1972) used a matrix known as *the Managerial Grid* to illustrate and evaluate the relationship between leaders' concern for production and concern for people. Each axis of the matrix was on a one to nine scale. Concern for production was the horizontal axis while concern for people formed the vertical axis.

Blake and Mouton (1972) elaborated on the four corners and the center of the Managerial Grid. Impoverished Management, 1,1 on the matrix, was the lowest point of both concerns and represents a total failure on the part of the leader to complete assigned tasks and meet the relational needs of followers. Country Club Management, 1,9 on the matrix, demonstrated total concern for the people, but virtually no concern for organizational objectives. Here the leader excessively values human attitudes and feelings and works diligently to establish an atmosphere that meets the relational needs and wants of subordinates. However, such leaders give little regard to assigned tasks or organizational objectives. Middle of the Road Management, 5,5 on the matrix, described leaders who sought balance between meeting people needs and production goals, but did not possess excessive concern for either. Such leaders frequently avoided conflict and were willing to compromise. Authority-Compliance, 9,1 on the matrix, describes leaders nearly solely focused on production goals and work outcomes. Such leaders have limited concern for followers and frequently see followers as means to production ends. Finally, Team Management, 9,9 on the matrix, consists of leaders possessing high regard for production and people needs. Such leaders involve followers in virtually every aspect of

production from conceptualization to problem solving simultaneously investing heavily in meeting prescribed production goals.

Situational leadership.

Hersey and Blanchard (1969) proposed the situational leadership model in the late 1960's believing leadership method is ultimately dependent on the maturity of followers. Hersey and Blanchard were influenced by Blake and Mouton's (1972) Managerial Grid, but believed the model's inability to measure leadership effectiveness was its weakness. Hersey and Blanchard argued that any of the styles of leadership presented on the Managerial Grid could potentially be effective depending on the maturity of the followers.

In situational leadership, the amount of attention given by the leader to followers is dependent on the followers' maturity. Maturity refers to "relative independence, ability to take responsibility, and achievement-motivation of an individual or group" (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969, p. 30). In this model, education and experience strongly influence maturity, but age is not a critical issue.

Followers functioning at a low level of maturity require high amounts of direction and the least amount of relational attention in situational leadership according to Hersey and Blanchard (1969). At that level, the leader impacts followers by *Telling*. As the followers grow more and more toward maturity, the means by which the leader influences followers changes from Telling to *Selling*, which is marked by high level of direction and a high level of relationship building. The needs of the maturing followers then transition from Selling to *Participating* involving a high level of relationship building but low operational direction. The process continues until the followers'

maturity level finally requires the leader to function by *Delegating*. Delegating occurs when followers attain the highest level of maturity requiring the least amount of direction and relational involvement from the leader (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985; Hersey & Blanchard).

Leader/Follower Relationship Centered Paradigms of the 1970's

The development of leadership paradigms shifted during the 1970's from emphasizing leader behaviors alone to emphasizing the relationship between leaders and followers (Northouse, 2012). The Managerial Grid (Blake & Mouton, 1972) and situational leadership (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969) were distinct from the three-skill approach (Katz, 1955) in that they gave consideration to followers' needs. Despite the consideration, leaders only met follower needs in order to achieve organizational productivity and not necessarily to contribute to the overall well being of followers. These paradigms showed little concern for how followers were ultimately impacted by leader influence. During the 1970's, three approaches to leadership emerged that were concerned with how followers benefited from their leaders' influence: charismatic leadership, full-range leadership theory, and servant leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Northouse, 2012).

Charismatic leadership.

Weber's (1948) theory of charismatic authority is the foundational premise of the charismatic leadership paradigm. For Weber, charisma was the "certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least exceptional powers or qualities" (p. 358). People follow and obey leaders possessing charisma because the leaders' abilities

are perceived to be possibly divine gifts thus making the leaders' missions holy. Followers are drawn to and trust in the leaders' special abilities believing the leader and his mission are worthy of devotion. Weber believed the amount of trust followers' place in their charismatic leader frequently drove followers to abandon traditional social structures and live in community with their leader taking on the role of disciple. Weber offered religious prophets as the primary example of charismatic leaders.

House (1977) presented charismatic leadership as a contemporized version of Weber's (1948) theory of charismatic authority. House embraced Weber's idea of charisma being special abilities, but in the form of strong personality rather than supernatural or superhuman giftedness. Giftedness, according to House, is the leader's ability to influence followers to accomplish exceptional goals and to facilitate major social change through the force of personality. The charismatic leader manifests a strong personality marked by self-confidence, a desire to dominate, and a strong conviction in the rightness of his beliefs. The charismatic leader influences through the exhibition of these characteristics, which instills trust and a sense of self-confidence in followers. Charismatic leaders are exceptional because they are able to impart something of themselves into followers rather than possess superhuman gifts (House).

House (1977) described the effects of charismatic leadership on followers rather than the markers of charismatic authority as Weber (1948) had done. House argued that followers are drawn to a charismatic leader's personality and identify themselves with the leader's mission, vision, or goal. Because charismatic leaders are frequently seen as agents of change, followers anticipate the possibility of the established order being radically altered whether the order is a nation, community, system, or organization. A

charismatic leader serves as a role model communicating a value system and followers internalize that system ultimately living out those values. From that value system, the leader articulates an ideological goal, which motivates followers to action. As the charismatic leader leads, follower self-efficacy grows motivating followers to establish and accomplish personal goals. For House, charismatic leadership is identified by the paradigm's impact on followers.

Full-range leadership theory.

Full-range leadership theory rose from two leadership paradigms introduced in Burns' (2012) seminal work, which reflected on the influential behavior of significant historical leaders, Burns concluded leadership was expressed in two forms: transactional leadership and transformational leadership. Transactional leadership, which is the more common of the two paradigms according to Burns, happens when a leader offers some form of compensation or benefit to followers in exchange for fulfilling organizational expectations or goals. The paradigm can also take the form of negative consequences in exchange for failure to achieve goals and expectations. Transformational leadership occurs when the leader personally observes followers' needs, attempts to meet those needs, and facilitates deeper communication between the leader and follower. Burns believed leaders intentionally and holistically engaging followers at a more personal level had a transforming effect on both leader and follower in that both gained additional motivation to achieve organizational goals and grow in personal morality.

Burns (2012) observed two forms of leadership in the behaviors of past leaders, but failed to provide an empirically verifiable model encompassing transactional and transformational leadership. Bass (1985) greatly expanded the work of Burns by

combining transactional leadership and transformational leadership with a third approach known as laissez-faire into the much larger full-range leadership theory. The basis for the full-range leadership theory is a continuum of leadership behaviors. Bass did not see stand-alone leadership approaches as originally posited by Burns. Instead, Bass believed a continuum existed between laissez-faire, transactional leadership, and transformational leadership. A leader could exhibit any of the behaviors found on the continuum though leaders usually behave solidly within one of the three paradigms (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Bass' full-range leadership theory has attracted the attention of researchers and received substantial empirical support; something Burns original ideas could not generate.

Components of full-range leadership theory.

The full-range leadership theory as formulated by Bass (1985) consists of three leadership paradigms: laissez-faire, transactional leadership, and transformational leadership. Laissez-faire is essentially the absence of leadership. The person in authority either due to a lack of interest or questionable character withdraws from the leadership role and offers little to no support or guidance to followers. Laissez-faire leaders essentially ignore their responsibilities and authority (Bass; Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Transactional leadership is the second paradigm of the full-range leadership model. Transactional leadership "is an exchange process based on the fulfillment of contractual obligations and is typically represented as setting objectives and monitoring and controlling outcomes" (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003, p. 265). Transactional leadership consists of three factors: contingent reward, management-by-exception active, and management-by-exception passive. Contingent reward occurs when goals are set and communicated by the leader, but the follower motivated by the

possibility of gaining monetary, emotional, or some other form of substantial reward fulfills expectations. Management-by-exception active occurs when the leader actively observes followers with the intention of identifying possible deviation from standards and provide corrective action. Conversely, the leader passively waits until mistakes have been made before taking action in management-by-exception passive (Bass, 1985; Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Transformational leadership is the third component of the full-range leadership theory (Bass, 1985; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Bass was particularly interested in transformational leadership and did not simply integrate Burns' (2012) understanding of the paradigm into the full-range leadership theory, but expanded the definition of transformational leadership. At the conceptual level, Bass incorporated Burns' emphasis of growth of motivation and morality through leadership with House's (1977) idea of charisma as a major form of influence into the model of transformational leadership that appears in the full-range leadership theory (Northouse, 2013). In its current formulation, transformational leadership motivates followers to achieve more than originally intended or even thought possible by challenging expectations, committing to follower satisfaction, and paying attention to followers individual needs and personal development. Transformational leadership functions beyond the exchange of services found in transactional leadership because followers are inspired by the charismatic characteristics of the leader to commit to shared organizational objectives, encouraged to participate in innovative problem solving, and supported through relationships to develop leadership competencies and behaviors (Bass & Riggio).

The transformational leadership paradigm is comprised of four factors: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Antonakis et al., 2003). Idealized influence occurs when the transformational leader charismatically impacts followers by behaving in a manner that fosters follower respect and admiration. Followers perceive leaders to possess extraordinary capabilities that especially equip them to meet organizational goals. Followers identify themselves as being connected to their leader and seek to emulate the leaders behaviors. Inspirational motivation involves the transformational leader inspiring and motivating followers to meet goals or expectations. The leader and followers together envision the future direction of the organization. The leader demonstrates a commitment to the shared vision to followers, which creates a sense of optimism or enthusiasm among followers about organizational objectives. Transformational leaders encourage followers to be innovative and creative during intellectual stimulation. The leader stimulates followers' minds by challenging follower assumptions, reframing problems, and approaching situations from new directions. The transformational leader avoids criticizing follower mistakes publicly, but instead offers personalized constructive correction. The leader appeals to followers for new ideas concerning methodology and procedure. Under intellectual stimulation, leaders invite followers to participate in every step of problem solving (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Smith, Montagno, & Kuzmenko, 2004) Individualized consideration is where the leader pays close and personal attention to follower needs for growth and achievement. In this capacity, the leader takes on the role of mentor or coach and recognizes each individual follower's unique developmental needs and potential. The leader attempts to shape support and learning opportunities for

each follower according to individual differences. Followers then experience persistent growth as a result of the leader's intentional effort to foster follower development (Bass & Riggio).

Leadership theory transitioned in the 1970's from paradigms that emphasized qualities of leaders to paradigms focused on the impact of leadership on followers. Three particular paradigms emerged during this period of time: charismatic leadership, full-range leadership theory, and servant leadership. Charismatic leaders through their strong personalities inspire followers to embrace value systems, motivate followers to fulfill an ideological goal, and encourage followers to set and fulfill personal goals because of increased self-efficacy (House, 1977). Followers of transformational leaders, the component of full-range leadership theory concerned with follower development, achieve more than expected in their lives because the leader influences them through inspiration and relationship to commit to a shared vision, participate in innovative problem solving, and develop moral behaviors (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Finally, servant leadership also appeared in the 1970's emphasizing influence through selflessly meeting followers' needs. Servant leaders intentionally influence with the goal of developing followers into future servant leaders who will eventually choose to influence through meeting the needs of others (Bugenhagen, 2006; Greenleaf, 2002). The following section deeply explores the servant leadership paradigm.

Servant Leadership

Inspired by the character Leo from Hesse's (2013) short novel *Journey to the East*, Greenleaf (2002) began writing in the 1970's essays that served as the foundation for the servant leadership paradigm. In the novel, the narrator tells his story of joining a

mystical religious sect and embarking on a pilgrimage to the east in search of enlightenment. Leo, the humble and good-natured servant of the pilgrims, cares for the travelers and maintains harmony within the group through kindness and optimism. Along the way, Leo disappears and the pilgrims collapse into dissention and fail to reach their destination. Years later, the narrator is still disillusioned and frustrated about life because of the failed pilgrimage. In order to regain some hope for his future, the narrator searches for and finds Leo learning he was the leader of the religious sect and had been preparing the pilgrims for a test of faith; Leo's disappearance. Leo had been leading the expedition all along, but his leadership was manifested through servanthood rather than positional prestige or any other attribute typically ascribed to leaders. Greenleaf (2002) believed the message communicated by Leo was the beginning of great leadership is the genuine desire to serve others.

Greenleaf (2002) began reflecting on the character Leo after retiring from AT&T in 1964 and starting a career in institutional consulting. Greenleaf observed established and respected institutions weakening during the social challenges of the late 1960's and concluded the United States was in the midst of a leadership crisis. Greenleaf offered servant leadership and its emphasis on service to others, community building, and shared decision making as an alternative to older leader focused paradigms that had dominated American organizations for the majority of the twentieth century. The paradigm was not proposed to resolve quickly the leadership crisis, rather Greenleaf intended for servant leadership to be a long-term approach to life and work. Greenleaf envisioned servant leaders over time causing positive change throughout society.

Servant leadership has grown in popularity since Greenleaf provided the early conceptual foundation for the paradigm. Several major American organizations promote servant leadership as their preferred leadership approach often with the intention of generating innovation through all levels and ensuring the possibility of meaningful change (Spears, 2002). Frequently, companies embracing servant leadership as their primary leadership approach such as AFLAC, TDIndustries, and Synovus appear on *Fortune's* annual list of the Top 100 Companies to Work for in America. Despite the popularity, the servant leadership paradigm has mainly garnered anecdotal support during the first few decades of its existence rather than empirical validation through well structured and published research (Washington, Sutton, & Field, 2006). As a result, servant leadership remained scientifically undefined throughout most of its history with many commentators describing what they believed constituted servant leadership but offering little evidence to support their claims (Farling, Stone, & Winston, 1999). Nevertheless, servant leadership continues to grow in popularity because of the practical credibility gained through the successful application of the paradigm in organizational settings. Fortunately, the practical credibility contributed to increased scientific interest in defining servant leadership and evaluating the organizational effectiveness of the paradigm through empirical research (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006). This scientific interest in servant leadership grew during the first decade of the twenty-first century, centering on characteristics of servant leadership and the paradigm's impact on various organizations.

Characteristics of Servant Leadership

Greenleaf (2002) described many different characteristics of the servant leader (Russell & Stone, 2002), but did not leave behind an empirically validated definition of

servant leadership (Smith et al., 2004). As a result, several writers and researchers have attempted to define the paradigm using Greenleaf as inspiration (Van Dierendonck, 2011). Table 1 gives a short timeline of some of the major models of servant leadership proposed in the literature.

Table 1

Major Models of Servant Leadership

Writer	Year Proposed	Number of Attributes or Behaviors
Spears (2002)	1996	10
Farling et al. (1999)	1999	5
Laub (1999)	1999	6 clusters each consisting of 3 interrelated behaviors
Russell and Stone (2002)	2002	9 functional; 11 accompanying
Patterson (2003)	2003	7

Larry C. Spears.

Spears (2002) reconceptualized Greenleaf's (2002) characteristics into 10 distinct attributes of a servant leader: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community. Spears acknowledged these 10 attributes do not constitute an exhaustive list, but believed these attributes communicate the highest intentions of the servant leadership paradigm.

Myra L. Farling, A. Gregory Stone, and Bruce E. Winston.

Farling et al. (1999) proposed a different model of servant leadership around the same time as Russell and Stone (2002) consisting of five variables: vision, influence, credibility, trust, and service. Farling et al. described the variables in a hierarchical model with an upward-spiraling cycle of ever increasing influence initially driven by the values of the leader or organization. The values provide the basis for vision, which serves as the lowest level of influence. As the leader communicates the vision to the followers and directs them to fulfill the vision, the leader and followers move to the next level of influence, credibility. Credibility is the basic reason followers believe in their leaders. As credibility grows, the leader and followers move to trust, which is the next higher level of influence. This trust is mutual trust within the leader follower relationship. The leader and followers move to the highest level of influence, service, as trust continues to grow between them. Service in this model is the highest level of influence because it is the result of growth through the variables and reflects a change in values. The change in values is the desire to serve the needs of others. The cycle then starts all over as the circumstances change. The new values resulting from the previous cycle, namely service, start the next cycle. The model for servant leadership described by Farling et al. (1999) was shaped by anecdotal support rather than empirical research. Farling et al. proposed the model as a foundation for future scientific investigation and encouraged researchers to evaluate the model.

James A. Laub.

Laub (1999) developed a model for servant leadership consisting of six clusters of characteristics with each cluster consisting of three interrelated behaviors (Laub; Van

Dierendonck, 2011). In Laub's model, a servant leader values people, develops people, builds community, displays authenticity, provides leadership, and shares leadership. These clusters served as the foundation for a research instrument called the Servant Organizational Leadership Assessment.

Laub (1999) added the term servant organization to the servant leadership lexicon. Servant organization is defined as "an organization where the characteristics of servant leadership are displayed through organizational culture and are valued and practiced by its leadership and workforce" (p. 82). Laub noted that organizations oriented toward meeting leaders' needs and protecting leaders' power typically consume large amounts of energy that could be dedicated to fulfilling the organization's purpose. Servant organizations allow that energy to be channeled toward the organization's followers, customers, and community.

Robert F. Russell and A. Gregory Stone.

Russell and Stone (2002) developed a model for servant leadership using Greenleaf (2002), Spears (2002), and additional literature from the broad spectrum of leadership studies. The model consisted of two categories of attributes: functional attributes and accompanying attributes.

In this model, the functional attributes are the "operative qualities, characteristics, and distinctive features belonging to leaders and observed through specific leader behaviors in the workplace" (Russell & Stone, 2002, p. 146). The nine functional attributes are the observable behaviors exhibited by effective servant leaders. The functional attributes are vision, honesty, integrity, trust, service, modeling, pioneering,

appreciation of others, and empowerment. Russell and Stone noted even though these attributes are distinct they are interrelated.

The second category of servant leadership characteristics in Russell and Stone's (2002) model is the accompanying attributes. The accompanying attributes consist of 11 distinct characteristics that are prerequisites for the functional attributes. The following list identifies the functional attributes and their accompanying attributes:

- Vision is accompanied by the attribute communication.
- Honesty and integrity are accompanied by credibility.
- Trust is accompanied by competence.
- Service is accompanied by stewardship.
- Modeling is accompanied by visibility.
- Pioneering is accompanied by the influence and persuasion.
- Appreciation for others is accompanied by listening and.
- Empowerment is accompanied by teaching and delegation.

The relationship between the two categories of attributes is forged by the values of the leader. Values serve as the catalyst of servant leadership because they encompass the core beliefs that drive the desire to invest in followers through service. Values combining with the accompanying attributes result in the exhibition of servant leadership behavior through the functional attributes (Russell & Stone, 2002). The researchers admitted the weakness of their model was the lack of empirical support. They were, however, hopeful this model could provide a foundation for research regarding servant leadership in the future.

Kathleen A. Patterson.

Patterson (2003) proposed yet another model for servant leadership based on seven virtuous constructs, which Patterson says "define servant leaders and shape their attitudes, characteristics, and behavior" (p. 8). *Agapē* love is the first virtuous construct and is demonstrated when a leader holistically and sacrificially considers a follower's needs and seeks to meet unconditionally those needs. *Agapē* love serves as the foundation for the other six virtuous constructs in Patterson's model.

Humility, the second virtuous construct, is the paradoxical relationship between self-confidence and personal meekness according to Patterson (2003). Humility drives the servant leader to influence followers confidently and elevate followers' interests above the leader's interests simultaneously.

Altruism is the third virtuous construct according to Patterson's (2003) model of servant leadership and involves the leader possessing a genuine, unselfish desire for followers to benefit from being influenced. Altruism motivates leaders to intentionally and sacrificially act in such a way as to improve the conditions in which followers function often at personal expense or loss.

Vision is the fourth construct and according to Patterson (2003) does not involve looking to the future of the organization or the fulfillment of a set of goals, as the construct is frequently understood. In servant leadership, vision "refers to the idea that the leader looks forward and sees the person as a viable and worthy person, believes in the future state for each individual, and seeks to assist each one in reaching that state" (p. 18). Vision involves the leader helping the follower become a better person perhaps a future servant leader.

Trust, the fifth virtuous construct, exists when a leader shows confidence in a follower's abilities and permits the follower to use those abilities (Patterson, 2003). Patterson believed trust forms a relationship between leader and follower that increases standards for excellence and fosters an environment of harmony.

The sixth virtuous construct of Patterson's (2003) model, empowerment, materializes when leaders share authority and responsibility with followers. In empowerment, leaders do not dominate but surrender situational control allowing followers to use their skills in such a way as to be successful and to further develop those skills.

Service is the seventh and final virtuous construct and manifests when a leader intentionally acts to meet follower needs (Patterson, 2003). Patterson presented a model of servant leadership marked by seven virtuous constructs, but provided no empirical support. Patterson simply believed these seven constructs could serve as the foundation for future research.

Research Instruments of Servant Leadership

The models for servant leadership provided by Spears (2002), Russell and Stone (2002), Laub (1999), and Patterson (2003) have emerged as the most influential models in the literature (Van Dierendonck, 2011). However, scholarship began to transition primarily from theoretical models for servant leadership to the development of instruments designed to quantify servant leadership behaviors. Table 2 shows the timeline by which these instruments were developed.

Table 2

Major Research Instruments of Servant Leadership

Researcher	Title	Number of Attributes Or Behaviors
Page & Wong (2000)	Servant Leadership Profile	10
Reinke (2004)	Reinke's Servant Leadership Survey	3
Barbuto and Wheeler (2006)	Servant Leadership Questionnaire	5
Sendjaya et al. (2008)	Servant Leadership Behavior Scale	6
Liden et al. (2008)	SLQ	7

Servant leadership profile.

Page and Wong (2000) proposed an instrument called the Servant Leadership Profile that allowed leaders to conduct a self-assessment on four domains of servant leadership: personality, relationship, tasks, and process. Each of those domains contained three servant leadership behaviors. Personality was made up of integrity, humility, and servanthood. Relationship consisted of caring for others, empowering others, and developing others. Visioning, goal setting, and leading made up the task domain. Finally, the process domain included modeling, team building, and shared decision-making.

Page and Wong (2000) conducted a pilot study of their instrument, but could not conduct inferential statistics due to the small sample size of six male leaders in an

academic setting and 18 students enrolled in a leadership course. Page and Wong calculated the α^2 values for each of the 12 servant behaviors to determine internal validity. Visioning and humility did not meet basic standards for reliability meaning only 10 of the 12 were statistically reliable characteristics.

Because Page and Wong (2000) did not complete more extensive analysis of their proposed instrument, Dennis and Winston (2003) conducted a more rigorous factor analysis and reliability test. Dennis and Winston presented the Servant Leadership Profile to two groups. The first group was 100 friends and acquaintances of the researchers and graduate students at Regent University. The second group was 429 randomly selected people from the Georgia Institute of Technology Study Response Database. After conducting correlational tests and an Oblimin rotation for factor analysis, the researchers found that only three of the twelve factors of the Servant Leadership Profile were measurable: empowerment, service, and vision. Dennis and Winston concluded the instrument may be useful for training or education, but is limited as a research tool unless more empirical evaluation is conducted.

Saundra J. Reinke's servant leadership survey.

Reinke (2004) evaluated Spear's (2002) list of characteristics and found them to be imprecise for empirical study arguing the tenth, building community, in particular represented the desired outcome of servant leadership. Reinke reconceptualized Spear's ten characteristics into three for her research: openness, vision, and stewardship. Using items measuring these characteristics from other research projects, Reinke developed a survey intended to discern the perceptions of leadership behavior. After testing the survey on Army ROTC cadets and revising the survey to ensure internal validity, 651 employees

of a suburban Georgia county were given the survey. Reinke found leaders who demonstrated the three characteristics improved the levels of trust within an organization. Reinke suggested openness, vision, and stewardship could be foundational characteristics in developing a clear empirical model for servant leadership.

Servant leadership questionnaire.

Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) developed an instrument called the Servant Leadership Questionnaire originally intended to measure the ten characteristics proposed by Spears (2002) and the additional characteristic, calling. According to Barbuto and Wheeler, calling derived from the writings of Greenleaf and involves the genuine desire to serve others. The researchers administered the initial questionnaire to 80 elected officials and 388 raters. The factor analysis reduced the 11 characteristics to five clear dimensions of servant leadership: altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizing stewardship. The five dimensions were shown statistically to possess strong internal reliability, distinction from other leadership paradigms, and predicative qualities regarding follower outcomes. The five validated dimensions serve as the measurements for the completed Servant Leadership Questionnaire.

Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) concluded the five dimensions of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire represent the best intentions of the servant leadership paradigm and if practiced will contribute to the personal growth of followers. Because of this conclusion, Barbuto and Wheeler provided basic definitions for the five dimensions to serve as beginning points for future research into servant leadership behaviors. Altruistic calling describes a person’s desire to influence others positively by prioritizing their

needs. Emotional healing refers to a person's ability and commitment to assist other people in their recovery from significant challenges. Wisdom means "a combination of awareness of surroundings and anticipation of consequences" (p. 318). Leaders strong in persuasive mapping use sound reasoning to conceptualize goals and opportunities and to communicate those concepts to others. Organizational stewardship describes a leader's ability to prepare an organization to make a positive contribution to society. Barbuto and Wheeler did not intend for these definitions to be final, but to be foundational concepts for research designed to further clarify servant leadership.

Servant leadership behavior scale.

Sendjaya et al. (2008) designed and validated a multifactor research instrument to measure servant leadership behaviors. Sendjaya et al. gathered qualitative data by interviewing 15 Australian executives and drew heavily from research instruments designed by Laub (1999), Page and Wong (2000), and Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) in the formulation of the Servant Leadership Behavior Scale. The researchers developed a pool of 101 items designed to measure servant leadership behaviors from the interviews and literature. The 101 items were categorized into six core dimensions: voluntary subordination, authentic self, covenantal relationship, responsible morality, transcendental spirituality, and transforming influence. Through testing for content validity, the researchers reduced the 101 items to 73 items and administered this version to 277 Australian graduate students. In the analysis of the collected data, all six dimensions were shown to possess internal consistency. Sendjaya et al. analyzed each of the six dimensions individually to determine if their corresponding items produced a good fit for the data. Items found to not fit the data were removed resulting in the final

Servant Leadership Behavior Scale consisting of 35 items. Sendjaya et al. believed the finalized Servant Leadership Behavior Scale is a strong psychometric instrument for measuring servant leadership behaviors.

SLQ (Servant leadership questionnaire).

Liden et al. (2008) identified nine potential servant leadership behaviors based on their understanding of the servant leadership paradigm and already existing taxonomies of servant leadership (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Page & Wong, 2000; Spears, 2002). The nine behaviors are emotional healing, creating value for the community, conceptual skills, empowering, helping subordinates grow and succeed, putting subordinates first, behaving ethically, relationships, and servanthood. From the nine behaviors, a preliminary 85-item survey was developed to analyze the measurability of the behaviors. The number of servant leader behaviors was eventually reduced to seven after the researchers determined relationships and servanthood were difficult to measure. For the remaining seven behaviors, the four items found to be most effective in measuring each behavior were retained in the final 28-item instrument SLQ.

The SLQ (Liden et al., 2008) has emerged as a strong instrument for measuring and explaining servant leadership for several reasons. First, Liden et al. considered and incorporated the taxonomies of servant leadership presented by earlier models and instruments when defining the final seven measurable servant leadership behaviors. Second, the validity of the SLQ was affirmed in a three-phase research project that included two distinct samples. The first was the pilot phase where an instrument of 85 items was given to 298 students from a Midwestern university. An exploratory factor analysis resulted in the emergence of the seven servant leadership behaviors of the final

SLQ. During the second phase, the four highest scoring items for each servant leadership behavior was incorporated into a survey and given to 25 supervisors and 164 employees of a Midwestern production and distribution company. Controlling for other leadership paradigms like transformational leadership and leader-member exchange and conducting a confirmatory factor analysis, Liden et al. found the 28 items of the SLQ were valid and reliable in the third phase.

Application of Servant Leadership

From its inception, theorists envisioned servant leadership to be a voluntary model where leaders specifically choose to influence by elevating followers' needs, aspirations, and interests above personal desires. Greenleaf (2002) believed the conscious decision to serve others was the essential first step in influencing people to become "healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous" (para. 2). Building on Greenleaf's vision, Sendjaya and Sarros (2002) argued servant leaders willingly take on leadership roles and responsibilities because they see such roles as opportunities for altruistic service. Spears (2002) affirmed the intentional follower focus of servant leadership and believed the elevation of follower needs made the paradigm an ideal fit for organizational settings. Leaders intentionally serving followers encourage group decision-making, continual innovation, and loyalty to the organization. These results of applied servant leadership strengthen the organization throughout the entire institutional structure. Russell (2001) suggested the intentional follower focus of servant leadership contributes to forming organizational values such as trust, appreciation for others, and empowerment. Because of the belief in the intentional follower focus of servant leadership, researchers have recently shown interest in the application of the servant leadership paradigm in

organizational settings particularly the approach's impact on followers and effectiveness in achieving organizational goals.

Effectiveness of servant leadership.

Research has shown the servant leadership paradigm potentially leads to stronger individual followers and more effective organizations. Ehrhart (2004) evaluated the relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior in a quantitative study of 249 grocery store employees and 120 grocery store department managers. Organizational citizenship behavior refers to " behaviors that enhance and maintain the social and psychological environment supporting task behavior" (p. 63). Organizational citizenship behavior includes two dimensions in Ehrhart's study: helping and conscientiousness. Ehrhart found statistically significant correlations between servant leadership and the two dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior among both the employees and managers. Ehrhart suggested from the findings followers are more likely to manifest helping behaviors and conscientiousness in units led by managers who intentionally demonstrate servant leadership behaviors.

Joseph and Winston (2005) studied the relationship between employee's perceptions of servant leadership and leader and organizational trust in a quantitative research project of 51 employed students of a small Bible college and 15 employees of a small Christian high school in Trinidad and Tobago. Using Laub's (1999) Servant Organization Leadership Assessment to measure servant leadership and the Organizational Trust Inventory to collect leader and organizational trust data, the researchers found a moderate, but statistically significant correlation between perceived servant leadership and leader trust. Joseph and Winston also found a high correlation

between perceived servant leadership and organizational trust. Additionally, independent sample *t*-tests showed a positive, statistically significant mean difference in leader trust between organizations perceived to be led by servant leaders and organizations perceived to not be led by servant leaders. A similar difference appeared concerning organizational trust between organizations perceived to be led by servant leaders and organizations perceived to not be led by servant leaders. Joseph and Winston suggested these findings support the belief that servant leadership is an antecedent for leader and organizational trust. Servant leadership may contribute to the development of a climate of trust.

Walumbwa et al. (2010) examined the influence of servant leadership on organizational citizenship behavior in a quantitative study of 815 employees and 123 supervisors of seven multinational companies operating in Kenya. Walumbwa et al. found servant leadership significantly and positively correlated to organizational citizenship behavior. The researchers also found four factors that contribute to the development of organizational citizenship behavior significantly correlated to servant leadership: commitment to supervisor, follower self-efficacy, procedural justice climate, and service climate. Procedural justice climate refers to a work group's perceptions regarding how leaders treat that work group. Service climate refers to a work group's perceptions about expected customer service policies, practices, and procedures. Additionally, the researchers found procedural justice climate and service climate accelerated the influence of commitment to supervisor and follower self-efficacy in developing organizational citizenship behavior. Walumbwa et al. concluded servant leadership influences organizational citizenship behavior by potentially increasing commitment to supervisor and follower self-efficacy and by potentially improving

procedural justice climate and service climate. The researchers admitted further studies are needed to identify other means by which servant leadership influences organizational citizenship behavior.

Hu and Liden (2011) investigated the impact of servant leadership, goal clarity, and process clarity on team performance and organizational citizenship behavior in a quantitative study of 304 employees forming 71 teams in five banks. Using the SLQ to measure servant leadership, the researchers found servant leadership, goal clarity, and process clarity all positively and significantly correlated to both team performance and organizational citizenship behavior. Additionally, the relationships between goal clarity, process clarity and team performance grew stronger the more the leader exhibited servant leadership behaviors. Hu and Liden concluded servant leadership likely helps strengthen the association between goal clarity, process clarity, and team potency.

Servant leadership and specific professions.

Research has shown that servant leadership positively impacts followers and organizations in a wide range of professional contexts (Ehrhart, 2004; Hu & Liden, 2011; Joseph & Winston, 2005; Walumbwa et al., 2010). Some commentators have suggested servant leadership may be the ideal leadership approach for certain professions. Garber, Madigan, Click, and Fitzpatrick (2009) argued servant leadership is a natural paradigm for the nursing profession because nurses are willing to accept the role of servant and collaborate with colleagues. Buchen (1998) and Winston (2004) believed servant leadership is an effective model for the faculty of institutions of higher education because of the role of faculty members in community building and connecting students to the larger knowledge base of their disciplines. Wis (2002) proposed servant leadership as the

preferred leadership paradigm for ensemble conductors because it fosters creativity, passion, and growth among musicians thus enhancing the musical experience. Although research has shown servant leadership to be an effective leadership approach in a broad spectrum of organizational settings, the paradigm may be the ideal leadership approach for some professions.

Challenges to applying servant leadership.

Despite the seeming advantages to an organization servant leadership provides, challenges to the implementation of the paradigm have been identified. In a qualitative study conducted by Savage-Austin (2009), experienced servant leaders identified two major obstacles to implementing servant leadership in an organizational context. First, organizations with a culture historically marked by authoritarian leadership styles resisted the transition to servant leadership because such organizations prioritized achieving goals rather than personally developing followers. This challenge to servant leadership fosters unethical leadership behavior because "these types of environments push followers into situations where they feel threatened to achieve results at any cost" (p. 80). Second, servant leadership is hampered in organizations where only a small number of leaders embrace the paradigm because of organizational failure to see the value of intentionally meeting the needs of followers. This failure can result in limited organizational growth, innovation, and profit gain.

Cultures and servant leadership.

From its development servant leadership has been generally isolated to the American context (Hale & Fields, 2007), but recent research has been conducted to evaluate the application of servant leadership in non-American cultural settings. Hale and

Fields conducted research designed to compare the level of exposure to servant leadership by Ghanaian and American students. In a quantitative study of 60 students of a Ghanaian seminary and 97 students of an American seminary, Hale and Fields found Ghanaians were less likely to have experienced servant leadership in the work place, but both subsamples related service and humility to leader effectiveness. The researchers also found the leadership dimension, vision, was more strongly associated with leader effectiveness among Ghanaians than Americans. The researchers suggested the distance between leaders and followers in Ghanaian culture may have contributed to the expectation among the Ghanaian sample that leaders will provide visionary direction. Hale and Fields concluded slight alterations of servant leadership based on local cultural perspectives are to be expected when applying the paradigm in different cultural contexts even when the core principles of servant leadership are preserved.

Han, Kakabadse, and Kakabadse (2010) interviewed 4 senior civil servants and 4 employees of private sector companies in a coastal city of the People's Republic of China. The researchers found the Chinese meaning of servant leadership generally paralleled the paradigm's meaning in the United States with a couple of noticeable differences. Chinese servant leadership also includes duty, devotion to the Communist Party and state, and listening to the opinions, ideas, and suggestions of followers. The researchers believed the differences between American and Chinese servant leadership were based on distinct Chinese cultural features. Han et al. concluded servant leadership with the distinct Chinese additions is likely a powerful leadership approach for motivating high performance employees, elevating employee trust, and ensuring employee commitment and confidence in management. The core principles of servant

leadership may transcend cultural boundaries even though research shows slight alterations to the paradigm based on local cultural features are to be expected.

Servant Leadership and Pastoral Ministry

Servant leadership has been applied to religious institutions since its inception as a distinct leadership paradigm. Greenleaf (1998a) believed the role of religious organizations was to serve as examples of moral trustworthiness and community service to other institutions. Greenleaf (2002) said:

> I view the churches . . . as the institutionalization of humankind's religious concern . . . In addressing the subject of servant leadership and the churches, I am bearing my wider concern for institutions and their service to society. Churches are needed to serve the large numbers of people who need mediative help if their alienation is to be healed and wholeness of life achieved . . . they can be helped to become servant-leaders - by being exemplars for other institutions (para. 3, 5).

Greenleaf (1998a) envisioned church leaders influencing people to overcome societal alienation, which he defined as a person's self-centered failure to serve other people and to contribute positively to the society. Church leaders possess the power through intentional and sacrificial service to assist people in developing a genuine desire to serve individuals and the community.

Greenleaf (2002) acknowledged his interest in the relationship between servant leadership and pastoral ministry was based on his understanding of organizational culture rather than theology. Similarly, Liden, Panaccio, Meuser, Hu, and Wayne (2014) acknowledged the servant leadership paradigm possessed aspects of biblical teaching, but were much more interested in the application of the paradigm to a broad spectrum of

organizational settings. Other commentators, researchers, and scholars, however, have sought to show a connection between servant leadership and Christian ministry and praxis (Agee, 2001; Akuchie, 1993; Rinehart, 1998; Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002; Sims, 1997).

Support for servant leadership in pastoral ministry.

Sims (1997) argued the paradoxical nature of servant leadership makes the paradigm compatible with pastoral ministry. Servant leadership is marked by two propositions that seem diametrically opposed to one another: leadership and servanthood. Leaders have historically been identified by positions of supremacy or social prominence and influencing other people from that position. Servants have historically been subjugated to positions of social anonymity responsible for meeting the needs of leaders. The paradox of the servant leadership paradigm is leaders influence followers through service rather than dominance. Sims believed Jesus Christ is the prototypical example of the servant leader because he embodied the paradigm's inherent paradox. Christian theology teaches that Jesus Christ is the incarnation of God who holds sovereign power over creation. Jesus Christ does not lead from the position of divine sovereignty, but paradoxically through humble service to humble people. Effective pastors model Jesus' example in their ministerial contexts.

Agee (2001) believed the servant leadership paradigm is consistent with pastoral ministry for two significant reasons. First, the internalized principles and values that drive the servant leader can be the internal transformation of the character resulting from the influence of the Holy Spirit. Second, the desire to influence people in becoming servant leaders, which is the foundation of the servant leadership paradigm, is parallel to the

missional drive of the pastor to influence others to be faithful followers of Jesus Christ. For Agee, pastoral ministry is servant leadership.

Sendjaya and Sarros (2002) proposed that Jesus Christ was the first to teach servant leadership and Greenleaf (2002) merely reconceptualized the paradigm for a contemporary audience. Sendjaya and Sarros pointed out that Jesus taught his disciples that true leadership was based in service to others citing Mark 10:42-45 (New Revised Standard Version) as the classic example:

> So Jesus called them and said to them, You know that among the Gentiles those whom they recognize as their rulers lord it over them, and their great ones are tyrants over them. But it is not so among you; but whoever wishes to become great among you must be your servant, and whoever wishes to be first among you must be slave of all. For the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many.

Jesus countered the popular opinion of his day by instructing his disciples that service to one another and others is the marker of authentic greatness. Jesus himself demonstrated a commitment to greatness through humble service by later washing the feet of his disciples in John 13. For Sendjaya and Sarros (2002), the teachings and ministry of Jesus Christ serve as the foundation of the contemporary servant leadership paradigm.

Criticism of servant leadership in pastoral ministry.

Some scholars resist embracing the servant leadership paradigm for leadership within Christian churches. Jones (2012) is among the harshest critics who strongly argued the relationship between the biblical perspective and the social scientific perspective of servant leadership is nonexistent at the foundational level. Despite acknowledging similar

language and the usefulness of the social scientific perspective of servant leadership in most organizational settings, Jones believed the two views are incompatible because they are based on diverging presuppositions. Jones argued Greenleaf (2002) based the servant leadership paradigm that has gained so much attention in recent decades on a personal philosophy, which Jones described as the syncretization of eastern religious thought, contemporized Gnosticism, and liberal Quakerism. The philosophical presuppositions embedded in those worldviews are inconsistent with orthodox Christianity according to Jones. The end goal of Greenleaf's social scientific view of servant leadership is the transformation of the society through humanistic altruism and morality in Jones's estimation. The biblical perspective of servant leadership, according to Jones, is founded on the paradoxical and holistic surrender of personal desires and needs to the will of God. From this foundation, service to others is not the exhibition of altruism, but ultimately obedience and service to Christ. The goal of the biblical view of servant leadership, in Jones's view, is the evangelization of the lost and the transformation of God's people toward positional holiness so that society can be transformed through the fulfillment of the Christian cultural mandate.

Research related to servant leadership and pastoral ministry.

Despite the disagreement among scholars about the compatibility of servant leadership and pastoral ministry, researchers have recently examined the servant leadership paradigm among pastors in local church settings. Dillman (2003) investigated in a mixed-methods study the extent to which Australian Nazarene pastors were aware of and implemented Patterson's (2003) model of servant leadership and how those pastors compared to their American colleagues. Dillman found Australian pastors were generally

unaware of the formalized servant leadership paradigm, but were familiar with servant leadership behaviors consistent with New Testament teachings and the example set by Jesus Christ. The Australian pastors also gave mixed support for the servant leadership behaviors proposed by Patterson (see Figure 5). Australian pastors generally agreed that *agapē* love, humility, empowerment, altruism, and service should be considered servant leadership behaviors and identified those behaviors in their personal leadership styles. Trust and vision, however, did not receive the same level of support from the Australian pastors. Dillman suggested this may indicate a need to clarify the behaviors of Patterson's model. Finally, in comparison of Australian and American pastors, both groups accepted the notion of servant leadership being rooted in New Testament teachings and *agapē* love and service are essential components of servant leadership. Dillman found Australian pastors are more likely to embrace servant leadership than their American counterparts.

Ming (2005) conducted a quantitative research project designed to evaluate the relationship between pastoral servant leadership and spiritual satisfaction of congregational members, the engagement of members in church activities, and church growth among Seventh-day Adventist churches in Jamaica. For this research project, Ming used the ten attributes of servant leadership initially proposed by Greenleaf (2002) and recategorized by Spears (2002): listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community. Ming found pastors exhibiting the servant leadership attributes listening, healing, and awareness positively affected the feelings of oneness among congregational members. The data analysis also identified a positive relationship between pastors demonstrating persuasion, conceptualization, and foresight and a sense of

congregational direction among members. The researcher also identified a statistically significant relationship between stewardship, growth, and building community among pastors and feelings of empowerment by congregational members. Finally, Ming found most servant leadership attributes had no significant impact on member church involvement, church growth, and church financial intake. Ming suggested these final findings indicate churches can experience overall growth even without all ten servant leadership characteristics being exhibited by pastors.

Bivins (2005) conducted a study of the relationship between ministry satisfaction and servant leadership among Baptist pastors serving in Alaska. Bivins discovered no significant relationship existed between ministry satisfaction and leadership style among pastors identified as servant leaders. A slight negative correlation was found between ministry satisfaction and leadership style among pastors generally practicing other than servant leadership behaviors. Among the entire sample group of 60 pastors, no correlation existed between ministry satisfaction and leadership style. Bivins did find other factors such as age, ministry setting, ministry position, overall experience, experience serving in Alaska, education, and concentration of highest degree contributed to ministry satisfaction.

Scuderi (2010) investigated in a quantitative study of American United Methodist pastors the impact of servant leadership on leader effectiveness, church health perceptions, church health statistics, and follower trust, satisfaction, commitment and faith maturity at both the individual and organizational levels. The data analysis revealed servant leadership significantly predicted leader effectiveness, church health perceptions, trust in leader, trust in organization, follower satisfaction, affective commitment,

normative commitment and faith maturity at the individual level. At this level, no predictive relationship was found between servant leadership and continuance commitment or church member giving. At the organizational level, servant leadership exhibited by pastors significantly predicted leader effectiveness, church health perceptions, trust in leader, trust in organization, follower satisfaction, affective commitment, and change in church size over time. Scuderi also found a strong negative correlation between servant leadership and continuance commitment at the organizational level. No relationships could be statistically discerned between servant leadership and the organizational level factors follower faith maturity, normative commitment, church health statistics, or measure of change in church finances over time. Scuderi suggested the findings demonstrate the servant leadership paradigm is effective in some but certainly not all aspects of pastoral ministry.

Bunch (2013) studied the extent to which African American pastors exhibit servant leadership behaviors. In a quantitative study of 358 African American pastors from 11 denominations, Bunch found the sample pastors sometimes exhibited servant leadership behaviors. Bunch quickly pointed out the mean score of the pastors on Barbuto & Wheeler's (2006) Servant Leadership Questionnaire fell within the sometimes category and very close to the fairly often category. Bunch also noted a significant relationship existed between servant leadership behaviors among pastors and church size. Pastors of larger churches more strongly exhibit servant leadership behaviors. The sample pastors serving churches with congregations larger than 2,000 worshipers scored the highest in each of the five dimensions of servant leadership. Of particular note was the dimension

altruistic calling where the average score of pastors of the largest churches was 15.3 out of a possible 16.

Servant Leadership Development

The servant leadership paradigm has garnered a significant amount of academic attention since the late 1990's. Scholars have attempted to define scientifically servant leadership and to describe attributes associated with the paradigm (Farling et al., 1999; Laub, 1999; Patterson, 2003; Russell & Stone, 2002). Servant leadership has been the focus of research projects designed to understand the impact of the paradigm on organizational dynamics (Ehrhart, 2004; Hu & Liden, 2011; Joseph & Winston, 2005; Russell, 2001; Walumbwa et al., 2010; Washington et al., 2006). Researchers have investigated the application of servant leadership in a number of professional disciplines ranging from nursing to pastoral ministry (Bivins, 2005; Bunch, 2013; Dillman, 2003; Garber et al., 2009; Ming, 2005; Scuderi, 2010; Winston, 2004; Wis, 2002). Research has suggested the servant leadership paradigm may transcend international and cultural boundaries (Hale & Fields, 2007; Han et al., 2010). The academic investigation of servant leadership has addressed a large number of issues in the past decade and a half.

The development of servant leaders, however, has attracted little academic attention (Phipps, 2010). The limited attention to development could stem from two notions originally posited by Greenleaf (2002) during the early formation of the servant leadership paradigm. The first notion was servant leadership is intended to be voluntary where leaders specifically and consciously choose to influence by meeting follower needs. The second notion was the goal of the servant leadership paradigm is to develop followers into fully functional servant leaders who volitionally choose to influence by

meeting needs. Both notions of Greenleaf suggested developing into a servant leader requires knowledge of the paradigm and a belief that effective influence is rooted in humble service.

Recent research challenged Greenleaf's (2002) notions by showing leaders can demonstrate servant leader attributes, influence by meeting follower needs, and have little knowledge of the existence of the servant leadership paradigm (Bunch, 2013; Dillman, 2003). The challenges to Greenleaf's beliefs about the volitional nature of servant leadership have created a need for increased knowledge regarding factors that contribute to the exhibition of servant leader behaviors. Because of the need, some scholars have attempted to explain servant leadership development through the introduction of models or research centered on leader characteristics and practices that serve as predictors of servant leadership behaviors.

Servant leadership and developmental psychology.

Kegan's (1982) constructive-development theory has gained the attention of several leadership development scholars (Bugenhagen, 2006; Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987; McCauley, Drath, Palus, O'Connor, & Baker, 2006; Phipps, 2010). Heavily influenced by developmental psychologists Piaget and Kohlberg, Kegan introduced a stage-based developmental theory, which centered on the evolution of the human personality. In Kegan's constructive/development theory, the evolution of personality occurs across five stages of development each of which is dependent on the way an individual derives meaning from the world around them. For Kegan, meaning refered to the way a person identifies, organizes, and responds to experiences, perceptions, emotions, thoughts, influences, and any other stimuli. Kegan believed meaning is a major part of being

human and an essential part of the human personality. Kegan said, “Meaning, understood in this way, is the primary human motion, irreducible. It cannot be divorced from the body, from social experience, or from the very survival of the organism” (p. 19).

The ability to derive meaning is known as the meaning-making process. At each stage of development, the meaning-making process changes the way the person expresses ideas, feelings, and purposes. The meaning-making process, according to Kegan (1982), incorporates two features of experience: subject and object. Subject refers to a person’s integrated framework by which experiences are organized and interpreted. Kegan believed people are embedded in that which is subject meaning subject is part of the self. As a result, a person cannot perceive or differentiate things that are subject apart from self. That which is subject is understood to be absolute. When a person becomes aware of something it is then considered object. That which is object is separate from the self and can be reflected upon, analyzed, and evaluated. Subject is the person’s idealized reference point, while object allows for complexity of thought and deeper understanding of experiences. As a person moves through the stages of development, subject eventually becomes object because the idealized reference point is separated from the self and reflected upon. Table 3 shows the various stages of Kegan’s theory and the corresponding subject-object relationships.

Table 3

Stages of Constructive-Development Theory

Stage	Subject	Object
1. Impulsive	Impulses, Perceptions	Reflexes
2. Imperial	Needs, Interests, Wishes	Impulses, Perceptions
3. Interpersonal	The Interpersonal, Mutuality	Needs, Interests, Wishes
4. Institutional	Authorship, Identity, Psychic Administration, Ideology	The Interpersonal, Mutuality
5. Interindividual	Interindividuality, Interpenetrability of Self Systems	Authorship, Identity, Psychic Administration Ideology

Note. Kegan (1982)

Stage 1, impulsive, occurs in the lives of children between approximately ages two and seven. Stage 1 children differentiate themselves from the autonomic reflexes that governed their infancy. Reflexes are the object state for this stage of development. Children living in Stage 1 still lack the ability to control their impulsive behaviors and to differentiate between their perceptions and reality. Fantasy and imagination, family structure, short attention spans, and limited perspective of the world are features of Stage 1's subject state (Kegan, 1982; Phipps, 2010).

Children in Stage 2, imperial, which runs from approximately ages seven through 12, gain a significant degree of self awareness. Stage 2 children recognize they have some control over the events of their lives resulting in the differentiation between impulses and reality. Impulses that drove behavior in Stage 1 become the object of stage

2. A natural implication of the transition to stage 2 is the cognizance of guilt resulting from the awareness of control over impulses. Stage 2 children are still not able to see their immediate needs, wants, and wishes as object. These children are still subject to their needs and wants and evaluate relationships, concepts, and items based on their ability to fulfill those needs and wants (Kegan, 1982; Phipps, 2010).

Stage 3, interpersonal, occurs during adolescence from approximately ages 12 to 16. During this stage, the adolescent is not driven and controlled by needs and wants. The adolescent has come to understand needs and wants are not part of their self and they have some control over gratifying needs. Needs, wants, and wishes have become the object of Stage 3. The subject of Stage 3 involves the adolescents' connections with other people and their obligations to those people. Stage 3 adolescents experience broader perspectives about life and begin to identify themselves by their relationships and roles in their communities. They develop qualities of mutuality, empathy, and social loyalty. Internal conflict can occur if the individual experiences pressure to give of themselves disproportionately to many different relationships or social roles. Stage 3 adolescents identify themselves by their relationships and the internal conflict results from a lack of clarity and persistent challenges to the individual's self-identity (Kegan, 1982; Phipps, 2010).

Young adults of Stage 4, institutional, have begun the process of developing a personal understanding of their identity. Stage 4 people have differentiated themselves from their relationships and social obligations. Interpersonal relationships, which were the subject of Stage 3, have become the object of Stage 4. Defining the self as an autonomous entity is the subject state of Stage 4. The self becomes a system of personal

standards and values intended to ensure consistency across all situations and circumstances. This system of standards and values becomes the basis for evaluating situations, resolving conflict, and determining right and wrong (Kegan, 1982; Phipps, 2010).

Few adults attain Stage 5, interindividual. During Stage 5, the person no longer is driven by the need to self define, rather the person gains broad understanding about life, other people, and other perspectives. Stage 5 people see themselves in a large network of interacting relationships and understand they are only a small part of that network. People who have attained Stage 5 possess the ability to navigate the network of interacting relationships with a sense of personal fulfillment. Stage 5 people appreciate diversity and believe diverse opinions about life are valid, which reduces the inner emotional tension to always be right (Kegan, 1982; Phipps, 2010).

Marilyn J. Bugenhagen.

Bugenhagen (2006) studied the relationship between Kegan's (1982) theory of constructive-development and three leadership paradigms: transactional, transformational, and servant leadership. Bugenhagen conducted a quantitative analysis of data collected from 49 leaders and 409 followers involved in community and educational programs across the United States. Although most of this research project centered on transactional and transformational leadership, which are both part of the larger full-range leadership theory (Bass, 1985), Bugenhagen made some conclusions about the relationship between servant leadership and constructive-development theory. Using the five dimensions from Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) Servant Leadership Questionnaire to define servant leadership behaviors, Bugenhagen was unable to identify

statistically significant relationships between constructive-development and four of the five dimensions. The servant leadership dimension wisdom, however, was found to have a statistically significant correlation with a leader's cognitive-development stage. Barbuto and Wheeler defined wisdom as awareness of the immediate surroundings and the ability to discern the implications of those surroundings. Bugenhagen suggested the relationship between wisdom and cognitive-development may stem from a leader's need to understand organizational expectations and the implications of fulfilling or failure to fulfill those expectations. Bugenhagen admitted additional research was needed to make conclusive claims about the relationship between servant leadership and constructive-development theory.

Kelly A. Phipps.

Phipps (2010) devised a model of servant leadership development by associating Kegan's (1982) constructive-development theory to the servant leadership paradigm. Phipps made six propositions about servant leadership and constructive-development theory, which serve as the framework for the model. The six propositions are listed below:

1. Servant leadership is impossible until Stage 3 of development.
2. A person choosing to be a servant leader can only subordinate the part of the self that is in an object state.
3. The context by which a servant leader defines service will be the subject state.

4. A servant leader in Stage 3 will understand service as the "subordination of personal goals and agendas in order to serve others through interpersonal connections" (p. 161).
5. A servant leader in Stage 4 will understand service as the "subordination of interpersonal obligations in order to be in service of a higher ideal" (p. 161).
6. A servant leader in Stage 5 will understand service as the "subordination of a personal value system in order to address the interpenetration of systems" (p. 162).

Empathy and self-sacrifice are critical features of servant leadership (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Liden et al., 2008; Sendjaya et al., 2008). The first proposition reflects Phipps (2010) conclusion that a person cannot genuinely express empathy and self-sacrifice until Stage 3 because the person is embedded in their own wants, needs and agendas in earlier stages of development. "Individuals operating out of Stage 3 are, for the first time, able to exercise empathy. Not until this stage can a leader fully experience mutuality and coordinate multiple perspective" (p. 157). During Stage 3, the person begins to self-identify by relationships and detaches from the need to have personal agendas fulfilled.

The second and third propositions represent the role of the subject-object relationship in Kegan's (1982) theory of constructive-development. Phipps (2010) argued because servant leaders volitionally choose their leadership style, servant leaders can only sacrificially give from the parts of the self from which they can detach and upon which they can reflect. A servant leader's investment in followers must come from the object stage. Servant leaders are embedded in their role as servant leader and will inevitably

understand service from the subject state. Servant leaders will not be able to reflect upon the definition of service and will assume their understanding is universal because of the subject state being experienced.

The fourth, fifth, and sixth propositions describe how servant leaders function in the top stages of development according to Phipps (2010). Servant leaders functioning at Stage 3 will set aside personal agendas and serve others through interpersonal relationships. Stage 4 servant leaders will be able to reflect upon personal relationships because they have become the object state. Servant leaders functioning at Stage 4 will look to serve others through a set of values and high ideals. Stage 5 servant leaders are capable of separating from and reflecting upon their personal values. Because the Stage 5 leader experiences a broad network of interacting relationships as the subject state, such leaders understand service as participating in a larger, more complex world.

At the time of this writing, Phipps' (2010) model of servant leadership development through constructive/development theory remains hypothetical. No empirical research has been conducted to either support or repudiate Phipps propositions. Despite the lack of research, Phipps believed his model could serve as a foundation for researching the development of servant leaders.

Predicting servant leadership through personal characteristics and practices.

Scholars have conducted research projects designed to identify predictable relationships between behaviors in a wide range of leadership paradigms and leader characteristics (Arvey, Zhang, Avolio, & Krueger, 2007; Atwater et al. 1999; Chan & Drasgow, 2001; Foti & Hauenstein, 2007; Ilies, Gerhardt, & Le, 2004; Mumford,

O'Connor, Clifton, Connelly, & Zaccaro, 1993; Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002). Despite the academic interest in predictable relationships between leader characteristics and behaviors, research associated with the servant leadership paradigm has been limited (Phipps, 2010). The limited research generally demonstrated positive relationships between servant leadership and leader characteristics and practices.

Washington et al. (2006) investigated the relationship between servant leadership behaviors and followers' perception of the extent of their leader valuing empathy, integrity, and competence. The researchers also analyzed the statistical relationship between servant leadership behaviors and leader agreeableness. In this quantitative study of 128 supervisors and 283 direct reports, Washington et al. found strong, statistically significant relationships between servant leadership behaviors and leaders' perceived valuing of empathy, integrity, and competence. The relationship between servant leadership behaviors and leader agreeableness was also found to be strong and statistically significant.

Washington et al. (2006) concluded their findings provided empirical support to four major propositions of servant leadership. First, the strong relationship between servant leader behaviors and leaders' perceived value of empathy supported the claim that servant leadership is a follower-focused paradigm. Second, the strong relationship between servant leadership behaviors and leaders' perceived value of integrity empirically supported the idea the "belief that integrity and honesty are critical components" (p. 710) of the paradigm. Third, the researchers concluded the finding provided empirical evidence to the idea that servant leaders rely on competence to effectively influence followers. Finally, the relationship between servant leadership and

leader agreeableness empirically supports the notion that servant leaders value and care for their followers.

Washington et al. (2006) argued the findings from their research provided two implications related to predicting servant leadership behavior in organizations. First, organizations interested in embracing servant leadership as the overarching leadership paradigm will likely benefit from recruiting leadership candidates who demonstrate agreeableness and self-report valuing empathy, integrity, and competence. Second, organizations intending to sustain a servant leadership culture will want to communicate accurately attributes valued in such a culture to leader recruits and leaders advancing through the organizational hierarchy.

Beck (2010) conducted a mixed methods study designed to identify antecedents to servant leadership behaviors. During Phase 1 of the project, 499 leaders and 630 raters from American community leadership programs completed the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006) to determine leaders' strength of servant leadership behaviors. During Phase 2, the researcher interviewed 12 highly rated servant leaders intending to identify behaviors or life experiences that predict servant leadership. From the analyzed quantitative and qualitative data, six findings emerged that Beck believed are predictors of servant leadership behavior. First, servant leadership behaviors are more frequent the longer a leader fills a leadership role. Second, "Leaders that volunteer at least one hour per week demonstrate higher servant leadership behaviors" (p. 57). Third, servant leaders influence other people through building trusting relationships. Fourth, servant leaders demonstrate an altruistic mindset, which Beck defined as "acting in the best interests of others (regardless of personal consequence) and is characterized by

others orientation, a desire to make a positive difference in the lives of others, and leading to help others" (p. 67). Fifth, interpersonal competence is a characteristic of servant leaders. Sixth, servant leaders may not necessarily lead from the front or the top of the organization. Beck concluded these finding indicate the real possibility that servant leaders can be developed because these findings represent antecedents to servant leadership that can be intentionally influenced.

Education and Servant Leadership Development

Theorists and commentators frequently acknowledge education as a factor of leadership development (Tilstra, 2006). Historically, formal education has existed for the development of various human behaviors (Kohlberg & Mayer, 1972). Leadership is among those behaviors resulting in institutions of higher education creating programs designed to teach leadership intentionally (Brungardt, 1997). For some, the formal instruction of leadership is more than an academic discipline, but the responsibility and priority of colleges and universities (Bass, 1990; Connaughton, Lawrence, & Ruben, 2003; Honaker, 2005; Messner & Ruhl, 1998).

Because of the scholarly consideration the relationship between formal education and leadership has acquired, servant leadership and formal education have become a topic of commentary and research. Greenleaf (1998b) argued formal education powerfully impacts the maturation of people. Maturity, which Greenleaf defined as the ability to maintain humility during all experiences, is essential for effective servant leadership and should be pursued with all seriousness. Additionally, Greenleaf designed the servant leadership paradigm with university students in mind (Beazley & Beggs, 2002). From that vantage point, Greenleaf (1998c) argued colleges and universities are

ideal environments for developing servant leadership behaviors among prospective leaders.

Beazley and Beggs (2002) believed academic introduction to the servant leadership paradigm was an essential first step for any person or organization seeking to embrace servant leadership as the preferred leadership style. Drawing heavily from Greenleaf's writings, Beazley and Beggs provided seven ideas that form a conceptual framework for the formal instruction of servant leadership. According to Beazley and Beggs, prospective servant leaders must be taught the following in an academic environment:

- Servant leaders first and foremost choose service as the means by which they influence.
- Servant leaders seek to build a caring and just society and seek to develop those served into effective servant leaders.
- Servant leaders serve with humility and accept service with gratitude and joy.
- Servant leaders carefully maintain personal integrity, boundaries of power and personal responsibility.
- Servant leaders empower rather than demean because servant leadership is rooted in the appropriate and judicious application of power and influence and not slavery or servitude.
- Servant leadership is a paradoxical idea where the leader receives gratification through giving to the needs of others.
- Servant leadership is a distinct leadership paradigm, but also exists within a larger context of leadership theory. (pp. 57-59)

For Beazley and Beggs, an academic understanding of these concepts is the foundation for practicing effective servant leadership behaviors.

Research concerning servant leadership and formal education has been meager similar to other areas of servant leadership investigation (Anderson, 2009; Van Dierendonck, 2010; Washington et al., 2006). Anderson, one of the few researchers of servant leadership and education, conducted a mixed method research project designed to ascertain whether an institution of higher education can develop servant leadership behaviors among adult students. Incoming and graduating students of Geneva College's degree completion program completed the Learning Activities Survey (King, 1998) to measure prospective transformation and the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006) to measure servant leadership behaviors during the quantitative phase. During the qualitative phase, the researcher interviewed select sample volunteers in order to clarify the quantitative data. From the compiled data, Anderson concluded there was little statistical difference in servant leadership behaviors between incoming and graduating students. The qualitative discussions showed the graduating students had a better understanding of the servant leadership paradigm. Anderson also found a low correlation between prospective transformational and servant leadership behaviors. Graduating students suggested the relationship between prospective transformation and servant leadership resulted from three foci of the program: acquiring the ability to apply personal beliefs to their profession, the influence of instructors on their development, and the impact of other students in their cohort. From the findings, Anderson suggested institutions interested in teaching servant leadership to their students should create

learning environments that foster community building and encourage students to think critically about course content and their personal and professional lives.

Experience and Servant Leadership Development

Experience has emerged in leadership literature as a significant developmental factor. The emergence of experience in leadership development is based on the role experience plays in learning new behaviors. Bandura (1971) argued a person's positive behaviors are reinforced and negative behaviors are rejected for other options by experiencing the consequences for made decisions. Kolb (1984) contended learning is an experiential process marked by a person interacting with their environment and resolving conflict between dialectically opposed variables like reflection and action, emotion and cognitive thought, or beliefs and reality. Kohlberg and Mayer (1972) suggested the developmental learning process is most effective when a person's experiences are involved especially situations that involve the resolution of problems or conflicts. Because of its role in learning new behaviors, experience has become a major point of interest in leadership development researchers (McCall, Lombardo, & Morrison, 1988).

Leadership development research.

Over the past two decades researchers have attempted to demonstrate empirically the influence of experience on leadership development. Avolio (1984) conducted a correlational and regression study of 182 community leaders anticipating strong relationships between a wide range of potential life experiences and transformational leadership behaviors. Avolio found statistically significant, positive correlations between work experience, school experience, and all transformational leadership behaviors. None of the correlations were particularly strong. During the regression study, positive work

experience and school experience were significant predictors of transformational leadership behaviors. All other categories of experience tested did not serve as predictors of transformational leadership.

Atwater et al. (1999) investigated the relationship between individual differences and leadership emergence and effectiveness by conducting a quantitative study of 236 military academy cadets. The cadets completed several inventories at matriculation, which rated their cognitive ability, conscientiousness, self-esteem, hardiness, moral reasoning, physical fitness, and prior leadership experience. The cadets completed the same inventories at the end of their fourth year. The cadets' level of leadership in the academy's corps of cadets at graduation provided leadership emergence data. The researchers found cadets with greater cognitive ability were more likely to emerge as leaders, but were not more effective. Conscientiousness was found to be related statistically insignificant to both emergence and effectiveness. Self-esteem related positively to emergence, but not effectiveness. Hardiness and moral reasoning were related to neither emergence nor effectiveness. Physical fitness and prior leadership experience were both positively related to leader emergence and effectiveness.

Cope and Watts (2000) investigated the role experience, in particular critical events, plays in the development of business leaders by conducting a longitudinal case study of six start-up business owners in the United Kingdom. By analyzing data collected from numerous unstructured interviews with the business owners, the researchers made several conclusions about the role of critical events in the development of leaders. First, a critical event is a "complex phenomenon that does not occur independently of the entrepreneur but in many cases is a change in perception and awareness that stimulates

the entrepreneur to action" (p. 113). Critical events are not isolated to one component of life, but may contribute to the development both personally and professionally. Second, the majority of critical events were described as negative regarding immediate impact, but were considered very positive regarding developmental outcomes. Third, the participants often described the emotions of anger and confusion while experiencing critical events, thus critical events contain a strong emotional element. The intense feelings of critical events are experienced both during the event itself and during subsequent reflection of the event. Finally, critical events may be necessary for the sustained growth and development of both the person and the business, but may be difficult to manage due to their complexity.

Kempster (2006) qualitatively investigated factors contributing to leadership development by interviewing six directors of a British multinational corporation. The directors were asked to develop a timeline of influences that shaped their leadership learning before the interview. During the interview, the researcher asked the participating directors to define leadership, to give biographical information from earliest memory to present, and any final reflections on leadership. After the data was coded and analyzed, Kempster made four conclusions about leadership development. First, the influence of notable people and the experience of critical events significantly impacts leadership development. Second, leadership development involves a process by which a person begins to self-identify as a leader. Third, interacting with difficult people like superiors who occasionally abuse their authority is a common experience for developing leaders. Kempster noted such managerial styles and experiences with difficult people is likely precipitating a shift toward more value based leadership styles that focus on follower

needs. Fourth, leadership development occurs through situational learning, which means development is impacted by the daily situations of filling both follower and leader roles.

Toor and Ofori (2008) hypothesized leadership development is directly influenced by significant individuals an emerging leader encounters and significant experiences that occur at various stages of an emerging leader's life. In order to determine whether the hypothesis should be accepted or rejected, the researchers collected data from 58 graduate students from the National University of Singapore using a questionnaire designed specifically for this project. The questionnaire asked the participants about the influence various experiences or relationship might have had on their leadership skills on a seven point Likert-type scale. From the data, Toor and Ofori found parents, teachers, and mentors were the relationships rated highest by the participants. Teachers were identified as the highest rated significant individuals in regards to mean score, but fathers were the significant individuals who received the most extremely positive influence ratings. The researchers also found experiences during university education and experiences during organizational work were the highest rated specific experiences. Experiences during university education was the highest rated significant experience in regards to mean score, but experiences during organizational work received the most extremely positive influence ratings. Toor and Ofori concluded their hypothesis was supported; significant individuals and significant experiences likely influence leadership development.

Dragoni, Tesluk, Russell, and Oh (2009) quantitatively investigated the relationship between managerial assignments and managerial development. The researchers hypothesized managerial assignments' developmental quality is positively

related to effective managerial behavior, learning orientation is positively related to assignments' developmental quality, and junior managers access to highly developmental assignments strengthens the relationship between learning orientation and assignment developmental quality. Dragoni et al. gathered data from 215 junior managers and their immediate supervisors on the developmental quality of managerial assignments, access to highly developmental assignments, and effective managerial behavior using the Developmental Challenge Profile (McCauley et al., 1994). Using a hierarchical regression, the researchers found a positive relationship existed between the developmental quality of assignments and effective managerial behavior. Dragoni et al. also found managers with higher levels of learning orientation were in more developmental positions. The researchers finally found the positive relationship between learning orientation and assignment quality was strengthened when managers had opportunities to pursue developmental assignments. Dragoni et al. concluded manager occupying assignments more conducive to leadership development were more likely to gain managerial competencies, and managers goal oriented toward learning were more likely to occupy developmental assignments.

From the research, one can conclude that leadership development is likely influenced by experience. In particular, relationships with influential people like parents, teachers, and mentors form leaders (Kempster, 2006; Toor & Ofori, 2008). Prior work or leadership experience including difficult or challenging events likely shapes leaders (Avolio, 1984; Atwater et al., 1999; Cope & Watts, 2000; Dragoni, et al., 2009). Finally, experiences during the years of formal education or training impact the development of leaders (Avolio; Atwater et al.; Toor & Ofori).

Servant leadership and experience literature.

Literature specific to the role of experience in the development of servant leaders is sparse. Greenleaf (2002) established the foundation for experiential development of servant leaders. Greenleaf argued the ideal situation is for practicing servant leaders to influence their followers to adopt consciously the servant leadership paradigm as their preferred leadership approach. This feature of servant leadership development stems from an early research project Greenleaf (1998a) conducted while still working for AT&T. Greenleaf studied the careers of 12 senior executives to determine what had made them successful. Each of the 12 had reported an early boss that "greatly accelerated" (p. 139) their leadership development through a form of mentoring relationship. This early research project greatly impacted Greenleaf's view on the role of relationships in developing servant.

Building on Greenleaf's call for servant leaders to develop servant leaders, Beazley and Beggs (2002) submitted that experiential learning must be a major component of any effort to develop effective servant leaders whether formal or informal. According to Beazley and Beggs, servant leadership development centers on the follower gaining the ability to listen, empathize, change, reflect and contemplate, and collaborate. Servant leaders gain these competencies experientially by repetitively encountering a wide range of scenarios with the support and guidance of a mentor or caring leader. Based on these principles, Beazley and Beggs call for the establishment of programs in universities, corporations, and non-profit organizations designed specifically to introduce potential servant leaders to situations where they are free to react with servant leadership

behaviors. Despite the call, few organizations have established such training programs with very limited empirical support (Spears, 2002).

Research concerning experience and servant leadership.

Research associated with the role of experience in servant leadership development is lacking at the time of this research project. The relationship between years of ministry experience and servant leadership behaviors was another component of Bunch's (2013) investigation into servant leadership among African American pastors. Using data collected from 358 African American pastors from 11 denominations using the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006) and a basic demographic survey, Bunch conducted an analysis of variance to determine if any differences in the participating pastors servant leadership scores were based on years of ministry experience. Bunch found no significant differences.

Conclusions

Servant leadership is likely a viable leadership paradigm for pastors serving in the Church of the Nazarene. Greenleaf (2002) described servant leadership as a follower focused paradigm where the leader seeks to meet the needs of the follower even above personal interests. The goal of the servant leader is to influence the follower to become a more fully developed person who will ultimately embrace the servant leadership paradigm and influence through meeting the needs of others. Similarly, the goal of pastoral ministry is to influence people in becoming more devoted followers of Jesus Christ who will ultimately influence other people to become followers of Jesus. Additionally, the commitment to humble service as a the means of influence in servant

leadership is consistent with the biblical concept of greatness through service described by Jesus Christ in Mark 10:42-45:

> So Jesus called them and said to them, You know that among the Gentiles those whom they recognize as their rulers lord it over them, and their great ones are tyrants over them. But it is not so among you; but whoever wishes to become great among you must be your servant, and whoever wishes to be first among you must be slave of all. For the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many.

According to Jesus, service to others makes authentic influence (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002). Because of the compatibility between servant leadership and pastoral ministry, research has demonstrated repeatedly the effective exhibition of servant leadership behaviors by pastors in churches in a number of contexts (Bivins, 2005; Bunch, 2013; Dillman, 2003; Ming, 2005). Nazarene pastors could potentially embrace servant leadership as the preferred leadership paradigm for their ministries.

Unfortunately, servant leadership has remained undefined scientifically throughout its history with several models and research instruments designed to facilitate empirical investigation (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Farling et al., 1999; Laub, 1999; Liden et al., 2008; Page & Wong, 2000; Patterson, 2003; Reinke, 2004; Russell & Stone, 2002; Sendjaya et al., 2008; Washington et al., 2006). Although each of these models or research instruments contributes to the overall understanding of the leadership paradigm, SLQ has emerged as strong option for measuring and explaining servant leadership behaviors. Liden et al. considered earlier servant leadership models and research instruments in developing the seven leadership behaviors measured by the SLQ. The final

28 items of the SLQ were determined to be valid and reliable. For the stated reasons, the SLQ was the chosen research instrument for this project.

Developing pastors into effective servant leaders is an ongoing concern for the Church of the Nazarene. Empirical support for servant leadership development is limited (Phipps, 2010), but education and experience are likely strong developmental factors. Greenleaf (1998b) argued formal education has a strong impact on the maturation of people, which is essential for servant leadership. Beazley and Beggs (2002) argued universities and colleges were ideal environments for developing servant leaders and formal education was a necessity for any person or organization seeking to embrace the servant leadership paradigm as their preferred leadership style. Although the relationship between experience and servant leadership has received almost no research support, ample research has been conducted on the relationship between experience and leadership generally. The research has shown relationships with significant people (Kempster, 2006; Toor & Ofori, 2008), prior work or leadership experience and challenging life events (Avolio, 1984, Atwater et al., 1999; Cope &Watts, 2000; Dragoni et al., 2009), and experiences during formal education and training (Avolio; Atwater et al.; Toor & Ofori) can all impact the formation of leadership behaviors. Education and experience are probably contributing factors to the development of servant leadership behaviors. The reliance of the Church of the Nazarene on education and experience in developing pastors into servant leaders is likely wise and effective.

Summary

This chapter reviewed literature relevant to the development of Nazarene pastors into effective servant leaders. Servant leadership emerged at a point in leadership history

when paradigms were shifting from emphasizing leader characteristics to interest in the impact of leadership on followers. The servant leadership paradigm as envisioned by Greenleaf (2002) involved leaders intentionally elevating follower needs above personal needs and attempting to meet follower needs. For the first few decades of the paradigms existence, the definition of servant leadership remained generally unclear, but scholars attempted to remedy the situation by developing models and research instruments to measure and define servant leadership behaviors. Researchers also began to evaluate the effectiveness of servant leadership in organizational settings and cultural contexts. Pastoral ministry in particular garnered the attention of research primarily because of the perceived compatibility of the altruistic nature of servant leadership and the biblical emphasis of greatness through servanthood. Factors contributing to servant leadership development gained scholarly attention with models introduced based on developmental psychology and research conducted to identify predictive relationships between leader characteristics and leadership behaviors. The role of education and experience in servant leadership development received special attention in this literature review. The chapter concluded servant leadership is likely a viable leadership approach for pastors serving in the Church of the Nazarene and the denominations reliance on education and experience in developing pastors into servant leaders is likely wise and effective.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The Church of the Nazarene relies heavily on the local church pastor to fulfill its mission to make followers of Jesus throughout the world. The denomination assigns oversight of local congregations to these credentialed ministers expecting pastors to effectively administrate the congregation's organization, provide theological instruction to the church's membership, invest in the lives of individual believers through ministerial care, fill a priestly role in worship through preaching and the administration of sacraments, and present a clear missional direction for the congregation (Church of the Nazarene, 2009). The mission of the Church of the Nazarene depends greatly on the effective leadership of local church pastors.

Servant leadership seems to be a likely viable leadership paradigm for Nazarene pastors. Greenleaf (2002) originally presented servant leadership as a follower focused paradigm marked by leaders meeting the needs of followers even above personal interests. This foundational feature of servant leadership seems consistent with the biblical principle of greatness through humble service as taught by Jesus Christ in the Gospels (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002). Additionally, the servant leader influences the follower to become a more fully developed person who will eventually demonstrate servant leadership behaviors and influence others by meeting their needs (Greenleaf). This principle of servant leadership parallels the goal of pastoral ministry of producing

followers of Jesus Christ who will eventually influence other people to become followers of Jesus. Servant leadership may be the preferred leadership paradigm for Nazarene pastors.

The development of pastors into servant leaders emerged as a critical concern for the Church of the Nazarene because of the likely compatibility between the denomination's missional objectives and the paradigm's principle features. In order to ensure effective pastors provide servant leadership to local churches, the Church of the Nazarene depends on two factors for leadership development: education and experience. Unfortunately, empirical support for servant leadership development is limited (Phipps, 2010), but one can expect education and experience to be strong developmental factors. Servant leadership commentators have argued that formal education contributes to the maturation of people and is the necessary first step for anyone seeking to embrace the paradigm as their primary leadership approach (Beazely & Beggs, 2002; Greenleaf, 1998b). Despite the limited research regarding the influence of experience on servant leadership, researchers have shown that significant relationships (Kempster, 2006; Toor & Ofori, 2008), prior work and leadership experiences (Avolio, 1984; Atwater et al., 1999; Dragoni et al., 2009), and challenging or critical events (Cope & Watts, 2000) all affect the formation of leadership behaviors. Education and experience probably contribute to the development of servant leadership behaviors. The reliance of the Church of the Nazarene on education and experience in developing pastors into servant leaders is likely wise and effective.

The purpose of this study was to analyze the relationship between the two developmental factors, education and experience, and servant leadership behaviors.

Specifically, the researcher sought to determine whether level of education, years of ministry experience, or a combination of these factors served as strongest predictor of servant leadership behaviors among Nazarene pastors. The researcher designed and implemented this study in an attempt to answer the following research questions.

1. How do Nazarene pastors rate in servant leadership behaviors?
2. What is the relationship between a Nazarene pastor's education level and rating in servant leadership behaviors?
3. What is the relationship between a Nazarene pastor's total number of years of ministry experience (full time and part time) and rating in servant leadership behaviors?
4. What is the relationship between the percentage of a Nazarene pastor's full time ministry experience and rating in servant leadership behaviors?

Research Design

This study focused on the relationship between developmental factors and servant leadership behaviors among Nazarene pastors. The researcher attempted to answer the study's four research questions using a non-experimental fixed design, which is quantitative research focused on describing the state of a variable or measuring the relationship between variables (Robson, 2011). This study was designed to analyze relationships and did not involve the random assignment of participants into groups and the manipulation of independent variables, which qualified the study as non-experimental. Additionally, this study possessed features consistent with fixed design research such as the statistical analysis of data and a detached researcher who had limited contact with and virtually no influence over participants (Robson). The features and goals

of this study rendered non-experiment fixed design the appropriate research approach.

This study answered research question one using a descriptive survey research. Descriptive research is used when the goal of the study is to describe the state of an issue, variable, or characteristic of a population or sample at the time the research project was conducted. Survey research is the form of descriptive research involving the distribution of a survey to study directly a population's characteristics, attitudes, beliefs, opinions, or any other psychological or sociological construct (Salkind, 2012). The intent of research question one was to determine how Nazarene pastors currently rate as servant leaders using data collected from those people directly affected by pastors' leadership behaviors making descriptive survey research the most reasonable choice of research design.

The study was constructed to answer research questions two, three, and four using correlational research design. Correlational research describes the linear relationship between two or more variables (Salkind, 2011). Correlational research can be conducted to predict how a particular variable will behave based on its relationships with other variables (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2012). One must take caution when making predictions based on correlational research because predictive relationships do not imply causation. Correlations, regardless of statistical test, do not indicate one variable causes the behavior of another. Correlational research can only demonstrate the existence of a relationship between variables (Leedy & Ormrod, 2013). Additionally, correlational research should not be confused with the correlation coefficient. A correlation coefficient is a statistic used to examine the relationship between two variables. Correlational research is a form of non-experimental fixed research design that focuses on the relationship between two or more variables and encompasses a wide range of statistical

tools (Robson, 2011). The researcher formulated questions two, three, and four to identify how a pastor's level of education, years of ministry experience, and years of full ministry experience relate to servant leadership behaviors. Further, a driving goal of the study was to determine if any of these developmental factors or a combination of developmental factors predicted servant leadership behaviors among Nazarene pastors. The overarching purpose of the study and the intentions of the research questions made correlational research the most viable option of research design to answer questions two, three, and four.

Population

The population for this study consisted of all ordained elders serving as pastors of local congregations in the USA/Canada Region of the Church of the Nazarene. At the time of writing, the population was 3,869 (Laura K. Lance, personal communication, February 4, 2013). Ordained elders serving as pastors of Nazarene congregations within the USA/Canada Region operate as the population for this study for two reasons. First, ordained elders have completed a validated course of study designed to provide the practicing minister through formal education the minimum competencies needed to effectively lead a Nazarene congregation. Second, ordained elders have served a minimum of three consecutive years of formal ministerial experience prior to applying for ordination (Church of the Nazarene, 2009). By having met the minimum requirements for ordination according to the rules of the Church of the Nazarene, ordained elders serving as pastors can contribute usable data to this research project.

The researcher randomly sampled $n = 350$ pastors from the population for this study and subsequently invited each member of the sample through a series of emails to

participate using contact information provided by the Global Ministry Center of the Church of the Nazarene. The respondents numbered n = 37 pastors agreeing to participate in this study for an initial response rate of 10.57%. Complicating the response rate further, the SLQ, which is one of the research instruments, requires followers to rate their leaders in servant leadership behaviors. The researcher asked members of the church boards served by the participating pastors to rate their pastors in servant leadership behaviors. Board members from 17 churches rated their pastors. Although the demographic data from all participating pastors was used, the servant leadership data from only 17 of the 37 participating pastors could be used for this study.

The researcher collected demographic data from the responding pastors in order to gain a better understanding of those being studied. The mean age of the participating pastors was 52.1 years old and the mean age of conversion to the Christian faith was 14 years old. The gender of 31 participants was male. White pastors were the majority race with 31 participants. African American pastors numbered 4 participants and 1 participant reported other as their racial background. The vast majority of participating pastors, 34, served in the United States while only 2 participating pastors served in Canada. Most participating pastors, 16, reported a master's degree was their highest level of education completed. Data collected also indicated 2 participating pastors completed the Nazarene course of study, 2 participating pastors completed a certificate program, 4 participating pastors completed an associate's degree, 10 participating pastors completed a bachelor's degree, and 2 participating pastors completed a doctoral degree. The mean number of years of ministry experience for participating pastors was 21.24 years. The mean number of years of full time ministry experience was 17.13 years.

The only significant threat participating pastors could potentially face results from a breakdown in confidentiality. The researcher carefully conducted this study in a manner that protected participating pastor's confidentiality in order to reduce any possible threat of harm. The researcher maintained confidentiality by assigning participating pastors an identification number. Pastors' names and contact information were only used to send invitation and reminder emails. The sampled pastors received these emails with their names alone and did not see the name of any other pastor invited to participate in this study. Participating pastors and the board members rating their pastors in servant leadership behaviors provided the identification number in the first question of both the survey and the SLQ in order to organize the data. This allowed the data to be organized according to the identification number rather than a name. The pastors' names and the identification numbers will not be used in this or any other publication. The researcher will maintain the raw data including the identification number catalogue for three years after completion of this document. The researcher will then destroy the raw data and the identification number catalogue.

Data Collection

The data collection process involved several steps: selection of research instruments, forming the sample, implementation of the study, and organizing the data for analysis.

Selection of Research Instruments

This study used two surveys for data collection. The researcher designed the first survey to collect basic demographic information and to provide the participating pastors

the ability to report on education level, years of ministry experience, and years of full time ministry experience. (Appendix A).

The researcher chose the SLQ for the second survey, which is a reliable and valid instrument consisting of 28 seven point Likert-type items designed to measure seven servant leadership behaviors. Liden et al. (2008) designed, demonstrated internal consistency, and validated the SLQ through three steps. The first step was a pilot study with an initial instrument meant to measure nine servant leadership behaviors conceptualized from past servant leadership research. The pilot instrument consisted of 85 items, 60 of which were written by the authors and the other 25 adapted from previous studies and research instruments. After presenting the pilot study instrument to 298 college students from a Midwestern university and conducting an exploratory factor analysis, seven servant leadership behaviors emerged with internal consistency: conceptual skills ($\alpha = .86$), empowerment ($\alpha = .90$), helping subordinates grown and succeed ($\alpha = .90$), putting subordinates first ($\alpha = .91$), behaving ethically ($\alpha = .90$), emotional healing ($\alpha = .89$), and creating value for the community ($\alpha = .89$) (Liden et al.).

The second step began by Liden et al (2008) was choosing the four highest scoring items from each of the seven measureable servant leadership behaviors identified in step one and creating a 28 item revised instrument. This revised instrument was given to 164 employees and 65 supervisors of a Midwestern production and distribution company. The data were analyzed for scale reliability using a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Each dimension possessed necessary scores in the CFA to determine reliability: conceptual skills ($\alpha = .81$), empowerment ($\alpha = .80$), helping subordinates grown and succeed ($\alpha = .82$), putting subordinates first ($\alpha = .86$), behaving ethically ($\alpha =$

.83), emotional healing (α = .76), and creating value for the community (α = .83) (Liden et al.).

Liden et al. (2008) used the data collected from the company employees and supervisors in step 2 to complete the third step of showing reliability and validity for the SLQ. The researchers developed a multi-level hierarchical linear model (HLM) by regressing outcomes of the seven servant leadership behaviors and controlling for two other leadership paradigm: transformational leadership and leader-member exchange theory. To complete this validation step, the participating employees and supervisors also completed the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1995), which measures transformational leadership, and the Multidimensional Measure of Leader-Member Exchange (Liden & Maslyn, 1998), which measures the leader and follower relationship for leader-member exchange theory. The HLM demonstrated that each servant leadership behavior measured by the SLQ, after controlling for transformational leadership and leader-member exchange theory, were distinct constructs and the items designed to measure these constructs possessed reliability. The α scores from the HLM for each servant leadership behavior are as follows: conceptual skills (α = .80), empowerment (α = .77), helping subordinates grown and succeed (α = .83), putting subordinates first (α = .86), behaving ethically (α = .82), emotional healing (α = .78), and creating value for the community (α = .84) (Liden et al.). The SLQ is a reliable and valid instrument for measuring servant leadership behavior.

For this research project, the language used in some of the items of the SLQ was modified with the permission of Liden et al. (2008). In those instances, the researcher replaced the term manager with pastor for this study. (Appendix B).

Forming the Sample

The General Secretary's Office of the Church of the Nazarene provided the researcher the contact information for the entire population. Each ordained elder serving as pastor in the USA/Canada region of the Church of the Nazarene was assigned a number ranging from one through 3,869. The pastors' numbers were inserted into an online randomizer, and the first 350 pastors output on the randomized list served as the sample for this research project. Each member of the sample was then assigned an identification number for the research project in order to organize data and to protect the pastors' confidentiality.

Implementation of the Study

The researcher collected data through an online service over the course of 60 days. At the beginning of the data collection period, the sample pastors received an email inviting them to participate. The email introduced the sample pastor to the researcher, offered a very brief description of the research topic, asked the sample pastor to participate, and provided instructions on how to participate. Every two weeks through the data collection period, the researcher sent a follow-up email to the sample pastors reminding them of the study and participation instructions. The researcher attached to each email instructions for the church board members and a letter of recommendation from Dr. Daniel Copp, director of Global Clergy Development for the Church of the Nazarene. (Appendix C).

Organizing the Data for Analysis

The researcher used an online service and Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) statistical software to organize the data. The researcher uploaded the

survey and the SLQ into the online service. The participating pastors and the board members completed the surveys online and had no direct contact with the researcher after receiving the invitation and reminder emails. The online service stored the raw data for use, but the researcher organized the data according to variables and entered it into the SPSS software.

Analytical Methods

The researcher used quantitative statistical tools to analyze collected data intending to answer the research questions that governed this study. The following is an explanation of the statistical analysis of the data for each research question.

Research Question 1

The researcher attempted to answer question one by calculating the mean and standard deviation of the pastors' scores for each of the seven servant leadership behaviors. The mean of the sample, according to Salkind (2011), most accurately reflects the mean score of the population. Calculating the mean for the pastors' SLQ scores indicates how average Nazarene pastors may generally rate in servant leadership behaviors. Additionally, the standard deviation provides a general understanding of how close to the mean the majority of Nazarene pastors likely rate in servant leadership behaviors (Salkind, 2012; Yockey, 2011).

Research Questions 2, 3, & 4

The researcher calculated a simple linear regression for research questions two, three, and four. The simple linear regression is used when the goal is to predict the scores of one variable using the scores from another variable (Yockey, 2011). The intention of research questions two, three, and four is to determine if predictive relationships exist

between leadership development factors and servant leadership behaviors among Nazarene pastors.

The simple linear regression analyzes the relationship between two variables in two ways. First, the regression calculates the Pearson correlation coefficient determining whether a relationship exists between the two variables. Second, the regression calculates the percentage of variance of the dependent variable accounted for by the independent variable. Higher percentage of variance between the variables (r^2) indicates a stronger predictive relationship. Additionally, an ANOVA is calculated along with the simple linear regression in order to demonstrate the statistical significance of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. SPSS generates the ANOVA automatically with the simple linear regression (Yockey, 2011).

In regression statistical tests, the dependent variable is the variable being predicted while the variable used to predict scores is the independent variable. The seven servant leadership behaviors served as the dependent variable for each research question. Because servant leadership behaviors are the dependent variable, seven regressions were calculated for each research question. Level of education served as the independent variable for research question two. The researcher used years of ministry experience and years of full time ministry experience as the independent variables for research questions three and four respectively.

Additional tests.

The researcher used a multiple regression to determine if a combination of developmental factors predicted servant leadership behaviors among Nazarene pastors. These tests were not required by the research questions, but offered additional statistical

support to the research questions. Further, these additional tests functioned within the overarching intentions of the study of determining whether education, experience, or a combination of both served as the strongest predictor of servant leadership behaviors among Nazarene pastors.

A multiple regression differs from a simple linear regression in that it is used to predict the scores of the dependent variable with two or more independent variables. Because the multiple regression uses two or more independent variables, a Pearson correlation coefficient is not calculated. Instead, a multiple correlations coefficient is calculated, which represents the degree to which the dependent variable is predicted by a combination of the independent variables. The percentage of variance of the dependent variable accounted for by the independent variables is also calculated as part of the multiple regression represented by r^2. Similar to the simple linear regression, an ANOVA is calculated automatically by SPSS with the multiple regression, which demonstrates whether or not the relationship between the independent variables and dependent variables is significant (Yockey, 2011).

The researcher generated two multiple regressions to evaluate whether a combination of developmental factors predicted servant leadership behaviors among Nazarene pastors. The multiple regression assumes that all independent variables are completely independent from one another. The independent variables must not influence one another or the accuracy of the statistical tests can be greatly compromised (Yockey, 2011). Because years of ministry experience includes years of full time ministry experience, these two independent variables could not be used together in the same multiple regression. The first multiple regression used level of education and years of

ministry experience as the independent variables and pastors' servant leadership behavior scores as the dependent variables. The second multiple regression used level of education and years of full time ministry experience as the dependent variables.

Limitations

Limitations are characteristics of a study beyond the control of the researcher that may negatively impact the results of the study and are expected in virtually all social scientific research projects (Gay et al., 2012; Robson, 2011). This study possessed three significant limitations that potentially influence the findings or conclusions.

Response Rate

A fixed number or percentage of participants needed to give validity to a research study does not exist. Studies are generally considered stronger when larger amounts of data are collected (Leedy & Ormrod, 2013; Salkind, 2012). The researcher anticipated a large quantity of data by randomly sampling 350 ordained pastors serving in Nazarene church throughout the United States and Canada. The number of responding pastors was less than expected with 37 of the 350 members of the sample agreeing to participate for a response rate of 10.57%. Of those participating pastors, the servant leadership data was collected on only 17. The researcher attempted to increase the number of participants within the 60 days the study was conducted, but the response rate remained low.

The low response rate could potentially impact the statistical tests used in this study. Simple linear regressions and multiple regressions both assume all continuous data variables possess a normal distribution (Salkind, 2011). Although abnormal distributions have minimal impact on large datasets, such distributions can produce inaccurate or inconclusive statistical findings in smaller datasets (Yockey, 2011). The continuous data

collected in this study could be distributed abnormally as a result of the small response rate. Because the low response rate did create a small data set, the statistical calculations could generate inaccurate or inconclusive findings if the continuous data variables are indeed abnormally distributed.

The low response rate could also influence the generalizability of any research findings. The researcher designed this study to identify how education and experience generally relate to the servant leadership development of ordained Nazarene pastors serving in the United States and Canada. Owing to this intention, random sampling was chosen as the sampling strategy because it allows for the best representation of the population within the study enabling more generalizable conclusions (Leedy & Ormrod, 2013; Salkind, 2012). While there is no fixed number or percentage for a sample, Leedy and Ormrod recommended a sample size of 400 in a population of 5,000 to capture accurately all of the characteristics of a study's population. For this study, the population N = 3,869, so the researcher decided on a sample size of n = 350, which is similar in proportion to the recommendation given by Leedy and Ormrod. Because only 10.57% of the sample agreed to participate in this study, all of the characteristics of the population may not be adequately represented in the dataset. The generalizability of any statistical conclusions made in this study could be limited if any characteristics of the population are not accurately represented due to the response rate.

The Church of the Nazarene Only

This study was designed and conducted with pastors of the Church of the Nazarene exclusively. Virtually no regard was given to pastors of other Christian denominations in the design and execution of this research project. Consideration was given to the

developmental factors used by the Church of the Nazarene to shape pastors into servant leaders. The standards used by the Church of the Nazarene for the preparation of men and women for ordained ministry may not be used by other Christian denominations to prepare ordained ministers. As a result, the conclusions of this study cannot be easily generalized to pastors serving Christians churches other than Nazarene churches. Additional research must be conducted to confirm whether or not the results of this study apply to other Christian traditions.

Servant Leadership Only

This study focused on the development of servant leadership behaviors among Nazarene pastors. Leadership paradigms, such as charismatic leadership or transformational leadership, which are similar to servant leadership (Humphreys, 2005), were not considered in the design and implementation of this study. Any predictive relationship between developmental factors and servant leadership behaviors cannot be generalized to leadership in general or to other leadership paradigms. Additional research must be conducted to determine if similar predictive relationships exist between developmental factors and other leadership paradigms.

Summary

This study was conducted using non-experimental fixed design to analyze the relationship between developmental factors and servant leadership behaviors among Nazarene pastors. Data were collected from 37 Nazarene pastors out of 350 randomly sampled pastors constituting a response rate of 10.57%. The researcher answered research question one using descriptive survey research and analyzed the collected data by calculating the mean and standard deviation of the pastors' servant leadership

behaviors. The study attempted to answer research questions two, three, and four using correlational research and analyzed the data with simple linear regressions. Simple linear regressions are inferential statistics used to determine if the score of the dependent variable could be predicted by the score of the independent variable (Yockey, 2011). For the simple linear regressions, the seven servant leadership behaviors measured by the SLQ served as the dependent variables while level of education, years of ministry experience, and years of full time ministry experience served as the independent variables. Additionally, two multiple regressions were calculated to give deeper insight in the predictive relationship between developmental factors and servant leadership behaviors. A multiple regression is similar to simple linear regression in that they both analyze predictive relationship between variables. The multiple regression allows for two or more independent variables (Yockey). Level of education and years of ministry experience served as the independent variables for the first multiple regression with servant leadership behaviors serving as the dependent variable. Level of education and years of full time ministry experience served as the independent variables for the second multiple regression. The collection and analysis of data as described in this chapter allowed for the analysis of the predictive relationship between developmental factors of education and experience and servant leadership behaviors among Nazarene pastors.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The Church of the Nazarene relies on education and experience to develop pastors into effective servant leaders. Although research concerning the relationship between servant leadership behaviors and developmental factors has been rarely conducted by social scientists (Phipps, 2010), the reliance of the Church of the Nazarene on education and experience seems wise and effective because of the trajectory of associated literature. Greenleaf (1998b) argued formal education is a potentially powerful element in maturing people for effective leadership. Beazley and Beggs (2002) believed formally educating leaders was the necessary first step for any organization attempting to adopt servant leadership as its primary leadership style. Research studies have repeatedly demonstrated that various experiences may contribute to the development of leadership behaviors in a number of different paradigms and contexts (Avolio, 1984; Atwater et al. 1999; Cope & Watts, 2000; McKenna et al., 2007). The Church of the Nazarene's use of education and experience to form pastors into effective servant leaders appears to be the appropriate developmental strategy because of the pertinent literature.

This study was conducted to analyze the relationships between education and servant leadership and between experience and servant leadership. The goal of the study was to determine if either of the two developmental factors served as a stronger predictor

of servant leadership behaviors in Nazarene pastors. The researcher implemented this study to answer the following research questions.

1. How do Nazarene pastors rate in servant leadership behaviors?

2. What is the relationship between a Nazarene pastor's education level and rating in servant leadership behaviors?

3. What is the relationship between a Nazarene pastor's total number of years of ministry experience (full time and part time) and rating in servant leadership behaviors?

4. What is the relationship between a Nazarene pastor's full time ministry experience and rating in servant leadership behaviors?

The researcher reported the findings of this study and possible answers to these research questions based on the analysis of collected data in this chapter.

Findings

Research Question 1

The primary goal of the first research question was to determine how Nazarene pastors generally score in the seven servant leadership behaviors measured by the SLQ (Liden et al., 2008). The mean and standard deviation of Nazarene pastors' ratings as servant leaders are reported in Table 4.

Table 4

Nazarene Pastors Servant Leadership Scores

Behavior	*M*	*SD*
CS	25.11	2.60
EMP	23.12	2.61
HELP	22.28	3.54
PSF	22.31	3.67
BE	26.47	2.31
EH	25.08	2.84
CVC	25.77	1.87

Note. n = 17; CS = conceptual skills; EMP = empowering; HELP = helping subordinates grow and succeed PSF = putting subordinates first; BE = behaving ethically; EH = emotional healing; CVC = creating value for the community

The participating pastors rated strongly in servant leadership behaviors. The SLQ (Liden et al., 2008) measures the seven servant leadership behaviors on a scale ranging from four to 28. The strongest behavior among participating Nazarene pastors according to the mean is behaving ethically. The behavior where the majority of the population is closest to the mean as indicated by the standard deviation is creating value for the community. The weakest servant leadership behavior according to the mean is helping

subordinates grow and succeed, though a mean score of 22.28 still indicated that Nazarene pastors are generally strong in this behavior.

Research Question 2

The intention of research question two was to analyze the relationship between Nazarene pastors' level education and servant leadership behaviors to determine whether education was a strong predictor of servant leadership. A linear regression was calculated using pastors' level of education as the independent variable and each of the seven servant leadership behaviors measured by the SLQ (Liden et al., 2008) as the dependent variable. Table 5 illustrates the statistical findings from each linear regression calculated to answer the second research question.

Table 5

Relationship Between Education and Servant Leadership

Behavior	β	r^2	t	df	p[b]
CS	-.43[a]	.19	-1.79	14	.10
EMP	-.34	.12	-1.37	14	.19
HELP	-.26	.07	-1.07	14	.32
PSF	-.33	.11	-1.33	14	.21
BE	.00	.00	.00	14	.99
EH	-.46[a]	.21	-1.92	14	.08
CVC	-.21	.04	-.79	14	.44

Note. CS = conceptual skills; EMP = empowering; HELP = helping subordinates grow and succeed PSF = putting subordinates first; BE = behaving ethically; EH = emotional healing; CVC = creating value for the community; $df = N - 2$ where N equals the number of pairs of scores in the study
[a] $p \leq .05$ (1-tailed test conducted with the Pearson coefficient)
[b]2-tailed test conducted with the ANOVA as part of calculating the linear regression

The linear regression conducted between conceptual skills and education found a statistically significant negative correlation, $\beta(14) = -.43$, $p \leq .05$. The β score refers to the Pearson coefficient between the two variables when reporting linear regressions (Yockey, 2011). The regression showed education was not a statistically significant predictor of conceptual skills among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = -.43$, $t(14) = -1.79$, $p > .05$. Education accounted for 19% ($r^2 = .19$) of the variance in conceptual skills scores.

The linear regression conducted between empowering and education found no statistically significant correlation, $\beta(14) = -.34$, $p > .05$. The regression also showed education was not a statistically significant predictor of empowering among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = -.34$, $t(14) = -1.37$, $p > .05$. Education accounted for 12 % ($r^2 = .12$) of the variance in empowering.

The linear regression conducted between helping subordinates grow and succeed and education found no statistically significant correlation, $\beta(14) = -.26$, $p > .05$. The regression also showed education was not a statistically significant predictor of helping subordinates grow and succeed among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = -.26$, $t(14) = -1.07$, $p > .05$. Education accounted for 7% ($r^2 = .07$) of the variance in helping followers grow and succeed.

The linear regression conducted between putting subordinates first and education found no statistically significant correlation, $\beta(14) = -.33$, $p > .05$. The regression also showed education was not a statistically significant predictor of putting subordinates first among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = -.33$, $t(14) = -1.33$, $p > .05$. Education accounted for 11% ($r^2 = .11$) of the variance in putting subordinates first.

The linear regression conducted between behaving ethically and education found no statistically significant correlation, $\beta(14) = .00$, $p > .05$, The regression also showed education was not a statistically significant predictor of behaving ethically among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = .00$, $t(14) = .00$, $p > .05$. Education accounted for 0% ($r^2 = .00$) of the variance in behaving ethically.

The linear regression conducted between emotional healing and education found a statistically significant negative correlation, $\beta(14) = -.46$, $p \leq .05$. The regression also

showed education was not a statistically significant predictor of emotional healing among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = -.46$, $t(14) = -1.92$, $p < .05$. Education accounted for 21% ($r^2 = .21$) of the variance in emotional healing.

The linear regression conducted between creating value for the community and edcuation found no statistically significant correlation, $\beta(14) = -.21$, $p > .05$. The regression also showed education was not a statistically significant predictor of creating value for the community among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = -.21$, $t(14) = -.79$, $p > .05$. Education accounted for 4% ($r^2 = .04$) of the variance in creating value for the community.

Research Question 3

The intention of research question three was to analyze the relationship between Nazarene pastors' total years of ministry experience, full time plus part time, and servant leadership behaviors to determine whether years of ministry experience was a strong predictor of servant leadership. A linear regression was calculated using pastors' total years of ministry experience as the independent variable and each of the seven servant leadership behaviors measured by the SLQ (Liden et al., 2008) as the dependent variable. Table 6 illustrates the statistical findings from each linear regression calculated to answer the third research question.

Table 6

Relationship Between Years of Ministry Experience and Servant Leadership

Behavior	β	r^2	t	df	p[b]
CS	-.05	.00	-.19	14	.85
EMP	-.42[a]	.18	-1.73	14	.11
HELP	-.10	.01	.37	14	.72
PSF	.36	.13	1.43	14	.18
BE	.05	.00	.18	14	.86
EH	.15	.02	.58	14	.57
CVC	-.11	.01	-.43	14	.67

Note. CS = conceptual skills; EMP = empowering; HELP = helping subordinates grow and succeed PSF = putting subordinates first; BE = behaving ethically; EH = emotional healing; CVC = creating value for the community; $df = N - 2$ where N equals the number of pairs of scores in the study
[a] $p \leq .05$ (1-tailed test conducted with the Pearson coefficient)
[b]2-tailed test conducted with the ANOVA as part of calculating the linear regression

The linear regression conducted between conceptual skills and years of ministry experience found no statistically significant correlation, $\beta(14) = -.05$, $p > .05$. The regression showed years of ministry experience was not a statistically significant predictor of conceptual skills among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = -.05$, $t(14) = -.19$, $p > .05$.

Years of ministry experience accounted for 0% (r^2 = .00) of the variance in conceptual skills scores.

The linear regression conducted between empowering and years of ministry experience found a statistically significant negative correlation, $\beta(14) = -.42$, $p \leq .05$. The regression also showed years of ministry experience was not a statistically significant predictor of empowering among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = -.42$, $t(14) = -1.73$, $p > .05$. Years of ministry experience accounted for 18 % (r^2 = .18) of the variance in empowering.

The linear regression conducted between helping subordinates grow and succeed and years of ministry experience found no statistically significant correlation, $\beta(14) = -.10$, $p > .05$. The regression also showed years of ministry experience was not a statistically significant predictor of helping subordinates grow and succeed among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = -.10$, $t(14) = .37$, $p > .05$. Years of ministry experience accounted for 1% (r^2 = .01) of the variance in helping followers grow and succeed.

The linear regression conducted between putting subordinates first and years of ministry experience found no statistically significant correlation, $\beta(14) = .36$, $p > .05$. The regression also showed years of ministry experience was not a statistically significant predictor of putting subordinates first among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = .36$, $t(14) = 1.43$, $p > .05$. Years of ministry experience accounted for 13% (r^2 = .13) of the variance in putting subordinates first.

The linear regression conducted between behaving ethically and years of ministry experience found no statistically significant correlation, $\beta(14) = .05$, $p > .05$, The regression also showed years of ministry experience was not a statistically significant predictor of behaving ethically among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = .05$, $t(14) = .18$, $p > .05$.

Years of ministry experience accounted for 0% (r^2 = .00) of the variance in behaving ethically.

The linear regression conducted between emotional healing and years of ministry experience found no statistically significant correlation, $\beta(14) = .15$, $p > .05$. The regression also showed years of ministry experience was not a statistically significant predictor of emotional healing among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = .15$, $t(14) = .58$, $p < .05$. Years of ministry experience accounted for 2% (r^2 = .02) of the variance in emotional healing.

The linear regression conducted between creating value for the community and years of ministry experience found no statistically significant correlation, $\beta(14) = -.11$, $p > .05$. The regression also showed years of ministry experience was not a statistically significant predictor of creating value for the community among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = .11$, $t(14) = -.43$, $p > .05$. Years of ministry experience accounted for 1% (r^2 = .01) of the variance in creating value for the community.

Research Question 4

The researcher analyzed the relationship between Nazarene pastors' years of full time ministry experience and servant leadership behaviors in research question four. The researcher sought to determine whether years of full time ministry experience was a strong predictor of servant leadership. A linear regression was calculated using pastors' years of full time ministry experience as the independent variable and each of the seven servant leadership behaviors measured by the SLQ (Liden et al., 2008) as the dependent variable. Table 7 illustrates the statistical findings from each linear regression calculated to answer the fourth research question.

Table 7

Relationship Between Years of Full Time Ministry Experience and Servant Leadership

Behavior	β	r^2	t	df	p[a]
CS	-.27	.07	-1.02	14	.32
EMP	-.14	.02	-.52	14	.62
HELP	-.13	.02	-.50	14	.62
PSF	.10	.01	.38	14	.71
BE	.09	.01	.32	14	.75
EH	-.05	.00	-.18	14	.86
CVC	-.20	.04	-.75	14	.46

Note. CS = conceptual skills; EMP = empowering; HELP = helping subordinates grow and succeed PSF = putting subordinates first; BE = behaving ethically; EH = emotional healing; CVC = creating value for the community; $df = N - 2$ where N equals the number of pairs of scores in the study
[a] 2-tailed test conducted with the ANOVA as part of calculating the linear regression.

The linear regression conducted between conceptual skills and years of full time ministry experience found no statistically significant correlation, $\beta(14) = -.27$, $p > .05$. The regression showed years of full time ministry experience was not a statistically significant predictor of conceptual skills among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = -.27$, $t(14) = -1.02$, $p > .05$. Years of full time ministry experience accounted for 7% ($r^2 = .07$) of the variance in conceptual skills.

The linear regression conducted between empowering and years of full time ministry experience found no statistically significant correlation, $\beta(14) = -.14$, $p > .05$. The regression also showed years of full time ministry experience was not a statistically significant predictor of empowering among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = -.14$, $t(14) = -.52$, $p > .05$. Years of full time ministry experience accounted for 2% ($r^2 = .02$) of the variance in empowering.

The linear regression conducted between helping subordinates grow and succeed and years of full time ministry experience found no statistically significant correlation, $\beta(14) = -.13$, $p > .05$. The regression also showed years of full time ministry experience was not a statistically significant predictor of helping subordinates grow and succeed among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = -.13$, $t(14) = -.50$, $p > .05$. Years of full time ministry experience accounted for 2% ($r^2 = .02$) of the variance in helping followers grow and succeed.

The linear regression conducted between putting subordinates first and years of full time ministry experience found no statistically significant correlation, $\beta(14) = .10$, $p > .05$. The regression also showed years of full time ministry experience was not a statistically significant predictor of putting subordinates first among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = .10$, $t(14) = .38$, $p > .05$. Years of full time ministry experience accounted for 1% ($r^2 = .01$) of the variance in putting subordinates first.

The linear regression conducted between behaving ethically and years of full time ministry experience found no statistically significant correlation, $\beta(14) = .09$, $p > .05$, The regression also showed years of full time ministry experience was not a statistically significant predictor of behaving ethically among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = .09$, $t(14) = .32$, p

> .05. Years of full time ministry experience accounted for 1% (r^2 = .01) of the variance in behaving ethically.

The linear regression conducted between emotional healing and years of full time ministry experience found no statistically significant correlation, $\beta(14) = -.05$, $p > .05$. The regression also showed years of full time ministry experience was not a statistically significant predictor of emotional healing among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = -.05$, $t(14) = -.18$, $p < .05$. Years of full time ministry experience accounted for 0% (r^2 = .00) of the variance in emotional healing.

The linear regression conducted between creating value for the community and years of full time ministry experience found no statistically significant correlation, $\beta(14) = -.20$, $p > .05$. The regression also showed years of full time ministry experience was not a statistically significant predictor of creating value for the community among Nazarene pastors, $\beta = -.20$, $t(14) = -.75$, $p > .05$. Years of full time ministry experience accounted for 4% (r^2 = .04) of the variance in creating value for the community.

Additional Tests

The researcher used two multiple regressions to determine if a combination of developmental factors predicted servant leadership among Nazarene pastors. These tests were not required by the research questions, but reflected the study's overall goal of analyzing the relationship between the developmental factors used by the Church of the Nazarene and servant leadership to ascertain if these individual factors or a combination of factors served as the stronger predictors of pastors' servant leadership behaviors.

Education and years of ministry experience.

The first multiple regression conducted used education and total years of ministry experience, which is the sum of both full time and part time service, as the independent variables. As with the linear regressions calculated in answering the research questions, the seven servant leadership behaviors measued by the SLQ (Liden et al., 2008) served as the depedent variables. Table 8 illustrates the statistical finding from each multiple regression calculated to analyze the relationship between education and years of ministry experience and servant leadership behaviors.

Table 8

Relationship Between Education, Years of Ministry Experience, and Servant Leadership

Behavior	F	r^2	ED[a] β	YM[b] β	ED t	YM t	p	df
CS	1.49	.19	-.44	.02	-1.72	.07	.26	13
EMP	2.22	.26	-.28	-.38	-1.17	-1.55	.15	13
HELP	.64	.09	-.29	.14	-1.07	.54	.54	13
PSF	2.58	.28	-.40	.42	-1.69	1.77	.11	13
BE	.02	.00	-.01	.05	-.03	.18	.99	13
EH	2.30	.26	-.49	.23	-2.05	.96	.14	13
CVC	.34	.05	-.19	-.08	-.71	-.30	.72	13

Note. CS = conceptual skills; EMP = empowering; HELP = helping subordinates grow and succeed; PSF = putting subordinates first; BE = behaving ethically; EH = emotional healing; CVC = creating value for the community; $df = N - p - 1$ where p = the number of predictors and N = the number of participants
[a] Education level
[b]Years of Ministry Experience.

The multiple regression conducted to predict conceptual skills using education and years of ministry experience as the independent variables was not statistically significant, $F(2, 13) = 1.49$, $p > .05$, $r^2 = .19$. Neither education ($\beta = -.44$, $t(13) = -1.72$, $p > .05$) nor years of ministry experience ($\beta = .02$, $t(13) = .07$, $p > .05$) were statistically significant predictors of conceptual skills among Nazarene pastors.

The multiple regression conducted to predict empowering using education and years of ministry experience as the independent variables was not statistically significant,

$F(2, 13) = 2.22$, $p > .05$, $R^2 = .26$. Neither education ($\beta = -.28$, $t(13) = -1.17$, $p > .05$) nor years of ministry experience ($\beta = -.38$, $t(13) = -1.55$, $p > .05$) were statistically significant predictors of empowering among Nazarene pastors.

The multiple regression conducted to predict helping subordinates grow and succeed using education and years of ministry experience as the independent variables was not statistically significant, $F(2, 13) = .64$, $p > .05$, $r^2 = .09$. Neither education ($\beta = -.29$, $t(13) = -1.07$, $p > .05$) nor years of ministry experience ($\beta = .14$, $t(13) = .54$, $p > .05$) were statistically significant predictors of helping subordinates grow and succeed among Nazarene pastors.

The multiple regression conducted to predict putting subordinates first using education and years of ministry experience as the independent variables was not statistically significant, $F(2, 13) = 2.58$, $p > .05$, $r^2 = .28$. Neither education ($\beta = -.40$, $t(13) = -1.69$, $p > .05$) nor years of ministry experience ($\beta = -.40$, $t(13) = 1.77$, $p > .05$) were statistically significant predictors of putting subordinates first among Nazarene pastors.

The multiple regression conducted to predict behaving ethically using education and years of ministry experience as the independent variables was not statistically significant, $F(2, 13) = .02$, $p > .05$, $r^2 = .00$. Neither education ($\beta = -.01$, $t(13) = -.03$, $p > .05$) nor years of ministry experience ($\beta = .05$, $t(13) = .18$, $p > .05$) were statistically significant predictors of behaving ethically among Nazarene pastors.

The multiple regression conducted to predict emotional healing using education and years of ministry experience as the independent variables was not statistically significant, $F(2, 13) = 2.30$, $p > .05$, $r^2 = .26$. Neither education ($\beta = -.49$, $t(13) = -2.05$, p

> .05) nor years of ministry experience (β = .23, t(13) = .96, p > .05) were statistically significant predictors of emotional healing among Nazarene pastors.

The multiple regression conducted to predict creating value for the community using education and years of ministry experience as the independent variables was not statistically significant, F(2, 13) = .34, p > .05, r^2 = .05. Neither education (β = -.19, t(13) = -.71, p > .05) nor years of ministry experience (β = -.08, t(13) = -.30, p > .05) were statistically significant predictors of creating value for the community among Nazarene pastors.

Education and years of full time ministry experience.

The second multiple regression conducted used education and years of full time ministry experience as the independent variables. As with the linear regressions calculated in answering the research questions, the seven servant leadership behaviors measued by the SLQ (Liden et al., 2008) served as the depedent variables. Table 9 illustrates the statistical findings from each multiple regression calculated to analyze the relationship between education and years of full time ministry experience and servant leadership behaviors.

Table 9

Relationship Between Education, Years of Full Time Ministry Experience, and Servant Leadership

Behavior	F	r^2	ED[a] β	YM[b] β	ED t	YM t	p	df
CS	1.51	.19	-.40	-.06	-1.38	-.20	.26	13
EMP	.89	.12	-.37	.05	-1.22	.18	.44	13
HELP	.49	.07	-.27	.00	-.86	.01	.62	13
PSF	1.74	.21	-.52	.37	-1.82	1.28	.21	13
BE	.07	.01	-.06	.12	-.19	.36	.94	13
EH	2.23	.26	-.56	.25	-2.10	.90	.15	13
CVC	.37	.05	-.14	-.12	-.46	-.39	.70	13

Note. CS = conceptual skills; EMP = empowering; HELP = helping subordinates grow and succeed; PSF = putting subordinates first; BE = behaving ethically; EH = emotional healing; CVC = creating value for the community; $df = N - p - 1$ where p = the number of predictors and N = the number of participants
[a] Education level
[b] Years of Ministry Experience.

The multiple regression conducted to predict conceptual skills using education and years of full time ministry experience independent variables was not statistically significant, $F(2, 13) = 1.51$, $p > .05$, $r^2 = .19$. Neither education ($\beta = -.40$, $t(13) = -1.38$, $p > .05$) nor years of full time ministry experience ($\beta = -.06$, $t(13) = -.20$, $p > .05$) were statistically significant predictors of conceptual skills among Nazarene pastors.

The multiple regression conducted to predict empowering using education and years of full time ministry experience as the independent variables was not statistically significant, $F(2, 13) = .89$, $p > .05$, $r^2 = .12$. Neither education ($\beta = -.37$, $t(13) = -1.22$, $p > .05$) nor years of full time ministry experience ($\beta = -.06$, $t(13) = .18$, $p > .05$) were statistically significant predictors of empowering among Nazarene pastors.

The multiple regression conducted to predict helping subordinates grow and succeed using education and years of full time ministry experience as the independent variables was not statistically significant, $F(2, 13) = .49$, $p > .05$, $r^2 = .07$. Neither education ($\beta = -.27$, $t(13) = -.86$, $p > .05$) nor years of full time ministry experience ($\beta = .00$, $t(13) = .01$, $p > .05$) were statistically significant predictors of helping subordinates grow and succeed among Nazarene pastors.

The multiple regression conducted to predict putting subordinates first using education and years of full time ministry experience as the independent variables was not statistically significant, $F(2, 13) = 1.74$, $p > .05$, $r^2 = .21$. Neither education ($\beta = -.52$, $t(13) = -1.82$, $p > .05$) nor years of full time ministry experience ($\beta = .37$, $t(13) = 1.28$, $p > .05$) were statistically significant predictors of putting subordinates first among Nazarene pastors.

The multiple regression conducted to predict behaving ethically using education and years of full time ministry experience as the independent variables was not statistically significant, $F(2, 13) = .07$, $p > .05$, $r^2 = .01$. Neither education ($\beta = -.06$, $t(13) = -.19$, $p > .05$) nor years of full time ministry experience ($\beta = .12$, $t(13) = .36$, $p > .05$) were statistically significant predictors of behaving ethically among Nazarene pastors.

The multiple regression conducted to predict emotional healing using education and years of full time ministry experience as the independent variables was not statistically significant, $F(2, 13) = 2.23$, $p > .05$, $r^2 = .26$. Neither education ($\beta = -.56$, $t(13) = -2.10$, $p > .05$) nor years of full time ministry experience ($\beta = .25$, $t(13) = .90$, $p > .05$) were statistically significant predictors of emotional healing among Nazarene pastors.

The multiple regression conducted to predict creating value for the community using education and years of full time ministry experience as the independent variables was not statistically significant, $F(2, 13) = .37$, $p > .05$, $r^2 = .05$. Neither education ($\beta = -.14$, $t(13) = -.46$, $p > .05$) nor years of full time ministry experience ($\beta = -.12$, $t(13) = -.39$, $p > .05$) were statistically significant predictors of creating value for the community among Nazarene pastors.

Conclusions

This study analyzed the relationships between education and servant leadership and between experience and servant leadership among Nazarene pastors. The researcher designed and implemented this study to determine if education, experience, or a combination of factors was the strongest predictor of Nazarene pastors' servant leadership behaviors. This section contains conclusions drawn from the statistical findings of this study. It should be noted this study's low response rate may have impacted the statistical analysis of the collected data, and similar studies using a larger data set may have different conclusions.

Nazarene Pastors and Servant Leadership

Nazarene pastors participating in this study rated very strongly in servant leadership behaviors. Although care must be taken when attempting to make definitive conclusions about a population based on descriptive statistics (Salkind, 2011) as used to answer the first research question, the probability exists that Nazarene pastors serving in the USA/Canada Region possess generally strong ratings in servant leadership behaviors. The findings of this study combined with the seeming compatibility between servant leadership and pastoral ministry and the findings of other research studies conducted on the application of servant leadership in various pastoral contexts (Bivins, 2005; Bunch, 2013; Dillman, 2003; Ming, 2005) supports this conclusion. Nazarene pastors serving in the USA/Canada Region likely possess strong ratings in servant leadership behaviors.

Servant Leadership and Developmental Factors

Nazarene pastors rate strongly in servant leadership, but the factors the denomination relies upon to develop those behaviors may not be as effective as expected. This study found no statistically significant predictive relationship between Nazarene pastors' level of education and any servant leadership behavior, between Nazarene pastors' years of ministry experience and any servant leadership behavior, or between Nazarene pastors' years of full time ministry experience and any servant leadership behavior. Similarly, no combination of these developmental factors served as a predictor of any servant leadership behavior among Nazarene pastors. These findings indicated the factors the Church of the Nazarene primarily uses for pastoral leadership development are not predictors of servant leadership behaviors.

The existence of three uexpected negative correlations between developmental factors and individual servant leadership behaviors support the conclusion that education and experience are not predictors of servant leadership among Nazarene pastors. The negative correlation between education and conceptual skills, $\beta(14) = -.43$, $p \leq .05$, posits the possibilty of conceptual skills being stronger among those with lower levels of formal education. Similarly the negative correlation between education and emotional healing, $\beta(14) = -.46$, $p \leq .05$, suggests sensitivity toward the needs of others (Liden et al., 2008) may also be more associated with lower levels of education. Finally, the negative correlation between pastors' total years of ministry experience and empowering, $\beta(14) = -.42$, $p \leq .05$, offers the possibility that seasoned pastors are less likely to enable members of their churches to identify and solve challenges (Liden et al.). These negative correlations provide additional credibility to the conclusion that education and experience are not strong predictors of Nazarene pastors' servant leadership behaviors.

Studies conducted by Anderson (2009) and Bunch (2013) similarly supported the conclusion that education and experience do not predict servant leadership behaviors. Anderson found graduating students of Geneva College's degree completion program had a better overall understanding of the servant leadership paradigm than incoming students, but there was little statistical difference between the two groups regarding the exhibition of servant leadership behaviors. Anderson's study indicated formal education may create awareness of the servant leadership paradigm, but does not necessarily result in stronger servant leadership behaviors. Bunch found statistically significant differences in pastors' servant leadership scores were not based on years of expereince. Bunch's conclusions suggested the compilation of experiences over time does not necessarily result in stronger

servant leadership behaviors among pastors. These studies supplement the conclusion that education and experience do not necessarily predict servant leadership among Nazarene pastors.

Implications and Recommendations

Nazarene pastors rating stongly in servant leadership behaviors implies the possibility of a strong connection between the servant leadership paradigm and pastoral ministry. Greenleaf (2002) believed servant leadership was an appropriate approach for members of the clergy because of the paradigm's emphasis of meeting followers' needs and encouraging followers to ultimately meet others' needs. Following Greenleaf's inspiration, several servant leadership commentators and researchers have proposed a strong connection between pastoral ministry and servant leadership (Agee, 2001; Akuchie, 1993; Rinehart, 1998; Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002; Sims, 1997). The present study seems to imply the existence of a significant relationship between servant leadership and pastoral ministry despite some scholars', such as Jones (2012), rejection of Greenleaf's (2002) views.

This implication reveals the need for extensive scholarly work regarding the relationship between servant leadership and pastoral ministry. Researchers must conduct similar studies on the relationship between pastoral ministry and a number of different leadership paradigms to determine if servant leadership possesses a unique association to the pastoral vocation. Pastoral ministry may connect more strongly to the influence exuded by servant leaders than the paradigm's emphasis on service, which means pastoral ministry could be strongly associated with several leadeship paradigms. Similarly, research must be conducted on the relationship between servant leadership and

pastoral ministry in different Christian traditions. Servant leadership may only connect strongly to pastoral ministry in the Church of the Nazarene. The researcher also recommnends the development of a theological model of contemporary pastoral ministry through which the characteristics of servant leadership can be applied and assessed. Jones (2012) argued the servant leadership paradigm, as envisioned by Greenleaf (2002), conflicted theologically with a biblical understanding of leadership through service. Jones's arguments raise the question of whether a possible connection between servant leadership and pastoral ministry would be based on pragmatic need or overarching theological principles. Additionally, studies similar to the present study should be conducted in different cultural contexts to discern if Nazarene pastors possess strong ratings in servant leadership globally or if this phenomenon occurs only in the United States and Canada. Such studies could demonstate whether servant leadership connects strongly to pastoral ministry throughout the world or pastoral ministry practiced in North America alone. A possible strong relationship between servant leadership and pastoral ministry especially within the Church of the Nazarene warrants additional scholarly attention.

The findings of this study do not support the Church of the Nazarene's reliance on education and experience to form pastors into servant leaders, but may have unexpectedly provided support to the larger servant leadership paradigm envisioned by Greenleaf (2002). Greenleaf believed servant leadership was volitional in nature meaning people choose to be servant leaders. The conviction that service rather than power or coercion should be the foundation for influence drove the choice to embrace servant leadership according to Greenleaf's postulation. Servant leaders are not developed procedurally, in

Greenleaf's view, but choose to embrace the paradigm, which changes the perception of factors such as education and experience from formational to augmental. Such factors augment the decision to become a servant leader, but people can exhibit servant leadership behaviors with no exposure to those factors according to Greenleaf.

Nazarene pastors may rate strongly in servant leadership regardless of level of education or years of experience because they may have chosen to exhibit behaviors consistent with the paradigm according to Greenleaf's (2002) view. Pastors may not have specifically chosen to become servant leaders, but possibly have chosen to influence by meeting followers' needs through intentional service. For such pastors, education and experience are still valuable regardless of their predictive qualities because they potentially fill an augmental role reinforcing the decision to embrace the paradigm. Greenleaf (1998b) argued education was necessary for the maturation of people meaning education potentially augments pastors' decisions to become servant leaders by strengthening their character. Anderson (2009) and Beazley and Beggs (2002) argued education contributes to people embracing servant leadership by creating awareness of the paradigm through program curricula. The Church of the Nazarene (2005) expects formal education to instill the competencies needed for effective ministry meaning pastors who have embraced servant leadership possess the skills necessary to serve their churches adequately. Greenleaf (2002) argued the ideal situation is servant leaders influencing followers to make the conscious choice of becoming servant leaders. Being influenced by and observing the effects of pastoral servant leaders may be one experience that motivates a candidate for ministry to embrace service as their primary approach to leadership. Education and experience may not predict servant leadership among Nazarene

pastors, but may augment the decision to become a servant leader, which is more in line with Greenleaf's original vision for the paradigm.

Greenleaf's (2002) concept of servant leadership being a volitional paradigm brings a number of additional implications. Leadership scholars seem to function with the presupposition that leaders are developed and leadership behaviors can be predicted based on certain developmental factors (Arvey et al., 2007; Atwater et al., 1999; Chan & Drasgow, 2001; Foti & Hauenstein, 2007; Ilies et al., 2004; Judge et al., 2002; Mumford et al., 1993). Greenleaf's belief in the volitional nature of servant leadership challenges presuppositions associated with leadership development and posits the idea that leaders may not only choose their approach to influencing followers, but also many qualities believed to contribute to leadership behaviors may not predict those behaviors.

Servant leadership possessing a volitional nature requires significant scientific investigation in order to be verified. The researcher recommends studies focused on principles and beliefs leaders embrace as part of their approach to influencing followers. While leaders may not use the term servant leadership, leaders may specifically identify principles, characteristics, or beliefs they have embraced that are consistent with the servant leadership paradigm. Qualitative research studies such as interviews, case studies, or observational studies could be helpful in ascertaining reasons strong servant leaders chose service as their primary approach to influencing followers. The possibility of servant leadership being volitional in nature requires extensive research based validation.

The potential compatibility between servant leadership and pastoral ministry coupled with the conceivable volitional nature of the paradigm could impact the education of Nazarene pastors. If servant leadership is the preferred approach to

leadership for Nazarene pastors and is to be chosen by Nazarene pastors, then servant leadership theory and practice must be a part of the curricular requirements for ordination in the Church of the Nazarene. Anderson (2009) recommended any institution interested in promoting servant leadership should design learning environments which emphasize community building and allow critical thinking about personal and professional lives. The researcher recommends an evaluation of the servant leadership paradigm by Clergy Development of the Church of the Nazarene to determine if the paradigm warrants special consideration within the denomination. If servant leadership emerges as a preferred approach to pastoral leadership, then the validated course of study must be reevaluated to ensure the inclusion of content and exercises that encourage pastors to embrace the driving principles and characteristics of servant leadership.

This study did not find education or experience to be strong predictors of servant leadership, but these factors may still play a role in the emergence of servant leaders. The researcher recommends more studies focused on the relationships between education and servant leadership and between experience and servant leadership. In future studies, the researcher recommends education should be classified into curriculum, educational settings, educational performance, or other possible variables. Similarly, several categories of experience should be examined because of the likelihood some experiences may influence servant leadership behaviors more than others. One of the limitations of this study was using broad concepts like level of education and years of ministry experience as predictive variables rather than itemized educational taxonomies or categories of experiences. A particular category of education or experience may predict

servant leadership behaviors among Nazarene pastors while predictive relationships between the larger concepts and servant leadership could not be identified by this study.

The findings of this study imply other factors such as family environment, personality type, life goals, cognitive development, and moral values may plausibly predict servant leadership behaviors. While Greenleaf's (2002) vision of servant leadership being a conscious choice directly challenges this implication, recent scholarly work supports this possibility and provides a foundation upon which future research focused on the relationship between servant leadership and potential developmental factors can be conducted. Bugenhagen (2006) and Phipps (2010) both connected servant leadership to Kegan's (1982) constructive-development theory with the belief that servant leadership behaviors are associated with the evolution of the personality. Washington et al. (2006) and Beck (2010) conducted research on the relationship between servant leadership and preexisting qualities with the belief that certain characteristics predict servant leadership behaviors. The researcher recommends extensive quantitative and qualitative research studies focused on the predictive relationship between possible developmental factors, other than education and experience, and servant leadership behaviors should be conducted in the future.

Finally and importantly, the researcher recommends this study should be replicated with a sampling strategy that fascilitates a stronger response rate. The possibility exists the low response rate of this study impacted its findings. The researcher chose simple random sampling because this strategy greatly reduces bias and allows more generalizeable conclusions (Salkind, 2012). Despite the advantages of this strategy, gathering data from the randomly selected sample of Nazarene pastors proved difficult

with only a very small percentage of those invited to participate responding. The researcher recommends convenience sampling in future studies. Convenience sampling involves collecting data from a captive audience such as all of the pastors attending a district assembly, seminar, or meeting. Convenience sampling is an easy strategy useful for collecting large amount of data, but is not random and only allows limited representation of the population. The disadvantage of convenience sampling is that it reduces the ability of researchers to make strong generalizeable conclusions (Salkind). A similar or duplicate study with considerably more data collected from Nazarene pastors serving in the USA/Canada Region through convenience sampling may provide additional insight into the results of the present study.

This study analyzed the relationships between education and servant leadership and experience and servant leadership. The goal was to determine whether these factors or a combination of factors strongly predicted servant leadership behaviors among Nazarene pastors. This study showed that Nazarene pastors generally rate strongly in servant leadership, but education and experience were not found to be strong predictors of servant leadership behaviors among Nazarene pastors. This study may have contributed to the belief that servant leadership is compatible with pastoral ministry and unexpectedly supported the notion presented by Greenleaf (2002) that servant leadership is volitional in nature. Ideally, this study will serve as the catalyst for future research associated with pastoral servant leadership.

REFERENCES

Agee, B. R. (2001). Servant leadership as an effective approach to leadership in the church. *Southwest Journal of Theology*, *43*(3), 7-19.

Akuchie, N. B. (1993). The servants and the superstars: An examination of servant leadership in light of Matthew 20:20-28. *Christian Education Journal*, *14*(*1*), 39-47.

Anderson, A. R. (2009). *Servant-leader development in an adult accelerated degree completion program: A mixed-methods study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.proxy.olivet.edu/docview/305135307/abstract?accountid=12974

Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivusubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*(3), 261-295. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00030-4

Arvey, R. D., Zhang, Z., Avolio, B. J., & Krueger, R. F. (2007). Developmental and genetic determinants of leading role occupancy among women. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(3). 693-706. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.693

Atwater, L. E., Dionne, S. D., Avolio, B., Camobreco, J. F., & Lau, A. W. (1999). A longitudinal study of the leadership development process: Individual differences predicting leader effectiveness. *Human Relations*, *52*(12), 1543-1562. doi:10.1023/A:1016985019728

Avolio, B. J. (1984). The "natural": Some antecedents to transformational leadership. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *17*(9), 1559-1581. doi:10.1080/01900699408524956

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1995). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire technical report*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Bandura, A. (1971). *Social Learning Theory*. New York, NY: General Learning Press.

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

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectation*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, *52*(2), 130-139. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.52.2.130

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). [Kindle edition]. Retrieved from http://www.amazon.com/Transformational-Leadership-Ronald-E-Riggio-ebook/dp/B000SI6HNS/ref=sr_1_1_bnp_1_kin?ie=UTF8&qid=1393878194&sr=8-1&keywords=bass+and+riggio+transformational+leadership

Beazley, H., & Beggs, J. (2002). Teaching servant-leadership. In L. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the twenty-first century* (pp. 53-64). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Beck, C. D. (2010). *Antecedents of servant leadership: A mixed methods study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retreived from http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/dissertations/AAI3412910/

Benis, W., & Nanus, B. (1997). *Leaders: Strategies for taking charge*. New York, NY: HarperBusiness.

Bivins, D. C. (2005). *A study of the correlation between servant leadership and ministry satisfaction in church leaders in Alaska* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.proxy.olivet.edu/pqdtft/docview/305419562/abstract/13F7CB2F6A77F23D739/1?accountid=12974

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1972). *The managerial grid: Key orientation for achieving production through people*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company.

Blanchard, K., Zigarmi, P., & Zigarmi, D. (1985). *Leadership and the one minute manager: Increasing effectiveness through situational leadership*. New York, NY: William Morrow.

Bluck, S, & Glück, J. (2004). Making things better and learning a lesson: Experiencing wisdom across the lifespan. *Journal of Personality*, *72*(3), 543-572.

Bredfelt, G. (2006). *Great leader great teacher: Rediscovering the biblical vision for leadership*. [Kindle edition]. Retrieved from http://www.amazon.com/Great-Leader-Teacher-Recovering ebook/dp/B003719GQ8/ref=tmm_kin_title_0?ie=UTF8&qid=1363982694&sr=8 1.

Brungardt, C. (1997). The making of leaders: A review of the research in leadership development and education. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *3*(3), 81-95. doi:10.1177/107179199700300309

Buchen, I. H. (1998). Servant leadership: A model for future faculty and future institutions. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *5*(1), 125-134. doi:10.1177/107179199800500111

Bugenhagen, M. J. (2006). *Antecedents of transactional, transformation, and servant leadership: A constructive-development theory approach* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/aglecdiss/2

Bunch, C. (2013). *Servant leadership and African American pastors* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://aura.antioch.edu/etds/20

Burns, J. M. (2012). *Leadership*. [Kindle edition]. Retrieved from http://www.amazon.com/Leadership-James-MacGregor-Burns-ebook/dp/B007MFECFU/ref=sr_1_1_bnp_1_kin?ie=UTF8&qid=1393874844&sr=8-1&keywords=burns+leadership

Chan, S. (2006). *Liturgical theology: The church as worshiping community*. Dowers Grove: IL: IVP Academic

Chan, K. Y., & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: Understanding the motivation to lead. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(3), 481-498. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.481

Church of the Nazarene. (2005). International sourcebook on developmental standards for ordained ministers. Retrieved from http://nazarenepastor.org/ClergyEducation/Portals/0/Resources/ISODSO.pdf

Church of the Nazarene. (2009). *2009-2013 Manual Church of the Nazarene*. Kansas City, MO: Nazarene Publishing House.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, *12*(4), 637-647. doi:10.5465/AMR.1987.4306715

Connaughton, S. L., Lawrence, F. L., & Ruben, B. D. (2003). Leadership development as a systematic and multidisciplinary enterprise. *Journal of Education for Business*, *79*(1), 46-51.

Cope, J., & Watts, G. (2000). Learning by doing – An exploration of experience, critical incidents and reflection in entrepreneurial learning. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*, *6*(3), 104-124.

Course of Study Advisory Committee. (2006). Sourcebook of ordination (United States of America Edition.). Retrieved February 6, 2013, from http://nazarenepastor.org/ClergyEducation/LinkClick51f0.pdf?link=Resources/USASB.pdf&tabid=74&mid=500

Dennis, R., & Winston, B. E. (2003). A factor analysis of Page and Wong's servant leadership instrument. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *24*(8), 455-459. doi:10.1108/01437730310505585

Dillman, S. W. (2003). *Leading in the Land of Oz: Cross-cultural study of servant leadership in Australia* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.proxy.olivet.edu/pqdtft/docview/305055006/abstract/140416A26B35D3A41FE/1?accountid=12974

Dowson, M., & McInerney, D. M. (2005). For what should theological colleges education? A systematic investigation of ministry education perceptions and priorities. *Review of Religious Research*, *46*(4), 403-421.

Dragoni, L., Tesluk, P. E., Russell, J. E. A., & Oh, I. S. (2009). Understanding managerial development: Integrating developmental assignments, learning orientation, and access to developmental opportunities in predicting managerial competencies. *Academy of Management Journal*, *52*(4), 731-743. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2009.43669936

Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, *51*(1), 61-94.

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), 49-72.

Foti, R. J., & Hauenstein, N. M. A. (2007). Pattern and variable approaches in leadership emergence and effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(2), 347-355. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.347

Galton, F. (1869). *Hereditary genius: An inquiry into its laws and consequences*. London, UK: Macmillan and Company.

Garber, J. S., Madigan, E. A., Click, E. R., & Fitzpatrick, J. J. (2009). Attitudes toward collaboration and servant leadership among nurses, physicians and residents. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, *23*(4), 331-340. doi:10.1080/13561820902886253

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2012). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (10th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

General Board of the Church of the Church of the Nazarene. (1952). A philosophy of education for the Church of the Nazarene. Retrieved February 4, 2013, from http://didache.nazarene.org/index.php?

Gonzalez, J. L. (1984). *The story of Christianity volume 1: The early church to the dawn of the reformation*. San Francisco, CA: Harper San Francisco.

Gonzalez, J. L. (1985). *The story of Christianity volume 2: The reformation to the present day*. San Francisco, CA: Harper San Francisco.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1998a). The servant as religious leader. In L. Spears (Ed.), *The power of servant leadership* (pp. 111-168). San Francisco, CA: Berret-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1998b). Education and maturity. In L. Spears (Ed.), *The power of servant leadership* (pp. 61-76). San Francisco, CA: Berret-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1998c). Seminary as servant. In L. Spears (Ed.), *The power of servant leadership* (pp. 169-234). San Francisco, CA: Berret-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness* [Kindle edition]. Retrieved from http://www.amazon.com/Servant-Leadership-Legitimate-Anniversary-ebook/dp/B00511JL6C/ref=sr_1_1?s=digital-text&ie=UTF8&qid=1363982995&sr=1-1&keywords=sevant+leadership+a+journey+into+the+nature+of+legitimate+power+and+greatness.

Hale, J. R., & Fields, D. L. (2007). Exploring servant leadership across cultures: A study of followers in Ghana and the USA. *Leadership*, *3*(4), 397-417. doi:10.1177/1742715007082964

Han, Y., Kakabadse, N. K., & Kakabadse, A. (2010). Servant leadership in the People's Republic of China: A case study of the public sector. *The Journal of Management Development*, *29*(3), 265-281. doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy.olivet.edu/10.1108/02621711011025786

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal*, *23*(5), 26-34.

Hesse, H. (2013). *Journey to the east* [Kindle edition]. Retrieved from http://www.amazon.com/The-Journey-East-Hermann-Hesse/dp/0312421680/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1412613133&sr=8-1&keywords=journey+to+the+east.

Honaker, K. (2005). Stay ahead of the curve. *Industrial Distribution, 94(*2), 30-34

House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. Hunt, & L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189-207). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Hu, J., & Liden, R. C. (2011). Antecedents of team potency and team effectiveness: An examination of goal and process clarity and servant leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *96*(4), 851-862. doi:10.1037/a0022465

Humphreys, J. H. (2005). Contextual implications for transformational and servant leadership: A historical investigation. *Management Decision*, *43*(10), 1410-1431.

Hybels, B. (2002). *Courageous leadership.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Ilies, R., Gerhardt, M. W., & Le, H. (2004). Individual differences in leadership emergence: Integrating meta-analytic findings and behavioral genetics estimates. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *12*(3), 207-219. doi:10.1111/j.0965-075X.2004.00275.x

International Board of Education. (2011). USA/Canada institutions. Retrieved from http://nazarene.org/education/iboe/usacanada/display.html

Irvin, D. T., & Sunquist, S. W. (2007). *History of the world Christian movement volume I: Earliest Christianity to 1453*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Jones, G. W. (2012). *A theological comparison between social science models and a biblical perspective of servant leadership* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.proxy.olivet.edu/pqdtft/docview/1018562752/abstract/13F7C7731C44405C954/5?accountid=12974

Joseph, E. E., & Winston, B. E. (2005). A correlation of servant leadership, leader trust, and organizational trust. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *26*(1), 6-22.

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(4), 765-780. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.765

Katz, R. L. (1955). Skills of an effective administrator. *Harvard Business Review*, *33*(1), 33-42.

Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self: Problem and process in human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kempster, S. (2006). Leadership learning through lived experience: A process of apprenticeship? *Journal of Management & Organization*, *12*(1), 4-22.

King, K. P. (1998). *A guide to perspective transformation and learning activities: The learning activities survey*. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools.

Kohlberg, L. & Mayer, R. (1972). Development as the aim of education. *Harvard Educational Review*, *42*(2), 449-496.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kuhnert, K. W., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, *12*(4), 648-657. doi:10.5465/AMR.1987.4306717

Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2013). *Practical research: Planning and design* (10th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Laub, J. A. (1999). *Development of the servant organizational leadership assessment (SOLA) instrument* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.proxy.olivet.edu/pqdtft/docview/304517144/abstract/1402B7E5157206BA746/1?accountid=12974

Liden, R. C., & Maslyn, J. M. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management*, *24*, 43-72.

Liden, R. C., Panaccio, A., Meuser, J. D., Hu, J., & Wayne, S. J. (2014). Servant leadership: Antecedents, processes, and outcomes. In D. Day (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations* (pp. 357-379). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

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*, 161-177. doi:10.1016/j.leaquaa.2008.01.006

Malphurs, A. (1999). *Developing a vision for ministry in the 21st century* (2nd ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.

Mann, R. D. (1959). A review of the relationship between personality and performance in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56(4), 241-270. doi:10.1037/h0044587

Messner, P. E., & Ruhl, M. L. (1998). Management by fact: A model application of performance indicators by an educational leadership department. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, *12*(1), 23-33.

McCall, M. W., Lombardo, M. M., & Morrison, A. M. (1988). *The lessons of experience: How successful executives develop on the job*. New York, NY: Lexington Books.

McCauley, C. D., Drath, W. H., Palus, C. J., O'Connor, P. M. G., & Baker, B. A. (2006). The use of constructive-development theory to advance the understanding of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*, 634-653. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.006

McCauley, C. D., Ruderman, M. N., Ohlott, P. J., & Morrow, J. E. (1994). Assessing the developmental components of managerial jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *79*(4), 544-560.

McKenna, R. B., Yost, P. R., & Boyd, T. N. (2007). Leadership development and clergy: Understanding the events and lessons that shape pastoral leaders. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 35*(3), 179-189.

Ming, H. S. (2005). *Servant leadership and its effect on church organization* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.proxy.olivet.edu/pqdtft/docview/305399252/3333C4A70E0D4A94PQ/1?accountid=12974

Mumford, M. D., O'Connor, J., Clifton, T. C., Connelly, M. S., & Zaccaro, S. J. (1993). Background data constructs as predictors of leadership behavior. *Human Performance*, *62*(2), 151-195.

Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Page, D., & Wong, P. T. P. (2000). A conceptual framework for measuring servant leadership. In J. Abjibolosoo (Ed.), *The human factor in shaping the course of history and development* (pp. 69-110). Washington, DC: American University Press.

Patterson, K. A. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.proxy.olivet.edu/pqdtft/docview/305234239/abstract/1402B728D99269E42BE/1?accountid=12974

Phipps, K. A. (2010). Servant leadership and constructive development theory. *Journal of Leadership Education*, *9*(2), 151-170. doi:10.12806/V9/I2/TF1

Reiland, D. (2011). *Amplified leadership: Five practices to establish influence, build people, and impact others for a lifetime*. Lake Mary, FL: Charisma House.

Reinke, S. J. (2004). Service before self: Towards a theory of servant-leadership. *Global Virtue Ethics Review*, *5*(3), 30-57.

Rinehart, S. T. (1998). *Upside down: The paradox of servant leadership*. Colorado Springs, CO: Navpress.

Robson, C. (2011). *Real world research* (3rd ed.). Chichester, United Kingdom: Wiley.

Rowell, J. L., (2010). *Clergy retention in the Church of the Nazarene: The role of the district superintendent in clergy decision-making regarding persistence in active vocational ministry* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.olivet.edu/edd_diss/13/

Russell, R. F. (2001). The role of values in servant leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *22*(2), 76-84.

Russell, R. F., & Stone, A. G. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *23*(3), 145-157. doi:10.1108/01437730210424084

Salkind, N. J. (2011). *Statistics for people who (think they) hate statistics* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage

Salkind, N. J. (2012). *Exploring research* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Savage-Austin, A. R. (2009). *Servant leadership: A phenomenological study of practices, experiences, organizational effectiveness, and barriers* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.proxy.olivet.edu/pqdtft/docview/305159665/abstract/13F7CEC72B16C5AB001/1?accountid=12974

Scuderi, N. F. (2010). *Servant leadership and transformational leadership in church organizations* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.proxy.olivet.edu/pqdtft/docview/749934545/abstract/532C259EF54844EDPQ/1?accountid=12974

Sendjaya, S., & Sarros, J.C. (2002). Servant leadership: Its origins, development, and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *9*(2), 57-64. doi:10.1177/107179190200900205

Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2008). Defining and measuring servant leadership behaviour in organization. *Journal of Management Studies*, *45*(2), 402-424.

Sims, B. J. (1997). *Servanthood: Leadership for the third millennium*. Boston, MA: Cowley Publications.

Smith, B. N., Montagno, R. V., & Kuzmenko, T. N. (2004). Transformational and servant leadership: Content and contextual comparison. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *10*(4), 80-91.

Spears, L. C. (2002). Introduction: Tracing the past, present, and future of servant-leadership. In L. Spears, & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the twenty-first century* (pp. 1-18). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *The Journal of Psychology*, *25*(1), 35-71. doi:10.1080/00223980.1948.9917362

Tilstra, D. (2006). Leadership development in higher education: What the research shows is working and why. *Journal of Applied Christian Leadership*, *2*(2), 18-25.

Toor, S., & Ofori, G. (2008). Tipping points that inspire leadership: An exploratory study of emergent project leaders. *Engineering, Construction, and Architectural Management*, *15*(3), 212-229. doi:10.1108/09699980810867389

Union Theological Seminary in the City of New York. (2013). Ordination process by denomination. Retrieved March 21, 2013, from http://www.utsnyc.edu/student-life/religious-spiritual-life/ordination-resources/ordination-process-by-denomination.

USA/Canada Regional Office Church of the Nazarene (2013). Clergy Development: Non-degree, credentialing programs. Retrieved from http://nazarenepastor.org/ClergyEducation/Nondegree/tabid/67/Default.html?link=67&tabid=72&mid=465

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

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. doi:10.1037/a0018867

Washington, R. R., Sutton, C. D., & Field, H. S. (2006). Individual differences in servant leadership: The roles of values and personality. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *27*(8), 700-716. doi: 10.1108/01437730610709309

Weber, M. (1948). *The theory of social and economic organization*. [Kindle edition]. Retrieved from http://www.amazon.com/Theory-Social-Economic-Organization-ebook/dp/B003IGDDJS/ref=sr_1_1_bnp_1_kin?ie=UTF8&qid=1393877228&sr=8-1&keywords=max+weber+theory+of+social+and+economic+organizations

Winston, B. E. (2004). Servant leadership at Heritage Bible College: A single-case study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *25*(7), 600-617.

Wis, R. M. (2002). The conductor as servant-leader. *Music Educators Journal*, *89*(2), 17-23.

Yockey, R. D. (2011). *SPSS demystified: A step-by-step guide to successful data analysis* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Prentice-Hall.

Zaccaro, S. J. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychologist*, *62*(1), 6-16. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.6

Zacharatos, A., Barling, J., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Development and effects of transformational leadership in adolescents. *Leadership Quarterly*, *11*(2), 211-226.

Appendix A

Pastor’s Survey

Pastor's Questionnaire

May 8, 2013

What is your age? _____

How old were you when you came to faith in Jesus Christ? _____

What country are you currently serving in? (Circle one) United States Canada

What is your gender? (Circle one) male female

What is your race? (Circle one)

White
African American/ Black
Hispanic/ Latin American
Native American/ Native Alaskan
Asian
Pacific Islander
Other: _____

What is the highest level of education you have completed? (Circle one)

4.1.1.Nazarene course of study
4.1.2.Certificate program
4.1.3.Associate degree
4.1.4.Bachelor's degree
4.1.5.Master's degree
4.1.6.Doctoral degree

How many years have you served in vocational ministry? _____

How many years have you served in full time vocational ministry? _____

Appendix B

Revised SLQ

Servant Leadership

Liden, R.C., Wayne, S.J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multilevel assessment. ***Leadership Quarterly,*** 19, 161-177.

****
**

Section A. In the following set of questions, think of your pastor.
Please select your response from Strongly Disagree = 1 to Strongly Agree = 7 presented below and enter the corresponding number in the space to the left of each question.
****
*****

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

____1. My pastor can tell if something is going wrong.

____2. My pastor gives me the responsibility to make important decisions about my job.

____3. My pastor makes my career development a priority.

____4. My pastor seems to care more about my success than his/her own.

____5. My pastor holds high ethical standards.

____6. I would seek help from my pastor if I had a personal problem.

____7. My pastor emphasizes the importance of giving back to the community.

____8. My pastor is able to effectively think through complex problems.

____9. My pastor encourages me to handle important work decisions on my own.

____10. My pastor is interested in making sure that I achieve my career goals.

____11. My pastor puts my best interests ahead of his/her own.

____12. My pastor is always honest.

____13. My pastor cares about my personal well-being.

____14. My pastor is always interested in helping people in our community.

____15. My pastor has a thorough understanding of our organization and its goals.

____16. My pastor gives me the freedom to handle difficult situations in the way that I feel is best.

____17. My pastor provides me with work experiences that enable me to develop new skills.

____18. My pastor sacrifices his/her own interests to meet my needs.

____19. My pastor would **not** compromise ethical principles in order to achieve success.

____20. My pastor takes time to talk to me on a personal level.

____21. My pastor is involved in community activities.

____22. My pastor can solve work problems with new or creative ideas.

____23. When I have to make an important decision at work, I do not have to consult my pastor first.

____24. My pastor wants to know about my career goals.

____25. My pastor does whatever she/he can to make my job easier.

____26. My pastor values honesty more than profits.

____27. My pastor can recognize when I'm down without asking me.

____28. I am encouraged by my pastor to volunteer in the community.

Item Key

Item #s	Reference/comments
1, 8, 15, 22	Servant Leadership: Conceptual skills
2, 9, 16, 23	Servant Leadership: Empowering: our items
3, 10, 17, 24	Servant Leadership: Helping subordinates grow and. Item #3 is adapted from Ehrhart, PPsych, Spring, 2004
4, 11, 18, 25	Servant Leadership Putting subordinates first. Items #11 and #18 adopted from Barbuto & Wheeler, paper under review at G&OM.
5, 12, 19, 26	Servant Leadership: Behaving. Item #5 is adapted from Ehrhart, PPsych, Spring, 2004.
6, 13, 20, 27	Servant Leadership: Emotional healing
7, 14, 21, 28	Servant Leadership: Creating value for the community. Item #7 is adopted from Ehrhart, PPsych, Spring, 2004

Appendix C

Letter of Recommendation from

Dr. Daniel Copp

CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE

Global Clergy Development

Dr. Daniel R. Copp, Director

October 1, 2013

Dear Pastor,

The Church of the Nazarene is committed to forming pastors as servant leaders in the life of the local church. In the spirit of that commitment, the Church of the Nazarene invests considerable resources towards pastoral education and vocational training. Our effectiveness in preparing pastors for this critical role would increase with a deeper understanding of the relationship between pastoral education, vocational ministry experience, and servant leadership behavior.

The examination of this relationship is the subject of a research project conducted by Rev. Justin Hayes. Rev. Hayes is a Nazarene pastor serving in Kentucky and passionate about pastoral leadership development. This research project will help us better understand the role of education and vocational experience in leadership development.

You have been randomly selected to participate in this research project. Your role will consist of two parts. First, you are asked to complete a short survey online. It will take only a few minutes. Second, members of your church board are asked to rate you in servant leadership behaviors in a short online questionnaire. Two board members are required. Confidentiality will be strictly maintained. You can receive a copy of your personal servant leadership rating if you choose.

I encourage you to assist Rev. Hayes in this research project. Your time investment is minimal, but the Church of the Nazarene could certainly benefit.

Grace & Peace,

Daniel R. Copp, D.Min.
Global Clergy Development Director

GLOBAL MINISTRY CENTER
www.nazarene.org 17001 Prairie Star Parkway Lenexa, KS 66220 913-577-0500