

Seton Hall University
eRepository @ Seton Hall

Theses

2010

The Relationship Between Servant Leadership Behavior and Individual Personality Style in New York Annual Conference United Methodist Pastors

Lisa A. Krekeler

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Krekeler, Lisa A., "The Relationship Between Servant Leadership Behavior and Individual Personality Style in New York Annual Conference United Methodist Pastors" (2010). *Theses*. 54.
<https://scholarship.shu.edu/theses/54>

**The Relationship Between Servant Leadership Behavior and
Individual Personality Style in New York Annual Conference
United Methodist Pastors**

Lisa A. Krekeler

**Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Strategic Communication
Seton Hall University
2010**

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the relationship between Servant Leadership behavior and the Big Five personality traits (extraversion, agreeableness, openness to experience, conscientiousness, and neuroticism). The subjects include 33 United Methodist Pastors. The self-rater version of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) and the Big Five Inventory (BFI) are used to evaluate participant's servant leadership behavior and personality. Statistical analysis includes Pearson correlations and Linear Regression, which determine the relationship between each personality factor and servant leadership behavior. Post hoc stepwise regression analysis additionally determine which personality variable would be the best predictors for the SLQ subscales. The research findings reveal a strong positive relationship between servant leadership and conscientiousness and agreeableness. This study contributes to previous research regarding the determinants of servant leadership and further developed and supported a trait based approach to leadership studies. Future studies should extend the research on servant leadership and personality style based on the results of this study. Furthermore, organizations and leaders should consider personality traits when promoting servant leadership behavior and hiring potential employees.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks to Dr Geoff Leatham who went above and beyond to advise and strengthen my research through statistical and subject matter expertise. Thanks, also, to Dr. Guy Golan for continual support, encouragement and guidance during the projects early stages. A special thanks to all my family, friends and co-workers who understood this project's importance and helped in its development.

Thesis Advisors:

Guy Golan, Ph.D

Monsignor Dennis Mahon, Ph.D

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background.....	1
Definitions.....	3
Purpose & Objectives	3
Rationale	4
 LITERATURE REVIEW	 6
Introduction	6
The Historical Development of Servant Leadership	7
Servant Leadership Theory Development	8
Defining Servant Leadership	8
Servant Leadership Behavior Characteristics and Attributes	9
Transformational Leadership and Servant Leadership	12
Leadership and Personality.....	13
The Big Five Model of Personality	14
Servant Leadership Behaviors and Personality.....	16
Five Factor Model of Personality and Servant Leadership	19
Summary of Literature	24
 METHODOLOGY.....	 25
Introduction	25
Selecting the Organization	25
Participants and Procedure.....	26
Instrument Selection and Design.....	28
Servant Leadership Instrument Selection	28
The SLQ Design.....	30
Personality Instrument Selection	31
The BFI Design	32
Analysis Plan	33

RESULTS.....	34
Introduction	34
Descriptive Statistics	34
Research Questions Test.....	35
Personality Type and Servant Leadership (RQ1)	35
Neuroticism and Servant Leadership (RQ2)	35
Hypotheses Test.....	36
Agreeableness and Servant Leadership (H1)	36
Openness to Experience and Servant Leadership (H2)	37
Extraversion and Servant Leadership (H3).....	38
Conscientiousness and Servant Leadership (H4).....	38
DISCUSSION	40
Introduction	40
Findings.....	40
Limitations.....	43
Implications.....	44
Directions for Future Research.....	45
Conclusion.....	46
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: SLQ (Servant Leadership Questionnaire)	48
Appendix B: BFI (Big Five Inventory)	49
Appendix C: Recruitment Letter.....	50
Appendix D: Letter Requesting Permission.....	51
REFERENCES	52

LIST OF TABLES

I:	Servant Leadership and Attributes.....	11
II:	Demographics of Participants.....	27
III:	Example SLQ Questions	31
IV:	Example BFI Questions	32
V:	Descriptive Statistics.....	34
VI:	Significant Regression Variables of Servant Leadership.....	36
VII:	Correlations Between Personality Factors and Servant Leadership Behavior.....	37
VIII:	Significant Regression Variables of SLQ Factors	39

INTRODUCTION

Background

Leadership has emerged as a highly researched, discussed and debated concept in past and recent years. Despite the large amount of received attention, there is still no universal definition of leadership due to its complexity (Lussier & Achua, 2007). This distinguishing characteristic of leadership is what has made the topic so appealing to researchers, organizations and business professionals. Over time, leadership approaches, theory, and skills have evolved and changed due to shifting environmental, social, and contextual trends.

One of the highly recognized first major shifts in leadership theory came from the classical approach theorist, Frederick Taylor. Taylor applied scientific inquiry focused on the micro relationship level between the manager and employee (Miller, 2006). Taylor maintained that there is a strict distinction between workers and managers and focused on workers outputs. Taylor's scientific approach to the study of leadership in the organizational context is still seen as a method today to increase productivity and enhance efficiency.

The next shift in leadership theory came from the human relations approach. A critical point for the human relations approach came in the late 1920's with the Hawthorne studies. The studies found that worker output increased through the working of informal social factors (Miller, 2006). The human relations approach began to recognize the relationship value between the worker and manager. In the mid 1940's Maslow responded to introducing social factors into the study of organizational leadership with his hierarchy of needs. Additionally, in the 1950's, Douglas McGregor introduced his Theory X and

Theory Y management approach; Theory X represents the negative aspects of the classical approach and Theory Y represents managers who uphold human relations values and management approaches (Miller, 2006). The evolution of leadership theory and focus shows that there is a growing interest in and need for new leadership approaches.

All prior theories suggest that there are underlying influential and persuasive elements to leadership. Greenleaf (1970) understood a leader's influential power and developed a leadership theory that positively utilizes that power by placing all energy and focus on the followers. This leadership theory and approach is known as 'servant leadership.' Servant leadership has gained popularity in management press, academic research, and society due to shifting values and roles seen in the workplace. In discussing servant leadership Laub (1999) notes that, "a new leadership is needed: leadership that is not trendy and transient, but a leadership that is rooted in our most ethical and moral teaching; leadership that works because it is based on how people need to be treated, motivated and led" (p. 7).

Leadership has been seen as an outward projection of an individual's values and beliefs. This trait-based approach to leadership has received academic support and practical application within an organizational context (Zaccaro, 2007; Judge, Bono, Illies, & Gerhardt, 2002; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). Understanding leadership behaviors through an individual's personality can impact the organization's success and failure. Recognizing the link between leadership behavior and personality type, this study seeks to expand upon previous study findings and approaches to leadership theory in relation to personality and trait theory.

Definitions

While there is no universal definition of servant leadership, scholars agree that an important element in Greenleaf's writings includes a motivation to serve others (Russell & Stone, 2002; Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002; Blunt, 2003; Lloyd, 1996; Spears, 1996; Block, 1993). Laub (1999) even notes that Greenleaf himself does not provide an explicit definition of the term. In response to the various working definitions provided for servant leadership, scholars have tried to distinguish servant leadership from other leadership theories by identifying specific characteristics and traits associated with servant leadership behavior. For purposes of this study, servant leadership is defined as having a motivation to serve others through the following characteristics/constructs: altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping and organizational stewardship (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006). This study seeks to understand servant leadership theory in relation to individual personality type. One approach to studying leadership is through trait theory. Trait theory is defined as, "distinguishing personal characteristics [and] personality as a combination of traits that classifies an individual's behavior" (Lussier & Achua, 2007, p.31).

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study is to analyze the relationship between servant leadership behavior and personality type.

The first objective of the study is to expand upon current research and understanding of servant leadership behaviors by evaluating distinguishing servant leadership behavior characteristics as presented in Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ). This is important because the SLQ and the associated

servant leadership defining features have only been used in a limited number of studies (Anderson, 2009).

The second objective is to analyze the relationship between the specific servant leadership characteristics of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping and organizational stewardship to the Big Five Model of Personality types of extraversion, openness to experiences, agreeableness, neuroticism and conscientiousness. This will help to specifically support existing research surrounding servant leadership characteristics and personality traits.

Rationale

Providing empirical support and evidence for the relationships between servant leadership behavior and individual personality type has multiple organizational and academic implications.

As environmental and generational shifts occur in the workplace, leaders are finding themselves having to deal with a vast array of issues and problems in which certain leadership skills and approaches are necessary. Organizations are becoming more transparent as the media is more accessible through technological advances. Having a sound leadership approach that originates from a motivation to serve and focus on followers needs is becoming a necessity for successful leaders. Kouzes and Posner (2003) emphasize the importance of being credible leaders and strengthening others. Servant leadership provides a model for leaders to follow in order to motivate, focus on, and strengthen others. Understanding servant leadership within a context of personality type can benefit organizations in their leadership selection and understanding of leadership actions. Being able to recognize potential leaders based on personality can help increase

the organizations success. Additionally, “several of the top twenty companies ranked in the 2001 issue of Fortune magazine’s 100 Best Companies to Work For in America were servant-led organizations” (Ruschman, 2002). Due to the apparent relationship between servant leadership and successful organizations, it is important to provide empirical and academic research support regarding the type of people who may exhibit servant leadership behavior.

More specifically, there is a lack of empirical support in relationship to servant leadership and individual attributes (Russell, 2001). While there have been recent strides made on the topic of servant leadership and personality type, there is still a need for more research (Washington, Sutton, & Field, 2006; Russell & Stone, 2002). This study is designed to expand upon past research and provide grounds upon which more research can be conducted. Leadership is always evolving and being able to bring more awareness and empirical evidence to servant leadership can help support organizations in an ever-changing environment.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

At the core of leadership is an individual's ability to influence, motivate and inspire followers. Contemporary writers affirm this by emphasizing leadership being built upon forming positive open relationships with others (Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Bethel, 2009; Maxwell, 2005; Braye, 2002). Non-contemporary leaders and scholars also support this position. In the early 1800's, then President, John Quincy Adams said, "if you actions inspire others to dream more, learn more, do more and become more, you are a leader." There are also other more power driven and authoritarian leadership approaches, which view the leader as being the decision maker and change agent. These methods are more in line with transformational and transactional leadership (Lussier & Achua, 2007). Jack Welch, former CEO of General Electric combines these approaches by believing that "leaders are people who inspire with clear vision of how things can be done better" (Slater, 1999, p.29). The difference in leadership approaches can be seen in leader's individual focus and values.

Throughout history, leadership theory and practice has shifted and developed to present different models through which individuals can lead. One such philosophy and model is servant leadership. Servant leadership provides focus on the leader-follower relationship by putting the followers first. This literature review clarifies and defines the theoretical foundation of this study by focusing on (a) understanding servant leadership development, theory and characteristics, (b) analyzing the relationship between personality, trait theory and leadership, and (c) discussing empirical evidence for servant leadership and personality factors. The subsequent literature review forms an underlying

baseline upon which servant leadership can be studied and tested in relation to personality and trait factors.

The Historical Development of Servant Leadership

While Robert K. Greenleaf is credited in 1977 with developing the phrase 'servant leadership,' the concepts and notions surrounding servant leadership have been around and in practice since biblical times. "Jesus taught that a leader's greatness is measured by a total commitment to serve fellow human beings. Not only did Jesus teach servant leadership, he applied the concept in concrete ways" (Sendjays & Sarros, 2002, p.59). Laub (1999) also writes that, "the concept of servanthood and the leader as servant is deeply rooted in the Judeo-Christian tradition" (p. 12). The religious base and background associated with Greenleaf's servant leadership writings can be linked directly to his religious upbringing. Greenleaf grew up in the Judeo-Christian tradition and, through the Methodist religion, was exposed to a methodical approach to religion and "a community of believers that engaged in the kind of pragmatic service that was echoed in Greenleaf's later, mature approach to organizations" (Frick, 2004, p. 41).

While his religious upbringing did not have major influence on his leadership philosophy, his work experiences and reading of Herman Hesse's short novel, *Journey to the East* had profound impacts. Greenleaf had a half-century of experience in working to shape large institutions. Greenleaf worked for AT&T for forty years in the areas of management research, development and education (Spears, 1996). From there, he consulted to a number of large institutions including MIT, the American Foundation for Management Research, and Lilly Endowment Inc. (Spears, 1996). Most importantly was that in the 1960's Greenleaf made a connection with Herman Hesse's *Journey to the East*

character Leo, who exemplified servant leadership behavior. (Greenleaf, 1970; Frick, 2004; Spears, 1996; Sendjays et al, 2002; Joseph & Winston, 2005). The reading of Hesse's novel became the starting point for the coined phrase and philosophy of servant leadership, which developed into Greenleaf's most important essay publication in 1970, *The Servant as Leader*. Later, in 1977 his famous book, *Servant Leadership: A journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness* was published. These essays began to form further writings and research attention from leadership scholars who were interested in understanding and defining servant leadership theory and philosophy.

Servant Leadership Theory Development

Defining Servant Leadership

Greenleaf (1977) defined servant leadership as,

“The servant-leader is servant first...It begins with the natural feeling that one who wants to serve, to serve *first*. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. That person is sharply different from one who is *leader* first, perhaps because of the need to assuage an unusual power drive or to acquire material possessions. For such it will be a later choice to serve- after leadership is established. The leader-first and the servant-first are two extreme types. Between them there are shadings and blends that are part of the infinite variety of human nature... The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant-first to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served” (Frick, 2004, p. 338; Laub, 1999, p. 13).

It is important to note that Greenleaf was not focused on defining servant leadership, rather he described and developed servant leadership actions and analyzed how those actions affected others (Laub, 1999). Even in the absence of guidance from Greenleaf on a universal definition of servant leadership, scholars agree that servant leadership originates from a motivation to serve others (Russell & Stone, 2002; Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002; Blunt, 2003; Lloyd, 1996; Spears, 1996; Block, 1993).

Another important servant leadership element is stewardship because it introduces the idea of servant leader's role in and interaction with the broad global society. This means servant leadership exists at both interpersonal and global levels. The concept of stewardship brings in the element of being accountable for the well being of the larger community by operating in the service of those around us (Block, 1993). "As stewards, servant leaders regard their followers as people who have been entrusted to them to be elevated in their better selves and to be what they are capable of becoming" (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002, p. 61). Stewardship encompasses Greenleaf's view of an organization in which every employee play significant roles in holding their institutions in trust for the greater good of society (Burkhardt & Spears, 2002) Lussier and Achua (2007) differentiate stewardship and servant leadership as separate leadership styles but see similarities in being follower-centered. However, in relation to stewardship, servant leadership is seen as the highest level of selflessness (Lussier & Achua, 2007).

While there are many minor differentiations in definition, scholars overall agree that servant leadership begins first with a motivation to serve others. The 'others' can be individual followers and also encompass elements of recognizing a more global mindset and serving society as a whole.

Servant Leadership Behavior Characteristics and Attributes

Russell and Stone (2002) argue that there needs to be differentiation between servant leadership and other leadership theories based on distinguished characteristics and behaviors in such leaders. Furthermore, Russell and Stone (2002) identified functional attributes and accompanying attributes in servant leadership literature (see table I).

Functional attributes are the "operative qualities, characteristics, and distinctive features

belonging to leaders and observed through specific leader behaviors in the workplace. The functional attributes are the effective characteristics of servant leadership” (Russell & Stone, 2002, p.146). The accompanying attributes are other characteristics that “supplement and augment the functional attributes” (Russell & Stone, 2002, p.147).

Russell and Stone (2002) offer two models of servant leadership in relation to these attributes. These models show the theoretical development behind the servant leadership concept in relation to attributes and organizations as a whole. The first looks at the core values and beliefs as being the independent variables moderated by the accompanying attributes to form the servant leadership as the dependant variable based on the functional attributes. The second model holds true to the first models organization but introduces the concepts that organizational culture, as a subsequent dependent variable, and employee attitudes may influence the effectiveness of servant leadership. “[Servant leadership can also then become] an independent variable that affects the subsequent dependant variable – organizational performance” (Russell & Stone, 2002, p.153).

Spears (2002) identifies ten major attributes of servant leadership to include listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community.

Another important distinguishing servant leadership factor is values. Russell (2001) concludes that, “the very concept of servant leadership is based on the values of humility and respect for others” and that “servant leadership succeeds or fails on the personal values of the people who employ it.” This begins to develop the notion that there is a personal inherent element to servant leadership that is dependant upon attributes based on traits and personal values. Patterson (2003) identified seven constructs central to

servant leadership as being, altruism, empowerment, humility, love, service, trust and vision. Additionally, Laub (1999) identified six components and accompanying behavior characteristics in relation to a servant organization. The components include; servant leadership as someone who values people, develops people, builds community, displays authenticity, provides leadership and shares leadership (Laub, 1999, p. 83). Wong and Page (2003) identified twelve attributes of servant leadership to be integrity, humility, servanthood, caring for others, empowering others, developing others, visioning, goal setting, leading, modeling, team building, and shared decision-making. Finally, Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) focus on five servant leadership factors of altruistic calling, emotional healing, persuasive mapping, wisdom, and organizational stewardship.

Table 1
Servant Leadership Attributes

<i>Laub (1999)</i>	<i>Wong & Page (2000)</i>	<i>Spears (2002)</i>	
Values people	Integrity	Listening	
Develops people	Humility	Empathy	
Builds community	Servanthood	Healing	
Displays authenticity	Caring for others	Awareness	
Provides leadership	Empowering others	Persuasion	
Shares leadership	Developing others	Conceptualization	
	Visioning	Foresight	
	Goal setting	Stewardship	
	Leading	Commitment to the growth of people	
	Modeling	Building community	
	Team building		
	Shared decision-making		
<i>Patterson (2003)</i>	<i>Barbuto & Wheeler (2006)</i>	Functional Attributes	Accompanying Attributes
Altruism	Altruistic Calling	Vision	Communication
Empowerment	Emotional Calling	Honesty	Credibility
Humility	Persuasive mapping	Integrity	Competence
Love	Wisdom	Trust	Stewardship
Service	Organizational Stewardship	Service	Visibility
Trust		Modeling	Influence
Vision		Pioneering	Persuasion
		Appreciation of others	Listening
		Empowerment	Encouragement

Table I indicates that there is evidence of some overlap in servant leader values and attributes. The varying attributes and values show a need for more development of servant leadership in relation to personal attributes, characteristics and values.

Transformational Leadership and Servant Leadership

Another important way scholars have distinguished servant leadership characteristics from other leadership theories is comparing and contrasting it to transformational leadership. Transformational leadership is defined as the leader being focused on the organization and his/her behaviors building follower commitment toward organizational objectives (Stone, Russell & Patterson, 2004). Avolio, Waldman & Yammarino (1991) identified four primary transformational leadership behaviors of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration (Stone, Russell & Patterson, 2004). Stone, Russell and Patterson (2004) conclude that “both transformational leaders and servant leaders are visionaries, generate high levels of trust, serve as role models, show consideration for others, delegate responsibilities, empower followers, teach, communicate, listen and influence followers. Nonetheless, there are significant points of variation in the concepts. Most importantly, transformational leaders tend to focus more on organizational objectives while servant leaders focus more on the people who are their followers” (p.359). While transformational leadership and servant leadership share some common constructs, they can be profitably differentiated. A personality approach to leadership may be helpful in identifying the differences between the approaches.

Leadership and Personality

Leadership theory can be broken down into four major classifications of trait, behavioral, contingency, and integrative (Lussier & Achua, 2007). Trait theory is said to be the foundation for the leadership studies field. "The original study of trait theory was called the Great Man (Person) Approach, which sought to identify the traits effective leaders possessed" (Lussier & Achua, 2007, p. 30). Similarly, Lussier & Achua (2007) define traits as "distinguishing personal characteristics [and] personality as a combination of traits that classifies an individual behavior" (p. 31). In essence a person's personality is made up of trait combinations, which makes understanding an individual's traits important to the study of personality.

There has been debate as to the validity of personality traits as a leadership predictor or indicator. Judge, Bono, Iles and Gerhardt (2002) note that, "despite [a] venerable tradition, results of investigations relating personality traits to leadership have been inconsistent and often disappointing" (p.765). Stogdill (1948) and Mann (1959) are among the first critics of trait theory, viewing it as an insufficient means of addressing leadership (Zaccaro, 2007). Other resistance to trait theory as a leadership indicator by Conger & Kanungo (1998) viewed trait theory as too simplistic and House & Aditya (1997) argued that there are not any universal traits associated with leadership (Zuccaro, 2007). However, Zuccaro (2007) points out that, "in the 1980's [and more recently], research emerged that directly challenged the purported empirical basis for the rejection of leader trait models" (p.6). There are scholars who argue that there are certain traits associated with leadership (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991) and leadership effectiveness (Zaccaro, 2007). Furthermore, Hogan and Kaiser (2005) affirm that "[through a review of] empirical

literature on personality, leadership, and organizational effectiveness that personality predicts leadership” (p.169).

In the world of leadership, understanding and knowing leader personality type is important and is gaining scholar attention. Out of 15,000 articles published since 1990 on the topic of leadership, 1,738 (12%) included the keywords *personality* and *leadership* (Bono & Judge, 2004). This supports the notion that leadership research in relation to personality and associated traits is an actively pursued research topic. Research importance can be seen through the fact that leadership can help shape and guide an organizations culture and success (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005; Kaiser, Hogan & Craig, 2008). Understanding the personality factors associated with leaders helps to define and map the basis for successful leadership and successful organizations.

The Big Five Model of Personality

In an attempt to analyze and develop different personality types there has been creation of personality models and tests that place individuals into their given category based on his/her defining traits. One commonly used model and test is the Big Five Model of Personality. The widely accepted five categories include, extraversion, neuroticism (also called emotional stability, stability or emotionality), agreeableness (also known as likeability), conscientiousness, and openness to experience (also called intellect) (Barrick & Mount, 1991). This taxonomy emerged significantly from Norman (1963) who is credited with labeling the five categories as extraversion, emotional stability, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and culture (Barrick & Mount, 1991).

There have been countless studies that have analyzed the relationship between personality and organizations using the Big Five Model. Research has been conducted in

the areas of organizational leadership, success and careers. Using the Big Five personality factors, Crant and Bateman (2000) studied the relationship between charismatic leadership and proactive personality through a survey of 156 managers and the managers' immediate supervisors. Their findings revealed that proactive personalities are a predictor of perceived charismatic leadership (Crant & Bateman, 2000, p69). Bono and Judge (2004) relied on another leadership model to analyze the relationship between personality and leadership. Using the five-factor model of personality as an organizing framework, Bono and Judge (2004) conducted a meta-analysis of 26 articles retrieved from PsycINFO database between 1887 to 2002 that contained the following keywords; personality, neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and transformational leadership. Interestingly, the results suggested a generally weak association between the variables; there was some support for the dispositional basis of transformational leadership in regard to charisma (Bono & Judge, 2004).

The next area in which personality in relation to the big five personality factors has received some research attention is in regard to organizational performance. Using the big five model of personality factors of conscientiousness, emotional instability, extraversion, openness, and agreeableness, Peterson, Smith, Martorana and Owens (2003) used content analysis of archival sources on 17 CEO's personalities from the CAQ and archival sources of associated CEO's Top Management Teams (TMT) to find support for their hypothesis that personality characteristics impact organizational performance. They found that "CEO personality affects TMT group dynamics and that TMT group dynamics are related to organizational performance (Peterson et al, 2003, p.802).

Additionally, the area of personality and career development has been receiving more attention. Judge, Higgins, Thoresen and Barrick (1999) examined the relationship between the big five model of personality and career success through a set of three studies that followed participants from early childhood to retirement. Findings indicate that conscientiousness positively predicts intrinsic and extrinsic career success while neuroticism negatively predicts extrinsic success (Judge et al, 1999). Seibert and Kraimer (2001) support these findings by examined the relationship between the big five personality dimensions and career success. After surveying 496 employees in a diverse set of occupations and organizations, they found that extraversion was positively related to salary level, promotions, and career satisfaction. Neuroticism and agreeableness were negatively related to career satisfaction (Seibert & Kraimer, 2001). Due to the overwhelming amount of previous research that has been conducted specifically using the big five model in relation to personality and organizational elements of leadership and organizational and career success, the big five serve as a widely accepted form of personality assessment. Additionally, previous research shows that the big five personality model has been used to analyze the relationship between different levels and aspects within organizations; including specific leadership positions, overall organizational success and individual lower level employee career development and success.

Servant Leadership Behaviors and Personality

Russell (2001) concludes that, “empirical support is particularly lacking for the roles of individual attributes in servant leadership, though a leader’s attributes significantly affect followers and organizational performance” (Washington, Sutton & Field, 2006). Joseph and Winston (2005) recognized the importance of empirical research in relation to

servant leadership and responded to Russell's (2002) observation that there is little empirical research supporting servant leadership. Taking the servant leadership attribute of trust, Joseph and Winston (2005) surveyed 69 individuals using the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) and the Organizational Trust Inventory (OTI). Their findings indicate a positive correlation between servant leadership and leader and organizational trust. The study also found that organizations perceived as servant-led exhibited higher levels of both leader trust and organizational trust than organizations perceived as non-servant led (Joseph and Winston, 2005). This study shows empirical support for the servant leadership concept in relation to trust as a servant leadership component and personal attribute associated with servant leadership.

Washington, et al, (2006) furthered empirical evidence in support of servant leadership by analyzing the relationship between individual values of empathy, integrity, competence, and the five-factor model's personality factor of agreeableness. The study surveyed 126 supervisors and 283 employees and found that followers' ratings of leaders' servant leadership were positively related to followers' ratings of leaders' values of empathy, integrity and competence. Followers' ratings of leaders' servant leadership were also positively related to leaders' ratings of their own agreeableness (Washington et al, 2006). This shows additional support for individual attributes being related to the practice of servant leadership. Joseph and Winston (2005) and Washington et al (2006) both point to the need for more studies in relation to servant leadership and individual attributes.

There is also empirical support for servant leadership's role in the impact on the overall organization. Irving (2004) was the first to empirically test the relationship between team effectiveness and servant leadership. Using the OLA (Laub, 1999) and

Larson and LaFasto's Team Effectiveness Questionnaire (TEQ) the study surveyed 729 employees within the U.S. division of an international nonprofit organization (Irving, 2004). The findings indicated support for the relationship between servant leadership and team effectiveness. Irving (2005) built upon Irving (2004) by surveying 729 nonprofit sector employees using the OLA, TEQ and Dennis's (2004) SLAI to bring in an added variable of individual characteristics to the relationship between servant leadership and team effectiveness. Irving (2005) found that all five essential characteristics of servant leadership as part of the SLAI (love, empowerment, vision, humility, and trust) positively and significantly correlated with team effectiveness. Irving (2005) provides another element that explores the possible relationship between individual attributes and servant leadership in relation to team effectiveness.

Overall empirical evidence supports the relationship between servant leadership and individual attributes (Irving, 2004; Irving, 2005; Joseph and Winston, 2004; Washington et al, 2006). Each research study used different measures of servant leadership including Laub's (1999) OLA, and Dennis's (2004) SLAI. Furthermore, other studies have used Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) servant leadership questionnaire (SLQ) (Anderson, 2009; Dannhauser and Boshoff, 2007; Bugenhagen, 2006). These instruments include different servant leadership elements and characteristics, which create debate surrounding servant leadership definitions and associated attributes. There is still need for further evidence and support for the specific relationship between servant leadership behavior and personality type. Therefore, the researcher proposes the following research question:

RQ1: Is there a relationship between servant leadership behavior and personality type?

Five Factor Model of Personality and Servant Leadership

Neuroticism

The neuroticism factor has also been called emotional stability, stability or emotionality. Common traits associated with the factor include being anxious, depressed, angry, embarrassed, worried and insecure (Barrick and Mount, 1991). Bono and Judge (2004) note that individuals high in neuroticism are “not likely to be seen as role models, are unlikely to have a positive view of the future, and may be too anxious to undertake transformational change efforts” (p.902). These behaviors and views would similarly impact individuals as servant leaders. Empowering, developing others, and being committed to the growth of people are important attributes servant leaders possess (Spears, 2002; Wong & Page, 2003; Laub, 1999; Russell & Stone, 2002; Patterson, 2003). It would be difficult for individuals high in neuroticism to empower others and be viewed as a leader when they are insecure and view the future negatively. Additionally, Bono and Judge (2004) found neuroticism negatively linked to three transformational leadership dimensions of idealized influence/inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Seeing as servant leadership and transformational leadership commonly share the aspect of focusing on others through empowerment and motivation, neuroticism may similarly be negatively associated to servant leadership.

Other research associated with servant leadership and emotion deals with emotional intelligence (EI). Winston and Hardsfield (2004) conclude that there are similarities between EI and servant leadership. Due to the fact that emotions emerge in patterns, servant leaders, knowing the cause and consequences of emotions may be more adept at shaping long-term behavior and affect-based commitment with followers (Winston and Hardsfield, 2004). It would appear that since servant leadership behavior

includes the ability of empathy, listening and creating safe environments, all which include elements of EI and are opposite of neuroticism traits, that there would be a negative relationship between servant leadership and neuroticism. Furthermore, Spears (2002) identified awareness as being a central servant leadership attribute. Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) note that research shows that, “awareness also plays a significant role as one of the key components of most behavior models of emotional intelligence” (p. 307). However, there is some disagreement in the literature as Parolini (2005) did not find support for EI as a servant leadership behavior predictor. The researcher therefore proposes the following research question:

RQ2: Is there a relationship between neuroticism and servant leadership?

Agreeableness

Agreeableness or sometimes referred to as likeability includes traits such as being courteous, flexible, trusting, good-natured, cooperative, forgiving, soft-hearted, and tolerant (Barrick and Mount, 1991). “Altruistic calling describes a leader’s deep-rooted desire to make a positive difference in other’s lives. It is a generosity of the spirit consistent with a philanthropic purpose in life” (Barbuto and Wheeler, 2006, p.318). Research suggests that servant leaders hold attributes congruent with the Big Five personality factor of agreeableness (Washington et al, 2006). Both the agreeable individual and servant leader emphasize altruism (Washington et al, 2006). Washington et al (2006) found a positive relationship between leaders’ agreeableness and perceived servant leadership. Furthermore, Costa and McCrae (1998) and Joseph and Winston (2005) argue that servant leaders demonstrate agreeableness through altruism (Washington et al, 2006). Seeing that agreeableness holds trusting elements and Joseph and Winston (2005) found trust to be

positively associated with servant leadership, the researcher proposes the following hypothesis.

H1: Agreeableness is positively related to servant leadership.

Openness to Experience

Openness to experience has been the most difficult to identify. Common associated traits include being imaginative, cultured, curious, original, broad-minded, intelligent and artistically sensitive” (Barrick & Mount, 1991, p. 4). This factor is associated with wisdom and organizational stewardship. Wisdom can be understood as a combination of awareness of surroundings, anticipating of consequences, height of knowledge, and utility (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006). “Organizational stewardship describes the extent that leaders prepare an organization to make a positive contribution to society through development, programs, and outreach” (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006, p.319). Competence was found to be positively related to servant leadership behavior (Washington et al, 2006) and is very similar to the openness to experience trait of intelligence. Additionally, being broad-minded is in direct relation to servant leadership’s stewardship characteristic. Judge et al, (2003) also found openness to experience to be related to leadership overall and leadership emergence and effectiveness. Therefore, the researcher purposes the following hypothesis:

H2: Openness to experience is positively related to servant leadership.

Extraversion

Traits associated with extraversion include being sociable, gregarious, assertive, talkative, and active. The two main components are ambition and sociability (Barrick & Mount, 1991, p.3). The associated servant leadership factor is persuasive mapping which “describes the extent that leaders use sound reasoning and mental frameworks. They encourage others to visualize the organization’s future and are persuasive, offering

compelling reason to get others to do things” (Barbuto, Wheeler, 2006, p.319). There is little empirical evidence to support this relationship. Due to the fact that servant leadership theorists recognize persuasion, influence and communication as accompanying attributes (Russell & Stone, 2002), servant leaders may find themselves in positions that require increased amounts of sociability and communication. In order to be effective, leaders must form positive relationships with followers, which require a degree of extraversion in the form of communication and sociability. Persuasive mapping also includes elements of vision and communication of that vision. Kouzes and Posner (2002) support this argument through the leadership element of being forward-looking and that having a vision is important. Furthermore, they argue for the enlistment of others in that common vision which requires communication and sociability (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Servant leaders are able to use foresight to conceptualize a vision and also model that vision through being open and active. Kouzes and Posner (2002) describe this leadership element as modeling the way. Without extraversion traits it may be difficult to exhibit servant leadership. Therefore the researcher purposes the following hypothesis:

H3: Extraversion is positively related to servant leadership.

Conscientiousness

There is wide variety as to the definition of conscientiousness. Scholars suggest that, “conscientiousness reflects being careful, thorough, responsible, and organized. There are also volitional elements such as being hardworking, achievement-oriented, and persevering” (Barrick & Mount, 1991, p.4). Conscientiousness includes elements of stewardship through being responsible. Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) describe organizational stewardship as “the extent that leaders prepare an organization to make a positive contribution to society through community development, programs, and outreach”

(p. 319). Additionally, “organizational stewardship involves an ethic or value for taking responsibility for the well-being of the community and making sure that strategies and decisions undertaken reflect the commitment to give back and leave things better than found” (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006, p.319).

Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) note that, “leaders must be tirelessly persistent in their activities and follow through with their programs” and that “the willingness to assume responsibility, which seems to coincide with leadership motivation, is frequently found in leaders (p.51-52). Judge et al (2002) support this view by finding conscientiousness being a strong leadership predictor and especially related to leader emergence. Servant leaders use conscientiousness, persistence, and hard work in order to serve society. A servant leader exhibits Kirkpatrick and Locke’s (1991) socialized power motive in which a leader uses power as a means to achieve desired goals, or a vision which results in empowered followers, independent followers. This contrasts a personal power motive in which individuals have little self-control and are often impulsive (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). Conscientious individuals possess opposite qualities of personal power motive by being careful and organized. Therefore, conscientious individuals more are likely to exhibit socialized power motive, which possess similar motive characteristics to servant leadership. Given servant leadership’s conceptual similarity to being conscientious, the researcher purposes the following hypothesis:

H4: Conscientiousness is positively related to servant leadership.

Summary of Literature

Previous research shows a strong correlation between leadership styles and personality traits. More specifically, as different leadership styles emerge there is a continued focus on personality's role in the usage and development of that leadership style. Servant leadership provides a current leadership model that is lacking empirical support for its effectiveness and characteristic dimensions. In analyzing personality characteristics in relation to servant leadership, we may begin to develop and see a differentiation from other accepted leadership styles. It is evident that personality and associated traits impact individual, organizational and leadership success. The big five factor model of personality is a widely used and accepted personality model among scholars. There has already been support for servant leader behavior in relation to the big five factor model. However, there is still further research needed to fully assess the relationship. Therefore, this study furthers previous research and seeks to offer empirical support for servant leadership being associated with individual personality traits and characteristics.

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The following section outlines the methodology used to study the research questions and hypothesized relationship(s) between servant leadership behavior and individual leader personality. The purpose of this study is to analyze the relationship between Barbuto and Wheelers (2006) identified five servant leader characteristics of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping and organizational stewardship and the Big Five personality factors of extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience (Barrick and Mount, 1991).

Leadership behavior is being assessed within the theoretical framework of servant leadership. Servant leadership has distinguished itself among other leadership theories as being based in individual values and focus on others. Personality type is grounded in trait theory and is a foundation for the field of leadership studies. The identified dependant variable in this study is servant leadership. The independent variables consist of the different personality types of extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. The methodology section clarifies and elaborates on (a) the selected organization, (b) participants and procedures, (c) instrument design and selection and (d) analysis plan.

Selecting the Organization

Research will be conducted with minister and pastoral leaders at United Methodist Churches located in New York. As previously outlined, servant leadership examples and behaviors can be seen through the biblical teachings of Jesus (Laub, 1999; Sendjaya &

Sarros, 2002), which are central to the Methodist tradition and teachings. Greenleaf was brought up within the Methodist religion and experiences, which is said to be “echoed in Greenleaf’s later, mature approach to organizations” (Frick, 2004, p.41). Management expert, Ken Blanchard, recognizes servant leadership as having a spiritual foundation that separates it from other management techniques (Frick, 2004). Through analyzing servant leadership behavior within an organization that has servant leadership values and frameworks, this research expands upon the theoretical framework of servant leadership as having spiritual foundations. This research also comes at a time when the United Methodist Church leadership is floundering and renewal can be found within the saints of the tradition and modern transformational leadership theories through leadership having spiritual elements (Delenschneider, 2002).

Participants and Procedure

The subjects of this study consisted of pastoral and minister leaders in the Long Island East and Catskill/Hudson district’s of the New York Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church (NYAC). Servant leadership behavior and personality type are measured by completion of the relevant survey questionnaire. Out of the 133 pastoral leaders asked to participate, 38 number of surveys were completed and 5 were found to be completed incorrectly or uncompleted, making the final sample size 33 for a 24.8% response rate. The average age of participants is 58, with the number of female participants being 9 and the number of male participants being 24. Table II outlines the demographic information that make up the sample population for this research study (N=33).

Table II
Demographics of Participants

Church Pastors	N=33	Percentage
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	24	72.7%
Female	9	27.3%
<i>Marital Status</i>		
Single	4	12.1%
Married	25	75.8%
Separated/Divorced	4	12.1%
Other	0	0.0%
<i>Age Group</i>		
40-50	6	18.2%
51-60	12	36.4%
61-70	12	36.4%
71+	3	9.1%
<i>Ethnicity</i>		
White/Caucasian	19	57.6%
Korean	2	6.1%
Irish	3	9.1%
European	3	9.1%
Scottish	1	3.0%
Other	5	15.2%

In order to be able to conduct the research study, the researcher contacted two NYAC District Office Heads through email requesting permission and outlining the purposed research project (see appendix D). After receiving verbal and written permission to conduct the research by both districts, a phone meeting was set up to discuss the survey completion procedure. The researcher was given the email addresses and phone numbers of the UMC church leaders by one of the district office superintendants, while the other

district chose to email the recruitment letter from the office and not provide the researcher with email addresses. The researcher then emailed a recruitment letter (see appendix C) to the UMC church leaders regarding the purpose of the study, a request for participation, a statement of confidentiality, and a link to the online survey. After the first week the survey was available, the researcher resent the request for participation to both districts.

Participants were additionally given a set time frame from June 5th 2010 to June 25th 2010 during which time the online survey would be accessible.

Instrument Selection and Design

Servant Leadership Instrument Selection

Servant leadership measurement instruments have been created for use at both the organizational and individual levels. Two available instruments that measure servant leadership at the organizational level are Laub's (1999) SOLA and Dennis and Bocarnea's (2005) Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument. The SOLA has been statistically found to be a reliable instrument for measuring the agreed upon characteristics of the servant leader in an organizational context (Laub, 1999). However, Anderson (2009) notes that Laub's instrument "cannot be used as a stand-alone for an individual to rate his or her own servant-leadership qualities" (p. 32). Dennis and Bocarnea's (2005) instrument is based upon Patterson's (2003) seven component concepts of servant leadership. Similar to Laub's SOLA, Dennis and Bocarnea's instrument addresses the opinions on leadership from the follower only. Due to the fact that the proposed research study does not assess followers' views of leader's servant leadership behavior, but rather leader's personal assessment of themselves, these two instruments are unable to be used.

According to Anderson (2009) there are two instruments that utilize self-rater scales for servant leadership qualities in individuals. These include Page and Wong (2003) Revised Servant Leadership Profile (RSLP) and Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ). Page and Wong's (2000) original Servant Leadership Profile (SLP) consisted of 99 questions measuring 12 sub-scales of integrity, humility, servanthood, caring for others, empowering others, developing others, visioning, goal setting, leading, modeling, team building and shared decision-making. These characteristics are based largely on previous literature surrounding servant leadership theory and development and can be found in Spears (1998) ten characteristics of servant leadership (Page & Wong, 2000). Their model is based on an individual's character leading outward toward impacting society and culture (Page & Wong, 2000). The RSLP was developed from the SLP with changes including 97 questionnaire items and 10 subscales (eight represent the presence of servant leader characteristics and two represent attributes authentic to servant leadership) (Page & Wong, 2003). Additional differences between the SLP and the RSLP include the RSLP being randomized to account for biases and online administration as apposed to paper-and-pencil (Page & Wong, 2003). Additionally, Dennis and Winston (2003) conducted a factor analysis of the SLP and developed a 23-item servant leadership scale that measures three servant leadership attributes of vision, empowerment and service.

The other instrument that utilizes a self-rater scale for servant leadership is Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) SLQ. The SLQ is based on Spear's (1995) 10 identified servant leadership characteristics along with the addition of altruistic calling which is fundamental to Greenleaf's early writings (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006). There are two versions of the SLQ

instrument that are differentiated by being completed by a self-rater and a follower-rater. Barbuto & Wheeler (2006) identified and tested the validity of the five identified subscales, including altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship. The absent subscales from the original 11 characteristics (such as listening, empathy, community building and growth) were not utilized because they are not specifically unique to servant leadership and/or are skills derived from the other identified subcategories (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006).

Both the RSLP and the SLQ are valid measures of servant leadership and are based on the characteristics outlined by Spears (1995, 1998). This study utilizes Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) SLQ because unlike the RSLP that developed additional servant leadership frameworks and constructs, the SLQ did not create a new framework and is grounded in the original servant leadership model presented by Greenleaf. There are other studies that have utilized the SLQ and have found it a valid measure of servant leadership (Anderson, 2009; Dannhauser & Bushoff, 2007; Bugenhagen, 2006). While both are valid servant leadership measurement tools, the SLQ is significantly shorter with only 23-items as apposed to the RSLP which includes 97.

The SLQ Design

The SLQ (see Appendix A) consists of a 23-item questionnaire that measures five servant leadership factors of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship. Two versions of the SLQ exist that can be used as a self-rater or follower-rater. This study utilized the self-rater version. Items are based on a 5-point likert scale (1 being strongly disagree to 5 being strongly agree), which measures

the degree to which the individual agrees with the described behavior. Table III outlines example questions for each subscale.

Table III
Example SLQ Questions

Subscales	Example Questions
Altruistic Calling	I sacrifice my own interests to meet others needs
Emotional Healing	I am talented at helping others heal emotionally
Wisdom	I have a great awareness of what is going on
Persuasive Mapping	I offer compelling reasons to get others to do things
Organizational Stewardship	I believe that the organization needs to play a moral role in society

Personality Instrument Selection

There are numerous instruments available to measure the big five model of personality. Goldberg (1992) is credited with developing a 100 item bipolar scale (20 items per personality type) that built upon the previous 20 item bipolar scale developed and used by Norman (1963). The other alternative measure to the Big-Five Markers is Costa and McCrae's (1985) 60-item NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI) (Goldberg, 1992). Due to the length of Goldberg's (1992) 100 item Big-Five Marker instrument, Saucier (1994) developed a 40-item mini-marker assessment tool based on Goldberg's (1992) work. While typical disadvantages include lower reliability and more constrained sampling of the Big-Five adjectives, benefits include fewer difficult items and lower interscale correlations (Saucier, 1994). Due to length, the Big-Five Markers and the NEO-PI will not be used in this study.

The Big Five Inventory (BFI) (see Appendix B) is the ideal choice to use for the purposes of this study (John & Srivastava, 1999). Among the most important reason for selection is that “the BFI scales have shown substantial internal consistency, retest reliability, and clear factor structure, as well as considerable convergent and discriminate validity with longer Big Five measures” (Srivastava, John, Gosling, & Potter, J, 2003). It also consists of only 44-items, which requires less time for participants to complete the survey as apposed to Goldberg’s (1992) 100 items. The BFI has also been used as a valid measure for the Big Five personality types in numerous studies (Srivastava et al, 2003; Anderson, Keltner & John, 2003; Schmitt, Allik, McCrae & Benet-Martinez, 2007). The research will therefore use the BFI as the selected measurement instrument.

The BFI Design

The BFI consists of a 44-item questionnaire that measures the five personality factors of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience. Items are based on a 5-point likert scale (1 being strongly disagree to 5 being strongly agree), which measures how much an individual agrees with the described characteristic. Table IV outlines example BFI questions.

Table IV
Example BFI Questions

Personality Factor	Example Questions
Extraversion	I am someone who is full of energy
Agreeableness	I am someone who has a forgiving nature
Conscientiousness	I am someone who is a reliable worker
Neuroticism	I am someone who gets nervous easily
Openness to Experiences	I am someone who has an active imagination

Analysis Plan

Servant Leadership Behavior scores were determined by the mean scores on the 23 servant leadership items of the SLQ. Additionally, scores for each servant leadership factor (altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping and organizational stewardship) were determined by the mean scores of the corresponding questions for each servant leadership factor. Personality scores were determined by the mean scores of the corresponding personality items for each personality factor (extraversion, agreeableness, openness, conscientiousness, neuroticism) of the BFI.

Pearson Correlation was used to investigate the relationship between each personality factor (extraversion, agreeableness, openness, conscientiousness, neuroticism) and servant leadership behavior (RQ2, H1, H2, H3 and H4).

Linear regression was then used to determine the relationship between servant leadership and the personality factors. Post hoc stepwise regression analysis was then used to determine which personality variables would be the best predictors for the SLQ subscales.

Data was entered into SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) for descriptive, correlation and inferential data analysis. The following descriptive statistics were used: mean, range, and standard deviation for each independent variables (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, openness) and dependant variable (servant leadership behavior).

Demographic variables provided a description of the sample characteristics. The small sample size (N=33) did not provide sufficient power to be able to test for interactions between research variables and demographic variables.

RESULTS

Introduction

The following section displays the results of Pearson Correlation and Stepwise Regression analysis testing for the two research questions and four hypotheses. The descriptive statistics including mean, range, and standard deviation are shown for the independent variables and servant leadership. In addition, the post hoc analysis results are presented from the Stepwise Regression analysis for the personality variables in relation to the SLQ subscales.

Descriptive Statistics

Table V reports the mean, range and standard deviations for the study variables (servant leadership, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experience).

Table V
Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation
Extraversion	33	1.625	5.000	3.66288	.757440
Agreeableness	33	2.889	4.889	4.17506	.531513
Conscientiousness	33	3.111	5.000	4.06394	.570039
Neuroticism	33	1.000	3.875	2.46970	.801019
Openness	33	2.7	5.0	4.109	.6237
Servant Leader	33	3.25	4.77	4.1809	.34712
Valid N (listwise)	33				

Research Questions Test

Personality Type and Servant Leadership (RQ1)

Stepwise regression analysis was used to determine the best fitting model between the independent variables (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experience) and the dependent variable (servant leadership). Table VI indicates that the overall model comprising conscientiousness and agreeableness was significant, explaining 38.6% of variance in the servant leadership scores, $F(2, 30) = 11.060$, $p < .001$. This shows support in favor of the relationship between personality type and servant leadership and that personality traits are important determinants of servant leadership.

Neuroticism and Servant Leadership (RQ2)

Pearson Correlation results indicate a significant correlation between neuroticism and servant leadership ($r = -.431$, $p < .05$). As shown in Table VII, neuroticism has a less significant association to servant leadership than agreeableness and conscientiousness. This indicates the answer to RQ2 is that there is a significant negative correlation between neuroticism and servant leadership. However, neuroticism did not appear to have any statistical significance when using stepwise regression analysis. Additionally, post hoc analysis shows that there was no statistically significant relationship between neuroticism and any servant leadership factors. However, Table VIII indicates that the closest predictor of wisdom was neuroticism, $F(1, 31) = 4.083$, $p = .052$, accounting for 8.8% of variance in wisdom. These results show that any relationship indicated by the Pearson Correlation most likely resulted from the wisdom servant leader factor. Therefore, more data collection is required in order to be confident of the results and answer to RQ2.

Table VI

<u>Significant Regression Variables of Servant Leadership</u>		
<u>Predictor Variables</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>P</u>
Conscientiousness	.461	p < .001
Agreeableness	.368	p < .001

Hypotheses Test

Agreeableness and Servant Leadership (H1)

Pearson Correlation results indicate that there is a significant association between servant leadership and agreeableness ($r=.471$, $p<.01$). Additionally, stepwise regression analysis indicates the overall model comprising conscientiousness and agreeableness is significant, explaining 38.6% of variance in the servant leadership scores, $F(2, 30)= 11.060$, $p<.001$. However, Table VI shows that standardized betas indicate agreeableness was the second most powerful of the independent variables, after conscientiousness. These results provide support for H1.

Post hoc analyses found agreeableness to be a statistically significant predictor of emotional healing $F(1, 31) = 9.612$, $p=.004$, and organizational stewardship, $F(1, 31) = 4.408$, $p=.004$, indicating additional support for H1 (see Table VIII). Agreeableness accounted for 21.2% of variance in emotional healing and 9.6% in organizational stewardship. These results indicate that those who are agreeable will more likely exhibit the servant leadership factors of emotional healing and organizational stewardship.

Overall, the results support H1 that agreeableness is positively related to servant leadership behavior. While it does not prove that everyone with an agreeable personality

exhibits servant leadership behavior, it does support the fact that those who score high on agreeableness are more likely to exhibit servant leadership behavior.

Openness to Experience and Servant Leadership (H2)

Table VII shows that, according to the results of the Pearson Correlation, there was no significant relationship found between openness to experience and servant leadership. Additionally, stepwise regression analysis results indicate that openness to experience does not have a significant relationship with servant leadership. Finally, post hoc analysis results indicate that openness to experience has no significant relationship with any servant leadership factors (see Table VIII). Therefore, the results do not support H2.

Table VII
Correlations Between Personality Factors and
Servant Leadership Behavior

Variables	Correlation
Extraversion servant leadership	.341
Agreeableness Servant Leadership	.471**
Conscientiousness Servant Leadership	.544**
Openness Servant Leadership	.117
Neuroticism Servant Leadership	-.431*

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Extraversion and Servant Leadership (H3)

Table VII shows that Pearson Correlation results indicate that there was no significant relationship found between extraversion and servant leadership. Additionally, extraversion does not have a significant relationship with servant leadership when using stepwise regression analysis. Finally, post hoc analysis results indicate that extraversion has no significant relationship with any servant leadership factors (see Table VIII). Therefore, the results do not support H3.

Conscientiousness and Servant Leadership (H4)

Table VII shows that Pearson Correlation results indicate that there is a significant association between servant leadership and conscientiousness ($r=.544, p<.01$). Additionally, stepwise regression analysis show that the overall model comprising conscientiousness and agreeableness is significant, explaining 38.6% of variance in the servant leadership scores, $F(2, 30) = 11.060, p<.001$. Moreover, Table VI shows that the standardized betas indicate conscientiousness is the most powerful of the independent variables, followed by agreeableness.

Table VIII shows that post hoc analyses indicate conscientiousness as being a statistically significant predictor of altruistic calling, $F(1, 31) = 4.895, p=.034$, and persuasive mapping, $F(1, 31) = 24.240, p<.001$. Conscientiousness accounted for 10.9% variance in altruistic calling and 42.1% variance in persuasive mapping. It can be concluded that individuals who are conscientious are more likely to exhibit the servant leadership factors of altruistic calling and persuasive mapping.

Overall, the results provide support for H4, indicating that those who score high on conscientiousness are more likely to exhibit servant leadership behaviors. While it does

not prove that everyone with a conscientious personality exhibits servant leadership behavior, it does support the fact that those who score high on conscientiousness are more likely to exhibit servant leadership behavior.

Table VIII
Significant Regression Variables of SLQ Factors

SLQ Factors and Predictor Variables	Beta	P
Altruistic Calling Conscientiousness	.369	.034
Persuasive Mapping Conscientiousness	.662	p<.001
Wisdom Neurotism	.341	.052
Emotional Healing Agreeableness	.502	.004
Organizational Stewardship Agreeableness	.353	.044

DISCUSSION

Introduction

The following section discusses the findings in relation to existing literature and theory development. Limitations, practical application and opportunities for further research are also presented.

Findings

The purpose of this study was to analyze the relationship between servant leadership behavior and personality type. The study specifically examined the relationship between Barbuto and Wheelers (2006) SLQ servant leadership factors and the Big Five model of personality as assessed by the BFI (John & Srivastava, 1999). Based on prior research, it was hypothesized that agreeableness, openness to experiences, extraversion and conscientiousness would be positively related to servant leadership. Additionally, based on previous research disagreement, the study also sought to examine the relationship between neuroticism and servant leadership (RQ2).

As indicated in the results, agreeableness and conscientiousness were statistically significant predictors of overall servant leadership scores and provided the best overall model for servant leadership behavior. This finding offers several contributions. First, it supports previous research that found empirical evidence supporting a positive significant relationship between servant leadership and individual attributes (Irving, 2004; Irving, 2005; Joseph and Winston, 2004; Washington et al, 2006). For example, it further developed Washington et al (2006) findings that servant leadership ratings were positively related to ratings for agreeableness by introducing an additional factor of conscientiousness as a servant leadership predictor.

Second, findings further developed and supported a trait based approach to leadership studies. More specifically, Judge et al (2002) findings in support for the leadership trait perspective when traits are organized to the five-factor model were further developed in this study by looking specifically at the servant leadership model and concluding a strong correlation. Additionally, this research provided support for Zuccaro (2007) who found that “combinations of traits and attributes, integrated in conceptually meaningful ways, are more likely to predict leadership than are the independent contributions of multiple traits” (p.14). By developing a significant predictor model of servant leadership based on the combination of conscientiousness and agreeableness, the research provided partial support for Zuccaro’s (2007) research.

The lack of statistically significant support for H2 and H3 indicate that openness to experience and extraversion may not be as significant servant leadership predictors as hypothesized. Openness to experiences was hypothesized to be positively related to servant leadership on a conceptual basis. Additionally, Judge et al (2002) found openness to experience to be related to leadership. Findings from this study indicate that the relationship may not necessarily be present when looking specifically at servant leadership. Furthermore, Judge et al (2002) note that, “in business settings, openness to experience, along with extraversion, was the strongest dispositional correlate of leadership” (p. 773). Interestingly, this study found both traits to have no significant relationship to servant leadership. However, the results indicate that there may be a relationship between extraversion and openness to experience as Judge et al (2002) found. This is due to the fact that both traits were found to have no significant relationship to servant leadership. Further research would be needed to investigate this relationship.

Extraversion was hypothesized to be positively related to servant leadership on the basis that without extraversion traits it may be difficult to exhibit servant leadership due to the need for communicating with others found in the servant leadership factor of persuasive mapping. Findings indicate that this may not be as strong of a correlation as predicted. However, these findings may provide further evidence in regard to the differences between servant leadership and transformational leadership. Stone et al (2003) conclude that servant leaders influence and motivate followers through service and stewardship and rely upon service to establish purposes for meaningful work. This is in contrast to transformational leaders who rely upon their charismatic abilities and enthusiastic nature to motivate and influences followers (Stone, et a, 2003). This suggests that transformational leadership may require more extraversion traits such as being assertive and sociable than servant leadership. Additionally, it may account for the unsupported hypothesis for the relationship between extraversion and servant leadership. Further research would be required to additionally differentiate servant leadership from transformational leadership in regard to extraversion.

Results indicate that there is no significant relationship between neuroticism and servant leadership when using stepwise regression analysis and that there is a need for further research to determine the relationship. There has been disagreement regarding the relationship between neuroticism, leadership and servant leadership. Judge et al (2003) found that in a multivariate analysis including the other big five traits, neuroticism failed to emerge as a significant leadership predictor. Other research identifies a relationship between emotional intelligence and servant leadership (Winston & Hardsfield, 2004). Servant leadership behavior also includes emotional intelligent aspects which are opposite

of neuroticism traits. There is also disagreement in the literature in regard to emotional intelligence as a servant leadership predictor (Parolini, 2005). Findings from this study provide further debate as to the relationship between neuroticism and servant leadership and support the fact that there may not be a significant correlation. Further research would be needed to look specifically at neuroticism and servant leadership in order to determine accurate correlations.

Limitations

There are a number of limitations to the research study that need to be discussed when considering the findings. The first limitation includes having a small sample size (N=33). While finding significant results with such a small sample size indicates a strong relationship between the independent variables and dependant variable, a larger sample size would provide further evidence and may account for unsupported hypotheses. The small sample size also led to an imbalance in demographics. There were significantly more males (24) than females (9) and 75% of the sample was married. This indicates an imbalance sample and not enough data to lend itself to show any differences in results when factoring in gender and marital status as moderating variables.

This study also looked specifically at United Methodist Pastors as leaders. This is a very specific group of individuals who may be more likely to exhibit servant leadership attributes than others. This is due to having a values system similar to servant leadership attributes and behaviors based on having a religious background (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002). Using United Methodist Pastors also indicates a sample size that is low on diversity in relation to job position and industry. Therefore, results may be limited in the application to other organizations.

Another limitation includes the fact that the research hypothesized simple linear relationships between personality type and servant leadership without accounting for any moderating variables. Other variables and situational factors need to be taken into account, such as organizational culture, emotional intelligence and employee attitudes toward leaders. For example, Joseph and Winston (2004) found perceptions of servant leadership based on leader and follower ratings correlated positively with both leader trust and organizational trust. Trust may in fact be a moderating variable that impacts an individual's ability to exhibit servant leadership behaviors when their personality reflects a high likeability to utilize servant leadership behavior. Russell and Stone (2002) offer various moderating variables to the linear relationship, including visibility and persuasion. Therefore, results can only be taken into account when looking at a simple linear relationship.

This research also only utilized the self-report SLQ in which the leaders rate their own personal perceptions of their behavior and did not explore employee perceptions regarding their leader's servant leadership behavior. In order to get a more comprehensive view concerning the leader's servant leadership behavior, it would be ideal to additionally use the follower-rating SLQ. This also may help to account for any social desirability bias participants encountered when completing the survey.

Implications

The research findings offer several practical implications for leadership and business approaches. First, organizations that want to use servant leadership as their leadership model would benefit from hiring and developing individuals with conscientious and agreeable personality traits. In order to maintain and promote servant leadership

behavior, employees should understand and actively exhibit servant leadership attributes through their personality traits. Hogan and Kaiser (2005) found that personality predicts leadership and that this information can be used to select leaders or improve the performance of current incumbents. Based on their conclusions and this study's findings, using selection criteria that takes personality type into account will help to predict an individual's use of servant leadership.

Second, leaders play an important role when it comes to an organizations success or failure (Hogan et al, 2008). Being able to identify conscientiousness and agreeableness in an individual means that a person is more likely to exhibit servant leadership attributes and therefore employers may be able to better predict an individual's contribution to the organizations success as a servant leader.

Third, organizations that wish to develop a culture in which servant leadership is widely and actively utilized should focus on developing attributes and values associated with conscientiousness and agreeableness. For example, a culture in which individuals are able to be flexible and cooperative would promote agreeableness. Furthermore, a culture that celebrates responsibility toward society and hard work would promote conscientiousness.

Directions for Future Research

The overall servant leadership regression model affirms and empirically supports that conscientiousness and agreeableness are useful traits in relation to servant leadership. Further research should investigate the relationship between other demographic information (ie. age, gender, marital status, ethnicity), servant leadership and personality type. The findings also provide the basis for further research to explore the relationship

between conscientiousness and agreeableness personality traits, servant leadership behavior and organizational/leader effectiveness. This study can also be replicated using various industries and populations. Studies would benefit from using larger for-profit organizations due to the fact that this study looked at a small nonprofit religious based organization.

Seeing as this research supported the overall use of personality traits as a leadership predictor, further research can utilize other personality trait models in relation to servant leadership in order to gain more understanding about the role different traits play in servant leadership behavior.

Another opportunity for further research is to utilize the follower-rater version of the SLQ in order to compare leader and follower perceptions of servant leadership behavior. This will help get a more accurate and well-rounded view on the leaders use of servant leadership behavior.

Seeing as neuroticism had a significant correlation to servant leadership when using a Pearson Correlation and no significant correlation when using Stepwise Regression analysis, future research should explore this relationship further. Looking specifically at neuroticism attributes in relation to servant leadership attributes using various servant leadership measurement tools would provide a more in depth analysis.

Conclusion

The research focused on testing the general model and relationship between personality type and servant leadership. This study replicates and confirms hypotheses from existing research on the relationship between personality type and servant

leadership. Further research is encouraged to elaborate on and further develop the findings indicated by the research study.

Appendix A: SLQ (Servant Leadership Questionnaire)

Using a 5 point scale rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements (1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree).

The Servant Leadership Questionnaire Items

1. I put others best interest ahead of my own
2. I do everything I can to serve others
3. I sacrifice my own interests to meet others needs
4. I go above and beyond the call of duty to meet others needs

5. I am one whom others would turn to if others have a personal trauma
6. I am good at helping other with their emotional issues
7. I am talented at helping others heal emotionally
8. I am one who can help other mend their hard feelings

9. I am alert to what's happening
10. I am good at anticipating the consequences of decisions
11. I have a great awareness of what is going on
12. I am in touch with what's happening
13. I know what is going to happen

14. I offer compelling reasons to get others to do things
15. I encourage others to dream 'big dreams' about the organization
16. I am very persuasive
17. I am good at convincing other to do things
18. I am gifted when it comes to persuading others

19. I believe that the organization needs to play a moral role in society
20. I believe that our organization needs to function as a community
21. I see the organization for its potential to contribute to society
22. I encourage others to have a community spirit in the workplace
23. I am preparing the organization to make a positive difference in the future

Appendix B: BFI (Big Five Inventory)

Using a 5 point scale rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements (1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree).

I am someone who...

1. ___ Is talkative
2. ___ Tends to find fault with others
3. ___ Does a thorough job
4. ___ Is depressed, blue
5. ___ Is original, comes up with new ideas
6. ___ Is reserved
7. ___ Is helpful and unselfish with others
8. ___ Can be somewhat careless
9. ___ Is relaxed, handles stress well.
10. ___ Is curious about many different things
11. ___ Is full of energy
12. ___ Starts quarrels with others
13. ___ Is a reliable worker
14. ___ Can be tense
15. ___ Is ingenious, a deep thinker
16. ___ Generates a lot of enthusiasm
17. ___ Has a forgiving nature
18. ___ Tends to be disorganized
19. ___ Worries a lot
20. ___ Has an active imagination
21. ___ Tends to be quiet
22. ___ Is generally trusting
23. ___ Tends to be lazy
24. ___ Is emotionally stable, not easily upset
25. ___ Is inventive
26. ___ Has an assertive personality
27. ___ Can be cold and aloof
28. ___ Perseveres until the task is finished
29. ___ Can be moody
30. ___ Values artistic, aesthetic experiences
31. ___ Is sometimes shy, inhibited
32. ___ Is considerate and kind to almost everyone
33. ___ Does things efficiently
34. ___ Remains calm in tense situations
35. ___ Prefers work that is routine
36. ___ Is outgoing, sociable
37. ___ Is sometimes rude to others
38. ___ Makes plans and follows through with them
39. ___ Gets nervous easily
40. ___ Likes to reflect, play with ideas
41. ___ Has few artistic interests
42. ___ Likes to cooperate with others
43. ___ Is easily distracted
44. ___ Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature

Appendix C: Recruitment Letter

June 2010

Dear United Methodist Church Leaders,

As a recognized leader within the United Methodist Church you have had numerous opportunities and experiences to develop and display your leadership skills and characteristics. I am conducting a research study aimed at identifying and measuring leadership behaviors in relation to personality type.

The information I receive from the study will help organizations and leaders better understand leadership behavior and help in organizational leader selection and identification.

This research is being done in partial fulfillment of my Master's degree in Strategic Communication requirements at Seton Hall University, Department of Communication.

The study consists of two questionnaires that include the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) and the Big Five Factor Personality Inventory (BFI). There are six additional brief demographic questions. The two survey's combined will take a total of fifteen minutes to complete.

The results will be used for the purpose of this study only and will be **completely anonymous** and **confidential** through online survey submission that does not ask for names.

Data will be stored on a USB memory key and will be kept in a locked desk drawer. Participation in this research study is completely voluntary. You may withdraw participation at any point without penalty.

To complete the questionnaires go online to <http://asset.tluc.shu.edu:80/servlets/asset.AssetSurvey?surveyid=3942> and follow the instructions.

When asked for a login/user name simply create any username you wish.

The password for accessing the survey is: leadership.

The website will be open to participants from June 7th 2010 until June 25th, 2010.

Your completion and submission of the survey indicates your consent to participate. Your time and willingness to participate in the study are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Lisa Krekeler (MASC Student)

Seton Hall University

Department of Communication

Appendix D: Letter Requesting Permission

April, 19 2010

Dear Superintendents,

My name is Lisa Krekeler and I am writing to you as a current Master's student at Seton Hall University's Communication Department in the Strategic Communication program. I am conducting a research study aimed at identifying and measuring leadership behaviors in relation to personality type.

The information I receive from the study will help organizations and leaders understand leadership behavior better and help in organizational leader selection and identification.

This research is being done in partial fulfillment of my Master's degree in Strategic Communication requirements at Seton Hall University, Department of Communication.

I am writing to ask permission to use the Catskill Hudson District and the Long Island East District United Methodist Church leaders as the selected organization and participants in this study.

The study consists of two questionnaires that include the Servant Leadership Questionnaire and the Big 5 Factor Personality Assessment. There are six additional brief demographic questions. An example question includes, using a 5-point scale (1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree) rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statement: I am someone who is full of energy. The two survey's combined will take a total of fifteen minutes to complete.

The results will be used for the purpose of this study only and will be **completely anonymous** and **confidential** through online survey submission that does not ask for names. Participants can withdraw participation at any point without penalty.

The survey's will be accessible online for two-weeks duration during the summer months. With your permission, I would contact the church leaders (minister/pastors) by email and send them a copy of the letter of recruitment (see attached). The church leaders can then decide to participate or not.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.
I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Lisa Krekeler
Student: Seton Hall University
518-322-5253
lkrekeler@gmail.com

References

- Anderson, A.R. (2009). "Servant-leader development in an adult accelerated degree completion program: A mixed methods study." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Anderson, C., Keltner, D., & John, O.P. (2003). Emotional convergence between people over time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(5): 1054-1068.
- Barbuto, J.E., & Wheeler, D.W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(3): 300-326.
- Barrick, M.R., & Mount, M.K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1): 1-26.
- Bethel, S.M. (2009). *A New Breed of Leader*. New York, NY: Penguin Group.
- Blunt, R. (2003). Leadership in the crucible: the paradox of character and power" *Public Manager*, 32(4): 35-40, in Lussier, R.N., & Achua, C.F. (2007). *Leadership Theory, Application, & Skill Development*. 3rd ed. Mason, OH: Thomson South-Western.
- Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship: Choosing Service over Self-Interest*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Bono, J.E., & Judge, T.A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5): 901-910.
- Braye, R.H. (2002). "Servant-leadership: leading in today's military," in Spears, L., & Lawrence, M. (Ed). *Focus on Leadership: Servant Leadership for the 21st*

Century. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

- Bugenhagen, M.J. (2006). "Antecedents of transactional, transformational, and servant leadership: A constructive-development theory approach. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Nebraska, Lincoln NB.
- Burkhardt, J., & Spears, L.C. (2002). "Servant –leadership and philanthropic institutions," in Spears, L., & Lawrence, M. (Ed). *Focus on Leadership: Servant Leadership for the 21st Century*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- Crant, J.M., & Bateman, T.S. (2000). Charismatic leadership viewed from above: the impact of proactive personality. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(1): 63-74.
- Dannhauser, Z., & Bushoff, A.B. (2007). Structural equivalence in the Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) servant leadership questionnaire on North American and South African samples. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2(2): 148-168.
- Delenschneider, A.M. (2002). Transforming leadership in the United Methodist Church. *Quarterly Review: A Journal of Theological Resources for Ministry*, 22(3): 286-299.
- Dennis, R.S, & Bocarnea, M. (2005). Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(7/8): 600-615.
- Dennis, R., & Winston, B.E. (2003). A factor analysis of Page and Wong's servant leadership instrument. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 24(7/8): 455-459.

- Frick, D.M. (2004). Robert K. Greenleaf A Life of Servant Leadership. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Goldberg, L.R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment*, 4(1): 26-42.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1970). "The servant as leader," in Spears, L., & Lawrence, M. (Ed). *Focus on Leadership: Servant Leadership for the 21st Century*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R.B. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General Psychology*, 9(2): 169-180.
- Irving, J.A. (2004). "Servant leadership and the effectiveness of teams." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Irving, J.A. (2005). "Exploring the relationship between servant leadership and team effectiveness: findings from the nonprofit sector." Paper presented at the Regent University Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Virginia Beach, VA.
- John, O.P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L.A. Pervin & O.P. John (Eds.) *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, 2nd Ed. (pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford.
- Joseph, E.E., & Winston, B.E. (2005). A correlation of servant leadership, leader trust, and organizational trust. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(1/2):6-22.
- Judge, T.A., Bono, J.E., Illies, R., & Gerhardt, M.W. (2002). Personality and leadership:

a qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4): 765-780.

Judge, T.A., Higgins, C.A., Thoresen, C.J., & Barrick, M.R. (1999). The big five personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span. *Personnel Psychology*, 52(3): 621-652.

Kaiser, R.B., Hogan, R., & Craig, S.B. (2008). Leadership and the fate of organizations. *American Psychologists*, 63(2): 96-110.

Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge*. 3rd ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kirkpatrick, S.A., & Locke, E.A. (1991). Leadership: do traits matter? *Academy of Management Executive*, 5(2): 48-60.

Laub, J.A. (1999). "Assessing the servant organization: development of the Servant Organizational Leadership Assessment (SOLA) instrument." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, FL.

Lloyd, B. (1996). A new approach to leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 17(7): 29.

Lussier, R.N., & Achua, C.F. (2007). *Leadership Theory, Application, & Skill Development*. 3rd ed. Mason, OH: Thomson South-Western.

Maxwell, J.C. (2005). *The 360 Leader*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.

McCrae, R.R., & Costa, P.T. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist*, 52(5): 509-516.

Parolini, J.L. (2005). *Investigating the relationships among emotional intelligence, servant leadership behaviors and servant leadership culture*. Paper presented

at the Regent University Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Virginia Beach, VA.

Patterson, K. (2003). *Servant leadership: a theoretical model*. Paper presented at the Regent University Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Virginia Beach, VA.

Peterson, R.S., Smith, D.B., Martorana, P.V., & Owens, P.D. (2003). The impact of chief executive officer personality on top management team dynamics: one mechanism by which leadership affects organizational performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5): 795-808.

Ruschman, N.L. (2002). "Servant-leadership and the best companies to work for in America," in Spears, L., & Lawrence, M. (Ed). *Focus on Leadership: Servant Leadership for the 21st Century*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

Russell, R.F. (2001). The role of values in servant leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 22*(2): 76-83

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.

Saucier, G. (1994). Mini-Markers: A brief version of Goldberg's unipolar Big-Five markers. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 63*(3): 506-516.

Schmitt, D., Allik, J., McCrae, R.P., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2007). The geographic distribution of the big five personality traits: patterns and profiles of human self-description across 56 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 38*(2): 173-212.

- Seibert, S.E., & Kraimer, M.L. (2001). The five-factor model of personality and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58(1): 1-21.
- Sendjaya, S & Sarros J.C. (2002). Servant leadership: its origin, development , and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership and Organization Studies*, 9(2): 57-64.
- Slater, R. (1999). *Jack Welch and the GE way*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Spears, L. (1996). Reflections on Robert K. Greenleaf and servant-leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 17(7): 33
- Spears, L.C. (2002). "Tracing the past, present, and future of servant-leadership," in Spears, L., & Lawrence, M. (Ed). *Focus on Leadership: Servant Leadership for the 21st Century*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- Srivastava, S., John, O.P., Gosling, S.D, & Potter, J. (2003). Development of personality in early and middle adulthood: set like plaster or persistent change? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(5): 1041-1053.
- Stone, G.A., Russell, R.F., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: a difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(3/4): 349-361.
- 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.
- Winston, B.E., & Hardsfield, M. (2004). *Similarities between emotional intelligence and servant leadership*. Paper presented at the Regent University Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Virginia Beach, VA.

- Wong, P.T., & Page, D. (2003). *Servant leadership: an opponent-process model and the revised servant leadership profile*. Paper presented at the Regent University Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Zaccaro, S.J. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychologists*, 62(1): 6-16.