

3. Entrepreneurship, Start-Ups and Small Business

Competitive Session

Examining the Influence of Servant and Entrepreneurial Leadership on the Work Outcomes of Employees in Social Enterprises

ABSTRACT: *The present study examines the relative influence of servant and entrepreneurial leadership on the organizational commitment and innovative behavior of employees working in the social enterprise sector. Although both styles of leadership were positively related to employees' organizational commitment, the relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment was stronger than that between entrepreneurial leadership and organizational commitment. In contrast, whilst entrepreneurial leadership was positively related to employees' innovative behavior, the relationship between servant leadership and employees' innovative behavior was insignificant. These findings are consistent with both social exchange and social learning theories, and provide us with a detailed understanding as to which styles of leadership are effective in promoting employees' work attitudes and behaviors in the social enterprise sector.*

Keywords: Entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial leadership, innovation, social entrepreneurship.

Over the last decade, social entrepreneurship has emerged as an important cultural and economic phenomenon (Dacin, Dacin, & Matear, 2010; Dacin, Dacin, & Tracey, 2011). Social enterprises refer to organizations that engage in business to achieve social impact, whilst at the same time maintaining a focus on commercial objectives (Duniam & Eversole, 2013). In other words, social enterprises are hybrid organizations that maintain both a social welfare logic and a commercial logic (Pache & Santos, 2013).

Despite the growth of the social enterprise sector in both developed and emerging economies, there is increasing recognition that much more needs to be done to support its development. In particular, leadership has been cited as a critical factor which determines the success of social enterprises more specifically (Prabhu, 1999), and entrepreneurial ventures more generally (Kuratko, 2007). However, there is a lack of research on what constitutes effective leadership in social enterprises given their unique mix of social and commercial objectives.

Using data from 163 employees in 42 social enterprises across three countries, the present study makes a significant contribution by examining the relative influence of two distinctive but complementary styles of leadership on employees' innovative behavior and organizational

commitment. More specifically, it will examine the differential influence of entrepreneurial leadership, i.e. a leadership style which influences and directs followers towards the achievement of organizational goals that involve identifying and exploiting entrepreneurial opportunities (Renko, El Tarabishy, Carsrud, & Brannback, 2015), and servant leadership, i.e. a leadership style which focuses on the development of followers and stresses to them the importance of serving others (Greenleaf, 2002). We focus on these two leadership styles given the dual mission of social enterprises to serve the community and develop innovative products and services that will allow them to be self-sustainable. In examining the relative influence of servant and entrepreneurial leadership, we argue that servant leadership will be more strongly related to the key work attitude of organizational commitment given it focuses on the development of followers and serving the community, whilst entrepreneurial leadership will be more strongly related to innovative behavior given it focuses on supporting followers to identify and exploit entrepreneurial opportunities.

By examining these issues our research makes important theoretical contributions. As well as establishing the relative effectiveness of different leadership styles in promoting follower work attitudes and behaviors in social enterprises, our research demonstrates the importance of leadership over and above followers' pro-social motivation and creative self-efficacy (Grant, Dutton, & Rosso, 2008; Tierney & Farmer, 2002).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Social entrepreneurship

Over the last few decades, social enterprise has emerged as a promising complement (and sometimes alternative) to both commercial and non-profit organization (Borzaga and Defourny, 2001), by leveraging capacities to deliver both economic and social value inherent in these more traditional organizational forms (Mair and Marti, 2006; Liu, Takeda, & Ko, 2014). Historically, it has arisen from two distinct phenomena: non-profit organizations left exposed to withdrawal of government funding (Dart, 2004), and for-profit organizations' increased willingness to engage in social wealth creation projects (Thompson, 2002). Although there is disagreement in the literature over an adequate definition of social entrepreneurship (Roper & Cheney, 2005), it has been argued that the distinctive feature of social entrepreneurship lies in the priority given to social wealth creation (Mair et al., 2006).

Yet, although social entrepreneurs focus on creating social value, they still need to have business skills in order to raise funds and develop innovative new products and services (Thompson, 2002).

Despite the recognized potential for complementary wealth creation, as hybrid forms of organization social enterprises face challenges of their own. To start with, their dual mission creates competing demands that are not always easily manageable. One such tension, more evident within shorter timeframes, is between the priority to be innovative (Thompson, Alvy, & Lees, 2000; Liu, Eng, & Takeda, 2013) and the need to serve wider stakeholder groups (Corner & Ho, 2010; Liu et al., 2013). The tension between the need to innovate and the expectation to serve more stakeholders has also been explained in terms of competing social welfare and commercial logics (Battilana & Dorado, 2010; Pache & Santos, 2013). Competing logics present social enterprise leaders with a difficult dilemma (Martin, 2003), and it is for this reason that organizations with a social mission must rely on leadership more than traditional organizations (Felício, Gonçalves, & da Conceição Gonçalves, 2013). In such an institutional setting, where social enterprises face pressure to develop innovative new products and services, whilst at the same time serve a range of stakeholders in the community, leadership is of critical importance to organizational success. Therefore, the present study investigates the relative influence of two distinct but complementary leadership styles on the attitudes and behaviors of employees working in social enterprises; namely servant and entrepreneurial leadership.

Servant leadership

Although the concept of servant leadership was developed over 40 years ago by Greenleaf (1970), only in recent years has it begun to attract the attention of academics and practitioners. According to Greenleaf (1977), servant leadership is a style of leadership in which the leader is effectively a first among equals. As well as focusing on the development of followers and empowering followers through mentoring, servant leaders also stress the importance of creating value outside of the organization by working in the interest of those in the wider community (Ehrhart, 2004; Greenleaf, 1977; Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008; Parris and Welty Peachey, 2013; Sendjaya, Sarros, & Santora, 2008; Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2003). For the purposes of this study we adopt Ehrhart's (2004) global measure of servant leadership which highlights seven main behaviors exhibited by servant leaders; Putting subordinates first, forming relationships with

subordinates, helping subordinates to develop and succeed, having conceptual skills, empowering subordinates, behaving ethically, and creating value for those outside the organization. The findings of research indicate that servant leadership fosters more satisfied, committed, engaged and better-performing followers (Carter & Baghurst, 2013; Liden et al., 2008; Mayer, Bardes, & Piccolo, 2008; Neubert, Kacmar, Carlson, Chonko, & Roberts, 2008).

Entrepreneurial leadership

Entrepreneurial leadership has been defined as a leadership style in which leaders influence and direct their subordinates to identify and explore entrepreneurial opportunities (Renko et al., 2015). Entrepreneurial leaders not only support and encourage their subordinates to experiment and innovate in the workplace, but also act as role-models by engaging in entrepreneurial activity themselves. Although there is growing recognition of the importance of leadership in the entrepreneurial process (Chen, 2007; Gupta, MacMillan, & Surie, 2004), limited work has examined the role the effects of entrepreneurial leadership on follower work outcomes. Most of the work looking at the effects of entrepreneurial leadership has focused on its effects on firm level outcomes (Chen, 2007; Huang, Ding, & Chen, 2014). For example, Chen (2007) found that entrepreneurial leadership led to higher levels of creativity amongst top-management team members, which in turn promoted the innovative capability of new ventures. Similarly, Huang et al. (2014) found that entrepreneurial leadership resulted in greater exploratory and exploitative innovation in enterprises.

Leadership and affective organizational commitment

In the present study, we first examine the relationship between both servant and entrepreneurial leadership and the affective organizational commitment of followers. Affective commitment refers to an employee's emotional attachment to and identification with the organization (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993). We chose to focus on affective organizational commitment as a focal work attitude as it has been shown by meta-analytical work to be a better predictor of key outcomes of benefit to organizations than other work attitudes (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002; Riketta 2002).

In prior research, social exchange theory (Blau 1964) has been invoked to explain why servant leadership enhances followers' organizational commitment (Miao, Newman, Schwarz, & Xu,

2014). As supervisors are perceived to be the face of the organization responsible for implementing organizational policy, the provision of positive treatment by supervisors is likely to lead followers to reciprocate in the form of improved work attitudes, such as organizational commitment. More specifically, the exhibition of key servant leadership behaviors, such as forming strong relationships with followers and helping them to develop and succeed, should lead followers to reciprocate through heightening their emotional attachment to and identification with the organization. Empirical research provides support for such assertions. For example, Miao et al. (2014) found a strong relationship between servant leadership and the affective commitment of civil servants in China. Similarly, Liden et al. (2008) found a strong relationship between servant leadership and the organizational commitment of employees in a commercial organization in the US. However, we expect the relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment to be even stronger in social enterprises, given it is a style of leadership that fits with the mission of social enterprises, i.e. creating value for those outside the organization. Although there is growing evidence of a positive relationship between servant leadership and employee work attitudes such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Liden et al., 2008; Miao et al., 2014; Schneider and George, 2011), prior research has not examined the relationship between entrepreneurial leadership and organizational commitment. We might also expect a positive relationship between entrepreneurial leadership and affective commitment as followers reciprocate the provision of encouragement by the leader for them to act in an entrepreneurial manner (Renko et al., 2015).

However, we also argue that servant leadership will be more strongly related to organizational commitment than entrepreneurial leadership. Unlike entrepreneurial leaders, who predominantly focus their resources on supporting their followers to experiment and innovate in the workplace (Renko et al., 2015), servant leaders are more likely to focus on developing their followers in a more holistic manner through the provision of socio-emotional support. For example, in addition to providing job-related support to followers, servant leaders also assist followers when they face difficulties in their personal lives (Liden et al., 2015). The above discussion leads us to the following hypotheses:

H1: Servant leadership is positively related to organizational commitment.

H2: Entrepreneurial leadership is positively related to organizational commitment.

H3: Servant leadership is more strongly related to organizational commitment than entrepreneurial leadership.

Leadership and innovative behavior

In the present study we also examine the relationship between both servant and entrepreneurial leadership and followers' innovative behavior in the social enterprise sector. Innovative behavior refers to the generation and implementation of new and useful ideas by employees in the workplace (Scott & Bruce, 1994). As well as being the source of around eighty percent of new ideas in the workplace (Getz and Robinson, 2003), the successful implementation of new ideas within organizations requires the involvement of employees. Although previous research has begun to link different styles of leadership to innovative behavior (Yoshida, Sendjaya, Hirst, & Cooper, 2014), it has failed to examine the relative effects of different leadership styles on followers' innovative behavior. First, we might expect servant leadership to be positively related to innovative behavior for at least two reasons: as well as promoting a climate of safety and security in which followers will be willing to put forward new ideas without fear of ridicule, servant leadership also fosters the collective effort of team members to implement such ideas in the workplace (Yoshida et al., 2014). Consequently, Yoshida et al. (2014) find a strong relationship between servant leadership and employee creativity, mediated by leader identification.

Second, we might expect entrepreneurial leadership to be strongly related to followers' innovative behavior. In the present study, we draw on social learning theory (Bandura 1977, 1986) to explain how entrepreneurial leaders enhance followers' innovative behaviour in the workplace. Social learning theory postulates that individuals learn through observing and emulating others' attitudes and behaviors (Bandura, 1977). Leaders are an especially important source of role modelling due to their status as well as their ability to utilize organizational rewards to establish what behaviour is expected (Miao et al., 2014). More specifically, through acting as entrepreneurial role models to their followers by identifying and exploiting new opportunities at work, entrepreneurial leaders highlight the importance of engaging in entrepreneurial behaviors in the workplace (Gupta et al., 2004; Renko et al., 2015). In addition to role modelling the behaviors expected from their followers, entrepreneurial

leaders actively encourage their followers to engage in innovative behavior and stimulate them to think in more innovative ways (Gupta et al., 2004; Thornberry, 2006).

Although we expect both servant and entrepreneurial leadership to be positively related to followers' innovative behavior, we expect the relationship between entrepreneurial leadership and innovative behavior to be stronger than that between servant leadership and innovative behavior. We argue that this results from the fact that the advice, support and role modelling provided by entrepreneurial leaders focuses more specifically on entrepreneurial behaviors than the more general support provided by servant leaders. The above discussion leads us to the following hypotheses:

H4: Servant leadership is positively related to innovative behavior.

H5: Entrepreneurial leadership is positively related to innovative behavior.

H6: Entrepreneurial leadership will be more strongly related to innovative behavior than servant leadership.

METHODS

Sample and procedures

Data collection for our project was undertaken in late-2014 to mid-2015 across three countries; Australia, Canada and the UK. Given there was no government registry of social enterprises in Australia, Canada and the UK in 2014, we used publicly available information from the member directories of Social Traders Australia, Social Enterprise Canada and Social Enterprise UK to develop our own database of social enterprises. In our database we included all enterprises from these directories that provided the name of a lead social entrepreneur and a contactable e-mail address. This amounted to 3316 enterprises in Australia, 99 enterprises in Canada and 236 enterprises in the UK. We sent out an e-mail to each of the social entrepreneurs in the database, inviting them to participate in the study. In this e-mail we highlighted the purpose of the study and promised participants that their responses would be kept confidential. We informed them that, in order to participate in the study, the social enterprise should employ at least three individuals. When a social entrepreneur agreed to take part in our study, we mailed them a pack of questionnaires. We instructed them to fill out one questionnaire and distribute the remaining questionnaires to 3-5 of their direct subordinates. The questionnaires were coded to allow us to match entrepreneur and subordinate responses. In order to

ensure confidentiality we provided stamp-addressed envelopes to allow participants to return the questionnaires directly to the research team. Although 99 social entrepreneurs initially agreed to participate in our research, around half withdrew after the questionnaires had been sent. A total of 199 employees from 48 social enterprises returned questionnaires. However, as only 42 social entrepreneurs rated their subordinates' innovative behavior, and a number of employees did not provide full responses, the final sample size consisted of 169 employees. The employees who participated in our study had on average worked for the social enterprises for 4.75 years and were on average around 41 years of age. 54 percent of them were female.

Measures

For all measures, participants rated items using a 5-point Likert scale where 1= 'strongly disagree' and 5= 'strongly agree'. The 8-item ENTRELEAD scale developed by Renko et al. (2015) was used by followers to rate the entrepreneurial leadership of the social entrepreneur. Sample items included 'My supervisor challenges and pushes me to act in a more innovative way'. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .86. Servant leadership of the social entrepreneurs was rated by followers using Ehrhart's (2004) 14-item scale. Sample items included 'My supervisor creates a sense of community among employees'. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .91. The six-item scale developed by Meyer and Allen (1993) was used to measure affective organizational commitment. Sample items included 'I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career at this organization'. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .88. 5 items from Scott and Bruce (1994) were used by social entrepreneurs to rate the innovative behavior of their followers. Sample items included 'This employee searches out new technologies, processes, techniques, and/or ideas'. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .91. Follower tenure at the social enterprise (measured in years), follower age (measured in years) and follower gender (coded 1 = male, 0 = female) were included as controls. We also controlled for followers' pro-social motivation, as it has been shown to exert a strong influence on employee work attitudes (Grant et al., 2008; Kjeldsen & Andersen, 2013). An adapted version of the four-item scale developed by Grant (2008) was used by followers to rate their pro-social motivation. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .92. Finally, we controlled for followers' creative self-efficacy as it has been found to be an important antecedent of employee creativity in the

workplace, a key dimension of innovative behavior (Tierney & Farmer, 2002; Tierney and Farmer, 2011). Creative self-efficacy was measured using the 4-item scale developed by Tierney & Farmer (2002). The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .89.

RESULTS

Table 1 reports means, standard deviations and correlations amongst the study variables.

[Table 1 here]

Construct validity of measurement model

Before hypothesis testing was undertaken, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted using LISREL 8.80 in order to determine the construct validity of study variables. The six-factor model (i.e. servant leadership, entrepreneurial leadership, pro-social motivation, creative self-efficacy, affective organizational commitment and innovative behavior) yielded a good fit to the data ($\chi^2 (df = 764) = 1314.73$, IFI = .95, CFI = .95, RMSEA = .066, SRMR = .072). These statistics meet the recommendations of researchers (Browne and Cudeck, 1992; Kline, 2005) who argued that a satisfactory model fit can be inferred when CFI is greater than .90 and the RMSEA and SRMR is lower than .08. The six-factor measurement model was then compared to a series of alternative models to provide further evidence of construct validity. A five-factor model in which servant and entrepreneurial leadership were loaded onto a single factor resulted in poorer fit ($\chi^2 (df = 769) = 1557.52$, IFI = .94, CFI = .94, RMSEA = .078, SRMR = .076), as well as a five-factor model in which pro-social motivation and creative self-efficacy were loaded onto a single factor ($\chi^2 (df = 769) = 1931.26$, IFI = .91, CFI = .91, RMSEA = .095, SRMR = .11). Finally, a one-factor model in which all study items were loaded onto a single factor resulted in extremely poor fit ($\chi^2 (df = 779) = 4071.41$, IFI = .79, CFI = .79, RMSEA = .16, SRMR = .14). Together these results highlight adequate discriminant and convergent validity of the study variables.

Given 169 employees provided ratings of entrepreneurial leadership and servant leadership for 42 social entrepreneurs, we conducted ANOVA and intra-class correlation (ICC) tests to ensure that non-independence of observations was not related to differences in employees' rating patterns for each entrepreneur (Bliese, 2000). The ANOVA was significant ($F = 2.48$, $p < .01$), and the ICC (1) and ICC (2) results for entrepreneurial leadership were 0.25 and 0.59, and = 2.48, $p < .01$).

Furthermore, the ANOVA was also significant ($F = 2.00, p < .01$) and the ICC (1) and ICC (2) results for servant leadership were 0.18 and 0.50, and $= 2.48, p < .01$). Although the ANOVA results of both leadership styles were significant, the ICC 2 of both leadership styles was lower than the recommended threshold of $ICC(2) > 0.60$ (Bliese, 2000). Since, the average group size and the overall sample size were relatively small, and ICC 2 is very sensitive to the sample size, we took a conservative approach and decided not to aggregate entrepreneurial leadership and servant leadership as group-level constructs for subsequent regression analyses.

Hypothesis testing

Hypotheses were tested using hierarchical regression analysis in SPSS 20. To reduce problems associated with multicollinearity in moderated regression, all variables were Z-standardized prior to analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). The results of analysis are presented in Table 2 for both affective organizational commitment (Models 1 and 2) and innovative behavior (Models 3 and 4). Initially, the control variables (tenure, age, gender, pro-social motivation and creative self-efficacy) were entered into the first step of the regression (Models 1 and 3). Out of all the control variables, only tenure ($\beta = .26, p < .01$) and pro-social motivation ($\beta = .39, p < .01$) were positively related to organizational commitment in Model 1, and only creative self-efficacy ($\beta = .18, p < .05$) was positively related to innovative behavior in Model 3.

Following this, both independent variables were entered into the second step of the regression. In Model 2, both servant leadership ($\beta = .34, p < .01$) and entrepreneurial leadership ($\beta = .16, p < .05$) were positively related to followers' organizational commitment. This is supportive of Hypotheses 1 and 2. In line with Hypothesis 3, the relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment was stronger than that between entrepreneurial leadership and organizational commitment. In Model 3, entrepreneurial leadership was positively related to followers' innovative behavior ($\beta = .36, p < .01$). This is supportive of Hypothesis 5. However, the relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment was negative and marginally insignificant ($\beta = -.20, p > .05$), providing no support for Hypothesis 4. The findings were supportive of Hypothesis 6, as they show that the relationship between entrepreneurial leadership and innovative behavior is stronger than that between servant leadership and innovative behavior.

DISCUSSION

The present study makes an important theoretical and empirical contribution by examining the role played by servant and entrepreneurial leadership in enhancing the organizational commitment and innovative behavior of employees in social enterprises whilst controlling for employees' pro-social motivation and creative self-efficacy (Grant et al., 2008; Tierney & Farmer, 2002).

Our findings of a strong association between servant leadership and organizational commitment confirm the findings of prior empirical work on servant leadership in China and the USA (Miao et al., 2014; Liden et al., 2008). They are also consistent with the tenets of social exchange theory (Blau 1964), which predicts that the employees will reciprocate the provision of positive treatment by their supervisors in the form of improved work attitudes. Our study was also the first to document a positive relationship between entrepreneurial leadership and organizational commitment. This suggests that the provision of encouragement by the leader for followers to act in an entrepreneurial manner will lead followers to reciprocate in the form of heightened organizational commitment (Renko et al., 2015).

Although our findings are consistent with social learning theory (Bandura, 1977), in that they demonstrate that the role modelling provided by entrepreneurial leaders will lead followers to be more innovative at work, they are inconsistent with those of prior empirical research which found a positive relationship between servant leadership and employee creativity (Yoshida et al., 2014). Two explanations may be provided for a negative but marginally insignificant relationship between servant leadership and innovative behavior. First, as highlighted by Yoshida et al. (2014) their work failed to control for other leadership styles. By measuring the relative importance of different leadership behaviors, the present study allows us to better pinpoint the unique effects of different leadership styles on innovative behavior than previous research. Second, given that followers generally choose to work for social enterprises to make a significant contribution to society, the encouragement provided by servant leaders to create value for those outside the organization may lead followers to focus more on serving others than developing innovative new products and services. Given the pressures faced by social enterprises to be innovative (Thompson et al, 2000; Liu et al, 2013), whilst serving the needs of wider stakeholder groups (Corner & Ho, 2010; Liu et al, 2012), our findings make a significant

contribution by providing us with a detailed understanding as to the relative effectiveness of different styles of leadership in promoting employees' work attitudes and behaviors in the social enterprise sector.

Our findings provide important practical implications for social entrepreneurs looking to enhance employee work attitudes and behavior in order to improve the overall effectiveness of their enterprises. They strongly indicate that no single leadership style is effective for all situations they need to manage at work, because the effects of different leadership styles can be outcome specific (Tse & Chiu, 2014). Specifically, our findings suggest that if social entrepreneurs want to encourage innovative behavior amongst their followers they should consider adopting an entrepreneurial style of leadership in which they act as an entrepreneurial role model and encourage their followers to act entrepreneurially, whereas if they want more committed employees who are less likely to leave the organization they should act as a servant leader to their followers through putting their subordinates first and encouraging them to create value for those outside the organization.

LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

A limitation of the present research is that it did not measure potential mediators of the relationship between different leadership styles and follower work outcomes. In order to confirm the proposed theoretical mechanisms linking both servant and entrepreneurial leadership to organizational commitment and innovative behavior, future empirical research might include mediators which capture social exchange and social learning processes.

A further limitation arises from the fact that although the independent and dependent variables in the study were collected from different sources, they were collected at the same point in time. This limits our ability to determine a causal relationship between leadership and the work outcomes in our study. In order to provide more robust findings around the influence of different styles of leadership on organizational commitment and innovative behavior, future research should ensure that the independent and dependent variables are collected at different time periods.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J., Stevenson, H. & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: same, different, or both? *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, 30(1), 1-22.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall.
- Battilana, J. & Dorado, S. (2010). Building sustainable hybrid organizations: The case of commercial microfinance organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 6, 1419–40.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*, New York, Wiley.
- Bliese, P. (2000). Within-group agreement, non-independence, and reliability. In K. Klein & S. Kozlowski (Eds.). *Multi-level theory, research, and methods in organizations*, 349-81. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass.
- Borzaga, C. & Defourny, J. (2001). *The emergence of social enterprise* (Vol. 4). Hove, UK, Psychology Press.
- Browne, M. W. & Cudeck, R. (1992). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. *Sociological Methods and Research*, 21, 230–58.
- Carter, D. & Baghurst, T. (2013). The influence of servant leadership on restaurant employee engagement. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 124(3), 453–64.
- Chen, M. H. (2007). Entrepreneurial leadership and new ventures: Creativity in entrepreneurial teams. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 16(3), 239–49.
- Corner, P. D., & Ho, M. (2010). How opportunities develop in social entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, 34(4), 635-59.
- Dacin, P. A., Dacin, M. T. & Matear, M. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24(3), 37-57.
- Dacin, P. A., Dacin, M. T. & Tracey, P. (2011). Social entrepreneurship: A critique and future directions. *Organization Science*, 22(5), 1203-13.

- Dart, R. (2004). The legitimacy of social enterprise. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 14(4), 411-24.
- Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(1), 61–94.
- Emerson, J. & Twersky, F. (1996). *New social entrepreneurs: The success, challenge, and lessons of non-profit enterprise creation*. San Francisco: Roberts Foundation.
- Felício, J. A., Gonçalves, H. M. & da Conceição Gonçalves, V. (2013). Social value and organizational performance in non-profit social organizations: Social entrepreneurship, leadership, and socioeconomic context effects. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(10), 2139-46.
- Getz, I. & Robinson, A. G. (2003). Innovate or die: Is that a fact? *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 12, 130-36.
- Grant, A. M. (2008). Does intrinsic motivation fuel the prosocial fire? Motivational synergy in predicting persistence, performance, and productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 48-58.
- Grant, A. M., Dutton, J. E. & Rosso, B. D. (2008). Giving commitment: Employee support programs and the prosocial sensemaking process. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(5), 898-918.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis, The Robert K. Greenleaf Center.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York, Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness* (25th anniversary ed.), New York, Paulist Press,
- Gupta, V., MacMillan, I. C. & Surie, G. (2004). Entrepreneurial leadership: Developing and measuring a cross-cultural construct. *Journal of Business Venturing* 19(2), 241–60.
- Huang, S., Ding, D. & Chen, Z. (2014). Entrepreneurial leadership and performance in Chinese new ventures: A moderated mediation model of exploratory innovation, exploitative innovation and environmental dynamism. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 23, 4, 453-71.

- Kline, R. (2005). *The principles and practices of structural equation modeling*. New York, The Guilford Press.
- Kjeldsen, A. M. & Andersen, L. B. (2013). How pro-social motivation affects job satisfaction: An international analysis of countries with different welfare state regimes. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 36(2), 153-76.
- Kuratko, D. F. (2007). Entrepreneurial leadership in the 21st century. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 13(4), 1-11.
- Lepoutre, J., Justo, R., Terjesen, S. & Bosma, N. (2013). Designing a global standardized methodology for measuring social entrepreneurship activity: The Global Entrepreneurship Monitor social entrepreneurship study. *Small Business Economics*, 40(3), 693-714.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H. & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multilevel assessment. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), 161–77.
- Liu, G., Eng, T. Y. & Takeda, S. (2013). An investigation of marketing capabilities and social enterprise performance in the UK and Japan. *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, 39(2), 267-98.
- Liu, G., Takeda, S. & Ko, W. W. (2014). Strategic orientation and social enterprise performance. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(3), 480-501.
- Mair, J. & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36-44.
- Martin, R. (2003). To the rescue: Beating the heroic leadership trap. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter, 36–43.
- Mayer, D. M., Bardes, M. & Piccolo, R. F. (2008). Do servant-leaders help satisfy follower needs? An organizational justice perspective. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 17(2), 180–97.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J. & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: extension and test of a three-component conception. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 538–51.

- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L. & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 20–52.
- Miao, Q., Newman, A., Schwarz, G. & Xu, L. (2014). Servant leadership, trust, and the organizational commitment of public sector employees in China. *Public Administration*, 92(3), 727-43.
- Neubert, M. J., Kacmar, K. M., Carlson, D. S., Chonko, L. B. & Roberts, J. A. (2008). Regulatory focus as a mediator of the influence of initiating structure and servant leadership on employee behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(6), 1220–33.
- Pache, A. C. & Santos, F. (2013). Inside the hybrid organization: Selective coupling as a response to conflicting institutional logics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(4), 972-1001.
- Parris, D. L. & Welty Peachey, J. (2013). A systematic literature review of servant leadership theory in organizational contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 113(3), 377–93.
- Prabhu, G. N. (1999). Social entrepreneurial leadership. *Career Development International*, 4(3), 40-145.
- Renko, M., El Tarabishy, A., Carsrud, A.L. & Brannback, M. (2015). Understanding and measuring entrepreneurial leadership style. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 53(1), 54-74.
- Ricketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: A meta- analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(2), 257–66.
- Roper, J. & Cheney, G. (2005). Leadership, learning, and human resource management: The meaning of social entrepreneurship today, *Corporate Governance*, 5(3), 95–104.
- Schneider, S. K. & George, W.M. (2011). Servant leadership versus transformational leadership in voluntary service organizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 32(1), 60–77.
- Scott, S. G. & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behaviour: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 580-607.
- Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J. C. & Santora, J. C. (2008). Defining and measuring servant leadership behaviour in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45, 402–24.

- Smith, L. & Woods, C. (2015). Stakeholder engagement in the social entrepreneurship process: identity, governance and legitimacy. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 6(2), 186-217.
- Stone, A. G., Russell R. F. & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational vs servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. *Leadership and Organisation Development Journal*, 25(4), 349-61.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston: Pearson.
- Thompson, J. L. (2002). The world of the social entrepreneur. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 15(5), 412-31.
- Thompson, J., Alvy, G. & Lees, A. (2000). Social entrepreneurship-a new look at the people and the potential. *Management Decision*, 38(5), 328-38.
- Thornberry, N. (2006). *Lead like an entrepreneur: Keeping the entrepreneurial spirit alive within the corporation*. Fairfield, PA, McGraw Hill.
- Tierney, P. & Farmer, S. M. (2002). Creative self-efficacy: Its potential antecedents and relationship to creative performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(6), 1137-48.
- Tierney, P. & Farmer, S. M. (2011). Creative self-efficacy development and creative performance over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(2), 277-93.
- Tracey, P. & Jarvis, O. (2006). An enterprising failure: Why a promising social enterprise collapsed. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Spring, 66-70.
- Tracey, P. & Phillips, N. (2007). The distinctive challenge of educating social entrepreneurs: A postscript and rejoinder to the special issue on entrepreneurship education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(2), 264-71.
- Tse, H. H. M. & Chiu, C. K. (2014). Transformational leadership and job performance. A social identity perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 67, 2827-35.
- Weerawardena, J. & Mort, G. S. (2006). Investigating social entrepreneurship: A multidimensional model. *Journal of World Business*, 41, 21-35.
- Yoshida, D., Sendjaya, S., Hirst, G. & Cooper, B. (2014). Does servant leadership foster creativity and innovation? A multi-level mediation study of identification and prototypicality. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(7), 1395-404.

Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations among the Study Variables

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1 Tenure	4.75	5.24									
2 Age	40.60	12.02	.33**								
3 Gender	0.54	.50	-.12	-.06							
4 Entrepreneurial leadership	4.01	.63	-.01	-.09	-.08						
5 Servant leadership	4.00	.62	.05	-.05	-.16*	.69**					
6 Pro-social motivation	4.28	.63	.06	-.03	.13	.21**	.25**				
7 Creative self-efficacy	4.01	.68	.01	.02	-.11	.08	.10	.21**			
8 Affective commitment	3.94	.77	.29**	.06	-.12	.45**	.54**	.39**	.13		
9 Innovative behavior	3.91	.79	-.06	-.00	.04	.22	.04	-.01	.16*	.07	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 2: Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses

	Affective Organizational Commitment		Innovative Behavior	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Tenure	.26**	.25**	-.06	-.05
Age	-.20	.01	.02	.03
Gender	-.14	-.05	.06	.06
Pro-social motivation	.39**	.26**	-.05	-.08
Creative self-efficacy	.04	.02	.18*	.18*
Servant leadership		.34**		-.20
Entrepreneurial leadership		.16*		.36**
R^2	.22	.42	.04	.11

Note. Standardized regression coefficients reported. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.