SERVING THE WORLD:

A CROSS-CULTURAL STUDY OF

NATIONAL CULTURE DIMENSIONS AND SERVANT LEADERSHIP

by

Darin R. Molnar

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Capella University

June 2007

© Darin R. Molnar, 2007

SERVING THE WORLD:

A CROSS-CULTURAL STUDY OF

NATIONAL CULTURE DIMENSIONS AND SERVANT LEADERSHIP

by

Darin R. Molnar

has been approved

June 2007

APPROVED:

THEODORE C. KARIOTIS, Ph.D., Faculty Mentor and Chair

GARY ROBINSON, Ph.D., Committee Member

VINCENT J. DEFAZIO, D.M., Committee Member

ACCEPTED AND SIGNED:

_____

THEODORE C. KARIOTIS, Ph.D.

_____

Kurt Linberg, Ph.D.
Dean, School of Business & Technology

Abstract

Since its introduction into the leadership and management literatures by Greenleaf, servant leadership has harbored the potential to act as an intellectual and emotional bridge between worldviews. Development of this bridging structure offers enormous heuristic utility for organizations entering new, international markets. Such organizations must attend to the social and cultural norms of the peoples with whom they interact or face possible conflict between incommensurate worldviews and probable failure in those markets. Hofstede's cultural typology has been used by organizations for many years as a framework for understanding national cultures at a high level. This study combines Hofstede's typology with Hebert's compression of Laub's six servant leadership sub-scores, (a) values people, (b) develops people, (c) builds community, (d) displays authenticity, (e) provides leadership, and (f) shares leadership, into the single factor, *servant leadership*, to arrive at filtering criteria for the World Values Survey (2006) dataset. The result is an *instrument* of 35 World Values Survey variables covering 3,282 respondents from 23 countries in the Northern Hemisphere. These 35 variables are used to construct a Servant Leadership Index (SLI) intended to measure servant leadership at the general study level. Statistical procedures are used to explore relationships between

Hofstede's cultural typology dimensions Power Distance (PDI), Individualism and Collectivism (IDV), Masculinity and Femininity (MAS), and Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI) and the SLI at the study level. Along with this, the influences of several WVS demographic variables upon the SLI are computed. The outcomes of this study are centered on the correlative and influential relationships gender has upon the applicability of servant leadership to the sample population.

Dedication

First and foremost, I dedicate this work to my wife, Andrea, who has endured the long nights, interminable weekends, and tedious hours of coursework, research, writing, and anxiety of the last seventeen years. Without her encouragement and support, college, graduate school, and this study would exist only in the dream state. I also dedicate this work to my mother, Windee, who always believed I could do it, even when I had my doubts. You are both inspirations to me. This is your accomplishment as much as it is mine.

Acknowledgments

At the top of any acknowledgement list sits my mentor, the inimitable Dr. Theodore Kariotis. It was Dr. Kariotis who first allowed me to voice my socialistic tendencies without judgment and it was Dr. Kariotis who encouraged me to do the dissertation I wanted, rather than the one I thought I should do. Ted, I will never be Greek, yet I hope I will always remain your good friend. Likewise, Dr. Gary Robinson deserves many thanks. Dr. Robinson was instrumental in "keeping the plane in the air" when it threatened to stall out on me—repeatedly. From those initial moments of our first meeting to the final version of this document, his maturity and guidance kept me on task and in line with what it means to be a scholar. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the unending moral support of my peer learners, Debra Elliott and Carlos Colon. Athos, Porthos, and Aramis shall always overcome!

Ever Onward!

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Study

The primary purpose of this study is an examination of the relationships between Hofstede's (2001) definitions of power distance, individualism and collectivism, masculinity and femininity, and uncertainty avoidance and servant leadership across cultures. Years of research and writing on the topic of servant leadership have produced a vast literature, yet no publications currently available assess the applicability of servant leadership across national cultures with or without consideration of other social dynamics. Nor do they offer insights into the theoretical and practical development of such an approach. This study introduces the concepts and ideas behind servant leadership theory and practice. It proposes a qualitative triangulation of Hofstede's cultural typology dimensions (Hofstede, 1993; 2001; 2003; 2005), Power Distance (PDI), Individualism/Collectivism (IDV), Masculinity/Femininity (MAS), and Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI), servant leadership characteristic categories as introduced by Laub (1999) and compressed by Hebert (2003), and the European Study Group and World Values Survey Association (2006) respondent database. Two main goals of this study are (a) an examination of the relationships between Hofstede's definitions of power distance, individualism and collectivism, masculinity and femininity, and uncertainty avoidance and servant leadership attributes at the national culture level in countries across the world

and (b) an examination of demographic factors which may or may not influence servant leadership practice at the national culture level in several countries across the world.

Servant Leadership

Servant leadership was introduced into the organizational leadership and management literatures with the publication of Greenleaf's *The Servant as Leader* (1970). Since then institutional types of all kinds have embraced his ideas as ways of leading and managing organizational members in more compassionate, inclusive ways. These institutional types have included businesses, churches, non-profits, foundations, and educational institutions, all of which are addressed by Greenleaf in his follow-up book, *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness* (1977/2002). Greenleaf's own dictum that the "servant-leader *is* servant first" (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 27) has been left largely intact by subsequent researchers. Several solid efforts have been made over the intervening years at developing theoretical tenets (Dennis, 2004; Koshal, 2006; Patterson, 2003; Reinke, 2004; Russell, 2001; Winston, 2003) and praxis guidelines (Autry, 2001; Blum, 2002; Dennis & Bocarnea, 2005; Dennis & Winston, 2003; Drury, 2004; 2005; Foster, 2000; Hebert, 2004; Herbst, 2004; Irving, 2005; Jennings, 2002; Laub, 1999; 2003; Miears, 2005; Page & Wong, 2000; Russell, 2003; Spears, 2004; Wong & Page, 2003; Wong & Page, 2005), yet none have substantively addressed the singular purpose of this study: The pan-cultural applicability of servant leadership in light of Hofstede's cultural typology.

Though the ideas behind servant leadership have existed for millennia within religious, mythical, and other moralistic prose, they first entered the contemporary organizational research literature in the 1970s with the publications of Robert K. Greenleaf (1970; 1977/2002). Greenleaf claims to have discovered servant leadership via an epiphany while reading Hesse's *Journey to the East* (2003) in which Leo, the apparent servant of the expeditionary group that is the subject of the book, turns out the be an exceptional spiritual leader who was acting as a servant for the group. According to Greenleaf, the "servant-leader is servant first" (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 27) and Leo's model prompted Greenleaf to make the intellectual shift necessary to begin the introduction of the idea into the organizational research literature. Through his many publications (Greenleaf, 1970; 1977/2002; 1996; 1998; 2003), Greenleaf carefully lays out the tenets of servant leadership with suggestions for implementation of them within several types of organizations, including business, education, foundations, and churches.

The principles of servant leadership are constructed upon a foundation of virtue ethics that extends from the works of Aristotle (Aristotle, 1911/1998) to contemporary times (Annas, 2003; Hookway, 2003; Koehn, 1995; Murphy, 1999; Shanahan & Hyman, 2003; Sherman, 2005; Siep, 2005; Slote, 2003; Solomon, 2003; Whetstone, 2001). The concept of an ethics based upon virtue emphasizes the personal moralistic character of the agent. In the case of the servant leader, the practitioner is admonished to ask "What sort of person am I?" whenever confronted with an ethical decision. This is in contrast to various other forms of normative ethics which prompt questions such as "How should I behave in order to maximize the good and minimize the harm for all parties involved?"

The servant leader will typically rely on intrinsic moral characteristics to make decisions in an ethical manner. In this way, servant leadership is considered a way of being in which the practitioner is constantly considering and honing his own functional leadership attributes with the goal of performing the role of true servant leader.

Assuming the role of servant leader requires proper organizational context. In the absence of such context, the servant leader will find himself a lone vessel on the ocean with neither a captain in the form of guiding organizational directives nor crew in the form of willing followers. This can create the type of confusion and ultimately dissension that will result in the leader either adopting another leadership style or being removed from the organization altogether. One way to avoid such a scenario is for the leader to first assess the level of servant leadership practiced at the organization in which he intends to put the principles into action. Fortunately, several good metrics and instruments are available to accomplish this task. Spears (2004) has provided a list of servant leadership characteristics that ring true: (a) listening, (b) empathy, (c) healing, (d) awareness, (e) persuasion, (f) conceptualization, (g) foresight, (h) stewardship, (i) commitment to the growth of people, and (j) building community (pp. 13-16). Spears' role as CEO of the Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership uniquely positions him as an unquestioned authority on the subject of servant leadership, yet nowhere has he suggested either a testable theoretical approach or practical decision model for burgeoning and experienced servant leaders.

Other researchers, such as Russell and Stone (Russell, 2000; Russell & Stone, 2002) and Page and Wong (Page & Wong, 2000; Wong & Page, 2003; 2005; Wong,

Page, & Rude, 2005), have offered functional attribute lists and assessment instruments. The most widely used (Braye, 2001; Drury, 2004; Hebert, 2003; Herbst, 2004; Horsman, 2001; Irving, 2005; Joseph & Winston, 2005; Ledbetter, 2004; Miears, 2005; Russell, 2001; Thompson, 2004) has been Laub's (1999) *Servant Organizational Leadership Assessment* (SOLA) survey instrument designed to assess servant leadership characteristics at the organizational level. Laub creates the SOLA within a three-phase study composed of a Delphi panel, a pilot study, and a cross-sectional survey that consists of a sample drawn from 41 different organizations throughout the world. His Delphi panel is composed of fourteen recognized experts in the field of servant leadership. A factor analysis of his study data results in the following six categories of servant leadership attributes: (a) values people, (b) develops people, (c) builds community, (d) displays authenticity, (e) provides leadership, and (f) shares leadership (Laub, 1999, p. 67).

Laub's (1999) development of the SOLA is important because his six sub-scales of servant leadership have generally been accepted by the research community as valid, thereby providing a common disciplinary vocabulary and research framework. Subsequent researchers have used the SOLA instrument in conjunction with other measurement instruments that fit within the research goal ranges of their particular projects. For instance, Hebert (2003) uses the Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Job Satisfaction Scale (MCMJSS) to measure her study participants' overall job satisfaction combined with the six job satisfaction measurement questions of the SOLA to determine the level of intrinsic job satisfaction of respondents in her study. The results of these

efforts have continued to confirm servant leadership as an important approach to organizational leadership and management. This could not have been so easily accomplished without the use of Laub's (1999) SOLA survey instrument, which contributes in a very fundamental way to this study by providing a list of criteria useful for developing research questions and testable working hypotheses centered on the pan-cultural applicability of servant leadership.

Globalization and Related Issues

As organizations that practice servant leadership extend their collective reach across the world, they must remain mindful of the differences between and within cultures at the national level. One way for them to accomplish this is by using Hofstede's (2001) cultural typology. The globalization phenomenon assumes a tacit role in this study. Globalization is a complex issue with social, political, economic, and even religious and sexual dimensions that cut across countries, societies, and cultures (Sachs, 2005; Schwerin, 2005; Stiglitz, 2003; 2006). For better or for worse, "economic globalization has outpaced political globalization. We have a chaotic, uncoordinated system of global governance without global government, an array of institutions and agreements dealing with a series of problems, from global warming to international trade and capital flows" (Stiglitz, 2006, p. 21). Scholars writing about globalization almost inevitably equate trade liberalization with the spread of democracy and hence its perennial peer capitalism (Moene & Wallerstein, 2006; Przeworski & Yebra, 2006; Welzel, 2006; Welzel & Inglehart, 2005). Some have made the connection between the

fall of communism and the nearly concomitant rise of technologies such as the Internet (Schwerin, 2005) as major factors in its most recent development trajectory.

Overwhelming evidence is accruing that globalization is simply not working on several levels, particularly if one's definition of success is the advance of the world's poorest populations beyond the level of extreme poverty; yet economic globalization is clearly reaping benefits for the wealthiest countries (Bardhan, 2006; Sachs, 2005; Schwerin, 2005, Stiglitz, 2006; 2006). Several researchers have explored the successes and failures of socio-economic globalization (Sachs, 2006; Schwerin, 2005; Stiglitz, 2003; 2006). These same researchers recognize that globalization is here to stay; they offer several remedies for the current issues which plague the phenomenon. Sachs (2006) suggests that the "the basic mechanics of capital accumulation" might be used to break the "poverty trap", thereby lifting people from extreme poverty onto the "first rung of the economic ladder" (pp. 247-249). Regardless of the current state of socio-economic globalization, organizations are clearly operating in a worldwide, multi-national environment which requires sensitivity by leaders and managers to national and local cultural attributes (Archdivli & Kuchinke, 2002; Beekun, Stedham, Yamamura, & Barghouti, 2003; Buller, Kohls, & Anderson, 1991; 2000; Cohn, White, & Sanders, 2000; Fadil, Segrest-Purkiss, Hurley-Hanson, Knudstrup, & Stepina, 2004; Ford, LaTour, Vitelli, & French, 1997; Heales, Cockcroft, & Raduescu, 2004; Hofstede, 1993; 2001; Hui, Au, & Fock, 2004; Jackson, 2002; Jackson & Artola, 1997; Kolman, Noorderhaven, Hofstede, & Dienes, 2003; Lu, Rose, & Blodgett, 1999; Peterson & Kim, 2003; Peterson, Kim, & Kim, 2003; Sachs, 2005; Schein, 1990; 2001; Schwerin, 2005; Stiglitz, 2003;

2006). One way to accomplish this is to apply a leadership paradigm that loses none of its efficacy across cultures and remains effective in the face of diverse and dynamic memberships. The primary goal of this study is to determine if Hofstede's (2001) cultural typology dimensions combined with the practice of servant leadership might answer such a call.

Western Intellectual Epochs

The true roots of Western-style globalism lay in the European sea-faring tendencies of the 15th and 16th centuries. Once European countries made the significant commitment to not only explore and map the world, but to conquer it as a means of acquiring valuable natural and human resources (Rabb, 2006), they began the slow process of linking together peoples and places across the globe. These linkages represented the same dynamics we see in globalism today: economic, social, political, and certainly religious. Though most countries of the world are now undeniably linked, not all have developed at the same, or even similar, speeds. We are left with societies operating concurrently within three disparate worldviews that are based largely upon Western intellectual epochs. These epochs represent three very different ways of looking at the world and thinking about how humans fit and interact with each other in that world.

The first worldview is the ancient, or premodern, sometimes referred to as "traditional" (Inglehart, 2000). This represents the relegation of control of day-to-day living to supernatural forces, most typically a god or gods. The weather, crop success or failure, fortunes of warfare; all outcomes are in the hands of preternatural forces. People

who maintain this worldview can only pray for guidance or release and behave in ways they think might please these unseen powers. This worldview is the oldest and has had the longest lifespan of all views with its roots extending far into the ancient past. As time passed, the Renaissance opened a new doorway to the Enlightenment and the Scientific Revolution, which ushered in the modern period. This prompts us to "think of the two centuries that began around 1700 as an era quite distinct from the Renaissance. This was a society that was heading in new directions. It had shaken off the reverence for antiquity; it had raised doubts about the glory of war; it had limited the authority of the supernatural; and it had resolved difficult struggles over centralized political authority and the role of the Church" (Rabb, 2006, pp. 207-208).

The modern period returned control to people; they began to see the world as a place where just about any problem could be solved simply by applying sound experimental methodologies. This worldview extends fully into the present; it is a view of inductive and deductive reasoning, hypothesis creation, testing, and falsification, and a general expansion of the popularity of what has become widely known as the Scientific Method (Popper, 1935/2002; Salmon, 1966). The result of this sort of thinking in the past gave us the Industrial Revolution and a mechanistic outlook on life that continues unabated to this day. A classic example of modernistic thought is Kuhn's idea of paradigm shifts: "during revolutions scientists see new and different things when looking with familiar instruments in places they have looked before. It is rather as if the professional community had been suddenly transported to another planet where familiar objects are seen in a different light and are joined by unfamiliar ones as well" (Kuhn,

1996, p. 111). This is not a postmodern explanation of change; it lies squarely within the modern scientific ideal, though is not beyond influencing postmodern thought or outcomes and vice versa.

Meanwhile, the postmodern viewpoint gestated quietly in the shadow of modernism. Postmodernism espouses concepts and ideas quite different from those of the premodern and modern eras. Postmodernism once again wrests control from the hands of people, yet does not return it to supernatural forces; rather, it posits that no one exercises control of anything. Lyotard (1984) succinctly describes its birth when he says "the status of knowledge is altered as societies enter what is known as the postindustrial age and cultures enter what is known as the postmodern age. This transition has been under way since at least the end of the 1950s" (p. 3). Other researchers (Powell, 2005; Thompson, 2004; Willmott, 1992) describe the characteristics and challenges of the postmodern era: "How can we adapt to reality when reality won't give us the time to master it before it changes, again and again, in ways we can but partially anticipate" (Paul & Elder, 2002, pp. 1-5)? The postmodern era is a postindustrial, postmaterial time of uncertainty for citizens of all countries and a "growing body of evidence indicates that deep-rooted changes in world views are taking place. These changes seem to be reshaping economic, political, and social life in societies around the world" (Inglehart, 2000, p. 215).

We live today with three very different worldviews by which people across the globe conduct their daily lives: the premodern, the modern, and the postmodern. The premodern worldview is represented in today's world by those who base their social, economic, sexual, and political interactions with others upon a religious foundation. An

example from the United States would be the conservative Christian view that politics and religion should not be separated because Christianity is the moral order upon which the country was founded. At the same time, a modernist might take the position that religion has no place in public affairs, especially those of governance. There exists no convincing evidence that the founders of the United States were anything more than deists at best, most probably agnostics. A postmodernist might then remind both that all governing structures require a recognition that the old ways of thinking about controlling people no longer apply in a postindustrial world where information is the primary commodity. This example illustrates how the three worldviews are largely incommensurate moral orders. People in both the developing and developed worlds still conduct themselves within at least one of these moral orders, often more.

The Intractability of Incommensurate Moral Orders

When thinking about the relationship between Hofstede's (2001) definitions of power distance, individualism and collectivism, masculinity and femininity, and uncertainty avoidance and servant leadership, it is important to also consider the moral orders of the countries chosen for this study. The conflict which inevitably arises from the clash of incommensurate moral orders can lead to anti-social behaviors such as civil disobedience, terrorism, and outright war. Along with the recognition of incommensurate moral orders currently active in the world, the issues of interminability and intractability are of equal importance: "Moral conflicts are interminable because they are intractable, but they are interminable for other reasons as well. In moral conflicts, the issues cannot

be adequately described in the terms that any of the participants would supply. Because their moral orders differ, they disagree about the meaning and significance of the issues, tactics, or potential resolution" (Pearce & Littlejohn, 1997, p. 71). The sort of intractability described by Pearce and Littlejohn is alarming on several levels. No single contemporary negotiation or political strategy offers a suitable path to resolution with one possible exception: servant leadership. Servant leadership offers a bridge between incommensurate, intractable, interminable moral orders because it is based squarely upon a foundation of virtue ethics. The approach is actively researched and practiced by theoreticians and practitioners as a way of leading and managing people within premodern, modern, and postmodern worldviews. Servant leadership has the potential power to serve as the glue binding us all together as we continue down the path of globalization, moving deeper into the socio-economic complexities of the 21st century.

Hofstede's Cultural Typology and Inequality on a Global Scale

Economic and social inequality on a global scale are corollaries to globalization that have led many researchers to question the assumptions which comprise contemporary thought and discussion streams on the topic (Argandona, 2003; Arjomand, 2004; Lubker, 2004; Sachs, 2005; Schwerin, 2005; Stiglitz, 2003; 2006; Velasquez, 2000). Out of this sensibility, a researcher from a capitalistic democracy such as the United States might assume that the worldwide promotion of the capitalist enterprise will foster greater equality when in fact this is simply not the case: "The figures, however, bear out that the widest inequality is within the USA and the UK" (Pieterse, 2002, p.

1027). When compared with the poorest countries, the richest are vastly wealthier and thus should be able to more equitably distribute benefits and burdens at localized levels yet they do not because this wealth is held mostly by corporations with a Friedmannian view of the maximization of profit in the interest of boosting stockholder benefit. This growing national and international polarization between the "haves" and "have-nots" calls for a general increase in the education and application of altruistic servant leadership principles in organizational and institutional settings of all kinds throughout the world.

As this study explores the relationship between Hofstede's definitions of power distance, individualism and collectivism, masculinity and femininity, and uncertainty avoidance and servant leadership, it necessarily takes into consideration issues of global inequality. Primary pillars of this study thus become Hofstede's (Hofstede, 1993; 2001; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005) cultural typology dimensions, Power Distance (PDI), Individualism/Collectivism (IDV), Masculinity/Femininity (MAS), and Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI). These dimensions deal directly with inequality as a measure of the social and cultural values of national citizenry within 79 countries from every region of the world; they offer explanatory utility for how and why the values measured by the WVS dataset are important indicators of servant leadership levels within those countries.

Values: Lynchpin of the Study

Schein's (1990; 2001; 2004) description of organizational culture may be extended to institutions of all kinds on several scales, including national and global. His

(Schein, 2004) "levels of culture" concept provides an eminently useful portrait of culture that meshes quite nicely with Hofstede's definitions spelled out in *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations* (2001) and *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (2005). Schein describes the three levels as (a) basic, underlying assumptions, (b) espoused beliefs and values, and (c) observable artifacts (Schein, 2004, p. 26). As we make thousands of assumptions per day about our culture, society, and environment, we are both informing and being informed by the next level, our espoused beliefs and values. These values are reflected within servant leadership practice and are evident in Laub's (1999) sub-scores: (a) values people, (b) develops people, (c) builds community, (d) displays authenticity, (e) provides leadership, and (f) shares leadership. Laub (1999) also states 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).

Servant leadership is a moralistic leadership approach, one that requires much of the leader in the form of candor and honesty about his values. One of Greenleaf's primary goals for the development of servant leadership within the United States is "building a better society" (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 24). To accomplish this, a fundamental shift in viewpoint is necessary for the aspiring servant leader to become an effective practitioner. As Greenleaf puts his ideas forward, he covers several types of institutional domains, including business, education, foundations, and churches. He suggests a "new ethic" for business composed of two major elements: "the work and the person" (Greenleaf,

1977/2002, p. 154). Greenleaf summarizes this idea in a single defining statement: "*The work exists for the person as much as the person exists for the work*. Put another way, the business exists as much to provide meaningful work to the person as it exists to provide a product or service to the customer" (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 154). This ideal shares deep-seated values with stakeholder theory in which profits benefit more organizational members than the stockholders. This emphasis shifts the leadership focus from the few to the many with all agents benefiting from happier, more productive workers. Combining this with cultural knowledge and sensitivity creates a formidable leadership approach.

Hofstede consistently emphasizes the importance of values in cultural research: "The key constructs used in this book for describing mental software are *values* and *culture*. Values are held by individuals as well as by collectivities; culture presupposes a collectivity" (Hofstede, 2001, p. 5). He continues:

> Values are feelings with arrows to them: Each has a plus and minus pole. Values deal with such things as the following:
>
> 1. Evil versus good
> 2. Dirty versus clean
> 3. Dangerous versus safe
> 4. Decent versus indecent
> 5. Ugly versus beautiful
> 6. Unnatural versus natural
> 7. Abnormal versus normal
> 8. Paradoxical versus logical
> 9. Irrational versus rational
> 10. Moral versus immoral (Hofstede, 2001, p. 6)

Hofstede concludes the point by suggesting that the "term *value* or *values* is used in all social sciences (anthropology, economics, political science, psychology, and sociology) with different although not completely unrelated meanings; *values* is nearly as much an

interdisciplinary term as *system* and therefore a natural choice as a central construct for a book like this, which borrows from several disciplines" (Hofstede, 2001, p. 6).

The World Values Survey

The World Values Survey (WVS) (2006) was initially developed as the European Values Survey (EVS) in 1981. Since then five interview waves in 1981, 1990, 1995, 2000, and 2005 have been conducted in 80 countries on every inhabited continent of the world. The intent of the WVS is to measure public values in developing and developed countries with the goal of providing valuable, multi-faceted research data on social change at no cost to any and all interested parties. A few conditions for use of the data apply. For instance, any research product must be submitted to the WVS research group for inclusion in their reference library designed to benefit all researchers working with the data. The WVS is overseen by three groups: The WVS Executive Committee and the WVS Scientific Advisory Committee as well as the WVS Secretariat, all of which are composed of researchers from around the world (European Study Group and World Values Survey Association, 2006). In its examination of sociocultural and political change over time, the World Values Survey "has produced evidence of gradual but pervasive changes in what people want out of life. Moreover, the survey shows that the basic direction of these changes is, to some extent, predictable" (European Study Group and World Values Survey Association, 2006). As a repository of dynamic political and sociocultural values data and information, the WVS dataset represents the bulk of data

used to determine the pan-cultural applicability of servant leadership at the very heart of this study.

Statement of the Study Problem

No research into the relationships between the dimensions of power distance, individualism and collectivism, masculinity and femininity, and uncertainty avoidance and servant leadership principles in a cross-cultural context has been conducted since the time of Greenleaf's (1970; 1977/2002) introduction of servant leadership principles into the leadership and management literatures. Theoretical and practice scholarship over the intervening years have increased the quantity and quality of servant leadership publications available (Anderson, 2005; Autry, 2001; Braye, 2001; DeGraaf, Jordan, & DeGraaf, 1999; Frick, 1995; Fryar, 2002; Greenleaf, 1970; 1987; 1977/2002; 2003; Helland, 2004; Hunter, 2004; 2006; Irving, 2005; Jennings, 2002; Laub, 1999; Lopez, 1995; McGee-Cooper & Looper, 2001; Melrose, 1998; Polleys, 2002; Rardin, 2001; Sarkus, 1996; Spears, 2004; Walls, 2004), yet none have focused solely upon discussions or explanations of potential correlative relations between cultural power structures and Greenleaf's intuitive approach. This study represents a focused effort at creating such knowledge with the singular goal of positioning servant leadership as an international bridging structure for practitioners from any sociocultural context wishing to lead people ethically into the 21st century.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to use quantitative methods and techniques to assess the relationships between Hofstede's definitions of power distance, individualism and collectivism, masculinity and femininity, and uncertainty avoidance and servant leadership principles. Precious little research centered on the worldwide, cross-cultural utility of servant leadership proper has been conducted since Greenleaf's (1970; 1977/2002) introduction of the concepts into the leadership and management literatures. Other researchers have considered its cross-cultural implications (Nelson, 2003; Sarayrah, 2005), yet none have developed a replicable methodology designed to assess the relation of servant leadership to power distance, individualism and collectivism, masculinity and femininity, and uncertainty avoidance in multiple sociocultural contexts within and between several national cultures of the world. Descriptive and exploratory statistics will be applied to World Values Survey (2006) data and conclusions will be drawn regarding observed correlative relationships between power distance, individualism and collectivism, masculinity and femininity, and uncertainty avoidance and servant leadership.

Research Questions

The research questions of this study are intended to elicit outcomes generated from the intersection of Hofstede's (1993; 2001; 2003) cultural typology dimensions, Laub's (1999) *Servant Organizational Leadership Assessment* (SOLA) instrument, and World Values Survey (2006) data. The Power Distance (PDI),

Individualism/Collectivism (IDV), Masculinity/Femininity (MAS), and Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI) dimensions of Hofstede's national culture typology are used to identify several countries to act as selection criteria for choosing a working data subset from the existing European Study Group and World Values Survey Association database. Along with this, Hebert's (2003) single component compression of Laub's (1999) SOLA sub-scores: (a) values people, (b) develops people, (c) builds community, (d) displays authenticity, (e) provides leadership, and (f) shares leadership will be used as a filter for particular variables from the WVS data. Out of these intersections, this study will address the following research questions:

1. What is the nature of the relationship between Hofstede's definitions of power distance, individualism and collectivism, masculinity and femininity, and uncertainty avoidance and servant leadership characteristics as introduced by Greenleaf and further defined by Hebert's singular compression of Laub's six SOLA servant leadership sub-scores: (a) values people, (b) develops people, (c) displays authenticity, (d) builds community, (e) provides leadership, and (f) shares leadership? This question is crucial to the development of an understanding of the applicability of servant leadership across the national cultures of the filtered WVS dataset of this study.
2. How do demographic factors from the WVS dataset such as gender, age, marital status, number of children, education level, supervisory status, profession, and ethnic group membership affect this relationship? This question is crucial in determining deep effects that will be necessary for extending the dynamics of this

study into a more expansive contextual view of how the dimensions of Hofstede's cultural typology and servant leadership principles interact at the national culture level.

Significance of the Study

Plenty of good, solid research on servant leadership has been developed over the years (Anderson, 2005; Autry, 2001; Braye, 2001; DeGraaf, Jordan, & DeGraaf, 1999; Frick, 1995; Fryar, 2002; Greenleaf, 1987; 1996; 1998; 1977/2002; 2003; Helland, 2004; Hunter, 2004; 2006; Irving, 2005; Jennings, 2002; Laub, 1999; Lopez, 1995; McGee-Cooper & Looper, 2001; Melrose, 1998; Polleys, 2002; Rardin, 2001; Sarkus, 1996; Spears, 2004; Walls, 2004) since Greenleaf's (1970; 1977/2002) introduction of the concept into the leadership and management literatures, yet no coherent, purposeful study of its relationship to power distance, individualism and collectivism, masculinity and femininity, and uncertainty avoidance on pan-cultural scale exists at this time. Two researchers have considered the efficacy of servant leadership principles in a cross-cultural context. Nelson's (2003) qualitative, exploratory case study doctoral dissertation is mainly concerned with how "Patterson's (2003) servant leadership theory has application and acceptance among black leaders in South Africa" (p. 9). The sample size of Nelson's study is 27 black leaders who consider servant leadership-related practice outcomes such as trust and empowerment to be "a major issue for leaders and their organizations" (Nelson, 2003, p. iii) in South Africa. This dissertation is an interesting discourse on several qualitative case studies intended to demonstrate a cross-cultural

component of servant leadership, yet the methodology and focus of the work is limited to the one country, South Africa. A conscientious researcher would be hard pressed to extend Nelson's conclusions into any kind of covering statement regarding the pan-cultural applicability of servant leadership.

Similarly, Sarayrah's (2004) article from *Global Ethics Review*, "Servant Leadership in the Bedouin-Arab Culture" describes the genesis and ongoing development of the Bedouin-Arab culture in the Islamic and mid-20th century periods. Sarayrah covers the basic tenets of servant leadership, including Spears' (2000) ten characteristics of the servant leader. He relates these characteristics to two examples from the Islamic and mid-20th century periods and concludes that servant leadership "is deeply rooted in the Arab/Islamic culture" (Sarayrah, 2004, p. 74) when he, in fact, has done nothing more than provide two brief yet interesting case studies to prove the case.

Nelson's (2003) and Sarayrah's (2004) efforts represent the extent of research currently available on the pan-cultural applicability of servant leadership. A dire need clearly exists for additional and more comprehensive research into the subject. This need largely determines the significance of this study as a descriptive and exploratory effort within the cross-cultural servant leadership research space.

Definition of Terms

The following key terms are used throughout this study:

1. Globalization: "In its broadest sense, globalization can be viewed as the world-wide integration of economic, political and social activities, and information" (Schwerin, 2005, p. 15).
2. Individualism/collectivism: A description of the relationship between the individual and the collectivity that prevails in a given society (Hofstede, 2001, p. 209).
3. Masculinity/femininity: The dominant gender role patterns in the vast majority of both traditional and modern societies (Hofstede, 2001, p. 284).
4. Pan-cultural/cross-cultural: The socio-cultural dynamic under consideration is widely applicable across just about any culture.
5. Power distance: Represents a measure of the unequal distribution of power over organizational members (Hofstede, 2001, p. 82).
6. Servant leadership: An approach to leadership introduced by Greenleaf (1977/2002) which emphasizes that the "servant-leader *is* servant first" (p. 27) as opposed to other leadership approaches which consider the leader first.
7. Uncertainty avoidance: The tendency to avoid uncertainty in organizational contexts – not to be confused with risk aversion (Hofstede, 2001, p. 148).

Assumptions of the Study

It is an assumption of this study that the servant leadership approach offers the conceptual power to act as an intellectual and emotional bridge between cultures and worldviews. Such a bridging structure will allow people from vastly different experiential contexts to develop the sort of empathetic understanding necessary to cross the chasms between nationalistic, religious, political, and economic ideologies and philosophies. These bridging structures are particularly important for multi-national organizations seeking to extend servant leadership practice into cross-cultural contexts. It is assumed that multi-national and multi-cultural leadership and management praxis benefits will accrue from this effort. These benefits might include more compassionate leadership and management practices within multi-national organizations as well as increased cultural sensitivity when interacting with peoples from different political, social, and cultural environments. A final assumption is that the World Values Survey, Laub's SOLA, Hebert's Principal Component Analysis, and Hofstede's cultural typology work and data were all executed and collected in fundamentally sound ways to ensure the consistency of their reliability and validity by disparate researchers over multiple collection waves.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

The remaining chapters of this study will cover the literatures related to servant leadership, globalization issues, Hofstede's cultural typology, Laub's (1999) *Servant Organizational Leadership Assessment* instrument sub-scores, Hebert's (2003) Principal Component Analysis of Laub's work, and the European Values Study Group and World

Values Survey Association (2006) database. A chapter describing the methodological approach and statistical methods to be used in the study will follow the literature review to be followed itself by a chapter on the data analysis methods and techniques employed to answer the research questions of this study. The final chapter will draw conclusions based upon the analysis phase of the study, wrapping all up by assessing the relationships between Hofstede's Power Distance (PDI), Individualism/Collectivism (IDV), Masculinity/Femininity (MAS), and Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI) dimensions and servant leadership in a cross-cultural context.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The primary focus of this study is an assessment of relationship between the dynamics of power distance, individualism and collectivism, masculinity and femininity, and uncertainty avoidance and servant leadership at the national culture level. The literatures of this study represent an intersection between three areas of scholarly pursuit for leadership and management theoreticians and practitioners concerned with the potential worldwide applicability of servant leadership in light of power distance, individualism and collectivism, masculinity and femininity, and uncertainty avoidance considerations: (a) the background of servant leadership theory and praxis, (b) national culture types, and (c) the survey collection of individual values data from members of several countries around the world. To better understand these dimensions, the moralistic and ethical aspects of the globalization phenomenon will be explored briefly as a means of setting the cultural contexts in which the literatures of this study are examined. The background, theory, and praxis of servant leadership will be explored in depth sufficient to determine the theoretical maturity of the model as well as its continued successful practice in the leadership and management communities. National culture types will be discussed in light of Hofstede's five-dimensional model with the goal of explaining how his cultural typology dimensions of Power Distance (PDI), Individualism/Collectivism (IDV), Masculinity/Femininity (MAS), and Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI) contribute to this study. Finally, World Values Survey data collection, analysis, and related scholarly

publications will be examined with the intent of introducing and describing the data which are the foundation of this study.

Servant Leadership: Background, Theory, and Practice

Robert K. Greenleaf

> It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve *first*. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. The 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 are shadings and blends that are part of the infinite variety of human nature. (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 27)

Servant leadership formally entered the organizational leadership and management literatures with Greenleaf's (1970) publication of his essay, *The Servant as Leader*. Greenleaf composed this essay during one of the most socially turbulent periods this country has ever experienced (Frick, 2004). The Vietnam War had driven political ideologies into direct conflict and people all over America were protesting government involvement in the war in many different ways. Greenleaf had observed firsthand the extremely negative attitudes of college students matriculating into the universities with which he had regular contact, such as Dartmouth, Harvard, and MIT (Frick, 2004). He was determined to present a more positive view of "the system" that pushed the

responsibility and accountability for world and community affairs and events back into the hands of those whom he thought should ultimately own them–the students themselves–by simply asking, "Who is standing in the way of a larger consensus on the definition of the better society and paths to reaching it?" (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 58). Out of this chaotic environment came Greenleaf's call for a more compassionate, caring approach to leading people; it was a cry in the wilderness during a time when conventional leadership was coercive, strictly hierarchical, and not terribly interested in fostering love in the workplace. Greenleaf's call has gained increasing currency over the intervening years. Today, leadership and management thought leaders enthusiastically embrace Greenleaf's ideas by incorporating them into their own works on the theory and praxis of leadership. Familiar names such as Bennis (2002), Blanchard (1998), Covey (2002), Peck (1995), and Senge (1995) have espoused servant leadership as a way of being that charges leaders with the mission of leading people into a brighter, more fulfilling future.

Greenleaf claims to have crystallized his thought centered on what it means to serve while leading, and vice versa, by reading Hesse's (2003) *Journey to the East*. Greenleaf was impressed by the character, Leo, who acts as servant to a group of men on a journey. Leo cares for and supports the men until his mysterious departure, which contributes to the group's demise. After wandering for many years, the narrator is eventually taken by Leo into the Order that originally sponsored the journey. "There he discovers that Leo, whom he had known first as *servant*, was in fact the titular head of the Order, its guiding spirit, a great and noble *leader*" (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 21). This

worldly example has become the foundation of a leadership approach that has far-reaching implications across multiple belief system domains. Secular and religious institutions have both laid claim to the origins and practice of servant leadership (Nielsen, 1998; Russell, 2003; Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002). It remains to be seen if one of these philosophical outlooks will come to dominate the approach or whether servant leadership will rise to the level of a theory that is able to support the development and accommodation of unforeseen empirical circumstances (Popper, 1935/2002). The hypothetical falsifiability of servant leadership is in doubt largely because it is a character-based paradigm which relies most heavily upon the assumptions and values of the leader who practices the approach as a way of being. Several interesting attempts have been made at servant leadership theory and measurement tool building, including a group effort out of Regent University (Bryant, 2003; Dennis, 2004; Dillman, 2004; Nelson, 2003; Patterson, 2003). How one accomplishes the practical feat of developing a reliable, tractable servant leadership praxis has been the subject of much discussion, debate, and dialogue (Anderson, 2005; Autry, 2001; Braye, 2001; DeGraaf, Jordan, & DeGraaf, 1999; Frick, 1995; Fryar, 2002; Greenleaf, 1987; 1996; 1998; 1977/2002; 2003; Helland, 2004; Hunter, 2004; 2006; Irving, 2005; Jennings, 2002; Laub, 1999; Lopez, 1995; McGee-Cooper & Looper, 2001; Melrose, 1998; Polleys, 2002; Rardin, 2001; Sarkus, 1996; Spears, 2004; Walls, 2004).

Servant Leadership Practice: A Way of Doing a Way of Being

Before practice guidelines of any kind may be constructed for a particular philosophical approach, a measurement strategy must be created to quantify outcomes. Such strategies should make sense to researchers while presenting a verifiable, reliable standard or set of standards that is repeatable within multiple research contexts. The first step in this construction process is the identification of characteristics that are capable of defining the discipline, field, or study. Several efforts have been made within quantitative and qualitative contexts to identify the fundamental behavioral and character attributes of servant leaders (DeGraaf, Tilley, & Neal, 2004; Dennis & Winston, 2003; Horsman, 2001; Kim, 2004; Koshal, 2005; Laub, 1999; Lubin, 2002; Markwardt, 2002; Page & Wong, 2000; Palmer, 1998; Russell, 2000; 2001; Russell & Stone, 2002; Sendjaya, 2003; Spears, 2004; Young, 2002). The most notable of these efforts are those by Spears (2004), Russell and Stone (2002), and Laub (1999). As the director of *The Greenleaf Center for Servant-Leadership*, Spears carries considerable weight whenever he addresses servant leadership topics. He identifies 10 characteristics of servant leadership in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Spears' Servant Leadership Characteristics

Characteristic	Description
Listening	Listening, coupled with regular periods of reflection, is essential to the growth of the servant-leader.
Empathy	The servant-leader strives to understand and empathize with others.
Healing	Learning to heal is a powerful force for transformation and integration.
Awareness	General awareness, and especially self-awareness, strengthens the servant-leader.
Persuasion	The servant-leader seeks to persuade others rather than to coerce compliance.
Conceptualization	The ability to look at a problem (or an organization) from a conceptualizing perspective means that one must think beyond day-to-day realities.
Foresight	Foresight is a characteristic that enables the servant-leader to understand the lessons from the past, the realities of the present, and the likely consequences of a decision for the future.
Stewardship	Servant-leadership, like stewardship, assumes first and foremost a commitment to serving the needs of others.
Commitment to the growth of people	Servant-leaders believe that people have an intrinsic value beyond their tangible contributions as workers.
Building community	Servant-leadership suggests that true community can be created among those who work in businesses and other institutions.

Note. From Spears, L. C. (2004). The understanding and practice of servant-leadership. In L. C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Practicing servant leadership: Succeeding through trust, bravery, and forgiveness* (pp. 9-24). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Though Spears' (1995; 1998; 2002; 2004; 2005) knowledge and expertise are beyond doubt or reproach, it is clear that these characteristics are qualitative ones defined by his many years spent thinking about and working with servant leaders in the capacity of CEO and President of the Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership. Russell and Stone (2002) offer two complementary lists of servant leadership attributes in much the same fashion as Spears with reference to the servant leadership literature from which they have drawn their lists. These lists are composed of attributes the authors identify as functional because their classification "primarily results from their repetitive prominence in the literature" (Russell & Stone, 2002, p. 146) as well as a complementary list of supporting attributes. The functional attributes listed in Table 2 below "are the operative qualities, characteristics, and distinctive features belonging to leaders and observed through specific leader behaviors in the workplace" (Russell & Stone, 2002, p. 146). The accompanying attributes are secondary characteristics which complement the functional list. There exists no direct correlation between the functional and accompanying attributes listed in Table 2; they are merely complementary counterparts which Russell and Stone consider fundamental parts of two basic servant leadership models.

Table 2

Russell and Stone's Servant Leadership Functional Attributes

Functional Attributes	Accompanying Attributes
Vision	Communication
Honesty	Credibility
Integrity	Competence
Trust	Stewardship
Service	Visibility
Modeling	Influence
Pioneering	Persuasion
Appreciation of others	Listening
Empowerment	Encouragement
	Teaching
	Delegation

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

As a summary to their literature review, the authors assert that "since values are the core beliefs that determine an individual's principles, they are the independent variables in a model of servant leadership. The dependent variable is manifest servant leadership" (Russell & Stone, 2002, p. 153). Russell and Stone (2002) suggest two models of servant leadership. Model 1 describes "the relationship between leader attributes and manifest servant leadership" (p. 153) while Model 2 "is a more encompassing model for servant leadership" (p. 153) that includes considerations of

organizational culture, behaviors, and performance in a systemic loop structure. The accompanying attributes act as intervening variables within both models which serve to raise and modify the functional attributes. Regardless of the model, the primary goal of the authors is to construct the groundwork necessary for further discussion and dialogue centered on the establishment of servant leadership theoretical and practical frameworks.

The Servant Organizational Leadership Assessment Instrument

Laub's (1999) creation of the *Servant Organizational Leadership Assessment* (SOLA) survey instrument marks a significant contribution to the development of a reliable, quantifiable servant leadership characteristics scale aimed at the organizational level. Several researchers have used the instrument in ways that span a range from school effectiveness to law enforcement to job satisfaction (Braye, 2001; Drury, 2004; Hebert, 2003; Herbst, 2004; Irving, 2005; Ledbetter, 2004; Miears, 2005; Thompson, 2004). Laub (1999) recognizes "a significant lack of quantitative research, as we are still in the early stages of study in this new field; and there is a need for tools to assist in ongoing research" (p. 34). His response is to develop a three-phase study composed of a Delphi panel, a pilot study, and a cross-sectional survey that consists of a sample drawn from 41 organizations distributed throughout the world. His Delphi panel is composed of fourteen recognized experts in the field of servant leadership. A factor analysis portion of the study results in the following six categories of servant leadership characteristics measured at the organizational level: (a) values people, (b) develops people, (c) builds

community, (d) displays authenticity, (e) provides leadership, and (f) shares leadership (Laub, 1999, p. 67).

Laub (1999) initially develops 74 survey questions using the Delphi technique. This survey uses a Likert-type scale that ranges from one for "Strongly Agree" to five for "Strongly Disagree" with six additional questions designed to assess job satisfaction for a total of 80 survey questions. After a determination that the survey took too long for respondents to complete, Laub eventually settles on 60 questions with the job satisfaction questions remaining intact for a total of 66 questions (Laub, 1999) with seven demographic, or control variable, questions designed to help assess respondents' categorical responses under gender, age, level of education, type of organization, number of years with the company, present position within the company, and ethnic origin. These demographic variables are important for hypothesis testing based upon research questions such as, "Does gender affect a participant's view of his/her role within the organization?"

The Delphi Method: Laub's Qualitative Approach

Laub puts the Delphi method to use as an effective way to ensure qualitative research design rigor (Malterud, 2001; Morgan & Smircich, 1980; Munck, 1998; Tobin & Begley, 2004). The origins of the method lie in the Rand Corporation's early efforts at forecasting military probabilities such as large-scale bombing attacks against the United States (Helmer, 1975, p. xix). This forecasting modality quickly extended into other research domains that required expert agreement such as government policy, corporate, and pure research. Linstone and Turoff (1975) offer a concise definition of the method:

"Delphi may be characterized as a method for structuring a group communication process so that the process is effective in allowing a group of individuals, as a whole, to deal with a complex problem" (p. 3). Thus, the Delphi technique is considered an iterative, facilitated, expert group communication process, yet there is more to the process than meets the eye. Linstone and Turoff (1975) suggest several application properties that drive the need to apply the Delphi method which are detailed in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1

Linstone and Turoff's Properties of Delphi Technique Application

---

(a) The problem does not lend itself to precise analytical techniques, but can benefit from subjective judgments on a collective basis.

(b) The individuals needed to contribute to the examination of a broad or complex problem have no history of adequate communication and may represent diverse backgrounds with respect to experience or expertise.

(c) More individuals are needed than can effectively interact in a face-to-face exchange.

(d) Time and cost make frequent group meetings infeasible.

(e) The efficiency of face-to-face meetings can be increased by a supplemental group communication process.

(f) Disagreements among individuals are so severe or politically unpalatable that the communication process must be refereed and/or anonymity assured.

(g) The heterogeneity of participants must be preserved to ensure validity of the results, i.e., avoidance of domination by quantity or by strength of personality.

Note. Linstone and Turoff's Properties of Delphi Technique Application are taken from Linstone, H. A., & Turoff, M. (Eds.). (1975). *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

The Delphi method makes a great deal of sense in today's complex world, especially when a single researcher such as Laub requires input from a globally distributed expert group. Further, the technique as an iterative approach calls for multiple phases which typically take the following form: (a) exploration of the subject under consideration, (b) reaching an understanding of how the group views the issue, (c) exploration of disagreements between group members, and (d) the final phase in which all the information have been analyzed and evaluations have been fed back to the group for consideration (Linstone & Turoff, 1975, pp. 5-6). Laub (1999) used paper-and-pencil surveys to negotiate his three study iterations on a worldwide scale. The use of the World Wide Web as a communication resource would significantly reduce both the complexity and feedback time required for each iteration, though not without potential methodological compromises (Taylor, 2000). Other possible issues that might arise with the application of the Delphi technique include the choice of the expert panel composition, which amounts to a sampling problem. A thorough literature review would help solve the issue of which experts to approach for inclusion in the survey. Another issue involves the potential for panel member dropouts during the course of the study. Experts on any subject are typically very busy people. The wise researcher should plan on an abbreviated response to initial inquiries for study participation. Laub (1999, p. 42) queried 25 experts for participation in his dissertation study. Fifteen eventually agreed to participate with one dropping out before the second iteration.

The Instrument: Laub's Quantitative Approach

A factor analysis of the initial SOLA items resulted in the six sub-scores mentioned above: (a) values people, (b) develops people, (c) builds community, (d) displays authenticity, (e) provides leadership, and (f) shares leadership. Laub creates these six sub-scores before engaging the pre-field test by identifying their potential for clustering the items of the SOLA. Laub asserts that the SOLA instrument "has been developed in such a way that is can be taken by anyone, at any level, within an organization, work group or team" (Laub, 1999, p. 49). Out of these efforts comes a survey instrument that measures servant leadership characteristics at the organizational level among three membership categories: (a) top management, (b) management, and (c) workforce/staff. All the items require answers using a Likert-type scale that runs a range from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree" (Laub, 1999). After pre-field testing the instrument with twenty-two people, Laub ran item-to-test correlations which included using the Cronbach's Alpha and Pearson correlation coefficient item-total tests to check the reliability and validity of the instrument. As mentioned above, it became clear during the course of pre-field testing that the original 74 questions of the SOLA were too many; it was just taking too long to complete the instrument. Laub eventually reduced the number of items to 60 with an additional six demographic items and ran the reliability and item-to-total correlations on the reduced instrument to determine a Cronbach's Alpha of .98 (Laub, 1999, pp. 78-79). A valuable exercise would reduce the number of items of the instrument even further in the interest of creating a tool that can be administered in

minutes while retaining the utility identified by Laub after the pre-field testing of the SOLA.

Hebert's Principal Component Analysis of Laub's Sub-scores

Hebert's (2003) dissertation study is instrumental in establishing Laub's (1999) six SOLA sub-scores as a single factor—servant leadership. Hebert (2003) describes how

> the principal component analysis yielded a single factor accounting for 86.6% of the total variance of the six sub-scales [Laub's six sub-scores]. The eigenvalue for the first principal component (5.19) was the only component extracted with an eigenvalue > 1.0, a commonly used criterion when evaluating the number of components to retain. Since these results suggested that the six sub-scales provide redundant information, further separate analyses for the six sub-scales were not carried out. (p. 85)

This study used Hebert's work as a way to filter the WVS data variables under the single component header of Servant Leadership. A recoding of the WVS data was exercised with the intent of normalizing the data scales of the WVS survey instrument thereby yielding consistent values across all variables. Considering Hebert's single component, the recoding of the WVS data establishes a binary presence/absence value indicating the intrinsic presence or absence of servant leadership.

Page and Wong's Servant Leadership Measurement Instruments

Page and Wong (Page, 2004; Page & Wong, 2005; Wong & Page, 2003; Wong & Page, 2005; Wong, Page, & Rude, 2005) are currently working as professors in the Master of Arts in Leadership program at Trinity Western University in Langley, British Columbia. These researchers have developed several servant leadership measurement instruments aimed at self-assessment and the measurement of both positive and negative leadership characteristics. The research behind the construction of these instruments is a qualitative literature review combined with their own experience implementing servant leadership principles (Page & Wong, 2000). The result is 12 servant leadership categories: integrity, humility, servanthood, caring for others, empowering others, developing others, visioning, goal setting, leading, modeling, team building, and shared decision-making. Other researchers (Dennis & Winston, 2003) take pains to apply quantitative statistical techniques to this work in the interest of creating a tractable servant leadership measurement scale. Dennis and Winston's (2003) principal component factor analysis "indicates that Page and Wong's instrument measures three of the 12 purported factors and while it did not represent all 12, this scale represents a potential tool with positive implications for training new and existing leaders" (Dennis & Winston, 2003, p. 456). This instrument clearly holds promise, yet lacks the maturity and quantitative methodological rigor and research history to recommend it as a survey instrument upon which to base a major study effort such as this.

Dennis and Bocarnea's Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument

Dennis and Bocarnea's (2005) build upon Dennis' (2004) study to create a servant leadership assessment instrument based upon Patterson's (2003) purported theory of servant leadership. Dennis and Bocarnea base their instrument upon Patterson's (2003) "component constructs underlying the practice of servant leadership" (p. 15) outlined in Table 3 below:

Table 3

Patterson's Servant Leadership Constructs

Construct	Description
Agapao Love	To love in a social or moral sense
Humility	The ability to keep one's accomplishments and successes in perspective
Altruism	Helping others selflessly just for the sake of helping
Vision	Necessary to good leadership
Trust	Speaks to leader morality and competence
Service	A mission of responsibility to others
Empowerment	Entrusting power to others

Note. From Patterson, K. A. (2003). Servant leadership: A theoretical model. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64* (02), 570. (UMI No. 3082719).

This study is similar to Laub's (1999) effort in that it constructs a proposed servant leadership characteristic set and uses the Delphi panel-of-experts method for settling upon a final survey item set. In this case, the researchers chose to gather data

from followers only. By engaging a factor analysis with Oblimin rotation, they Dennis and Bocarnea (2005) "sought to answer the following question: Can the presence of Patterson's servant leadership concept be assessed through a written instrument?" (p. 610). In the end, they were only able to verify five of Patterson's seven servant leadership constructs, eliminating measurement of the altruism and service factors. Considering the fact that this study only begins to address the validity of an assessment instrument based upon Patterson's (2003) servant leadership constructs, Laub's (1999) SOLA remains the comparative instrument of choice for this study.

The Sacred and the Profane

Over the intervening years since its introduction into the organizational management and leadership literatures, servant leadership has split into two schools representing discrete servant leadership meta-philosophies: the sacred and the profane. The sacred school is a religious/spiritual one that relies upon metaphysical rhetorical devices to call for keyword applications in the workplace such as "heart", "love", and "spirit". This group is not limited to producing only popular texts. Several university-based programs have popped up over the last ten years offering university degrees at all levels. Many of the professors and students of these programs frequently publish in peer-reviewed journals (Dennis, 2004; Dennis & Winston, 2003; Dillman, 2004; Horsman, 2001; Irving, 2005; Van Kuik, 1998; Page & Wong, 2000; Patterson, 2003; Russell, 2000; 2001; Russell & Stone, 2002; Thompson, 2004; Winston, 2004) or teach in these programs. One notable example is the newly established Regent University School of

Global Leadership and Entrepreneurship. Before the creation of this school, the Regent University School of Leadership Studies offered certificates and graduate degrees in organizational and strategic leadership. Out of this school came multiple recurring Servant Leadership Roundtables that have produced papers and presentations on several servant leadership-related topics (Anderson, 2005; Drury, 2004; 2005; Irving, 2005; Laub, 2003; 2004; Matteson & Irving, 2005; Ndoria, 2004; Nixon, 2005; Nwogu, 2004; Page, 2004; Parolini, 2004; 2005; Patterson, 2003; Rennaker, 2005; Rude, 2003; Russell, 2003; Sendjaya, 2003; Stone & Patterson, 2005; Winston, 2003; Winston & Hartsfield, 2004; Wolford-Ulrich, 2004; Wong & Page, 2004). Conversely, the profane camp is founded upon the secular tenets of virtue ethics based upon concepts first introduced by Plato (1952) and Aristotle (1911/1998) and expanded upon as subsumed forms of normative ethics by the likes of Kant (1996) and Hursthouse (2003).

The Sacred: Religious and Spiritual Responses

The single factor separating the religious/spiritual and secular servant leadership approaches is a belief in what exactly constitutes the origins of human morality. In Western countries, these origins most often take the form of the Christian God and the belief system built upon worship of that god. Similarly, spirituality as a fundamental tenet of servant leadership has become increasingly popular in recent years. Several researchers and authors have produced works reflecting this belief (Agosto, 2005; Anderson, 2005; Asante, 2005; Beazley, 2002; Bekker, 2005; Bivins, 2005; Blanchard & Hodges, 2003; Cedar, 1987; Cory, 1998; Gardiner, 1998; Gunderson, 1992; Habecker,

1990; Hildebrand, 1990; Kahl & Donelan, 2004; Kelley, 2002; Van Kuik, 1998; Lee & Zemke, 1995; Lore, 1998; Nielsen, 1998; Rardin, 2001; Rinehart, 1998; Russell, 2000; 2003; Schuster, 1998; Schwartz, 1987; 1990; Specht & Broholm, 2004; Tatum, 1995; Thompson, 2004; Turner, 1999; Winston, 2004; Young, 1999). While Greenleaf addressed the need for servant leadership behaviors within churches (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, pp. 231-261), the case has not been convincingly made in the literature that the practice of servant leadership is a solely religious response to leadership and management in any context. The claim has been made and is based upon the perception that Greenleaf's primary motivation for developing servant leadership was born of his personal religious beliefs. Greenleaf was a member of the Society of Friends, otherwise known as the Quakers, and some have suggested he only referenced the story about Leo detailed above in order to provide a more inclusive practice environment (Frick, 2004). Greenleaf was explicit in his self-described, non-specific religious motivation for promoting the idea of servant leadership: "My view of religion is relatively non-theological. I am content to stand in awe and wonder before the ineffable mystery. I do not feel called upon to invent explanations of the mystery. I meet with others, whose religious concerns are expressed differently, at the level of the mystical. In this mood there is much common ground with those of quite differing theological positions (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 231).

The Profane: Secular Origins and Practices

The significant and ever-widening gulf between secular and religious practitioners of servant leadership becomes clearer as the secular school makes the claim that servant leadership rests squarely upon a foundation of virtue ethics. A quick World Wide Web search of the terms, "servant leadership virtue ethics" results in literally thousands upon thousands of returned sites and Web pages. Many of these are affiliated in some way with a particular Christian church that stakes a claim upon servant leadership as a Christian, values-based approach to leading and managing people. Secular practitioners disagree. MacIntyre (2003) points out that Aristotle's humanistic focus upon the perfection of the self is at odds with the Christian New Testament virtues of faith, hope, love, and humility. Aristotle would have held these definitions in very low esteem and probably would have found the Christian ideal of virtue to be vacuous and not worthy of pursuit by an educated person. In this way, premodern concepts of virtue, justice, and what constitutes the social contract conflict with modern and postmodern ideas about the same. This creates an environment of confusion around precisely what is and is not virtue ethics. Regardless, many still view virtue ethics as a valuable approach to leading and managing people in the business and organizational context (Koehn, 1995).

One researcher who takes a particular interest in the virtue ethics origins of servant leadership is Whetstone (2001) who proposes a tripartite approach to leadership development and practice. This tripartite approach involves teleology, deontology, and virtue in the form of servant leadership in which the "reality of complex issues suggests a need for developing a practical, user-friendly decision model combining act-oriented

approaches with attention to the virtues and vices of human character" (Whetstone, 2001, p. 110). In this case, Whetstone proposes a leadership decision model centered on a goal-directed, duty-based approach to leadership tempered by the character-based approach of servant leadership. The addition of "a virtue perspective [such as servant leadership] as a complement to act-oriented perspectives can expand to [sic] scope and perspectives of ethical analysis and understanding" (Whetstone, 2001, p. 111).

Servant Leadership and Virtue Ethics

The principles of servant leadership are constructed upon a foundation of virtue ethics that extends from the works of Aristotle (Aristotle, 1911/1998) to contemporary times (Annas, 2003; Hookway, 2003; Koehn, 1995; Murphy, 1999; Shanahan & Hyman, 2003; Sherman, 2005; Siep, 2005; Slote, 2003; Solomon, 2003; Whetstone, 2001). The concept of an ethics based upon virtue emphasizes the personal moralistic character of the agent. In the case of the servant leader, the practitioner is admonished to ask "What sort of person am I?" whenever confronted with an ethical decision. This is in contrast to various other forms of normative ethics which prompt questions such as "How should I behave in order to maximize the good and minimize the harm for all parties involved?" The servant leader will typically rely on intrinsic moral characteristics to make decisions in an ethical manner. In this way, servant leadership is considered a way of being in which the practitioner is constantly considering and honing his own functional leadership attributes with the goal of performing the role of true servant leader. The best way for the

servant leader to monitor his own behaviors is to base his servant leadership practice upon the concept of virtue ethics.

Virtue ethics is considered by some a branch of normative ethics, by others a branch unto itself (Hursthouse, 2003). Whether it is one or the other becomes less important as we explore what it means for servant leadership practitioners. Philosophers from the time of Aristotle have not come to complete agreement about what exactly constitutes virtue ethics or its practice. Until such agreement can be arrived at, categorization is meaningless. Aristotle's ideas about morality and virtue are based upon his conception of excellence, or personal mastery, defined between moral and intellectual poles of understanding:

> The Excellence of Man then is divided in accordance with this difference: we make two classes, calling the Intellectual, and the other Moral; pure science, intelligence, and practical wisdom-Intellectual: liberality, and perfected self-mastery-Moral: in speaking of a man's Moral character, we do not say he is a scientific or intelligent but a meek man, or one of perfected self-mastery: and we praise the man of science in right of his mental state; and of these such as are praiseworthy we call Excellences. (Aristotle, 1911/1998, p. 19)

Aristotle's is a humanistic, rational approach to virtues and virtuous behaviors (London, 2001), yet some researchers believe that the "rationality of virtue, then, is not demonstrable from an external standpoint" (McDowell, 2003, p. 137). This means that virtue ethics as a character-based approach to excellence must be measured in ways that do not rely on observation as a primary mode of interpreting the character of the

individual. In order to do this effectively, we must arrive at universal agreement about those measurement methods. As Gill (2005) points out, there is a difference between ancient and modern ideals of universality. Aristotle's idea of universality was related strictly to the personal realm in which each person's efforts at achieving excellence were unique. Conversely, our modern ideas about this extend into the realm of distributive justice which includes universal rights for all people based upon agreement. For instance, Rawls (2004) lays out a theory of justice based upon the collective social contract in which "each person must decide by rational reflection what constitutes his good, that is, the system of ends which it is rational for him to pursue, so a group of persons must decide once and for all what is to count among them as just and unjust" (pp. 10-11). Thusly justice and the pursuit of personal excellence are placed into the public realm. Not so with Aristotle: "We see then that all men mean by the term Justice a moral state such that in consequence of it men have the capacity of doing what is just; and actually do it, and wish it" (Aristotle, 1911/1998, p. 76). Aristotle has here identified the search for personal excellence with the goal of seeking to do what is right as well as doing it under social contract. Aristotle assures the reader that such a person will do what is right without the need for specific rules and is obligated to do so by virtue of his desire to do the right thing in his own selfish interest of achieving personal mastery.

In a more contemporary discussion about moral virtues, Foot (2003, p. 107) identifies several that deserve attention and further consideration: (a) courage, (b) temperance, (c) wisdom, and (d) justice. These mesh quite nicely with Aristotle's ideas of virtue. Carrying these forward into present circumstance is important for the theoretical

development and practice of virtue ethics, though some would argue that virtue ethics represents a way of being while more applied methodics like servant leadership represent a way of doing (Hursthouse, 2003). Within this, other researchers consider virtues to be character traits that are both taught and learned (Annas, 2003; McDowell, 2003) so that virtues take on their own traits of skill and expertise with the aim of achieving moral success through right actions. How one goes about accomplishing this is another matter because no prescribed method or methods have been developed. In the end, the question of practicing virtue ethics becomes "What kind of person should I be?" versus "What should I do?"

Hofstede's National Culture Typology

It is clear from Hofstede's works (1993; 2001; 2003; 2005) that he considers the measurement of values the primary metric by which he develops his cultural typology. Other researchers have made extraordinary efforts and measuring and studying values (Rokeach, 1972; 2000). Hofstede himself recognizes how this differs from attitudes and beliefs. He describes its inherently contradictory nature: "Our values are mutually related and form value systems or hierarchies, but these systems need not be in a state of harmony: Most people simultaneously hold several conflicting values, such as 'freedom' and 'equality'" (Hofstede, 2001, p. 6). Though may be true at the individual level, it must be understood for the purposes of this study that Hofstede's cultural typology dimensions and Servant Leadership characteristics are considered in the final analysis stages only at the collective level. By remembering to correlate the relevant variables of the study at the

collective level, we successfully avoid the ecological fallacy of quantitatively associating variables designed to measure individually scoped characteristics with those measuring the collective.

Hofstede's original dataset for the study from which he developed his cultural typology was gleaned from the administration of 116,000 survey questionnaires in 72 countries, resulting in a typology based upon 50 of those countries. The respondents were, like Hofstede, employees of the multinational IBM Corporation. Given the breadth of respondent locations, Hofstede (2001) wrestles with differences between national character and national culture. Before the development of anthropology as an academic discipline, notable authors such as De Tocqueville (1835/2000) were busy chronicling the American national character. One could even argue that myths and legends from the distant past are strong indicators of character at the national level. These facts beg the question: "How could Hofstede have settled upon national character as the focal point of his typology when he had already recognized levels of culture from the general to the very specific?" Hofstede answers this question by tracing the vector of national character as a viable anthropological concept that died out in the 1950s "due to oversimplified theories that could not be improved for lack of adequate research methods. Traditional anthropological methods were unable to tackle the complexity of whole nations" (Hofstede, 2001, p. 13). In this way, "national character" became a non-scientific term that eventually lost favor with anthropological researchers.

The application of national culture as a working concept should always be based upon scientifically valid principles. Hofstede provides several criteria for this: (a) it is

descriptive and not evaluative (judgmental), (b) it is verifiable from more than one independent source, (c) it applies, if not to all members of the population, at least to a statistical majority, and (d) it discriminates; that is, it indicates those characteristics for which this population differs from others (Hofstede, 2001, p. 14). Hofstede applies these criteria and eventually settles upon the five dimensions of his famous cultural typology: (a) power distance, (b) uncertainty avoidance, (c) individualism and collectivism, (d) masculinity and femininity, and (e) long-term versus short-term orientation. The fifth, long-term versus short-term orientation, was dropped due to the lack of available dimensional data for all countries included in this study.

Power Distance

Power distance is concerned with human inequality and is determined using the Power Distance Index (PDI). The PDI was derived from three survey questions concerned with "perceptions of subordinates' fear of disagreeing with superiors and of superiors' actual decision making styles, and with the decision making style that subordinates preferred in their bosses" (Hofstede, 2001, p. 79). All hierarchical social systems contain the potential for at least some measure of power distance. For instance, even a relationship as natural as father and son has a hierarchical component that puts both parties at a distance. For some cultures, this distance may be remarkably small, for others it may be a gap that is large and difficult for either party to cross. In the case of Hofstede's work, power distance serves as an indicator of relational inequality; therefore, it may be used when examining distributive justice at the national level. Several

researchers have combined this dimension with another such as individualism vs. collectivism when studying employee empowerment or cross-cultural leadership styles and management practices (Ardichvilli & Kuchinke, 2002; Hui, Au, & Fock, 2004; Kolman, Noorderhaven, Hofstede, & Dienes, 2003; Zagorsek, Jaklic, & Stough, 2004). Examples of countries with a high PDI are Mexico and India; those with low PDI scores are Great Britain, Germany, and the United States.

Uncertainty Avoidance

Like the PDI above, Hofstede (2001) develops the Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI) using three survey questions "dealing, respectively, with rule orientation, employment stability, and stress. The same index cannot be used for distinguishing occupations, nor does it apply to gender differences" (Hofstede, 2001, p. 145). Naturally, different nations and cultures react to uncertainty in different ways. Perhaps the single most important point Hofstede makes about uncertainty avoidance is that it is not the same as risk avoidance: "As soon as uncertainty is expressed as risk, it ceases to be a source of anxiety" (Hofstede, 2001, p. 148) and anxiety is at the heart of taking action to avoid uncertainty. This manifests in all sorts of ways in societal contexts, the most interesting of which might be how social science research is conducted. In low-UAI countries, induction is preferred over deduction and vice versa. Perhaps developing general principles from observable facts represents less ambiguity for the low-UAI researcher engaged in the discovery process. Examples of countries with a high UAI are Greece and Portugal; those with low UAI scores are Denmark and Sweden.

Individualism and Collectivism

Hofstede prefers to refer to this dimension solely as *individualism*, though collectivism is certainly part of the equation: "It describes the relationship between the individual and collectivity that prevails in a given society. It is reflected in the way people live together—for example, in nuclear families, extended families, or tribes—and it has many implications for values and behavior" (Hofstede, 2001, p. 209). As with his other dimensions, Hofstede creates the Individualism Index (IDV), which is considered by him "not suitable for distinguishing among occupations, the genders, age groups, or individuals" (Hofstede, 2001, p. 209). Hofstede's goal for developing this dimension is to measure individualism for family relations and personality and behavioral characteristics. Examples of countries with a high IDV are the United States and Australia; those with low IDV scores are Arab countries and Brazil.

Masculinity and Femininity

As with the IDV, Hofstede prefers to refer to this dimension by a single term, *masculinity* and assigns the index the acronym *MAS*. In this case, masculinity and its opposite, femininity, denote qualities teased from surveys of the genders in which it was determined that "almost universally women attach much more importance to social goals such as relationships, helping others, and the physical environment, and men attach more important to ego goals and money" (Hofstede, 2001, p. 279). During the course of his study, Hofstede was able to deduce that "the importance respondents attached to such 'feminine' versus 'masculine' work goals varied across countries as well as across

occupations" (Hofstede, 2001, p. 279). Examples of countries with low MAS scores are Sweden and Norway; those with high MAS scores are Japan and Austria.

Long- versus Short-Term Orientation

The long-term/short-term (LTO) orientation dichotomy is perhaps the most interesting dimension because it was not initially identified by Hofstede from the IBM data, rather it was "developed by Michael Harris Bond from values suggested by Chinese scholars" (Hofstede, 2001, p. 351) in 1985 using the Chinese Value Survey (CVS). That Hofstede did not recognize this dimension is explained by him as a fault of his and his colleagues' own thinking: "The fact that this dimension was not found in the IBM data can be attributed to the Western minds of the designers of the questionnaire and other values lists used in international research so far" (Hofstede, 2001, p. 351). At its most basic, this dimension is concerned with the Confucian ideal of the polar values that run the spectrum from "persistence and thrift to personal stability and respect for tradition" (Hofstede, 2001, p. 351). Examples of nations with high LTO scores are China and Hong Kong; low LTO values are associated with Pakistan and Nigeria.

The World Values Survey: Assessing Values on a Global Scale

The World Values Survey (WVS) (2006) is a complex, multi-phased survey that initially began in 1981 as the European Values Survey (EVS). The WVS is intended to measure the values of people in developing and developed countries around the world: "Interviews have been carried out with nationally representative samples of the publics of

more than 80 societies on all six inhabited continents. A total of four waves have been carried out since 1981 making it possible to carry out reliable global cross-cultural analyses and analysis of changes over time" (European Study Group and World Values Survey Association, 2006). All interviews are conducted by local researchers under various funding scenarios. Each sample must include at least 1,000 respondents and any and all results are shared immediately with the larger WVS research community. The data are freely shared with a few conditions (European Study Group and World Values Survey Association, 2006) and hundreds of publications have resulted from the acquisition and analysis of the data. The variables of the survey fall under several meaningful categories: (a) framework, (b) perceptions of life, (c) environment, (d) work, (e) family, (f) politics and society, (g) religion and morality, (h) national identity, and (i) sociodemographics (European Study Group and World Values Survey Association, 2006).

The literature generated by researchers associated with the WVS phases is naturally centered on descriptions and explanations of values at the national level (Inglehart, 2000; Inglehart & Baker, 2000; Dalton, Hac, Nghi, & Ong, 2002) as well as political liberalization and democratization (Inglehart & Welzel, 2004; 2005; Wang, 2005; Welzel, 2006; Welzel & Inglehart, 2005; Welzel, Inglehart, & Deutsch, 2005) and other miscellaneous topics (Nicolas, Welzel, Inglehart, & Klingemann, 2003). Several insightful volumes have also come from a few of the primary researchers associated with the WVS (Inglehart, 1989; 1997; Inglehart & Welzel, 2005; Norris & Inglehart, 2004). Two articles from the entire collection stand out as particularly relevant to this study:

Inglehart's (2000) *Globalization and Postmodern Values* and Inglehart and Welzel's (2004) *What Insights can Multi-country Surveys Provide about People and Societies?* In *Globalization and Postmodern Values*, Inglehart (2000) describes the changes in values as societies move from "traditional", or premodern as described above, to modern and from modern to postmodern, or postmaterialist, worldviews: "The early stages of economic development seem to have a major impact on subjective well-being. Moving from starvation level to a reasonably comfortable existence makes a big difference. But beyond a certain threshold, the subjective payoff from economic development ceases" (p. 219). The basic message is that people in developing countries are less secure about basic necessities of life such as food and shelter while people in developed countries are experience a shift in values based upon the fact that economic scarcity is no longer a concern. Inglehart continues to explain that "during the past few decades, a new set of postmodern values has been transforming the social, political, economic, and sexual norms of rich countries around the globe. These new values reflect conditions of economic security. If one grows up with a feeling that survival can be taken for granted, instead of the feeling that survival is uncertain, it influences almost every aspect of one's worldview" (p. 223).

Complementary to the Inglehart (2000) article, Inglehart and Welzel's (2004) *What Insights can Multi-country Surveys Provide about People and Societies?* asks an important question that cannot be ignored in the context of this study. It is the acceptance of this question that makes this study possible. Many challenges present when conducting multi-country surveys, including the need for careful colloquial translation of the survey

instrument between language and culture groups. Fortunately, the WVS research team has taken great pains to ensure that such translation is comprehensive and accurate (Inglehart & Welzel, 2004, p. 2). The authors wrap up the article by recognizing that a "major value of multi-country surveys is that they can demonstrate or disconfirm cross-level linkages that tie system-level characteristics to population tendencies. Such linkages are central to general social theories, illuminating the psychological dimension of social reality, which is not covered by economic or institutional data" (Inglehart & Welzel, 2004, p. 7). This statement holds special import for this study as linkages between demographic, servant leadership, and values characteristics are sought for hypothetical proof or disproof. The WVS dataset is a valuable resource for accomplishing this goal.

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

Conceptual Framework

The primary goal of this study is an examination of the relationship between the variables of Hofstede's (2001) cultural typology and servant leadership at the general study level. This study is designed to accomplish this through the use of Hofstede's cultural typology dimensions of Power Distance (PDI), Individualism/Collectivism (IDV), Masculinity/Femininity (MAS), and Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI). Hebert's (2003) collapses Laub's (1999) six SOLA sub-scores, (a) values people, (b) develops people, (c) builds community, (d) displays authenticity, (e) provides leadership, and (f) shares leadership into a single servant leadership construct. The dataset from which conclusions about this study were drawn is a subset of the European Values Study Group and World Values Survey (2006) database. Hofstede's Power Distance dimension was used as the limiting criterion for choosing the countries from the WVS dataset for participation in the study. This necessitated a paired matching between the countries of Hofstede's study and those of the WVS dataset. The single Hebert/Laub servant leadership component was used during data analysis as a means of determining the presence or absence of latent servant leadership characteristics within the WVS dataset variables. Since the WVS survey instrument is not standardized across item scales, binary recoding was necessary. The absence or presence of servant leadership within the chosen

variables is now indicated by a 0 or 1 in the dataset. The statistical analyses of this study are composed of descriptive statistics such as frequencies and population means for the chosen variables as well as various correlational and influential measures between WVS variables and the single servant leadership construct.

Design of the Study

The design of this study is centered on a quantitative assessment of the relationship between power distance, individualism and collectivism, masculinity and femininity, and uncertainty avoidance and servant leadership at the general study level using data gathered from several national cultures across the world as well as WVS values data from many countries. The methodology for choosing the countries from which the data were drawn is based upon a consideration of Hofstede's (1993; 2001) Power Distance (PDI), Individualism/Collectivism (IDV), Masculinity/Femininity (MAS), and Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI) dimensions as a means of identifying crossover points between Hofstede's work and the WVS variables chosen. Since the dataset for this study is composed of the secondary WVS (European Study Group and World Values Survey Association, 2006) data, the bulk of the work concentrated upon describing, defining, and refining the statistical models that lie at the heart of this study.

The research questions of this study were determining factors in how the WVS data was analyzed in light of Hofstede's PDI, IDV, MAS, and UAI scores. The first task was to match the countries of Hofstede's study and the countries of the WVS dataset. Once these were paired, recoding of all relevant WVS variables restated all the item

values as presence/absence binary values. This allowed a total, objective servant leadership score to be obtained for each country included. This resulted in 35 variables settled upon for inclusion in this study, which means the total possible "servant leadership index" (SLI) value for any one respondent is 35. Once all respondent SLI variables were computed, an average SLI at the general study level was calculated. In this way, the research questions were answered by examining the relationship between Hofstede's (2001) Power Distance (PDI), Individualism and Collectivism (IDV), Masculinity and Femininity (MAS), and Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI) scores and servant leadership levels at the general study level.

Population and Sample

The population of this study is composed of survey respondents from 93 countries on the six inhabited continents of the world. The years in which respondents participated in the surveys spans 1981 to 2005 in five waves: 1981, 1990, 1995, 2000, and 2005. The dataset chosen for this study covers the years 1999 to 2002 and is typically referred to in the WVS literature as the "2000 wave" (European Study Group and World Values Survey Association, 2006). The countries and exact participation years from which the data for this study are drawn are listed in Table 4 below.

Table 4

Countries of the World Values Survey, 1999–2002

Country	Participation Year(s)
Albania	2002
Algeria	2002
Argentina	1999
Austria	1999
Bangladesh	2002
Belarus	2002
Belgium	1999
Bosnia-Herzegovina	2001
Bulgaria	1999
Canada	2000
Chile	2000
China	2001
Croatia	1999
Czech Republic	1999
Denmark	1999
Egypt	2000
El Salvador	1999
Estonia	1999
Finland	2000
France	1999
Great Britain	1999
Greece	1999

(*table continues*)

Table 4 (*continued*)

Country	Participation Year(s)
Hungary	1999
Iceland	1999
India	2001
Indonesia	2001
Iran	2000
Ireland	1999
Ireland, Northern	1999
Israel	2001
Italy	1999
Japan	2000
Jordan	2001
Korea, Republic of	2001
Latvia	1999
Lithuania	1999
Luxembourg	1999
Macedonia, Republic of	2001
Malta	1999
Mexico	2000
Moldova, Republic of	2002
Montenegro	2001
Morocco	2001
Netherlands	1999
Nigeria	2000
Pakistan	2001
Peru	2001

(*table continues*)

Table 4 (*continued*)

Country	Participation Year(s)
Philippines	2001
Poland	1999
Portugal	1999
Puerto Rico	2001
Romania	1999
Russian Federation	1999
Serbia	2001
Singapore	2002
Slovakia	1999
Slovenia	1999
South Africa	2001
Spain	1999; 2000
Sweden	1999
Tanzania, Republic of	2001
Turkey	2001
Uganda	2001
Ukraine	1999
United States of America	1999
Venezuela	2000
Vietnam	2001
Zimbabwe	2001

Note. From European Study Group and World Values Survey Association. (2006). *European and World Values Survey Four-Wave Integrated Data File, 1981-2004.* Retrieved December 30, 2006, from the World Values Survey: The world's most comprehensive investigation of political and sociocultural change Web site: http://www.WorldValuesSurvey.org

The samples from each population were drawn randomly with several limiting criteria. These criteria are questionnaire guidelines established by the European Values Study Group and World Values Survey Association Scientific Advisory Committee (European Study Group and World Values Survey Association, 2006) and include several rules for defining country samples and for conducting the survey interviews. Some of the more salient points are listed in Table 5 below.

Table 5

World Values Survey Questionnaire Administration Guidelines

Guideline
The preferred method of sampling is a full probability sample.
The minimum sample size must be at least 1,000 people (N=1,000) with larger samples strongly recommended.
Investigators must make every effort to minimize non-responses.
Investigators must cover all residents of a country, not just citizens, aged 18 to 85, inclusive.
The primary mode for data collection is face-to-face interviewing.
Dataset submission by Primary Investigators must be submitted with a completed methodological questionnaire and a report of country-specific relevant information.
No survey that does not adhere fully and completely to the guidelines will be accepted.

The limiting activity for drawing data from the WVS dataset for this study involved the use of Hofstede's (1993; 2001) Power Distance (PDI), Individualism/Collectivism (IDV), Masculinity/Femininity (MAS), and Uncertainty

Avoidance (UAI) dimensions. The countries of Hofstede's study with their attendant dimension index scores are listed in Table 6 below:

Table 6

Countries of Hofstede's Study with PDI, IDV, MAS, and UAI Index Scores

Country	PDI	IDV	MAS	UAI
Argentina	49	46	56	86
Australia	36	90	61	51
Austria	11	55	79	70
Bangladesh	80	20	55	60
Belarus	93	39	36	95
Belgium	65	75	54	94
Brazil	69	38	49	76
Bulgaria	70	20	55	60
Canada	39	80	52	48
Chile	63	23	28	86
China	80	20	66	30
Colombia	67	13	64	80
Costa Rica	35	15	21	86
Czech Republic	57	58	57	74
Denmark	18	74	16	23
Ecuador	78	8	63	67
Estonia	40	60	30	60
Finland	33	63	26	59
France	68	71	43	86
Germany	35	67	33	65

(*table continues*)

Table 6 (*continued*)

Country	PDI	IDV	MAS	UAI
Ghana	77	89	33	35
Guatemala	95	6	37	101
Hong Kong	68	25	57	29
Hungary	46	80	88	82
India	77	48	56	40
Indonesia	78	14	46	48
Iran	58	48	56	40
Ireland	28	70	68	35
Israel	13	54	47	81
Italy	50	76	70	75
Jamaica	45	39	68	13
Japan	54	46	95	92
Korea (South)	60	18	39	85
Luxembourg	40	60	50	70
Malaysia	104	26	50	36
Malta	56	59	47	96
Mexico	81	30	69	82
Morocco	70	46	53	68
Netherlands	38	80	14	53
New Zealand	22	79	58	49
Norway	31	69	8	50
Pakistan	55	14	50	70
Panama	95	11	44	86

(*table continues*)

Table 6 (*continued*)

Country	PDI	IDV	MAS	UAI
Peru	64	16	42	87
Philippines	94	32	64	44
Poland	68	60	64	93
Portugal	63	27	31	104
Romania	90	30	42	90
Russia	93	39	36	95
Saudi Arabia	80	38	53	68
Sierra Leone	77	20	46	54
Singapore	74	20	48	8
Slovakia	104	52	110	51
South Africa	49	65	63	49
Spain	57	51	42	86
Surinam	85	47	37	92
Sweden	31	71	5	29
Switzerland	34	68	70	58
Taiwan	58	17	45	69
Tanzania	64	27	41	52
Thailand	64	20	34	64
Trinidad	47	16	58	55
Turkey	66	37	45	85
UAE	80	38	53	68
Ukraine	93	39	36	95
United Kingdom	35	89	66	35
United States	40	91	62	46

(*table continues*)

Table 6 (*continued*)

Country	PDI	IDV	MAS	UAI
Uruguay	61	36	38	100
Venezuela	81	12	73	76
Vietnam	70	20	40	30
Zambia	64	27	41	52

Note. From Hofstede, G. H. (2001). *Cultures consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Data Collection Procedures

The data for this study were collected by the European Values Study Group and World Values Survey (2006) researchers via a set of questionnaires developed by the groups over several years, hence it is considered a secondary dataset. Though the EVS/WVS data collection waves were conducted in 1981, 1990, 1995, 2000, and 2005, this study exploits only data from the 2000 data collection sessions. Collection of the WVS data has been and continues to be accomplished by researchers in each of the countries from which the data are collected. The primary "mode of data collection for the WVS surveys is face-to-face interviewing. Other modes (e.g., telephone, mail, Internet) are not acceptable except under very exceptional circumstances and only on an experimental basis" (European Study Group and World Values Survey Association, 2006).

Data Analysis Procedures

Research Question 1

What is the nature of the relationship between Hofstede's definitions of power distance, individualism/collectivism, masculinity/femininity, and uncertainty avoidance and servant leadership attributes as introduced by Greenleaf and further refined by Hebert's compression of Laub's six SOLA sub-scores (a) values people, (b) develops people, (c) displays authenticity, (d) builds community, (e) provides leadership, and (f) shares leadership into a single servant leadership factor?

Analysis Plan

The relationship between the Hofstede's PDI, IDV, MAS, and UAI indexes of various countries and the intrinsic level of servant leadership in those countries were correlated using Pearson's correlation coefficient with the intent of determining the linear relationship between the variables. Each of the chosen variables of the WVS dataset were recoded into binary, presence/absence values. All the possible presence values for each of the variables were summed to provide an overall servant leadership index (SLI) score for each respondent. This is possible based upon Hebert's (2003) principal component analysis compression of Laub's (1999) six SOLA sub-scores into a single factor—s*ervant leadership*. Hypotheses were created and accepted or rejected based upon the correlations discovered.

Research Question 2

How do demographic factors (i.e., control variables) from the chosen WVS dataset, including gender, age, marital status, number of children, education level, and number of people supervised affect the overall servant leadership scale scores (SLI) at the general study level?

Analysis Plan

The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistical procedure was used for Research Question Two to compare means in the interest of exploring the WVS dataset to determine the direction and magnitude of any influences upon the SLI scores by each of the demographics study variables.

Validity and Reliability

The validity and reliability of the data will be assessed by using known and widely accepted statistical measures of reliability Cronbach's Alpha (α). This reliability measure ranges from 0 to 1 with a higher number indicating lower model error variance. Generally, values at 0.70 and above are considered acceptable for social scientific research (Lattin, Caroll, and Green, 2003, p. 181).

Limitations of the Study

One crucial limitation of this study is concerned with the rigor of the data collection methods of the European Values Study Group and World Values Survey Association (2006). The WVS group has collected data over the years in as careful and professional a manner as possible, yet the potential always exists for the introduction of bias by interviewers in the field. The EVS and WVS research groups have also taken steps to ensure the cross-cultural efficacy of the survey questions. This includes translation oversight at the global level, yet the concern of information and semantic loss between languages remains. The countries included in this study are all located in the Northern Hemisphere. These countries are either European and/or possess a history of European national culture influence (e.g., Iceland) or were part of the former Soviet bloc of countries (e.g., Czech Republic and Russian Federation). How these influences affected this study cannot be directly known without explicitly measuring effects across the cultures of survey countries not located in the Northern Hemisphere. Survey datasets are notoriously incomplete with multiple missing values with each respondent record. The binary recoding of the WVS data may represent a loss of statistical power that could skew the results of this study. Finally, the exclusion of Hofstede's fifth dimension, Long-term versus Short-term Orientation, could have resulted in unforeseen influences across the correlative relationships measured. Inclusion of this dimension was weighed against its efficacy as a potential correlative variable. The decision to drop the variable was made based upon a perceived lack of utility and the fact that no data were available for a majority of the countries included in the study.

CHAPTER 4. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Survey Data Analysis

The main purpose of this study is to assess the relationships between Hofstede's (2001) definitions of power distance, individualism and collectivism, masculinity and femininity, and uncertainty avoidance and servant leadership principles. The measures of servant leadership principles used in this study are those described by Laub (1999) and compressed by Hebert (2003) into a single *servant leadership* construct using Principal Component Analysis. To accomplish this, descriptive and exploratory statistics using SPSS 15.0 will be applied to World Values Survey (2006) data. This chapter will analyze the results of these analyses, including consideration of any discovered correlative relationships between power distance, individualism and collectivism, masculinity and femininity, and uncertainty avoidance and servant leadership.

The sample for this study was drawn from the World Values Survey database (European Study Group and World Values Survey Association, 2006). Several filtering criteria were used to arrive at an acceptable list of 3,282 respondents from 23 countries. The data are normally distributed across all variables, a finding that was expected given the size of the dataset. Before arriving at the test and control variables to be used in this study, it was necessary to limit the entire dataset using the variables, *Supervising Someone* and *Number Supervised People*. The respondents answering positively to

Supervising Someone are in supervisory/management roles in their respective jobs, which positions them as prime candidates for consideration of the application of servant leadership principles in the workplace. *Number Supervised People* was used as an additional criterion in interest of data integrity. Table 7 below describes the resulting diverse group by detailing the demographic variables chosen for the study.

Table 7

World Values Survey Demographic Variables Filtered by Hebert's Servant Leadership Factor

Variable	Category	N	Percent
Gender	Male	2057	62.7%
	Female	1225	37.3%
	Total	3282	100.0%
Age	No answer	8	.2%
	15-24	175	5.3%
	25-34	796	24.3%
	35-44	1014	30.9%
	45-54	933	28.4%
	55-64	320	9.8%
	65-98	36	1.1%
	Total	3282	100.0%

(*table continues*)

Table 7 (*continued*)

Variable	Category	N	Percent
Marital Status	Married	2259	68.8%
	Divorced	266	8.1%
	Separated	57	1.7%
	Widowed	76	2.3%
	Single/Never married	611	18.6%
	Total	3269	99.6%
Missing	No answer	12	.4%
	Don´t know	1	.0%
	Total	13	.4%
	Grand Total	3282	100.0%
How Many Children	No child	747	22.8%
	1 child	739	22.5%
	2 children	1234	37.6%
	3 children	393	12.0%
	4 children	92	2.8%
	5 children	17	.5%
	6 children	11	.3%
	8 or more children	1	.0%
	9	2	.1%
	Total	3236	98.6%
Missing	No answer	46	1.4%
	Grand Total	3282	100.0%

(*table continues*)

Table 7 (*continued*)

Variable	Category	N	Percent
Highest Educational Level Attained	Inadequately completed elementary education	41	1.2%
	Completed (compulsory) elementary education	163	5.0%
	Incomplete secondary school: technical/vocational	289	8.8%
	Complete secondary school: technical/vocational	404	12.3%
	Incomplete secondary: university-preparatory	423	12.9%
	Complete secondary: university-preparatory	644	19.6%
	Some university without degree	399	12.2%
	University with degree	900	27.4%
	Total	3263	99.4%
Missing	No answer	19	.6%
	Grand Total	3282	100.0%
Number Supervised People	1	357	10.9%
	2-9	1804	55.0%
	10-24	686	20.9%
	25-49	229	7.0%
	50-99	113	3.4%
	100 and more	93	2.8%
	Grand Total	3282	100.0%

The 3,282 participants in the WVS survey are composed of 2,057 men (62.7%) and 1,225 (37.3%) women. The *Age* variable listings in Table 7 above represent a recoding performed by the WVS researchers into manageable categories. Eight (.2%) of the participants provided no answer while 175 (5.3%) ranged from 15 to 24 years, 796 (24.3%) from 25 to 34 years, 1,014 (30.9%) from 35 to 44 years, 933 (28.4%) from 45 to 54 years, 320 (9.8%) from 55 to 64 years, 36 (1.1%) from 65 to 98 years old.

The marital status of the respondents broke down into several categories with 3,269 of the respondent providing the following answers: 2,259 (68.8%) are married, 266 (8.1%) are divorced, 57 (1.7%) are separated, 76 (2.3%) are widowed, 611 (18.6%) are single and have never been married, and 13 (.4%) of the respondents provided no answer or did not know their marital status.

The number of children a respondent has was also split into several categories: 747 (22.8%) have no children, 739 (22.5%) have one child, 1,234 (37.6%) have two children, 393 (12.0%) have three children, 92 (2.8%) have four children, 17 (.5%) have five children, 11 (.3%) have six children, one (.0%) has eight or more children, and two (.1%) have nine or more children.

The education level of the participants was measured by the *Highest Education Level Attained*, which was broken into several discrete categories: 41 (1.2%) inadequately completed elementary education, 163 (5.0%) completed compulsory elementary education, 289 (8.8%) did not complete secondary (technical/vocational) school, 404 (12.3%) did complete secondary (technical/vocational) school, 423 (12.9%) did not complete secondary (university preparatory) school, 644 (19.6%) completed

secondary (university preparatory) school, 399 (12.2%) completed some university education at the lower division level without earning a degree, 900 (27.4%) earned a degree from a university, and 19 (.6%) provided no answer.

The number of people supervised by the respondent group was also compressed into categories: 357 (10.9%) of the respondents supervise one person, 1,804 (55.0%) supervise two to nine, 686 (20.9%) supervise 10 to 24, 229 (7.0%) supervise 25 to 49, 113 (3.4%) supervise 50 to 99, and 93 (2.8%) supervise 100 or more people. No missing values are present here because the dataset used for analysis was filtered by the *Supervising Someone* and *Number Supervised People* variables where *Supervising Someone* was equal to one and *Number Supervised People* was greater than zero.

Survey Scale Reliability Analysis

The primary filter applied to arrive at the 35 test variables of this study was the servant leadership factor identified by Hebert (2003) using Principal Component Analysis with Laub's (1999) SOLA servant leadership sub-scores. Application of this factor to the WVS database resulted in the 35 test variables described in Appendix A.

The original list chosen for this study did not include the *Important in a Job* category of variables. Since the Cronbach's Alpha (α) estimate of reliability is intended to determine if the variables used measure the same latent variable or construct (Lattin, Carroll, & Green, 2003, p. 188), this had serious implications for the reliability estimates detailed below. When the Cronbach's Alpha results were consistently returned in the .5 to .6 range, a review of the dataset was conducted with the intent of identifying additional

variables that might be useful to this study. The initial Cronbach's Alpha value was arrived at through a subtractive method based upon results returned from SPSS which included a *Cronbach's Alpha If Item Deleted* column. Repeated removal of variables from the original list resulted in 25 variables and unacceptable Alpha scores across the board. Inclusion of the *Important in a Job* category of variables described in Appendix A resulted in the acceptable Alpha scores detailed below.

Because this study is primarily concerned with the cross-cultural applicability of servant leadership and the effects of Hofstede's cultural typology dimensions upon such a practice, the next step in the filtering process was to identify respondents in the WVS database who supervised or managed workers. This filter was applied by selecting cases in SPSS in which the binary *Supervise Someone* variable was equal to 1 or, for our purposes, true, was used to arrive at the final group of 31 countries with 3,282 respondents. This list differs from the countries in Table 8 below based upon a combination of missing values from Hofstede's cultural typology and no WVS data for the 35 questions in the final test variable set. The countries eliminated were Austria, Croatia, Denmark, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovenia, and North Ireland. A cross-reference between Hofstede's cultural typology dimension scores for PDI, IDV, MAS, and UAI and available test variable data was performed. This analysis resulted in the final group of 23 countries described in Table 8 below.

Table 8

Final Group of Countries Identified for Inclusion in Study with PDI, IDV, MAS, and UAI Scores

Country	PDI	IDV	MAS	UAI
Belgium	65	75	54	94
Belarus	93	39	36	95
Bulgaria	70	20	55	60
Czech Republic	57	58	57	74
Estonia	40	60	30	60
Finland	33	63	26	59
France	68	71	43	86
Germany	35	67	33	65
Greece	60	35	57	112
Hungary	46	80	88	82
Ireland	28	70	68	35
Italy	50	76	70	75
Luxembourg	40	60	50	70
Malta	56	59	47	96
Netherlands	38	80	14	53
Poland	68	60	64	93
Portugal	63	27	31	104
Romania	90	30	42	90

(*table continues*)

Table 8 (*continued*)

Country	PDI	IDV	MAS	UAI
Russian Federation	93	39	36	95
Slovakia	104	52	110	51
Spain	57	51	42	86
Ukraine	93	39	36	95
United Kingdom	35	89	66	35

Note. *PDI* = Power Distance Index, *IDV* = Individualism/Collectivism Index, *MAS* = Masculinity/Femininity Index, *UAI* = Uncertainty Avoidance Index.

Recoding and Computation of the Servant Leadership Index Scale Scores

The scale scores for each of Hofstede's cultural typology dimensions were taken from Hofstede's work (2001) and are listed in Table 8 above. These scores are essentially mean values by country. In this same vein, a Servant Leadership Index (SLI) scale score was computed using mean values arrived at by first recoding each of the chosen variables described in Appendix A. This was done with the intent of creating a common construct from a variety of scale values that ranged from binary values to choices between one and 10. Each variable was thoroughly analyzed with Hebert's (2003) servant leadership factor in mind and carefully recoded into zero and one values with zero representing the absence of servant leadership and one representing its presence. For instance, the original scale range of the first variable from Appendix A, *Family Important*, is detailed in Table 9 below.

Table 9

Family Important Variable Scale Score Range

Score	Definition
-4	Not asked in survey
-3	Not applicable
-2	No answer
-1	Don't know
1	Very important
2	Rather important
3	Not very important
4	Not at all important

Recoding the *Family Important* variable required making a determination about which values did and did not represent servant leadership attributes. In the case of the *Family Important* variable as described in Table 9 above, the one and two values were recoded as one and the three and four values were recoded as zero. When transforming data in SPSS, values not identified for transformation during the recoding process are stored as missing values in the subsequent variable rows. With respect to the *Family Important* variable, all the negative numbers were subsequently recoded into missing values, which left gaps in the dataset. Data imputation was used to remedy these gaps by using the SPSS "Replace Missing Values" functionality with linear interpolation. This resulted in the transformation of missing data points into probability values ranging from

zero to one. Since the ultimate goal of the recoding exercise was to arrive at binary values for each of the chosen variables, another recoding episode was required. Values from zero to .4 were recoded as zero and values from .5 to one were recoded as one. The function of imputing data, when done properly, results in lower standard deviations for each of the missing values across the dataset. For example, imputing missing values for the variable, *Political Action: Attending Lawful Demonstrations*, resulted in before and after standard deviations of .494 and .459. This is not a drastic improvement yet is an improvement nonetheless.

In the spirit of Hofstede's indexes, a Servant Leadership Index (SLI) was created by summing all the values for each of the chosen test variables at the respondent row level. In this way, an objective level of servant leadership was arrived at for each qualifying participant in the study. This places the optimal SLI score at 35 with a mean over all countries of 14.67. The SLI, along with Hofstede's PDI, IDV, MAS, and UAI scores is one of the primary scale score indexes of this study. Table 10 below describes the mean SLI scores for each country included in this study.

Table 10

Mean SLI Scores for Each Study Country

Country	SLI
Belgium	14.97
Belarus	15.14
Bulgaria	12.25
Czech Republic	11.97
Estonia	11.80
Finland	16.70
France	13.90
Germany	15.10
Greece	15.47
Hungary	16.12
Ireland	16.04
Italy	16.04
Luxembourg	16.24
Malta	17.89
Netherlands	17.12
Poland	14.14
Portugal	16.03
Romania	15.87
Russian Federation	12.54
Slovakia	13.96
Spain	13.04
Ukraine	14.82
United Kingdom	14.04

Reliability Estimates of the Servant Leadership Index Scale Scores

The reliability estimation technique used for this study consisted solely of the application of Cronbach's Alpha within SPSS 15.0. An initial list of test variables drawn from the WVS database did not yield an acceptable overall study Alpha score. The scores arrived at ranged from .5 to .6, which are low for a social scientific study (Lattin, Carroll, & Green, 2003, p. 188). A subtractive method of maximizing the *Cronbach's Alpha If Item Deleted* SPSS output column was used with no success. Upon further consideration of the original intent of this study, including the filtering criteria of the *Supervising Someone* variable, several additional variables were included in the study. These variables are *Important in a Job: A Job Respected*, *Important in a Job: Opportunity to Use Initiative*, *Important in a Job: You Can Achieve Something*, *Important in a Job: A Responsible Job*, *Important in a Job: A Job That is Interesting*, *Important in a Job: A Job that Meets One's Abilities*, *Important in a Job: Pleasant People to Work With*, *Important in a Job: Good Chances for Promotion*, *Important in a Job: A Useful Job for Society*, *Important in a Job: Meeting People*. These variables were included based upon the ostensible management role of the respondents who met the filter criteria represented by the variables *Supervising Someone* described above. Adding these additional variables to the study resulted in the variable set and potential Cronbach's Alpha scores described in Table 11 below.

Table 11

World Values Survey Test Variables and Cronbach's Alpha Scores If Item Deleted

Variable	Alpha If Item Deleted
Family Important	.715
Friends Important	.713
Politics Important	.712
Religion Important	.711
Belong: Social Welfare Service for Elderly	.713
Belong: Church Organization	.712
Belong: Political Parties	.713
Belong: Local Political Parties	.713
Belong: Human Rights	.713
Belong: Conservation	.713
Belong: Youth Work	.714
Belong: Peace Movement	.715
Belong: Concerned with Health	.715
Would Give Part of my Income for Environment	.716
Increase Taxes to Prevent Pollution	.716
Important in a Job: A Job Respected	.701
Important in a Job: Opportunity to Use Initiative	.693
Important in a Job: You Can Achieve Something	.701
Important in a Job: A Responsible Job	.698
Important in a Job: A Job that is Interesting	.703
Important in a Job: A Job that Meets One's Abilities	.701
Important in a Job: Pleasant People to Work With	.704

(*table continues*)

Table 11 (*continued*)

Variable	Alpha If Item Deleted
Important in a Job: Good Chances for Promotion	.703
Important in a Job: A Useful Job for Society	.696
Important in a Job: Meeting People	.699
Political Action: Signing a Petition	.716
Political Action: Joining in Boycotts	.717
Political Action: Attending Lawful Demonstrations	.718
Confidence: Churches	.712
Confidence: Armed Forces	.712
Confidence: The Press	.712
Confidence: Labor Unions	.710
Confidence: The Police	.707
Confidence: Parliament	.704
Confidence: The Civil Services	.707

These chosen variables are considered the *instrument* for this study. The final Cronbach's Alpha (α) reliability estimate across all 35 variables is .715, an acceptable score for a social scientific study such as this (Lattin, Carroll, & Green, 2003, p. 188).

Internal Validity Analysis

Scale Correlations

The purpose of running the scale correlations detailed in Table 12 below was intended to assess the internal construct validity of the chosen variables. The matrix provided below describes the absolute Pearson's correlation coefficient as well as a measure of the significance level of linear, bi-directional relationships between the variables. The accepted significance level against which the Pearson's correlation coefficient values were measured was .05. The SLI variable stands at a medial point between the demographic variables and Hofstede's indexes. The relationships described in Table 12 below will be analyzed here and discussed further in Chapter Five, Conclusions, Discussion, and Recommendations.

Table 12

Pearson's Correlation Coefficients among All Study Variables

N=3,282		G	A	MS	# C	EL	# P	SLI
A	r	-.045	1					
	Sig	.009	.					
MS	r	.093	-.352	1				
	Sig	.000	.000	.				
# C	r	-.057	.427	-.525	1			
	Sig	.001	.000	.000	.			
EL	r	.082	-.006	.064	-.111	1		
	Sig	.000	.721	.000	.000	.		
# P	r	-.040	.058	-.058	.022	.097	1	
	Sig	.023	.001	.001	.213	.000	.	
SLI	r	-.003	.036	-.004	.037	.071	-.011	1
	Sig	.848	.041	.815	.037	.000	.547	.
PDI	r	.067	.027	-.103	.007	.202	.031	-.167
	Sig	.000	.126	.000	.686	.000	.080	.000
IDV	r	-.077	-.014	.076	.022	-.201	-.041	.113
	Sig	.000	.440	.000	.219	.000	.020	.000
MAS	r	-.013	-.005	-.021	.053	.001	-.022	.001
	Sig	.442	.793	.228	.003	.970	.215	.961
UAI	r	.005	.040	-.059	-.048	.160	.012	-.066
	Sig	.777	.024	.001	.007	.000	.505	.000

Note. G = Gender, A = Age, MS = Marital Status, # C = Number of Children, EL = Highest Educational Level Attained, # P = Number Supervised People, SLI = Servant Leadership Index, PDI = Power Distance Index, IDV = Individualism/Collectivism Index, MAS = Masculinity/Femininity Index, UAI = Uncertainty Avoidance Index.

Three types of Pearson's correlation coefficients and their attendant significance are described in Table 12 above. The first type consists of correlations between the demographic variables drawn from the WVS data itself. The only correlation of any

significance in this category is between *Age* and *Highest Educational Level Attained* at .721. The next important type of correlation is between the study SLI score and each of the demographic variables drawn from the WVS data. Three correlations were significant here, SLI and *Gender* at .848, *SLI* and *Marital Status* at .815, and SLI and *Number Supervised People* at .547. The first two correlations are strong, while the third is in a lower range of significance. The third type of correlation is between Hofstede's index scores and the study SLI score. The only significant correlation here is between Hofstede's masculinity/femininity index, *MAS*, and the SLI score at .961. This correlation is quite strong whereas all other correlations between the remaining Hofstede indexes and the study SLI score are completely insignificant at .000. Correlation significance between Hofstede's index scores and the demographic variables not considered within this scope of this study, though the correlations are included in Table 12 above as a consequence of listing all variables correlations in a compact, readable form.

Testing of Hypotheses

Several hypotheses were developed from the research questions and plans posed in Chapter Three. All these consider the SLI variable a fundamental construct included in any of the testing of hypotheses. Intersected Pearson's correlation coefficient values and demographic and index values from Table 12 above were used to determine the acceptance or rejection of all hypotheses detailed below.

Research Question One

Research Question One: What is the nature of the relationships among each of Hofstede's definitions of power distance (PDI), individualism and collectivism (IDV), masculinity and femininity (MAS), and uncertainty avoidance (UAI) and servant leadership attributes as introduced by Greenleaf and further refined by Hebert's compression of Laub's six SOLA sub-scores (a) values people, (b) develops people, (c) displays authenticity, (d) builds community, (e) provides leadership, and (f) shares leadership into a single servant leadership factor?

Research Question One Hypotheses

Hypothesis One.

H_0: No significant relationship exists between Hofstede's PDI dimension and the overall SLI score.

H_A: A significant relationship exists between Hofstede's PDI dimension and the overall SLI score.

Based upon the significance value of .000 at the intersection of Hofstede's PDI and SLI scores from Table 12 above, H_0 is accepted and H_A is rejected.

Hypothesis Two.

H_0: No significant relationship exists between Hofstede's IDV dimension and the overall SLI score.

H_A: A significant relationship exists between Hofstede's IDV dimension and the overall SLI score.

Based upon the significance value of .000 at the intersection of Hofstede's IDV and SLI scores from Table 12 above, H_0 is accepted and H_A is rejected.

Hypothesis Three.

H_0: No significant relationship exists between Hofstede's MAS dimension and the overall SLI score.

H_A: A significant relationship exists between Hofstede's MAS dimension and the overall SLI score.

Based upon the significance value of .961 at the intersection of Hofstede's MAS and SLI scores from Table 12 above, H_0 is rejected and H_A is accepted.

Hypothesis Four.

H_0: No significant relationship exists between Hofstede's UAI dimension and the overall SLI score.

H_A: A significant relationship exists between Hofstede's UAI dimension and the overall SLI score.

Based upon the significance value of .000 at the intersection of Hofstede's IDV and SLI scores from Table 12 above, H_0 is accepted and H_A is rejected.

Table 13

Research Question One Acceptance or Rejection of Null Hypotheses

Hypothesis	H_0
No significant relationship exists between Hofstede's PDI dimension and the overall SLI score.	Accept
No significant relationship exists between Hofstede's IDV dimension and the overall SLI score.	Accept
No significant relationship exists between Hofstede's MAS dimension and the overall SLI score.	Reject
No significant relationship exists between Hofstede's UAI dimension and the overall SLI score.	Accept

Exploratory Statistics

The demographic variables and SLI means are explored here with the intent of discovering any influences and relationships that may exist between the demographic variables and SLI means. The one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) technique is used to make these determinations.

Gender

The SLI means for the *Gender* variable with the categories male and female were 14.49 for males and 14.47 for females. A comparison of the *Gender* and SLI means was significant (df = 3,280, F = .037, p < .050).

Age

The SLI means for the various *Age* variable categories were 15 to 24 – 14.55, 25 to 34 – 14.32, 35 to 44 – 14.45, 45 to 54 – 14.48, 55 to 64 – 14.91, and 65 to 98 – 14.83. A comparison of the *Age* variable categories and SLI means was not significant (df = 3275, F = 2.044, p < .050).

Marital Status

The SLI means for the various *Marital Status* variable categories were Married – 14.55, Divorced - 13.73, Separated – 14.26, Widowed – 13.87, and Single, never been married – 14.65. A comparison of the *Marital Status* variable categories and SLI means was not significant (df = 3,264, F = 2.660, p < .050).

How Many Children

The SLI means for the various *How Many Children* variable categories were 0 (None) – 14.74, 1 – 14.07, 2 – 14.27, 3 – 14.78, 4 – 16.74, 5 – 15.06, 6 – 14.55, 8 or more – 23.00. A comparison of the *How Many Children* variable categories and SLI means was not significant (df = 3227, F = 5.272, p < .050).

Highest Educational Level Attained

The SLI means for the various *Highest Educational Level Attained* categories were Inadequately completed elementary education – 14.07, Completed (compulsory) elementary education – 14.03, Incomplete secondary education (vocational/technical) – 14.20, Complete secondary school (vocational/technical) – 13.91, Incomplete secondary education (university preparatory) – 14.13, Complete secondary education (university preparatory) – 14.33, Some university without degree – 15.71, University with degree – 14.63. A comparison of the *Highest Educational Level Attained* variable categories and SLI means was not significant (df = 3,255, F = 6.776, p < .050).

Number Supervised People

The SLI means for the various *Number Supervised People* categories were 1 – 14.62, 2 to 9 – 14.33, 10 to 24 – 14.52, 25 to 49 – 15.23, 50 to 99 – 15.44, and 100 or more – 13.51. A comparison of the *Number Supervised People* variable categories and SLI means was not significant ($df = 3,276$, $F = 3.596$, $p < .050$).

A summary of all demographic variable ANOVA statistics is provided in Table 14 below.

Table 14

Summary of ANOVA Statistics Values for All Demographic Study Variables

Variable	Category	Mean	df	F
Gender			3,280	.037
	Male	14.49		
	Female	14.47		
A comparison of the *Gender* and *SLI* variables was significant at p < .050.				
Age			3,275	2.044
	15-24	14.55		
	25-34	14.32		
	35-44	14.45		
	45-54	14.48		
	55-64	14.91		
	65-98	14.83		
A comparison of the *Age* and *SLI* variables was not significant at p < .050.				
Marital Status			3,264	2.660
	Married	14.55		
	Divorced	13.73		
	Separated	14.26		
	Widowed	13.87		
	Single/Never Married	14.65		
A comparison of the *Marital Status* and *SLI* variables was not significant at p < .050.				

(*table continues*)

Table 14 (*continued*)

Variable	Category	Mean	df	F
How Many Children			3,227	5.272
	None	14.74		
	1 child	14.07		
	2 children	14.27		
	3 children	14.78		
	4 children	16.74		
	5 children	15.06		
	6 children	14.55		
	8 or more children	23.00		

A comparison of the *How Many Children* and *SLI* variables was not significant at $p < .050$.

(*table continues*)

Table 14 (*continued*)

Variable	Category	Mean	df	F
Highest Educational Level Attained			3,255	6.776
	Inadequately completed elementary education	14.07		
	Completed (compulsory) elementary education	14.03		
	Incomplete secondary school: technical/vocational	14.20		
	Complete secondary school: technical/vocational	13.91		
	Incomplete secondary: university-preparatory	14.13		
	Complete secondary: university-preparatory	14.33		
	Some university without degree	15.71		
	University with degree	14.63		
A comparison of the *Highest Educational Level Attained* and *SLI* variables was not significant at $p < .050$.				
Number Supervised People			3,276	3.596
	1	14.62		
	2-9	14.33		
	10-24	14.52		
	25-49	15.23		
	50-99	15.44		
	100 and more	13.51		
A comparison of the *Number Supervised People* and *SLI* variables was not significant at $p < .050$.				

Research Question Two

Research Question Two: How do demographic factors (i.e., control variables) from the chosen WVS dataset, including gender, age, marital status, number of children, education level, and number of people supervised affect the servant leadership scale scores (SLI) at the general study level?

Research Question Two Hypotheses

Hypothesis One.

H_0: No significant relationship exists between *Gender* and SLI at the general study level.

H_A: A significant relationship exists between *Gender* and SLI at the general study level.

Based upon the F value of .037 at the intersection of *Gender* and SLI scores from Table 14 above, H_0 is rejected and H_A is accepted.

Hypothesis Two.

H_0: No significant relationship exists between *Age* and SLI at the general study level.

H_A: A significant relationship exists between *Age* and SLI at the general study level

Based upon the F value of 2.044 at the intersection of *Age* and SLI scores from Table 14 above, H_0 is accepted and H_A is rejected.

Hypothesis Three.

H_0: No significant relationship exists between *Marital Status* and SLI at the general study level.

H_A: A significant relationship exists between *Marital Status* and SLI at the general study level.

Based upon the F value of 2.660 at the intersection of *Marital Status* and SLI scores from Table 14 above, H_0 is accepted and H_A is rejected.

Hypothesis Four.

H_0: No significant relationship exists between *How Many Children* and SLI at the general study level.

H_A: A significant relationship exists between *How Many Children* and SLI at the general study level.

Based upon the F value of 5.272 at the intersection of *How Many Children* and SLI scores from Table 14 above, H_0 is accepted and H_A is rejected.

Hypothesis Five.

H_0: No significant relationship exists between *Highest Educational Level Attained* and SLI at the general study level.

H_A: A significant relationship exists between *Highest Educational Level Attained* and SLI at the general study level.

Based upon the significance value of 6.776 at the intersection of *Highest Educational Level Attained* and SLI scores from Table 14 above, H_0 is accepted and H_A is rejected.

Hypothesis Six.

H_0: No significant relationship exists between *Number Supervised People* and SLI at the general study level.

H_A: A significant relationship exists between *Number Supervised People* and SLI at the general study level.

Based upon the F value of 3.596 at the intersection of *Number Supervised People* and SLI scores from Table 14 above, H_0 is accepted and H_A is rejected.

Table 15

Research Question Two Acceptance or Rejection of Null Hypotheses

Hypothesis	H_0
No significant relationship exists between *Gender* and SLI at the general study level.	Reject
No significant relationship exists between *Age* and SLI at the general study level.	Accept
No significant relationship exists between *Marital Status* and SLI at the general study level.	Accept
No significant relationship exists between *How Many Children* and SLI at the general study level.	Accept
No significant relationship exists between *Highest Educational Level Attained* and SLI at the general study level.	Accept
No significant relationship exists between *Number Supervised People* and SLI at the general study level.	Accept

Conclusion

The analysis of the WVS data as described in this chapter produced some surprising outcomes. One of these was the significant correlation discovered between the SLI and MAS scores at the general study level with no correlations of significance between the SLI and PDI, IDV, or UAI scores. Other interesting findings were related to the ANOVA mean comparisons which resulted in the discovery of a significant relationship between the *Gender* demographic variable mean and the SLI score at the general study level. This may or may not have implications for the correlation discovered between the SLI and MAS indexes. All findings will be discussed in greater depth and conclusions will be drawn regarding all in Chapter Five below.

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Servant Leadership: A Feminine Approach to Leading and Managing People?

Before discussing the results of the analysis phase of this study, it is necessary to make clear the gender association of servant leadership as a leadership and management approach. Greenleaf's described own wishes for how servant leadership becomes manifest in the business world: "My search, therefore, day by day, is for a path through the maze along which people are accepted as they are and which leads to a world that is more benign" (Greeneleaf, 1977/2002, p. 151). This is not a search for ego-driven, assertive means by which followers, peers, and managers might be manipulated into specific action, a masculine approach. Rather, it is a feminine approach in which social goals are valued and individuals are nurtured to achieve their fullest potential. Along with this, Hofstede (2003) recognizes that the "balance between ego goals and social goals in an individual is influenced by that individual's gender" (p. 11). Regardless of individual influences, Hofstede's indexes were derived using factor analysis on country level means. This recognition helps us avoid the ecological fallacy of making invalid assumptions by imputing individual characteristics to the group level, in this case at the country and general study levels. In the end, we explore masculinity/femininity (MAS) at a more general level than even Hofstede. In the context of this study, servant leadership principles and masculinity/femininity were strongly correlated in a bi-directional, linear

way, which tells us that the decision to explore the correlative relationship between servant leadership and masculinity/femininity at the general study level was a valid one.

Restatement of the Study Problem

Virtually no research into the relationships among Hofstede's (2001) dimensions of power distance, individualism and collectivism, masculinity and femininity, and uncertainty avoidance and servant leadership principles has been accomplished since Greenleaf's (1970; 1977/2002) introduction of the concept of servant leadership as a practice model into the leadership and management literatures. Though several researchers have developed high quality studies on the theoretical and practical development of servant leadership principles (Anderson, 2005; Autry, 2001; Braye, 2001; DeGraaf, Jordan, & DeGraaf, 1999; Frick, 1995; Fryar, 2002; Greenleaf, 1970; 1987; 1977/2002; 2003; Helland, 2004; Hunter, 2004; 2006; Irving, 2005; Jennings, 2002; Laub, 1999; Lopez, 1995; McGee-Cooper & Looper, 2001; Melrose, 1998; Nelson, 2003; Polleys, 2002; Rardin, 2001; Sarayrah, 2005; Sarkus, 1996; Spears, 2004; Walls, 2004), none have concentrated solely upon its applicability in a cross-cultural context using Hofstede's cultural typology. This study represents a quantitative approach to establishing servant leadership as an international bridging structure for theorists and practitioners developing the principles of servant leadership as an approach for leading and managing people into the 21st century.

Review of the Data Analysis Procedures

The final sample used in this study is composed of a subset of World Values Survey (European Study Group and World Values Survey Association, 2006) *2000 Wave* data covering 23 countries, 3,282 respondents, 35 test variables, and six demographic variables. The initial delimitation of the sample dataset involved choosing countries from the WVS database which were also reflected in Hofstede's cultural typology dataset. Once these countries were chosen, the dataset was again filtered to include only those respondents who were in supervisory/managerial positions at the time of the survey. This involved filtering the data yet again by using the *Supervising Someone* demographic variable. Once the dataset was filtered to include only supervisors/managers, test variables were then identified that met the criterion of representing Hebert's (2003) Principal Component Analysis compression of Laub's (1999) servant leadership sub-scores (a) values people, (b) develops people, (c) build community, (d) displays authenticity, (e) provides leadership, and (f) shares leadership into a single factor, *Servant Leadership*. Subtractive and additive techniques were applied to arrive at an acceptable Cronbach's Alpha (α), which served as an estimation of instrument reliability. This estimation value is used in survey data analysis to determine if the variables chosen measure the same construct—in this case, *Servant Leadership*. The value arrived at was .715, which is within an acceptable range for a social scientific study (Lattin, Carroll, & Green, 2003).

Demographic variables were then chosen for their potential to inform the study about any respondent characteristics that might influence the final sample and

computation of SLI scores. The demographic variables chosen were *Gender*, *Age*, *Marital Status*, *How Many Children*, *Highest Educational Level Attained*, and *Number Supervised People*. Other studies have noted the level of influence of such demographic variables upon the level of servant leadership practiced at the organizational level (Hebert, 2003; Horsman, 2001; Laub, 1999).

The *instrument* of this study was created simply by choosing the test variables detailed in Appendix A. Each of these variables was scored on widely divergent scale ranges. When analyzing data for a survey study such as this, it is important to compare data with a high degree of scale similarity. Each chosen test variable was recoded into binary, 0/1, values based upon the perceived level of servant leadership intrinsic in the available answers. Recoding was done in as careful a manner as possible to ensure the integrity of the servant leadership content of each result, including imputation of missing values after the final recoding exercise. Based upon the number of test variables chosen, the highest score possible for the *instrument* of this study was 35. This allowed an objective servant leadership scale score to be computed by summing all values for each of the test variables chosen into a single variable, Servant Leadership Index (SLI), at the respondent level. Once this value was computed for each respondent, statistics could be applied at the country and general study levels. This also provided a way to explore the nature of the relationships that might exist between Hofstede's dimensions chosen for this study and the level of servant leadership computed from the recoded WVS data.

The statistics of this study were centered on the application of the Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) techniques. The Pearson's

correlation coefficient was used to discover bi-directional, linear relationships that might exist between each of Hofstede's cultural typology dimensions, Power Distance (PDI), Individualism/Collectivism (IDV), Masculinity/Femininity (MAS), and Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI), and the Servant Leadership Index (SLI) scale scores created from the sample dataset. ANOVA was used to explore any influences the demographic variables might have had on the SLI scale scores at the general study level. The results from both of the techniques were used to accept or reject the null and alternative hypotheses created for each research question of the study.

Summary of the Findings, Discussion, and Conclusions

Each of Hofstede's cultural typology dimension index scores amount to mean values by country. Considering this, a variable was created and populated for each of the respondents of the study sample which reflected the dimensions: Power Distance (PDI), Individualism/Collectivism (IDV), Masculinity/Femininity (MAS), and Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI). A Servant Leadership Index (SLI) score was also computed for each respondent at the individual level. This allowed for calculation of SLI means at the country and general study levels. Once this was accomplished, Pearson's correlation coefficient could be calculated at the general study level with the intent of testing the null and alternative hypotheses generated from Research Question One and the index variables. Before addressing the acceptance and rejection of the hypotheses, we revisit

Research Question One:

> What is the nature of the relationships among each of Hofstede's definitions of power distance (PDI), individualism and collectivism (IDV), masculinity and femininity (MAS), and uncertainty avoidance (UAI) and servant leadership attributes as introduced by Greenleaf and further refined by Hebert's compression of Laub's six SOLA sub-scores (a) values people, (b) develops people, (c) displays authenticity, (d) builds community, (e) provides leadership, and (f) shares leadership into a single servant leadership factor?

Four hypotheses were generated at the intersection points between Hofstede's cultural typology dimensions chosen for this study and the SLI score. The only significant correlation in which the null hypothesis was rejected was found was between Hofstede's MAS and SLI at .961. This is an extremely high value, which reflects a strong positive correlation between Hofstede's definition of masculinity and femininity and servant leadership at the general study level. The remaining three correlations came in at .000, reflecting no correlation whatsoever between Hofstede's PDI, IDV, and UAI indexes and the SLI index at the study level.

The implications for this finding are centered on Hofstede's definition of masculinity and femininity within the context of his work:

> A society is called *masculine* when emotional gender roles are clearly distinct: men are supposed to be assertive, tough, and focused on material success, whereas women are supposed to be more modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life.

> A society is called *feminine* when emotional gender roles overlap: both men and women are supposed to be modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life. (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p. 120)

Hofstede (2004) concludes: "Study of work goals *by gender* have shown again and again that other things being equal, men tend to stress ego goals more and women tend to stress social goals" (p. 11).

These ideas are reflected in Stedham and Yamamura's (2004) assessment of the importance of gender when measuring national cultures. Within their own study, these researchers base one set of hypotheses upon the fact that "the higher the score on this dimension [MAS], the greater the support for gender role separation" (Stedham & Yamamura, 2004, p. 239). Their study produces no conclusive evidence that gender differences were implicit in the MAS scores for their subjects in Japan and the United States.

In another study, Nicholson and Yim-Yu (2002) examined gender differences in business across Venezuela and Chile in the southern hemisphere and the United States in the northern. Their study examines the gender role attitudes of managers, professionals, and upper division business students using a modified version (Dorfman & Howell, 1988) of Hofstede's (2001) cultural typology. In contrast to Stedham and Yamamura's study, Nicholson and Yim-Yu find that "interesting and intriguing results also emerged when interaction effects of gender, age, and nationality on gender-role typing were explored. All three two-way interactions were statistically significant at the $p = < 0.001$ level" (2002, p. 298). Their final conclusions are centered on how "gender roles and

social attitudes toward assertiveness and male dominance in business seem to be a function of nationality, gender, and age differences" (Nicholson & Yim-Yu, 2002, p. 298).

The correlative relationship between masculinity/femininity and servant leadership was explored at the general level in this study by examining the Pearson's correlation coefficient between them. Any assumptions about gender differences at the country level have been subsumed by the exploration of Hofstede's MAS and the SLI indexes at the general study level. Regardless, the statistical method used for this analysis could only establish a correlative relationship that does not imply causation in either direction, only that masculinity/femininity and servant leadership principles are related in a positive way that should be examined further in subsequent studies.

Research Question Two explored the relationships between the means of the demographic variables of the study, *Gender*, *Age*, *Marital Status*, *How Many Children*, *Highest Educational Level Attained*, and *Number People Supervised* and the Servant Leadership Index (SLI) variable:

> How do demographic factors (i.e., control variables) from the chosen WVS dataset, including gender, age, marital status, number of children, education level, and number of people supervised affect the servant leadership scale scores (SLI) at the general study level?

One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted with the demographic variables considered the independent and the SLI score the dependent variables. In this way, the effects of the demographic variables upon the level of servant leadership in the

sample population were explored. The single interesting outcome discovered during this exploration was centered on the association between the *Gender* demographic variable and the SLI at the general study level. This finding is summarized in Table 15 below.

Table 16

Summary of ANOVA Statistics Values for Gender and Servant Leadership Index

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	df	F
Gender	Servant Leadership Index	3,280	.037

Note. $p < .050$ for all ANOVA statistic results of the study.

This study was intended to describe any relationships discovered between Hofstede's Power Distance (PDI), Masculinity/Femininity (MAS), Individualism/Collectivism (IDV), and Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI) and servant leadership characteristics. Likewise, it was intended to discover any effects selected demographic variables might have upon the level of servant leadership found at the general study level. This finding described in Table 16 above aligns closely with the significant MAS/SLI correlation found using Pearson's correlation coefficient. One of the points considered at the outset of this study was how servant leadership might act as an intellectual and emotional bridge between worldviews. Gender clearly plays an important role in the creation of such a bridging structure. The alignment between Hofstede's MAS and servant leadership and gender and servant leadership reveals the significant role gender plays when considering the applicability of servant leadership on a cross-cultural

scale. Recommendations for further research based upon this discovery are offered below.

Recommendations for Further Research

Several of the limitations of this study beg for additional research. For instance, the fact that all the study countries are located in the Northern Hemisphere and are either European or possess a history of European national culture influence or were members of the former Soviet bloc countries practically cries for extension of the study protocol into countries located on other continents. The exclusion of Hofstede's (2001) fifth dimension, Long- versus Short-term Orientation, might produce interesting results when considered along with gender. All of the statistical measures of this study were conducted at the general study level. It would be extremely useful to break the statistics down by gender at the general and country levels to see how each affects servant leadership as an outcome variable. Finally, additional research at the country level across all variables identified for this study might also prove to be instructive, especially for organizations and individuals interested in developing a servant leadership practice within those countries. This could be easily accomplished by using the WVS (European Study Group and World Values Survey Association, 2006) dataset and the same procedures detailed in this study.

REFERENCES

Agosto, E. (2005). *Servant leadership: Jesus and Paul*. Atlanta, GA: Chalice Press.

Anderson, J. (2005). Servant leadership as the true parental model: A construct for better research, study, and practice. In Regent University School of Leadership Studies (Ed.), *Proceedings from the 2005 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University School of Leadership Studies.

Anderson, K. P. (2005). A correlational analysis of servant leadership and job satisfaction in a religious educational organization. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66 (01)*, 239. (UMI No. 3162292).

Annas, J. (2003). The structure of virtue. In M. DePaul & L. Zagzebski (Eds.), *Intellectual virtue: Perspectives from ethics and epistemology* (pp. 15-33). New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Archdivli, A., & Kuchinke, K. P. (2002). Leadership styles and cultural values among managers and subordinates: A comparative study of four countries of the former Soviet Union, Germany, and the U.S. *Human Resource Development International, 5*(1), 99-117.

Argandona, A. (2003). The new economy: Ethical issues. *Journal of Business Ethics, 44*, 3-22.

Arjomand, S. A. (2004). Social theory and the changing world: Mass democracy, development, modernization, and globalization. *International Sociology, 19*(3), 321-353.

Aristotle. (1998). *Nicomachean ethics* (D. P. Chase, Trans.). Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, Inc. (Original work published 1911)

Asante, S. W. (2005). Process and qualities for developing servant-shepherd leaders within the Church of Pentecost for effective cross-cultural ministry. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66 (03)*, 1029. (UMI No. 3163178).

Autry, J. A. (2001). *The servant leader: How to build a creative team, develop great morale, and improve bottom-line performance*. New York: Three Rivers Press.

Beazley, D. A. (2002). Spiritual orientation of a leader and perceived leader behavior. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63 (04)*, 1436. (UMI No. 3049889).

Bekker, C. J. (2005). Kenotic mysticism and servant leadership in the letters of Clare of Assissi to Agnes or Prague. In *Proceedings from the 2005 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University School of Leadership Studies.

Bennis, W. (2002). Becoming a tomorrow leader. In *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the twenty-first century* (pp. 101-110). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Bivins, I., D. C. (2005). A study of the correlation between servant leadership and ministry satisfaction in church leaders in Alaska. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66 (03)*, 941. (UMI No. 3167901).

Blanchard, K. (1998). Servant-leadership revisited. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 21-28). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Blanchard, K., & Hodges, P. (2003). *The servant leader: Transforming your heart, head, hands, and habits*. Nashville, TN: J. Countryman.

Blum, M. (2002). The development of a servant leadership model for application to a competitive team sport setting. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63 (06)*, 2173. (UMI No. 3058177).

Braye, R. H. (2001). Servant-leadership: Belief and practice in women-led businesses. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61 (07)*, 2799. (UMI No. 9981536).

Bryant, S. R. (2003). Servant leadership and public managers. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64 (02)*, 634. (UMI No. 3082716).

Buller, P. F., Kohls, J. J., & Anderson, K. S. (1991). The challenge of global ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics, 10*(10), 767-775.

Buller, P. F., Kohls, J. J., & Anderson, K. S. (2000). When ethics collide: Managing conflict across cultures. *Organizational Dynamics, 28*(4), 52-66.

Cedar, P. A. (1987). *Strength in servant leadership*. Waco, TX: World Books Publisher.

Cory, D. (1998). The killing fields: Institutions and the death of our spirits. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 209-215). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Covey, S. R. (1998). Servant-leadership and community leadership in the twenty-first century. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the twenty-first century* (pp. 27-34). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Crippen, C. L. (2005). Three women pioneers in Manitoba: Evidence of servant-leadership. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65 (08)*, 2844. (UMI No. 3143999).

Dalton, R. J., Hac, P. M., Nghi, P. T., & Ong, N. T. (2002). Social relations and social capital in Vietnam: The 2001 World Values Survey. *Comparative Sociology, 1*(3-4), 369-386.

De Tocqueville, A. (2000). *Democracy in America* (H. Reeve, Trans.). New York: Bantam Classic Books. (Original work published 1835)

DeGraaf, D. G., Jordan, D. J., & DeGraaf, K. H. (1999). *Programming for parks, recreation, & leisure services: A servant leadership approach*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.

DeGraaf, D., Tilley, C., & Neal, L. (2004). Servant leadership characteristics in organizational life. In L. C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Practicing servant leadership: Succeeding through trust, bravery, and forgiveness* (pp. 133-166). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dennis, R. S. (2004). Servant leadership theory: Development of the Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65 (05)*, 1857. (UMI No. 3133544).

Dennis, R. S., & Bocarnea, M. (2005). Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 26*(8), 600-615.

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

Dillman, S. W. (2004). Leading in the Land of Oz: Cross-cultural study of servant leadership in Australia. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65 (06)*, 2273. (UMI No. 3136215).

Dorfman, P. W., & Howell, J. P. (1998). Dimensions of national culture and effective leadership patterns: Hofstede revisited. In R.N. Farmer & E.G. McGoun (Eds.), *Advances in International Comparative Management* (pp. 127-150). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Inc.

Drury, S. L. (2004). Servant leadership and organizational commitment: Empirical findings and workplace implications. In Regent University School of Leadership

Studies (Ed.), *Proceedings from the 2004 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University School of Leadership Studies.

Drury, S. L. (2005). Employee perceptions of servant leadership: Comparisons by level and with job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65 (09)*, 3457. (UMI No. 3146724).

European Study Group and World Values Survey Association. (2006). *European and World Values Survey Four-Wave Integrated Data File, 1981-2004.* Retrieved December 30, 2006, from the World Values Survey: The world's most comprehensive investigation of political and sociocultural change Web site: http://www.WorldValuesSurvey.org

Fadil, P., Segrest-Purkiss, S. L., Hurley-Hanson, A. E., Knudstrup, M., & Stepina, L. (2004). Distributive justice in northern Mexico and the U.S.: A cross-cultural comparison. *Cross Cultural Management, 11*(3), 3-24.

Foot, P. (2003). Virtues and vices. In S. Darwall (Ed.), *Blackwell readings in philosophy: Virtue ethics*(pp. 105-120). New York: Oxford University Press.

Ford, J. B., LaTour, M. S., Vitelli, S. J., & French, W. A. (1997). Moral judgment and market negotiations: A comparison of Chinese and American managers. *Journal of International Marketing, 5*(2), 57-76.

Foster, B. A. (2000). Barriers to servant leadership: Perceived organizational elements that impede servant leadership effectiveness. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61 (05)*, 384. (UMI No. 9974230).

Frick, D. M. (2004). *Robert K. Greenleaf: A life of servant leadership*. San Francisco: Berrett-Kohler Publishers.

Fryar, J. L. (2002). *Trust and teams: Putting servant leadership to work*. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House.

Gardiner, J. J. (1998). Quiet presence: The holy ground of leadership. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 116-125). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Gill, C. (2005). In what sense are ancient ethical norms universal? In C. Gill (Ed.), *Virtue, norms, and objectivity: Issues in ancient and modern ethics* . New York: Oxford University Press.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *Servant as Leader*. Indianapolis, IN: The Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1987). *Teacher as servant: A parable*. Indianapolis, IN: The Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership.

Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness* (25th anniversary ed.). New York: Paulist Press. (Original work published 1977)

Gunderson, D. (1992). *Through the dust: Servant leadership using Jesus as an example*. Seattle, WA: YWAM Publishing.

Habecker, E. (1990). *Leading with a follower's heart*. Wheaton, IL: Scripture Press.

Heales, J., Cockcroft, S., & Raduescu, C. (2004). The influence of national culture on the level and outcome of IS development decisions. *Journal of Global Information Technology Management, 7*(4), 3-28.

Hebert, S. C. (2004). The relationship of perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction from the follower's perspective. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64 (11)*, 4118. (UMI No. 3112981).

Helland, M. R. (2004). *Proceedings from the 2004 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable* (Regent University School of Leadership Studies, Ed.). Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University School of Leadership Studies.

Helmer, O. (1975). Foreword. In H. A. Linstone & M. Turoff (Eds.), *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Herbst, J. D. (2004). Organizational servant leadership and its relationship to secondary school effectiveness. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64 (11)*, 4001. (UMI No. 3110574).

Hesse, H. (2003). *Journey to the east* (H. Rosner, Trans.). New York: Picador USA.

Hildebrand, H. P. (1990). *The model of servant leadership*. Perrysburg, OH: Welch Publishing Co.

Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive, 7*(1), 81-94.

Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hofstede, G. (2004). *Masculinity and femininity: The taboo dimension of national cultures* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G. J. (2005). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.

Hookway, C. (2003). How to be a virtue epistemologist. In M. DePaul & L. Zagzebski (Eds.), *Intellectual virtue: Perspectives from ethics and epistemology* (pp. 183-202). New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Horn, J., T. W. (2006). Developmental processes critical to the formation of servant leaders in China. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66 (12)*. (UMI No. 3196713).

Horsman, J. H. (2001). Perspectives of servant-leadership and spirit in organizations. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 62 (03)*, 1119. (UMI No. 3010149).

Hui, M. K., Au, K., & Fock, H. (2004). Empowerment effects across cultures. *Journal of International Business Studies, 35*, 46-60.

Hunter, J. C. (1998). *The servant: A simple story about the true essence of leadership*. New York: Crown Business.

Hunter, J. C. (2004). *The world's most powerful leadership principle: How to become a servant leader*. New York: Crown Business.

Hursthouse, R. (2003). Normative virtue ethics. In S. M. Cahn (Series Ed.), S. Darwall (Ed.), *Blackwell readings in philosophy: Virtue ethics* (pp. 184-202). New York: Oxford University Press.

Ingehart, R., Basanez, M., Diez-Medrano, J., Halman, L., & Luijkx, R. (Eds.). (2004). *Human beliefs and values: A cross-cultural sourcebook based on the 1999 - 2002 values survey*. Mexico City: Siglo XXI.

Inglehart, R. (2000). Globalization and postmodern values. *The Washington Quarterly, 23*(1), 215-228.

Inglehart, R. (2005). The worldviews of Islamic publics in global perspective. In M. Moaddel (Ed.), *Worldviews of Islamic publics*. New York: Palgrave.

Inglehart, R., & Baker, W. E. (2000). Modernization, cultural change, and the persistence of traditional values. *American Sociological Review, 65*, 19-51.

Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2004, Summer). What insights can multi-country surveys provide about people and societies? *Comparative Politics Newsletter*.

Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2005, March). Exploring the unknown: Predicting the responses of publics not yet surveyed. *International Review of Sociology, 15*(1), 173-201.

Irving, J. A. (2005). Servant leadership and the effectiveness of teams. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66 (04)*, 1421. (UMI No. 3173207).

Jackson, T. (2002). Managing people across cultures: Valuing people differently. *Human Resource Management, 41*(4), 455-475.

Jackson, T., & Artola, M. C. (1997). Ethical beliefs and management behaviour: A cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Business Ethics, 16*(11), 1163-1173.

Jennings, D. B. (2002). Those who would lead must first serve: The praxis of servant leadership by public school principals. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63 (04)*, 1207. (UMI No. 3049171).

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

Kahl, J., & Donelan, T. (2004). *Leading from the heart: Choosing to be a servant leader*. Greenwood Village, CO: Kahl & Associates.

Kant, I. (1996). *The metaphysics of morals [Metaphysik der Sitten]* (2nd rev. ed., M. Gregor, Ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kelley, R. E. (2002). *A woman's guide to servant leadership: A Biblical study for becoming a Christlike leader*. Birmingham, AL: New Hope Publishers.

Koehn, D. (1995). A role for virtue ethics in the analysis of business practice. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 5*(3), 533-539.

Kolman, L., Noorderhaven, N. G., Hofstede, G., & Dienes, E. (2003). Cross-cultural differences in Central Europe. *Journal of Management Psychology, 18*(1), 76-88.

Koshal, J. N. (2006). Servant leadership theory: Application of the construct of service in the context of Kenyan leaders and managers. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66 (08)*, 2998. (UMI No. 3188226).

Kuhn, T. S. (1996). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (3rd ed.). Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Lattin, J. M., Carroll, J. D., & Green, P. E. (2003). *Analyzing Multivariate Data*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole-Thomson Learning.

Laub, J. A. (1999). Assessing the servant leadership organization: Development of the Servant Organizational Leadership Assessment (SOLA) instrument. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 62 (02)*, 308. (UMI No. 9921922).

Laub, J. A. (2003). From paternalism to the servant organization. In Regent University School of Leadership Studies (Ed.), *Proceedings from the 2003 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University School of Leadership Studies.

Ledbetter, D. S. (2004). Law enforcement leaders and servant leadership: A reliability study of the organizational leadership assessment. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64 (11)*, 4200. (UMI No. 3110778).

Lee, C., & Zemke, R. (1995). The search for spirit in the workplace. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers* (pp. 99-112). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Linstone, H. A., & Turoff, M. (Eds.). (1975). *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

London, A. J. (2006). *Moral knowledge and the acquisition of virtue in Aristotle's Nicomachean and Eudemian ethics.* Retrieved March 5, 2006, from the Review of Metaphysics Web site: http://www.highbeam.com/library/doc3.asp?DOCID=1G1:81891826&num=2&ctrlInfo=Round18%3AProd%3ASR%3AResult&ao=&FreePremium=BOTH

Lopez, I. O. (1995). Becoming a servant-leader: The personal development path. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers* (pp. 149-160). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Lore, J. S. (1998). Servant-leadership in a Christian organization: The sisters of St. Joseph Health System. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 297-307). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Lu, L., Rose, G. M., & Blodgett, J. G. (1999). The effects of cultural dimensions on ethical decision making in marketing: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Ethics, 18*(1), 91-105.

Lubin, K. A. (2002). Visionary leader behaviors and their congruency with servant leadership characteristics. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 62 (08)*, 2645. (UMI No. 3022943).

Lubker, M. (2004). Globalization and perceptions of social inequality. *International Labour Review, 143*(1-2), 91-128.

Lyotard, J. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge: Vol. 10. Theory and history of literature* (W. Godzich, & Schulte-Sasse, J., Series Ed., G.

Bennington, & Massumi, B., Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

MacIntyre, A. (2003). The nature of the virtues. In S. M. Cahn (Series Ed.), S. Darwall (Ed.), *Blackwell readings in philosophy: Virtue ethics* (pp. 144-167). New York: Oxford University Press.

Malterud, K. (2001). Qualitative research: Standards, challenges, and guidelines. *The Lancet, 358*, 483-488.

Markwardt, R. A. (2002). Servant leadership: Moral foundations and academic manifestations. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63 (02)*, 449. (UMI No. 3042390).

McDowell, J. (2003). Virtue and reason. In S. M. Cahn (Series Ed.), S. Darwall (Ed.), *Blackwell readings in philosophy: Virtue ethics* (pp. 121-143). New York: Oxford University Press.

McGee-Cooper, A., & Looper, G. (2001). *The essentials of servant-leadership: Principles in practice*. Waltham, MA: Pegasus Communications.

Melrose, K. (1998). Putting servant-leadership into practice. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 279-296). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Miears, L. D. (2005). Servant-leadership and job satisfaction: A correlational study in Texas Education Agency Region X public schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65 (09)*, 3237. (UMI No. 3148083).

Morgan, G., & Smircich, L. (1980). The case for qualitative research. *Academy of Management Review, 5*(4), 491-500.

Munck, G. L. (1998). Canons of research design in qualitative analysis. *Studies in Comparative International Development, 33*(3), 18-45.

Murphy, P. E. (1999). Character and virtue ethics in international marketing: An agenda for managers, researchers, and educators. *Journal of Business Ethics, 18*(1), 107-124.

Nelson, L. (2003). An exploratory study of the application and acceptance of servant-leadership theory among black leaders in South Africa. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64 (03)*, 944. (UMI No. 3086676).

Nicholson, J. D., & Wong, Y. (2002). North-South Gender Role Differences in Business. *Journal of American Academy of Business, 1*(2), 296-300.

Nicolas, J. D. (1996). Social position, information, and postmaterialism. *Sociological Investigations*, 153-165.

Nielsen, R. P. (1998). Quaker foundations for Greenleaf's servant-leadership and "friendly disentangling" method. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 126-144). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Page, D. (2004). Experiential learning for servant leadership. In Regent University School of Leadership Studies (Ed.), *Proceedings from the 2004 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University School of Leadership Studies.

Page, D., & Wong, P. T. (2000). A conceptual framework for measuring servant-leadership. In S. B.-S. K. Adjibolosoo (Ed.), *The human factor in shaping the course of history and development*(pp. 1-16). Latham, MD: University Press of America.

Patterson, K. A. (2003). Servant leadership: A theoretical model. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64 (02)*, 570. (UMI No. 3082719).

Paul, R. W., & Elder, L. (2002). *Critical thinking: Tools for taking charge of your professional and personal life*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Pearce, W. B., & Littlejohn, S. W. (1997). *Moral conflict: When social worlds collide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Peck, M. S. (1995). Servant-leadership training and discipline in authentic community. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers* (pp. 87-98). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Peterson, D. K., & Kim, C. (2003). Perceptions on IS risks and failure types: A comparison of designers from the United States, Japan, and Korea. *Journal of Global Information Management, 11*(3), 19-38.

Peterson, D. K., Kim, C., & Kim, J. H. (2003). Perceptions of information systems objectives: A comparison of IS professionals from the United States and Korea. *Journal of Global Information Technology Management, 6*(2), 27-44.

Plato. (1952). *The dialogues of Plato* (B. Jowett, Trans., R. M. Hutchins, Ed.). Chicago: William Benton.

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

Popper, K. (2002). *The logic of scientific discovery* (J. Fried & L. Fried, Trans.). New York: Routledge. (Original work published 1935)

Powell, J. L. (2005). 'Modernist' sociology in a 'postmodern' world. *The International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 25*(10/11), 1-13.

Rabb, T. K. (2006). *The last days of the Renaissance and the march to modernity*. New York: Basic Books.

Rardin, R. (2001). *The servant's guide to leadership: Beyond first principles*. Pittsburgh, PA: Selah Publishing Co.

Rawls, J. (1999). *A theory of justice* (Rev. ed.). Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

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

Rinehart, S. (1998). *Upside down: The paradox of servant leadership*. Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress Publishing Group.

Rokeach, M. (1972). *Beliefs, attitudes, and values: A theory of organization and change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rokeach, M. (2000). *Understanding human values: Individual and societal*. New York: Free Press.

Russell, R. F. (2001). Exploring the values and attributes of servant leaders. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61 (12)*, 4856. (UMI No. 999498).

Russell, R. F. (2001). The role of values in servant leadership. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 22*(2), 76-89.

Russell, R. F. (2003). A practical theology of servant leadership. In Regent University School of Leadership Studies (Ed.), *Proceedings from the 2003 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University School of Leadership Studies.

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

Salmon, W. C. (1966). *The foundations of scientific inference*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Sarkus, D. J. (1996). Servant-leadership in safety: Advancing the cause and practice. *Professional Safety, 41*(6), 26-32.

Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. *American Psychologist, 45*(2), 109-119.

Schein, E. H. (2001). The impact of transnational institutions on cultural values and vice versa. *Reflections, 3*(1), 41-48.

Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schuster, J. P. (1998). Servants, egos, and shoeshines: A world of sacramental possibility. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 271-278). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*(3), 550-562.

Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: Extensions and cross-cultural replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*(5), 878-891.

Seitz, V., Garcia, S. O., & Liston, A. (2000). Alternative coding strategies and the inapplicable data coding problem. *Taxon, 49*(1), 47-54.

Sendjaya, S. (2003). Development and validation of servant leadership behavior scale. In University School of Leadership Studies (Ed.), *Proceedings from the 2003 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University School of Leadership Studies.

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

Senge, P. M. (1995). Robert Greenleaf's legacy: A new foundation for twenty-first century institutions. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers* (pp. 217-240). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Shanahan, K. J., & Hyman, M. R. (2003). The development of a virtue ethics scale. *Journal of Business Ethics, 42*(2), 197-208.

Sherman, N. (2005). The look and feel of virtue. In C. Gill (Ed.), *Virtue, norms, and objectivity: Issues in ancient and modern ethics* (pp. 59-82). New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Siep, L. (2005). Virtue, values, and moral objectivity. In C. Gill (Ed.), *Virtue, norms, and objectivity: Issues in ancient and modern ethics* (pp. 83-98). New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Slote, M. (2003). Agent-based virtue ethics. In S. M. Cahn (Series Ed.) & S. Darwall (Vol. Ed.), *Blackwell readings in philosophy: Virtue ethics* (pp. 203-226). New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Solomon, D. (2003). Virtue ethics: Radical or routine? In M. DePaul & L. Zagzebski (Eds.), *Intellectual virtue: Perspectives from ethics and epistemology* (pp. 57-80). New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Spears, L. C. (2004). The understanding and practice of servant-leadership. In L. C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Practicing servant leadership: Succeeding through trust, bravery, and forgiveness* (pp. 9-24). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Specht, D. L., & Broholm, R. R. (2004). Toward a theology of institutions. In L. C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Practicing servant leadership: Succeeding through trust, bravery, and forgiveness* (pp. 167-200). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stedham, Y. A., & Yamamura, J. H. (2004). Measuring national culture: Does gender matter? *Women in Management Review 19*(5/6), 233-243.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2003). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2006). *Making globalization work*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Tatum, J. B. (1995). Meditations on servant-leadership. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers* (pp. 308-312). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Taylor, H. (2000). Does internet research work? *International Journal of Market Research, 42*(1), 51-63.

Thompson, R. S. (2004). The perception of servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction in a church-related college. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64 (08)*, 2738. (UMI No. 3103013).

Tobin, G. A., & Begley, C. M. (2004). Methodological rigour within a qualitative framework. *Methodological Issues in Nursing Research, 48*(4), 388-396.

Turner, W. B. (1999). *The learning of love: A journey toward servant leadership*. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, Inc.

Van Kuik, A. (1998). The meaning of servant leadership. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 59*. (UMI No. NQ32029).

Velasquez, M. (2000). Globalization and the failure of ethics. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 10*(1), 343-352.

Walls, W. J. (2004). Anatomy of a collaboration: An act of servant-leadership. In L. C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Practicing servant leadership: Succeeding through trust, bravery, and forgiveness* (pp. 113-132). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wang, Z. (2005). Before the emergence of critical citizens: Economic development and political trust in China. *International Review of Sociology, 15*(1), 155-171.

Welzel, C. (2006). Democratization as an emancipative process: The neglected role of mass motivations. *European Journal of Political Research, 45*, 871-896.

Welzel, C., & Inglehart, R. (2005). Liberalism, postmaterialism, and the growth of freedom. *International Review of Sociology, 15*(1), 81-108.

Welzel, C., Inglehart, R., & Deutsch, F. (2005, September). Social capital, voluntary associations and collective action: Which aspects of social capital have the greatest 'civic' payoff? *Journal of Civil Society, 1*(2), 121-146.

Welzel, C., Inglehart, R., & Klingemann, H. (2003). The theory of human development: A cross-cultural analysis. *European Journal of Political Research, 42*, 341-379.

Westre, K. R. (2003). Servant-leadership in sport. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64 (06)*, 2025. (UMI No. 3093080).

Whetstone, J. T. (2001). How virtue fits with business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics, 33*, 101-114.

Whetstone, J. T. (2003). The language of managerial excellence: Virtues applied and understood. *Journal of Business Ethics, 44*(4), 343-357.

Whetstone, J. T. (2005). A framework for organizational virtue: The interrelationship of mission, culture, and leadership. *Business Ethics: A European Review, 14*(4), 367-378.

Willmott, H. (1992). Postmodernism and excellence: The de-differentiation of economy and culture. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 5*(1), 58-68.

Winston, B. E. (2003). Extending Patterson's servant leadership model: Explaining how leaders and followers interact in a circular model. In Regent University School of

Leadership Studies (Ed.), *Proceedings from the 2003 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University School of Leadership Studies.

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

Wong, P. T., & Page, D. (2003). Servant leadership: An opponent-process model and the revised servant leadership profile. In Regent University School of Leadership Studies (Ed.), *Proceedings from the 2003 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University School of Leadership Studies.

Wong, P. T., & Page, D. (2005). *Servant leadership profile - revised.* Retrieved June 26, 2006, from the Trinity Western University: Master of Arts in Leadership Web site: http://www.twu.ca/leadership/reading/faculty-writings/servant-leadership-self-profile.pdf

Wong, P. T., Page, D., & Rude, W. (2005). *Servant leadership profile: 360.* Retrieved June 26, 2006, from the Western Trinity University: Master of Arts in Leadership Web site: http://www.twu.ca/leadership/reading/faculty-writings/servant-leadership-profile-360.pdf

Young, D. S. (1999). *Servant leadership for church renewal: Shepherds by the living springs*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press.

Zagorsek, H., Jaklic, M., & Stough, S. J. (2004). Comparing leadership practices between the United States, Nigeria, and Slovenia: Does culture matter? *Cross Cultural Management, 11*(2), 16-34.

APPENDIX A. WORLD VALUES SURVEY TEST VARIABLES FILTERED BY HEBERT'S SERVANT LEADERSHIP FACTOR

Table A1

World Values Survey Test Variables Filtered by Hebert's Servant Leadership Factor

Test Variable
Family Important
Friends Important
Politics Important
Religion Important
Belong: Social Welfare Service for Elderly
Belong: Church Organization
Belong: Political Parties
Belong: Local Political Parties
Belong: Human Rights
Belong: Conservation
Belong: Youth Work
Belong: Peace Movement
Belong: Concerned with Health
Would Give Part of my Income for Environment
Increase Taxes to Prevent Pollution
Important in a Job: A Job Respected
Important in a Job: Opportunity to Use Initiative
Important in a Job: You Can Achieve Something
Important in a Job: A Responsible Job
Important in a Job: A Job that is Interesting

(*table continues*)

Table A1 (*continued*)

Test Variable
Important in a Job: A Job that Meets One's Abilities
Important in a Job: Pleasant People to Work With
Important in a Job: Good Chances for Promotion
Important in a Job: A Useful Job for Society
Important in a Job: Meeting People
Political Action: Signing a Petition
Political Action: Joining in Boycotts
Political Action: Attending Lawful Demonstrations
Confidence: Churches
Confidence: Armed Forces
Confidence: The Press
Confidence: Labor Unions
Confidence: The Police
Confidence: Parliament
Confidence: The Civil Services