

*Interdisciplinary Journal of
Research on Religion*

Volume 10

2014

Article 5

The Use of Servant Leadership
in the United Methodist Church

Jessica Dearth and G. R. Bud West*

Regent University
Virginia Beach, Virginia

* georwes@regent.edu

The Use of Servant Leadership in the United Methodist Church

Jessica Dearth and G. R. Bud West

Regent University
Virginia Beach, Virginia

Abstract

For over a decade, the United Methodist Church has directed that throughout the organization, individuals who serve in positions of authority should lead through the use of servant leadership. By surveying over 300 United Methodist congregants and over 300 United Methodist pastors, using Barbuto and Wheeler's servant leadership instrument, we measured the perceptions of the observed leadership behaviors of both groups of responders and considered the differences between them. Through the use of descriptive statistics, congregants rated pastors at or below the median average (at or below 3 on a five-point Likert-type scale) in four of the five categories defined by Barbuto and Wheeler. Results of *t*-test and regression analyses also revealed that (1) congregants perceive that pastors generally apply greater levels of servant leadership to themselves than the congregants do, (2) pastors generally apply greater levels of servant leadership to themselves than the congregants perceive about themselves, (3) congregants perceive that pastors generally apply the same levels of servant leadership to themselves that the pastors themselves perceive that they do, and (4) a positive linear relationship exists between congregants' perceptions of their pastors as servant leaders and perceptions of themselves as servant leaders.

The United Methodist Church (UMC) has called on all of its members to employ servant leadership. In 1996, the UMC created the Connectional Process Team to “manage, guide, and promote a transformational direction for the United Methodist Church” (Connectional Process Team 2000: 1). Members of the Connectional Process Team (2000: 4) explained that “developing a servant leadership will require that the United Methodist Church move away from being a clergy-dependent church to one where ministry is shared among clergy and laity.” The UMC subsequently took these findings and institutionalized them by including associated information in *The Book of Discipline* (United Methodist Church 2008), the principal governing book used in administration. Specifically, in *The Book of Discipline*, the UMC describes servant leadership as “essential to the mission and the ministry of congregations” (United Methodist Church 2008: 91). The UMC also suggests that servant leaders should form Christian disciples through spiritual formation and guidance for Christian living in the world. However, Frank (2006: 124) noted that previous editions of *The Book of Discipline* did not include any passages that provide interpretation of what “servant leadership is, what are its marks or features, or how it relates to the Methodist or broader Christian heritage.” Nor did the 2008 or 2012 editions provide these clarifications.

The UMC has described servant leadership as a privilege, carrying with it the associated obligations to discern and nurture a spiritual relationship with God. The UMC has also suggested that servant leaders must instruct and guide Christian disciples “in their witness to Jesus Christ in the world through acts of worship, devotion, compassion, and justice under the guidance of the Holy Spirit” (United Methodist Church 2008: 92). By leaving out interpretations regarding the function and ideal implementation of servant leadership, the UMC has left members to infer the meanings of the nature of servanthood and the nature of authority as associated with the performance of leadership (Frank 2006).

CONSIDERATIONS

Russell and Stone (2002: 153) suggested that servant leadership attributes “grow out of the values and core beliefs of the individual leaders [S]ince values are the core beliefs that determine an individual’s principles, they are the independent variables [T]he dependent variable is manifest servant leadership.” Dillman (2003) proposed that Jesus Christ serves as the model for servant leadership for those who value the Judeo-Christian tradition. However, he also proposed that even though pastors experience exposure to the servant leadership concept, their “knowledge of specific facts about servant leadership is limited” (Dillman 2003: 62). The United Methodist General Conference has adopted two language sets for leadership expectations: the set related to the church’s mission to make disciples

of Jesus Christ and the set related to the term *servant leadership* as attached to ministry definitions and descriptions for every office of ministry (Frank 2002).

The Book of Discipline maintains that people can find the model for servant leadership within the ministry of Jesus Christ. Yet the UMC has not described practices or situations to illustrate or interpret servant leadership. As churches struggle with their institutional legacy, leadership offers a hope for change (Frank 2002). However, if the UMC wants to institutionalize servant leadership in practice, it must address, with critical analysis, “naming its biases and sifting through its perspectives with care” (Frank 2002: 7).

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM AND ABSENCE OF ASSOCIATED RESEARCH

To reach given destinations, people must have relative understandings of their current locations, visions of where they want to go, and navigation aids that will help direct them to those destinations. The UMC has espoused the relative importance of having members who serve in leadership positions apply servant leadership. That arguably serves as the desired destination. However, the UMC has not provided a clear, comprehensive, unified definition of servant leadership or specific descriptions of how leaders at various levels throughout the organization should apply that concept in practice. Thus they have not provided the navigation aids necessary to reach the desired destination, nor has anyone published any research that could provide a snapshot of the perceptions of members about the current use of servant leadership across the UMC. Consequently, no one knows the current location of the collective church regarding the use of servant leadership.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purposes of this study are to describe a model of servant leadership that members can use throughout the UMC and to measure the current relative perceptions of servant leadership by assessing the constructs that support this recommended servant leadership model. This study includes the examination and recommendation of the concepts included in Spears’s (1998) model of servant leadership as developed by Barbuto and Wheeler (2002). It also includes a report on the measured perceptions of servant leadership constructs and overall servant leadership of both pastors and congregants. It contributes to the knowledge base by exploring the organizational application of servant leadership across the UMC.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purposes of this literature review are to identify existing publications related to the significance of the concept of servant leadership to the UMC. These works

pertain to the theory of servant leadership, the foundation and aspects of servant leadership, servant leadership characteristics, constructs for measuring servant leadership, servant leadership intentions and behaviors, and follower outcomes.

Servant Leadership

Reportedly after reading *Journey to the East* by Hermann Hesse (1956), Robert Greenleaf (1977) coined the term *servant leadership* from the behaviors of the character Leo to describe people who lead by serving. In the novel, Leo accompanied a group of men on a spiritual journey as their servant. While serving the group, he sustained the men and kept them on their quest. Later, after Leo disappeared, the men attempted to find him, to no avail. They then tried to continue their spiritual journey. However, without Leo, their group fell apart, and they could not complete their spiritual journey. Years later, one man from the group found Leo and discovered that he served as the leader of their entire spiritual order. The man then realized that leadership actually represented those who became servants first and whose foremost inclinations included helping people. From this, according to Spears (1996), Greenleaf (1977: 33) similarly concluded “that the central meaning of it [leadership] was that the great leader is first experienced as a servant to others, and that this simple fact is central to his or her greatness.”

Greenleaf further suggested that the servant leadership model emphasizes “increased service to others; a holistic approach to work; promoting a sense of community; and the sharing of power in decision making” (as cited in Spears 1996: 33). Greenleaf focused on describing servant leader actions and how those actions affect others rather than focusing on a specific definition for *servant leadership* (Laub 1999). While theorists have not yet agreed on a singular definition or a uniform set of constructs for servant leadership, a consensus has emerged among some researchers that servant leadership commences from the motivation to serve others rather than serving self-interests (Patterson 2003; Russell 2000; Russell and Stone 2002; Sendjaya and Sarros 2002; Spears 1996).

Greenleaf (1977: 27) asked, “[D]o those served grow as persons? Do they, *while being served*, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants.” In asking this, he called for people to consider the effects of leader behaviors on the followers they serve. He suggested that the value of service results from the effects on recipients and not from the acts of service themselves (Finch 2007). Therefore to attract followers to servant leadership who consequently commit themselves to the same lifestyles of service, servant leaders must provide commitment, dedication, discipline, and excellence (Briner and Pritchard 1998).

Foundation and Aspects of Servant Leadership

Types of servant leadership have existed at least since Lao-Tzu (circa 600 B.C.E.), Chānakya (circa 300 B.C.E.), and Jesus Christ (circa 7 B.C.E.–30 C.E.). Lao-Tzu stressed that those who accomplish great achievements can do so only because they do not make themselves great. Chānakya (300 B.C.E.) wrote instructions to teach the king how to lead, emphasizing duties and conduct. Chānakya described an ideal king as understanding the needs of his subjects. Specifically, he suggested, “the king (leader) shall consider as good, not what pleases himself, but what pleases his subjects (followers)” (as cited in Jain and Mukherji 2009: 443). Similarly, Jesus Christ taught servant leadership by seeming “equally at home with exercising power and the humility of servant-hood” (Wong 2003: 2). Jesus’ teachings also promote the servant leadership model, calling for leaders to empty themselves of their pride, selfishness, and worldly aspirations (Wong 2003).

Modern researchers have explored servant leadership and have expanded the concept from various initial, theoretical approaches. Spears (1996) primarily extended Greenleaf’s work. Farling, Stone, and Winston (1999) provided a hierarchical model of servant leadership. Bass (2000) distinguished the parallel relationship between servant leadership and transformational leadership. Polleys (2002) extricated the distinguishing marks of servant leadership from other leadership paradigms. Patterson (2003) presented servant leadership as a virtue theory. Barbuto and Wheeler, (2006) expanded servant leadership from the influential works in the field (e.g., Greenleaf 1977; Spears 1996).

From the 6th century to the present, the key value in servant leadership has been presented as how leaders view people (Wallace 2007). Additionally, theorists such as Greenleaf (1977) have suggested that servant leadership does not represent just another tool with which superiors lead or govern over other people. Rather, servant leadership represents an ideal that should govern daily life. In that regard, servant leadership reflects who a person is and becomes rather than what a person does (Greenleaf 1977; Wallace 2007). Additionally, Spears (2011: 20) suggested that servant leadership found in individuals, organizations, and societies “offers one of the brightest hopes for the future of humanity.”

Servant Leadership Characteristics

Russell and Stone (2002) suggested that if servant leadership differs from other forms of leadership, people should be able to observe distinct characteristics and behaviors in servant leaders. Several lists exist, but scholars have not yet agreed on one comprehensive list of these characteristics. Graham (1991) identified humility, relational power, autonomy, moral development of followers, and emulation of leaders’ service orientation as servant leadership characteristics (as cited in

Focht 2011). De Pree (1992) posited that leadership exists as a position of servanthood and identified “integrity, vulnerability, discernment, awareness of the human spirit, courage in relationships, sense of humor, intellectual energy and curiosity, respect of the future, regard for the present, understanding of the past, predictability, breadth, comfort with ambiguity, and presence” (as cited in Focht 2011: 10).

Spears (1998) later identified ten characteristics as being central to the development of servant leaders: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community. However, Spears maintained that he did not provide exhaustive coverage of all potential characteristics of servant leaders and that his list serves to challenge those who would open to themselves to the invitation of adopting servant leadership as their lifestyle. Barbuto and Wheeler (2002) extended the characteristics that Spears had previously suggested by adding the construct of calling. Buchen (1998) associated identity, capacity for reciprocity, relationship building, and preoccupation with the future as key characteristics of servant leaders. Farling, Stone, and Winston (1999) hypothesized that servant leaders utilize the same variables as transformational leaders do. However, they further suggested that servant leadership emerges from the underlying motivational forces found “exclusively in the principles, values, and beliefs that the leader holds” (Farling, Stone, and Winston 1999: 53). Leaders have arguably manifested servant leadership through their observed behaviors. On that basis, Farling, Stone, and Winston (1999) constructed a servant leader–follower transformational model with variables that include vision, influence, credibility, trust, and service. Similarly, Laub (1999) suggested that servant leaders should value and develop people, build communities, display authenticity, and provide and share leadership authority.

Some researchers have contended that servant leadership characteristics and attributes grow from the values and core beliefs of the leader (Batten 1998; Covey 1992; Farling, Stone, and Winston 1999). Russell (2000) identified twenty such characteristics that should exist among servant leaders and further categorized nine of the twenty characteristics as functional attributes, described as operative, identifiable, and distinct. Russell (2000: 12) further suggested that the functional attributes (vision, honesty, integrity, trust, service, modeling, pioneering, appreciation of others, and empowerment) “must be present to truly qualify an individual as both a servant and a leader.” He categorized the remaining eleven characteristics as accompanying attributes that supplement and augment the functional attributes. These accompanying attributes are communication, credibility, competence, stewardship, visibility, influence, persuasion, listening, encouragement, teaching, and delegation.

Servant Leader Constructs for Measuring Servant Leadership

The impact that servant leadership has on people can serve as its measure, but for it to become a sustainable movement, “there must be a reliable and valid measure of this construct” (Page and Wong 2000: 12). Frick (2004) remarked that people may become frustrated and feel guilty for not measuring up to a collection of admirable qualities and learned skills. In reducing the attributes of servant leadership to a manageable checklist, Frick (2004) maintained that people would forget that servant leadership relates more to their deep identities than to their chance behaviors Page and Wong (2000: 13) countered this claim by arguing that “high standards serve the dual purpose of encouraging the pursuit of excellence and monitoring progress.” People who constantly encounter challenges to develop and maintain high ideals have greater likelihoods of stretching and reaching “beyond their own expectations” (Page and Wong 2000: 13).

Barbuto and Wheeler (2002: 1) contended that the servant leadership characteristics noted by Spears (1998) and modified by themselves “are inherent attributes or beliefs that servant leaders need to hold.” They acknowledged that many of the characteristics present as behavioral and that these characteristics provide descriptions of what servants do, while leaders have to develop the others as skills. They argued that “the ultimate servant leader has developed all 11 characteristics and is continuously improving” (Barbuto and Wheeler 2002: 1). They further suggested that servant leaders commit themselves to continual development in the eleven characteristics of servant leadership through the belief that servant leadership is characterized by an ongoing, lifelong learning process. Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) described servant leadership as a set of eleven characteristics, consistent with Greenleaf’s original message. These characteristics are listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, building community, and calling. They further suggested that when properly employed, these characteristics contribute centrally “to the development of servant-leaders” (Barbuto and Wheeler 2006: 3). In their Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ), they operationalized a scale for the empirical research of servant leadership. We utilized the SLQ in this present study.

Listening

Listening is considered essential to the growth and well-being of servant leaders, as people must understand what their body, spirit, and mind communicate (Spears 1998). Listening also serves indispensably in the ways in which “leaders demonstrate respect and appreciation of others” (Russell and Stone 2002: 151). Listening

reinforces communication and decision-making skills as the servant leader identifies and clarifies the will of the group.

Empathy

Effective leaders extend empathy by putting themselves in others' circumstances (Barbuto and Wheeler 2006). Leaders who provide empathy understand others' emotions and needs, and other people give them acceptance and recognition "for their special and unique spirits" (Spears 1998: 4).

Healing

Healing represents a servant leadership characteristic that separates servant leadership from most other leadership theories (Barbuto and Wheeler 2006). Ndoria (2004: 3) cited healing as a critical characteristic of servant leadership because "it describes a willingness to seek to minister to the deep personal needs of individuals." Servant leaders have the ability to heal themselves and others and recognize "when and how to foster the healing process" (Barbuto and Wheeler 2006: 306). Servant leaders can serve as powerful forces in transformation as "they make whole those with whom they come in contact" (Spears 1998: 4).

Awareness

Both general awareness and self-awareness strengthen servant leadership. Greenleaf (1977) stated that "awareness is not a giver of solace . . . it is a disturber and an awakener" (as cited in Spears 2010: 27) as awareness enables the leader to view situations from an integrated, holistic position (Spears 2010). Effective leaders maintain awareness of who they are, how they affect others, and what happens around them, using cues found in the environment (Barbuto and Wheeler 2006; Keith 2010).

Persuasion

The incorporation of persuasion makes servant leadership distinct from authoritarian models of leadership. Authoritarian leaders utilize coercion and positional authority, whereas servant leadership relies on persuasion to convince others and to build consensus with groups (Spears 1998). Servant leaders use their ability to convince through persuasion, as one of the most effective influencing tactics (Ndoria 2004; Russell and Stone 2002).

Conceptualization

Conceptualization provides for visionary concepts, as servant leaders cultivate their abilities to dream great dreams for themselves, their followers, and their overall organizations (Ndoria 2004; Spears 1998). Dreams provide the road maps for future and successful servant leaders to go beyond what they, as dreamers, can accomplish to include and add value to the workforce (Brewer 2010; Spears 1998).

Foresight

Foresight represents the one servant leadership characteristic that people may receive at birth, while they may consciously develop the other characteristics. Foresight serves as the ability to anticipate the future and its consequences through lessons from the past to the realities of the present (Barbuto and Wheeler 2006; Spears 1998).

Stewardship

Stewardship represents the concept of purposefully contributing to society. Servant leaders, first and foremost, commit to serve the needs of others. They uphold that commitment through trust and conviction (Barbuto and Wheeler 2006; Ndoria 2004; Spears 1998).

Commitment to the Growth of People

Commitment to the growth of people requires the servant leader to identify others' needs and to provide opportunities for others to develop not only as better workers, but also as better humans (Barbuto and Wheeler 2006; Ndoria 2004). Commitment to the growth of people presents a tremendous responsibility, but servant leaders remain "deeply committed to the growth of each and every individual within his or her institution" (Spears 1998: 6)

Building Community

One of the main functions of servant leadership is to build "human infrastructure on which relationships and community may be built" (Irving and Longbotham 2007: 108). Servant leaders build community, primarily through collaboration. Because of this, it is necessary for followers to exhibit commitment to leaders (Goffee and Jones 2001).

Calling

Servant leaders differ from other leaders in their intentions. Servant leaders are more likely to embrace selfless objectives (Bass 2000). Calling represents the “desire to serve and willingness to sacrifice self-interest for the benefit of others” (Barbuto and Wheeler 2006: 305).

Servant Leadership Intentions and Behaviors

The primacy of servanthood forms the heart of servant leadership. True servant leadership starts with the intention to serve first. Intention infuses meaning into behaviors as people act to fulfill intentions arising from their beliefs and desires (Baldwin and Baird 2001; Showkeir and Showkeir 2011). In a biography of Greenleaf, Frick (2004: 5) stated, “The core of servant-leadership is quite simple: authentic, ethical leaders, those whom we trust and want to follow, are servants first.” Servant leaders provide clear intent, and they align their “actions, skills, capacities, and ways of being with that intention” (Showkeir and Showkeir 2011: 156).

Through the theories of reasoned action (Fishbein and Ajzen 2010) and planned behavior (Ajzen 2002) and the model of interpersonal behavior (Triandis 1980), these authors suggested that intentions work as the most immediate and important determinant of behavior (as cited in Webb and Sheeran 2006). Servant leaders’ intentions will embrace selfless objectives with the expected outcome of follower satisfaction, development, and commitment to service (Barbuto and Wheeler 2006). “The ability to interpret and predict others’ behavior hinges crucially on judgments about the intentionality of others’ actions” (Baldwin and Baird 2001: 171).

The knowledge that is gained in discerning intentions from the actions of others is implicit, systematic, multifaceted, and generative (Baldwin and Baird 2001). Senge (2006) reasoned that mental models determine how people make sense of the world and how they take action. When people hold different mental models, it affects how they observe and describe events. Greenleaf (1977) suggested that the effects on their followers best identifies servant leaders. Greenleaf also maintained that people can test servant leadership by assessing the outcomes of associated followers. For example, if after experiencing servant leadership, followers present as healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, and emulating the servant leader and they become servants and servant leaders, then their leaders have passed the test. Similarly, followers who desire to become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, servants themselves, and eventually servant leaders must maintain awareness of their personal mental models to accelerate the learning (Senge 2006) associated with transforming into servant leaders.

Follower Outcomes

Developing servant leadership requires a learning process. As servant leaders serve their followers, those followers can experience positive transformations into servant leaders (Sendjaya, Sarros, and Santora 2008). Bass (2000) claimed that follower learning represents one of servant leadership's strengths. Real learning enables people to re-create themselves through the generative processes of life, and real learning "gets to the heart of what it means to be human" (Senge 2006: 13). When individuals, re-create themselves through learning, their perceptions of the world and their relationships to it change (Senge 2006).

Summary and Hypothesis

The UMC claims that Christ calls all Christians, through their baptisms, to servanthood. "The church is either faithful as a witnessing and serving community, or it loses its vitality and its impact on an unbelieving world" (United Methodist Church 2008: ¶129). Therefore all Christians must share in the responsibilities associated with living in service to God and neighbors. This service, through servant leadership and servant ministry, represents a privilege in the UMC and carries with it the obligation to discern and nurture personal, spiritual relationships with God. Servant leaders must also instruct and guide Christian disciples "in their witness to Jesus Christ in the world through acts of worship, devotion, compassion, and justice under the guidance of the Holy Spirit" (United Methodist Church 2008: ¶137).

Values represent the core beliefs that determine individuals' principles (Russell and Stone 2002). Servant leadership serves as the dependent variable that manifests because of those values. The functional attributes of servant leadership determine its form and effectiveness, while the accompanying attributes affect the level and intensity of the functional attributes (Russell and Stone 2002). Therefore our hypotheses include the following:

Hypothesis 1a: A difference exists in the United Methodist Church between the mean level of servant leadership that pastors generally perceive in themselves and the mean level of servant leadership perceived in pastors by congregants.

Hypothesis 1b: A difference exists in the United Methodist Church between the mean level of servant leadership that congregants generally perceive in themselves and the mean level of servant leadership perceived in pastors by congregants.

Hypothesis 1c: A difference exists in the United Methodist Church between the mean level of servant leadership that congregants generally perceive in

themselves and the mean level of servant leadership that pastors generally perceive in themselves.

Hypothesis 2: A positive predictive relationship exists in the United Methodist Church between the mean level of servant leadership perceived in pastors by congregants and the mean level of servant leadership that congregants generally perceive in themselves.

METHODS

This research involved a nonexperimental, cross-sectional study of the relationship between United Methodist congregants' perceptions of servant leadership in their pastors, congregants' perceptions of themselves as servant leaders, and pastors' reported perception of themselves as servant leaders.

Participants

We began this study of servant leadership in the UMC by sending 1,820 e-mails to 47 United Methodist (UM) bishops, 487 district superintendents, and 1,276 UM churches throughout the United States. We obtained the addresses from the UMC online directory. Pastors completed the appropriate questionnaires themselves, and pastors who decided that members of their churches would participate in the study passed the request on to their congregants. Participants voluntarily completed one of two questionnaires either through the use of an online survey on SurveyGizmo.com or in print form, which the pastors subsequently scanned and returned electronically.

Measures

The survey consisted of two questionnaires: a rater version and a self-report version, each consisting of twenty-three items. All congregants who responded to the survey completed the rater version of the servant leadership questionnaire to rate their perception of their pastor's servant leadership. Additionally, each congregant and each pastor completed the self-report version of the servant leadership questionnaire to rate their perceptions of their own servant leadership. The congregants rated their pastors and themselves, and the pastors rated themselves using a five-point Likert-type scale, ranging from "never" to "always."

To measure servant leadership, this study included the use of Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) SLQ. Barbuto and Wheeler proposed a servant leader framework by combining Spears's (1998) ten servant leadership characteristics with the dimension "calling." To measure the resulting eleven potential servant leadership characteristics, Barbuto and Wheeler developed operational definitions and scales

to validate their construct. They then reduced the instrument to five key factors: altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship.

Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) performed a confirmatory factor analysis using LISREL 8.54 on the twenty-three servant leadership items. The self-report and rater-report versions fit the overall model with the $\chi^2(220) = 1,410.69$ ($p = 0.0$). In their study, Barbuto and Wheeler used SPSS to assess the internal reliability of subscales of both the self-report version and the rater-report version of the instrument. The self-report coefficient alphas ranged from 0.68 to 0.87, while the rater-report coefficient alphas ranged from 0.82 to 0.92. Simple statistics on the self-rated subscales ranged from 2.48 to 2.98 with standard deviations ranging from 0.49 to 0.58. The rater-report means ranged from 2.58 to 3.24 with standard deviations from 0.73 to 0.97. In both versions, wisdom and organizational stewardship were the highest reported characteristic, while persuasive mapping was the lowest. Wisdom and persuasive mapping had the greatest variance in self-report responses, while emotional healing had the greatest variability in the rater-report responses.

Analyses

The analyses included reducing the data into an Excel spreadsheet and analyzing it in Excel, using the *Real Statistics Resource Pack*. The procedure included determining the Cronbach alpha values of each factor. The next step included determining the Pearson product moment correlations for the variables and for their supporting factors, as correlations can confirm the strength or weakness of theoretical relationships. Afterward, the process included performing three *t*-tests to determine whether differences exist between each of the three pairs of variables and then performing a simple regression analysis to identify the predictive effects of congregant-perceived servant leadership on the parts of pastors and on self-perceived servant leadership on the part of the congregants.

RESULTS

This section displays the results, including descriptive statistics, correlations, *t*-tests, and simple regression analysis.

Descriptive Statistics

A total of 338 respondents participated in the study by completing the pastor questionnaire; the responses from 329 of these met the criteria for inclusion in the study. Of the 329 respondents who completed the pastor instrument, 104 women

and 225 men reported their gender, 320 reported having participated from 45 states of the United States, and 329 reported having a mean average age of 55 years.

A total of 305 respondents participated in the study by completing the congregant questionnaire; the responses from 301 of these met the criteria for inclusion in the study. Of the 301 who completed the congregant instrument, 226 women and 75 men reported their gender, 286 reported having participated from 42 states of the United States, and 301 reported having a mean average age of 57 years.

Table 1 shows the Cronbach alphas, means, and standard deviations for each of the several constructs by reporting categories.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistic for Servant Leadership Factors

	Cronbach α	Mean	S.D.
<i>Pastor Self</i>			
Altruistic calling	0.78	2.96	0.56
Emotional healing	0.77	2.76	0.63
Wisdom	0.83	2.95	0.63
Persuasive mapping	0.82	2.71	0.75
Organizational stewardship	0.76	3.56	0.64
<i>Congregant Pastor</i>			
Altruistic calling	0.94	3.00	0.92
Emotional healing	0.95	2.82	1.15
Wisdom	0.97	3.00	0.91
Persuasive mapping	0.94	2.78	0.99
Organizational stewardship	0.92	3.45	0.84
<i>Congregant Self</i>			
Altruistic calling	0.83	2.78	0.62
Emotional healing	0.88	2.37	0.72
Wisdom	0.86	2.80	0.69
Persuasive mapping	0.90	2.49	0.81
Organizational stewardship	0.82	3.30	0.79

The results of the Pearson product moment correlations indicate that a significant positive relationship exists between the level of servant leadership exhibited by pastors as perceived by congregants and the self-reported level of congregants' own servant leadership. Table 2 shows the Pearson product moment correlation

between overall servant leadership as self-reported by pastors (PAS-SELF), overall servant leadership of pastors as perceived and reported by congregants (CONG-PAS), and overall servant leadership as self-reported by congregants (CONG-SELF).

Table 2: Pearson Correlation for Overall Servant Leadership by Pastors and Congregants

	PAS-SELF	CONG-PAS
CONG-PAS	-0.05	—
CONG-SELF	-0.05	0.32**

** $p < 0.001$, otherwise $p \geq 0.05$; two-tailed, $N = 329$.

Table 3 shows the Pearson product moment correlation between the supporting factors for all three of those reporting categories. The results in the correlation matrix in Table 3 show that all factors correlate significantly with their given components and that nearly all of the factors supporting CONG-PAS correlate with those factors supporting CONG-SELF but that none of the factors supporting those two variables correlate with those factors that support PAS-SELF.

t-Tests

The next step in the study included conducting three independent samples *t*-tests, to determine whether significant differences exist between perceptions regarding the applications of servant leadership by congregants and pastors. Regarding the comparison of results of self-rating instrument completed by the pastors and the instrument that the congregants used to rate pastors, the two-tailed results presented as $t(628) = 0.41$ ($p = 0.68 > 0.05$). Thus the results do not support Hypothesis 1a. Regarding the comparison of results of the instrument that the congregants used to rate pastors and the self-rating instrument completed by the congregants, the two-tailed results presented as $t(301) = 5.80$ ($p = 0.00 < 0.05$). Thus the results support the acceptance of Hypothesis 1b. Regarding the comparison of results of self-rating instrument completed by the pastors and the self-rating instrument completed by the congregants, the two-tailed results presented as $t(628) = 8.66$ ($p = 0.00 < 0.05$). Thus the results support the acceptance of Hypothesis 1c.

Table 3: Pearson Product Moment Correlation, by Factor, for Pastors and Congregants

	PSAC	PSEH	PSW	PSPM	PSOS	CPAC	CPEH	CPW	CPPM	CPOS	CSAC	CSEH	CSW	CSPM
PSEH	0.48**													
PSW	0.38**	0.47**												
PSPM	0.33**	0.49**	0.42**											
PSOS	0.70**	0.80**	0.75**	0.76**										
CPAC	-0.04**	-0.01**	-0.07**	-0.02**	-0.05**									
CPEH	0.01**	-0.03**	-0.06**	-0.02**	-0.04**	0.77**								
CPW	-0.01**	-0.02**	-0.06**	-0.04**	-0.05**	0.77**	0.73**							
CPPM	-0.05**	-0.04**	-0.06**	-0.05**	-0.07**	0.71**	0.76**	0.72**						
CPOS	-0.04**	-0.01**	-0.09**	-0.03**	-0.06**	0.71**	0.65**	0.70**	0.73**					
CSAC	0.01**	0.03**	0.07**	-0.05**	0.02**	0.27**	0.28**	0.21**	0.25**	0.15**				
CSEH	0.07**	0.02**	0.03**	-0.00**	0.04**	0.16**	0.20**	0.18**	0.19**	0.10**	0.42**			
CSW	0.04**	0.02**	0.07**	0.07**	0.14**	0.14**	0.13**	0.19**	0.16**	0.07**	0.48**	0.47**		
CSPM	0.01**	0.03**	0.05**	0.04**	0.21**	0.21**	0.21**	0.18**	0.23**	0.07**	0.41**	0.61**	0.51**	
CSOS	-0.01**	0.02**	0.05**	0.03**	0.03**	0.33**	0.31**	0.33**	0.36**	0.40**	0.43**	0.40**	0.37**	0.49**

** $p < 0.001$, * $p < 0.05$, otherwise $p \geq 0.05$; two-tailed, $N = 329$.

PS = pastor self-evaluation, CP = congregants' evaluation of their pastors, CS = congregants' evaluation of self, AC = altruistic calling, EH = emotional healing, W = wisdom, PM = persuasive mapping, OS = organizational stewardship.

Regression Analysis

Using the combined five factors of servant leadership, simple linear regression provided information to help determine the existence of predictive relationship between the levels of servant leadership employed by pastors, as perceived by congregants, on the congregants' level of servant leadership as perceived by themselves. The servant leadership perceived of pastors significantly predicted self-perceived servant leadership of congregants and showed a statistically significant linear relationship between the combined servant leadership of pastors and the combined servant leadership of congregants, both as perceived by congregants: $F(1,299) = 33.37$ ($p = 0.00 \leq 0.00$). The overall model fit presented as $R^2 = 0.10$. This result supports the accepted Hypothesis 2: In the UMC, a positive predictive relationship exists between the level of servant leadership perceived of pastors by congregants and the level of servant leadership that congregants generally perceive of themselves.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study included investigating UMC congregants' perceptions of servant leadership found in their pastors and in themselves and UMC pastors' self-perceptions of their own levels of servant leadership. This section provides insights into the findings and global implications regarding the relationships between these various perceptions, limitations of the study, and proposed opportunities for future research.

Findings

In this study, the focus included determining the relationships between the perceptions of UM congregants and pastors regarding servant leadership through the use of Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) SLQ instruments (leader and self-report versions). Through *t*-tests and simple linear regression, the study supported the acceptance of three of the hypotheses: Hypothesis 1b, Hypothesis 1c, and Hypothesis 2 and the rejection of Hypothesis 1a. These results indicate several things.

The congregants indicated that they perceive that pastors generally apply greater levels of servant leadership than they do themselves. Since scholars have addressed the relative importance for pastors to exercise leadership (Carroll 2006; Chaves 2004) and the *Book of Discipline* calls for UM pastors to take leadership roles, this result represents a logical conclusion. Similarly, in their study of congregation growth in UM churches, Medcalfe and Sharp (2012) directly identified pastors as one of four driving forces of church vitality. The other three drivers included "small groups and programs, worship service, [and] lay leadership"

(Medcalfe and Sharp 2012: 30). Medcalfe and Sharp went on to cite De Wertter and colleagues (2010) and Roozen (2009), who in separate studies theorized the existence of relationships between vitality, church health, and church growth. If congregants generally perceive that pastors should take the primary responsibilities associated with achieving church vitality, health, and growth through their applications of servant leadership, then that perception also supports this result. On the other hand, if small groups and programs and lay leadership contribute as much or more to church vitality, health, and growth as does pastoral leadership and if congregants serve in roles associated with the development and maintenance of small groups and programs and other roles of lay leadership, then this result does not inspire confidence that congregants have done all that they should have to effectively employ servant leadership in their own experiences.

The pastors indicated that they generally apply greater levels of servant leadership than the congregants perceived about themselves. Additionally, for each of the five factors supporting the servant leadership concept, the mean average scores support this result. Arguably, by an average age of 55 years, most pastors would have gained some experiences and possibly some education and training in each of the factors that support servant leadership. Additionally, the *Book of Discipline* lists the specified vocational expectations regarding the roles and responsibilities of UM pastors. These expectations at least imply the need for pastors to incorporate each of the supporting servant leadership factors into their ministry actions. On the other hand, it does not appear that any such formally specified servant leadership-related expectations exist for congregants. That could explain the observed disparity in the self-perceptions of these two groups. Nevertheless, the measurement of the mean scores of the five factors also indicated that neither group responded at or above the median rank of 3 in four of the five categories investigated. Both groups scored only above the midrange on organizational stewardship. Certainly, like all human beings, pastors and congregants of UM churches have room to grow, and the Bible does call disciples to a life of humility (e.g., Philippians 2:3; 1 Peter 5:5). Conversely, since self-efficacy affects the choices people make about the behaviors in which they engage as well as in what motivates them (Bandura 1977, 1994) and the UMC has called for the institutionalization of servant leadership, it is imperative for both pastors and congregants to further develop their awareness and skills associated with the factors that contribute to servant leadership in order to improve their self-perceptions in that area.

The congregants indicated that they perceive that pastors generally apply the same levels of servant leadership as the pastors themselves perceive that they do. This can inform congregants, pastors, and other stakeholders about the current effectiveness with which UM pastors apply the skills and behaviors commonly associated with the five factors that contribute to servant leadership. The associated factor scores can also provide pastors as well as district and denominational

executives with accurate foundational information in order to better address deficiencies in the servant leadership capabilities of pastors throughout the UMC. Additionally, Kouzes and Posner (2002) suggested that leaders necessarily model behaviors, so they should model behaviors that they want their followers to adopt. In this case, pastors can model servant leadership behaviors for congregants as the pastors change their lifestyles and subsequently improve their own servant leadership skills and abilities. The modeling effect should thereby result in the improvement of the overall servant leadership capabilities of their congregants.

Similarly, the results of the regression analysis confirmed that servant leadership employed by pastors, as perceived by congregants, positively affects the congregants' self-perceived levels of servant leadership. Greenleaf (1977) asserted that the motivation to become a servant leader starts with the need to serve. That need to serve then grows into the motivation to lead. In servant leaders, the need to serve combines with the need for power. However, servant leaders deal with power differently from other leaders in a way that Dierendonck (2011) called helping power motivation. Frieze and Boneva (2001) described leaders who employ helping power motivation as "people with a need for power who want to use it to help and care for others" (as cited in Dierendonck 2011: 1245). Additionally, the belief in the intrinsic value of individual people forms the core of servant leadership (Spears 1998). When people build solid relationships, they do so with foundations of values that include mutual trust, respect, and obligation. To build high-quality dyadic relationships between leaders and followers, servant leaders rely on persuasion (Dierendonck 2011). When servant leaders exhibit empowering and developing behaviors that provide autonomy and direction, people will follow "voluntarily, because they are persuaded that the leader's path is the right one for them" (Greenleaf 1977: 44). Therefore for congregants to develop Christ-centered servant leadership, it will prove imperative for pastors to lead by going before their congregants with that Christ-centered servant leadership to show them the way.

Global Implications

Javidan and colleagues (2006: 67) stated, "Almost no American corporation is immune from the impact of globalization." This is true for the UMC as well. The UMC was formed in 1968 in the United States; however, today the church also provides ministry in Europe, Africa, and the Philippines and consists of nearly 3.5 million people. Many of these members live in Africa, primarily in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Nigeria (Tooley 2008). From the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness Research Program (GLOBE) study, the culturally endorsed implicit leadership theory emerged, with the presumption that "followers are more motivated to build relationships with and act in accord

with the leader if the life and behaviors of the leader are in line with the follower's mental model of expected leadership" (as cited in Winston and Ryan 2008: 21). Presenting servant leadership as a Western leadership theory has often resulted in people thinking of it "as contrary to local beliefs or a form of colonialism seeking to impose values and beliefs over the local beliefs" (Winston and Ryan 2008: 220). Therefore indigenous people will likely prove more reluctant to accept servant leadership. However, presenting servant leadership as a global leadership theory that represents distinct leader characteristics (humility, care, concern, benevolence, altruism, service, fairness, and friendship) based on love might enable people to more readily accept servant leadership throughout the world so that people and cultures do not miss out on this most humane form of leadership (Winston and Ryan 2008).

Servant leadership can prove appropriate in global cultures and therefore in various global settings. However, a working knowledge of culture and its influences remains paramount, as cultural differences do influence leadership (Javidan et al. 2006). Leader "attributes, behavior, status, and influence vary considerably, as a result of culturally unique forces in the countries or regions in which leaders function" (Javidan et al. 2006: 72). Even though scholars have deemed servant leadership an effective form of leadership in all societies, four of the five dimensions differed significantly across the ten culture clusters, with moral integrity not having a main effect.

Limitations

Several concerns could have limited the general validity and reliability of the present study. The small sample size might not adequately represent the overall UM population. There are 33,248 UM churches in the United States, so the sample size represents only a small portion of potential respondents. Fink (2010: 95) stated that "small samples may not be able to include the mix of people or programs that should be included in a study and may be unable to detect an effect even if one would have taken place with more people." In addition to small sample size, the response rate may represent a questionably small number of participants. Fink (2010: 96) also stated that "all studies aim for a high response rate. No standard exists . . . in deciding whether the aim was achieved and, if not, the effect on the study's outcomes." With a relatively low response rate, nonresponse bias can impair the generalizability of the results of a study (Fink 2010). A third limitation is that, in completing the SLQ, the respondents based their responses on their perceptions of their respective pastors, who may or may not have completed the associated instrument. A fourth limitation might be the issue of longevity in UM churches. UM pastors can regularly receive appointments to new churches each year. This might not provide enough time for pastors to build high-quality dyadic

relationships with their congregants that might prove necessary to the cultural norms associated with servant leadership. In addition, congregants' views of their pastors might not provide true representations of those pastors if the congregants recently started attending church or if the pastors' appointments were recent.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Greenleaf (1977) was focused on describing servant leader actions and how those actions affect others, and in this study, we attempted to follow that lead. This research adds to the current literature in that it linked perceived leader servant leadership behavior with follower servant leader behavior. Current literature has primarily reported on what constitutes a servant leader, with few studies researching living organizations. The essence of servant leadership consists of followership; therefore the effect of servant leaders' actions on followers creates an ongoing need for research. Specifically, this research should focus on Greenleaf's (1977: 27) test of servant leaders: "[D]o those served grow as persons? Do they, *while being served*, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants?"

Other opportunities for future research also exist. Since the simple linear regression accounted for only 10 percent of the total variance in the model, a question emerges as to what else contributes to servant leadership on the parts of congregants. Winkleblack (2011: 13) emphasized that "90% of what a pastor does is invisible to 90% of the congregation 90% of the time." This further suggests a question of how much time congregants spend observing their pastors' behaviors. Additionally, an investigation of servant leaders' use of power and persuasion and how leaders use them to influence their followers would prove beneficial, as it could serve as a basis to explain how to form and affect high-quality dyadic relationships between leader and follower. Finally, researchers should examine the time and efforts that are required to cultivate relationship whereby followers gain the motivation to become servants themselves.

CONCLUSION

In this study, we examined the servant leadership perceptions of over 300 pastors and over 300 congregants affiliated with the United Methodist Church, from over 40 of the 50 states. The generalized conclusions include that (1) congregants perceive that pastors generally apply greater levels of servant leadership than they (the congregants) do, (2) pastors generally apply greater levels of servant leadership than the congregants perceive that they do themselves, (3) congregants perceive that pastors generally apply the same levels of servant leadership as the pastors themselves perceive that they do, and (4) a positive linear relationship exists

between UMC congregants' perceptions of their pastors as servant leaders and their perceptions of themselves as servant leaders. Results indicated that leader servant leadership behavior does affect follower servant leadership. On a global scale, servant leaders should have the ability to witness how their behaviors affect their followers' behaviors, regardless of their geographic location. However, servant leaders must also resist ethnocentrism to present servant leadership as a global leadership theory and not as just another Western idea that is being used to change local culture.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. 2002. "Perceived Behavioral Control, Self-Efficacy, Locus of Control, and the Theory of Planned Behavior." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 32: 665–683.
- Baldwin, D., and J. Baird. 2001. "Discerning Intentions in Dynamic Human Action." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 5: 171–178.
- Bandura, A. 1977. *Social Learning Theory*. Alexandria, VA: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. 1994. "Self-Efficacy." In *Encyclopedia of Human Behavior*, Vol. 4, edited by V. S. Ramachandran, 71–81. New York: Academic Press.
- Barbuto, J., and D. Wheeler. 2002. "Becoming a Servant Leader: Do You Have What It Takes?" NebGuide G1481. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska. Available at www.ianrpubs.unl.edu/sendIt/g1481.pdf.
- Barbuto, J., and D. Wheeler. 2006. "Scale Development and Construct Clarification of Servant Leadership." *Group and Organization Management* 31: 300–326.
- Bass, B. 2000. "The Future of Leadership in Learning Organizations." *Journal of Leadership Studies* 7: 18–40.
- Batten, J. 1998. "Servant-Leadership: A Passion to Serve." In *Insights on Leadership: Service, Stewardship, Spirit, and Servant-Leadership*, edited by L. Spears, 38–53. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Brewer, C. 2010. "Servant Leadership: A Review of Literature." *Online Journal of Workforce Education and Development* 4: 1–8.
- Briner, B., and R. Pritchard. 1998. *More Leadership Lessons of Jesus: A Timeless Model for Today's Leaders*. Nashville, TN: Broadman and Holman.
- Buchen, I. 1998. "Servant Leadership: A Model for Future Faculty and Future Institutions." *Journal of Leadership Studies* 5: 125–134.
- Carroll, J. W. 2006. *God's Potters: Pastoral Leadership and the Shaping of Congregations*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans.
- Chaves, M. 2004. *Congregations in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Connectional Process Team. 2000. "Transformational Directions for the United Methodist Church for the Twenty-First Century: Report and Recommendations of the Connectional Process Team." United Methodist Church General Conference 2000, Cleveland, OH. Available at gc2000.org/studies/report/finalReport.pdf.
- Covey, S. 1992. *Principle-Centered Leadership*. New York, NY: Fireside Press.
- De Pree, M. 1992. *Leadership Jazz*. New York, NY: Dell.

- De Wertter, D., Gochman, L., Luss, R., and Sherwood R. 2010. *UMC Call to Action: Vital Congregations Research Project*. Arlington, VA: Towers Watson. Available at www.bwcumc.org/sites/default/files/Church%20Vitality%20Research.pdf.
- Dierendonck, D. 2011. "Servant Leadership: A Review and Synthesis." *Journal of Management* 37: 1228–1261.
- Dillman, S. 2003. "Leading in the Land of Oz: Cross-Cultural Study of Servant Leadership in Australia." *Dissertation Abstracts International* 65: 2273. (AAT 3136215).
- Farling, M., A. Stone, and B. Winston. 1999. "Servant Leadership: Setting the Stage for Empirical Research." *Journal of Leadership Studies* 6: 49–72.
- Finch, K. 2007. "The Image of God, Servant-Leadership and Forgiveness." *The International Journal of Servant-Leadership* 3: 203–216.
- Fink, A. 2010. *Conducting Research Literature Reviews: From the Internet to Paper*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fishbein, M., and I. Ajzen. 2010. *Predicting and Changing Behavior: The Reasoned Action Approach*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Focht, A. 2011. "Identifying Primary Characteristics of Servant Leadership: A Delphi Study." *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses* (AAT 3485990).
- Frank, T. 2002. "The Discourse of Leadership and the Practice of Administration." *Journal of Religious Leadership* 1: 7–30.
- Frank, T. 2006. "From Connection to Corporatization: Leadership Trends in United Methodism." *Journal of Religious Leadership* 5: 109–130.
- Frick, D. 2004. *Robert K. Greenleaf: A Life of Servant Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Barrett-Koehler.
- Frieze, I. H., and B. S. Boneva. 2001. "Power Motivation and Motivation to Help Others." In *The Use and Abuse of Power: Multiple Perspectives on the Causes of Corruption*, edited by A. Y. Lee-Chai and J. A. Bargh, 75–89. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Goffee, R., and G. Jones. 2001. "Followership: It's Personal, Too." *Harvard Business Review* 79: 148–149.
- Graham, J. W. 1991. "Servant-Leadership in Organizations: Inspirational and Moral." *The Leadership Quarterly* 2:105–119.
- Greenleaf, R. 1977. *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.
- Hesse, H. 1956. *Journey to the East*. New York, NY: Picador.
- Irving, J., and G. Longbotham. 2007. "Team Effectiveness and Six Essential Servant Leadership Themes: A Regression Model Based on Items in the Organizational Leadership Assessment." *International Journal of Leadership Studies* 2: 98–113.
- Jain, N., and S. Mukherji. 2009. "Communicating a Holistic Perspective to the World: Kautilya on Leadership." *Leadership and Organizational Journal* 30: 435–454.
- Javidan, M., P. W. Dorfman, M. Sully de Luque, and R. J. House. 2006. "In the Eye of the Beholder: Cross Cultural Lessons in Leadership from Project GLOBE." *The Academy of Management Perspectives* 20: 67–90.
- Keith, K. 2010. "The Key Practices of Servant-Leaders." Westfield, IN: Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership. Available at www.greenleaf.org/whatissl/TheKeyPracticesOfServant-Leaders.pdf.

- Kouzes, J. M., and B. Z. Posner. 2002. *The Leadership Challenge*, 3rd Edition. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lao-Tzu. 600 B.C.E. *The Tao-Te Ching*, translated by J. Legge. Available at classics.mit.edu/Lao/taote.html.
- Laub, J. 1999. "Assessing the Servant Organization: Development of the Servant Organizational Leadership Assessment (SOLA) Instrument." *Dissertation Abstracts International* 60: 308. (AAT 9921922).
- Medcalfe, S., and C. Sharp. 2012. "Enthusiasm and Congregation Growth: Evidence from the United Methodist Church." *International Journal of Business and Social Science* 3: 30–39.
- Ndoria, J. 2004. "Servant Leadership: Academic Jargon or Lifestyle?" Paper presented at Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA. Available at www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings.
- Page, D., and T. P. Wong. 2000. "A Conceptual Framework for Measuring Servant-Leadership." In S. Adjibolosoo (Ed.), *The Human Factor in Shaping the Course of History and Development*, 69–110. Boston, MA: University Press of America.
- Patterson, K. 2003. "Servant Leadership: A Theoretical Model." *Dissertation Abstracts International* 64: 570A (AAT 3082719).
- Polleys, M. 2002. "One University's Response to the Anti-Leadership Vaccine: Developing Servant Leaders." *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies* 8: 117–130.
- Russell, R. 2000. "Exploring the Values and Attributes of Servant Leaders." *Dissertation Abstracts International* 61: 4856. (AAT 9999498).
- Russell, R., and A. Stone. 2002. "A Review of Servant Leadership Attributes: Developing a Practical Model." *Leadership and Organizational Development* 23: 145–157.
- Roosen, D. A. 2009. *American Congregations 2008*. Hartford, CT: Hartford Institute for Religion Research, Hartford Seminary. Available at faithcommunitiestoday.org/sites/faithcommunitiestoday.org/files/American_Congregations_2008.pdf
- Sendjaya, S., and J. Sarros. 2002. "Servant Leadership: Its Origin, Development, and Application in Organizations." *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies* 9: 57–64.
- Sendjaya, S., J. Sarros, and J. Santora. 2008. "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership Behavior in Organizations." *Journal of Management Studies* 45: 402–424.
- Senge, P. M. 2006. *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Showkeir, M., and J. Showkeir. 2011. "Clarifying Intention as the Path to Servant-Leadership." In *The Spirit of Servant-Leadership*, edited by S. R. Ferch and L. Spears, 152–165. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Spears, L. 1996. "Reflections on Robert K. Greenleaf and Servant-Leadership." *Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 17: 33–35.
- Spears, L. 1998. "Tracing the Growing Impact of Servant-Leadership." In *Insights on Leadership: Service, Stewardship, Spirit, and Servant-Leadership*, edited by L. Spears, pp. 1–12. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Spears, L. 2010. "Character and Servant Leadership: Ten Characteristics of Effective, Caring Leaders." *Journal of Virtues and Leadership* 1: 25–30.

- Spears, L. 2011. "The Spirit of Servant-Leadership." In *The Spirit of Leadership*, edited by S. R. Ferch and L. C. Spears, pp. 7–20. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Tooley, M. 2008. "African Power: How 192 Delegates Saved Methodists from Madness & Other Stories from the General Conference." *Touchstone: A Journal of Mere Christianity* 21(9). Available at www.touchstonemag.com/archives/article.php?id=21-09-043-r.
- Triandis, H. C. 1980. "Values, Attitudes, and Interpersonal Behavior." In *Nebraska Symposium of Motivation*, Vol. 27, edited by H. E. Howe, Jr. and M. Page, 195–259. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- United Methodist Church. 2008. *The Book of Discipline*. Nashville, TN: United Methodist Publishing House.
- Wallace, J. 2007. "Servant Leadership: A Worldview Perspective." *International Journal of Leadership Studies* 2: 1–19.
- Webb, T. and P. Sheeran. 2006. "Does Changing Behavioral Intentions Engender Behavioral Change?: A Meta-Analysis of the Experimental Evidence." *Psychological Bulletin* 132: 249–268.
- Winkleblack, D. 2011. *Who Cares for the Pastor?: A Manual and Workbook for Pastor/Staff-Parish Relations Committees*. Available at www.nyac.com/files/fileslibrary/whocarespastor2013.pdf.
- Winston, B., and B. Ryan. 2008. "Servant Leadership as a Humane Orientation: Using the GLOBE Study Construct of Humane Orientation to Show That Servant Leadership Is More Global Than Western." *International Journal of Leadership Studies* 3: 212–222.
- Wong, P. 2003. "Servant Leadership: An Opponent-Process Model and the Revised Servant Leadership Profile." Paper presented at Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA. Available at www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings.