THE CHARACTERISTICS, BEHAVIORS, AND
EFFECTIVE WORK ENVIRONMENTS OF SERVANT LEADERS:
A DELPHI STUDY

Ann Todd Abel

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

in

Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

APPROVED:

David J. Parks, Chair
Jean B. Crockett
Christina M. Dawson
Sally N. Johnston
Wayne M. Worner

October 31, 2000
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Servant Leaders, Leadership, Characteristics,
Behaviors, Work Environments, Leadership Inventory

ABSTRACT

Based upon the principles of equality, respect, and dignity for an organization and its community, Robert K. Greenleaf (1977) dedicated his life to conceptualizing and defining the humanistic philosophy of "servant leadership." With *service* and *leadership* sometimes seen as opposites, servant leaders are often misunderstood and perhaps underestimated. The purpose of this study was to create a well-defined comprehensive portrait of a servant leader by identifying key descriptors of the characteristics and behaviors of servant leaders and the work environments where they are effective.

The research procedure consisted of a three-round Delphi to gain consensus on responses to four key research questions. From your experience and observation, what are the key words or phrases that describe (1) the characteristics that distinguish servant leaders, (2) the behaviors that distinguish servant leaders, (3) the work environments in which servant leaders are effective, and (4) the work environments in which servant leaders are ineffective? The following groups were represented on the panel of experts: (a) appointed and elected officials, (b) authors, (c) business leaders, (d) clergy, (e) educators, (f) leaders of associations, and (g) leaders of volunteer organizations.

The first round Delphi instrument was open-ended. The second round gained opinion by adding a Likert scale to the results of the first round. The third round Delphi instrument was used to gather opinions from each panel member using a revised Likert scale instrument. In the third round each panelist received the statistical information calculated from the second round. The characteristics, behaviors, and effective work environments, as agreed upon consensually by the panel of experts in the third round, were reported.

Twenty-eight panelists participated in each of the three rounds of the Delphi study.   The characteristics, behaviors, and effective work environments of servant leaders, as determined by the panel of experts, are presented and discussed.   A Servant Leadership Inventory was created from the data. The self-rating inventory is offered as an instrument to create discussion and increase awareness about leadership based on service to others.

Dedicated to F. Dale and Louise Todd
To my dad who was and my mother who continues to be
a role model for hard work and perseverance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Effective and dynamic leadership is a quality for which every organization searches, but the specific combination of attributes that enables a person to become a successful leader proves difficult to delineate. While many factors lead to the success of an organization, the major feature that distinguishes a successful organization from one that is unsuccessful is the presence of effective leadership (Hersey et al., 1996).

Defining the term *leader* is crucial to any discussion of leadership. Webster defined a leader as "one who guides on the way, especially by going in advance" or "one who directs as on a course or in a direction." In his study of successful leaders and how they lead, Gardner (1995) defined leaders as "persons who, by word and/or personal example, markedly influence the behaviors, thoughts, and/or feelings of a significant number of their fellow human beings" (p. 8). Using case studies, Gardner demonstrated the capacity of individuals to influence others either directly or indirectly. In summarizing the findings of management writers, Hersey and others (1996) concluded that the task of any leader involves "the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation" (p. 91). Effective leadership involves not only a successful leader, but also the followers and the environment.

In summarizing the findings on leadership, Hersey and others (1996) found that successful leaders adapt their leadership behavior in response to the situation and to the needs of the people involved. The effectiveness of any leader is tied to the followers' perceptions of the leader's motive for action. With researchers emphasizing the role of the follower, and with the success of the leader dependent

on the goodwill of the people they lead, the idea of the leader as servant began to emerge in the literature.

Based upon the principles of equality, respect, and dignity for an organization and its community, Robert K. Greenleaf (1977) dedicated his life to conceptualizing and defining the humanistic philosophy of "servant leadership." In a case study on servant leaders (Taylor-Gillham, 1998), one participant reflected on the need to examine responses to the words *servant* and *service.* The words elicited meanings ranging "from well-meaning care for others to oppressive servitude" (p. 84). Often, service is seen as tainted by selfish motives or "the inner needs of a compulsive person" (Van Kuik, 1998, p. 9).

With *service* and *leadership* sometimes viewed as opposites, servant leaders are often misunderstood and perhaps underestimated. They lead in ways which consider the needs of the people and not as a leader who makes independent decisions which determine the action of the group (Fiedler & Chemers, 1984). Especially in ambiguous situations, where a greater sense of security for the followers comes from working with a leader who is structured (House, 1971), servant leaders may initially seem naïve and weak.   Sergiovanni (1992) observed that servant leaders may be viewed as weak because our leaders have traditionally been portrayed as, "strong, mysterious, aloof, wise, and all-powerful" (p. 23). Differing from other persons of goodwill, servant leaders act on what they believe. They view their actions and make their decisions "using the lens of being a servant to others" (Knicker, 1999, p. 132). They are servants first who become leaders for the purpose of serving, rather than being leaders first who choose to give service.

The Greenleaf Center for Servant-Leadership is located in Indianapolis, Indiana, and has as a logo a variation of the geometrical figure called a mobius strip. It is a one-sided surface that is constructed from a rectangle by holding one end fixed, rotating the opposite end through 180 degrees and attaching it to the first

end. This gives the appearance of a two-sided figure, symbolizing the servant leader concept as a merging of servanthood into leadership and back into servanthood again, in a continuous pattern (Taylor, 1997).

Greenleaf (1996) was not so naïve as to think the idea of "servant as leader" would appeal to all. Reflecting upon his life's work and in response to the idea that servant leadership was "romantic," he wrote, "Such servants may never predominate or even be numerous; but their influence may form a leaven that makes possible a reasonably civilized society" (p. 52).

<div align="center">Purpose</div>

This study stems from the misunderstanding and limited interpretation of the concept of servant leadership and the extent of its effectiveness in specific work environments. While the idea of servant leadership has become more widely known and practiced, servant leaders are not yet readily recognized or easily understood. Greenleaf, in his writings, did not define servant leadership but rather spent his time discussing what the servant leader does and how those actions affect others. He believed that if servant leadership was being practiced that "all men and women who are touched by the effort grow taller, and become healthier, stronger, more autonomous, and more disposed to serve" (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 47). In developing an assessment instrument for servant leadership, Laub (1999) offered a more recent definition:

> Servant leadership is an understanding and practice of leadership that places the good of those led over the self-interest of the leader. Servant leadership promotes the valuing and development of people, the building of community, the practice of authenticity, the providing of leadership for the good of those led and the sharing of power and status for the common good of each individual, the total organization and those served by the organization. (p. 81)

The purpose of this study was to create a well-defined, comprehensive portrait of a servant leader by identifying key descriptors of the characteristics and behaviors of servant leaders and the work environments where they are effective.

Because effective leadership is responsive to the people and the work environment, the skills needed for success are sometimes difficult to separate. The skills are so closely intertwined, for example, in the area of school leadership, that success does not rest on knowledge of educational methods alone. Leadership skills are needed that are focused on the context and the people involved. In determining the characteristics and behaviors of servant leaders, those with an existing interest in serving others could, with training, improve their ability to lead and increase their effectiveness in the workplace. In assessing servant organizations, Laub (1999) discovered that the more strongly respondents perceived that servant leadership existed in their organizations, the higher was their job satisfaction level. This has major implications for organizations that view job satisfaction as a critical ingredient to the success of the organization. In determining the environments where servant leaders are effective, leaders can be more appropriately matched to situations where they have the most positive impact.

Research Questions

Research for this study is dependent on four basic questions relating to servant leaders. The first two questions are designed to collect information on that which can be observed about servant leaders: (1) What are the characteristics that are common to those who practice servant leadership, and (2) what are the behaviors exhibited by servant leaders in the workplace?

While servant leadership is a well-developed theory of Robert K. Greenleaf, most proponents of the theory place primary emphasis on the motivation and philosophy which guide this type of leader. The first two questions are designed to

discover the outward characteristics and behaviors of servant leaders which differ from other persons of benevolence.

The final two questions are to determine the effectiveness of servant leaders in relation to the work environment and to discover the range of applicability for the concept of servant leadership: (3) What are the work environments in which servant leaders are effective, and (4) what are the work environments in which servant leaders are ineffective?

The research will be completed using a three-round Delphi method. Relying on the expertise of a panel comprised of identified servant leaders and those who have written about or trained servant leaders, the research questions listed above will be the focus of inquiry.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study the following terms are defined as follows:

Servant leadership - - A humanistic leadership structure of observable characteristics and behaviors based on the primary principles of equality, respect, and dignity for an organization and its community (Greenleaf, 1977).

Characteristics - - the distinctive qualities or traits that distinguish servant leaders as agreed upon consensually by a panel of experts.

Behaviors - - the actions taken by a leader to facilitate achievement of goals, as identified consensually by a panel of experts.

Effective work environment - - an environment in which the knowledge, characteristics, and behaviors of the leader can be used to move the group toward the achievement of goals, as agreed upon consensually by a panel of experts.

Ineffective work environment - - an environment in which the knowledge, characteristics, and behaviors of the leader cannot be used to move the group toward the achievement of goals, as agreed upon consensually by a panel of experts.

Summary of Chapter I and Overview of the Report

In Chapter I the context of the problem, the purpose and the significance of the study, the research questions, and the definitions of terms were presented. The results of the study are reported in the following chapters. The review and synthesis of the literature relative to the topic are presented in Chapter II. This includes a brief history of leadership thought, an overview of the literature related to servant leadership, and a review of the Delphi Technique.

In Chapter III the research design is presented and includes the organization of the Delphi Technique and the collection and analysis of the data. The research findings and results from each round of the Delphi are summarized in Chapter IV. Conclusions drawn from the study and implications and recommendations for future research are discussed in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of Chapter II is to review the literature relative to the topic under research. Included is literature relating to the history of leadership thought, with emphasis on the literature relating to the primary topic of servant leadership. The chapter concludes with an explanation of the Delphi technique and its applicability to determining the characteristics, behaviors, and effective work environments of servant leaders.

History of Leadership Thought

As in other fields of study, the many works on leadership that exist today are based on the work of writers and researchers of the past. While leadership includes the leader and the followers in the achievement of goals, writers and theorists have addressed the issues of leadership with differing emphasis. In the early 1900s, Frederick Winslow Taylor (1911) espoused scientific management, a classical theory of leadership. The emphasis was on increasing worker output by improving the techniques used in production.

Following Taylor (1911), Elton Mayo (1945) headed the Human Relations Movement where it was argued that in addition to providing technology for the improvement of production, it was also necessary to develop the interpersonal relations within a work unit. Under the theory of human relations, it was important to provide opportunities for the personal growth and development of the workers. With Taylor emphasizing worker output and Mayo concerned with the relationships of people, leadership writers since that time have centered their work on these two major ideas.

Trait Approach to Leadership

Prior to 1945, leadership studies centered on identifying the traits of leadership, with the suggestion that specific characteristics were essential to leader

effectiveness. With stress being placed on the idea that successful leadership involved a group of inherent traits, and only those individuals possessing those traits being considered as potential leaders, the emphasis was on measuring and discovering the extent of leadership characteristics. The trait approach implied that leadership training would be beneficial only to those who already possessed the characteristics needed for leadership (Hersey et al., 1996). Researchers who have investigated the trait approach have found few significant findings and have failed to produce a specific set of qualities that consistently identify leaders from nonleaders (Stodgill, 1948). Leadership, they surmised, was based on the interaction of variables that are in constant change. Since the trait research lacked consistent findings, the behavioral approach to leadership began to gain acceptance.

<div align="center">Behavioral Approach to Leadership</div>

Behavioral studies, occurring after 1945 through the mid-1960s, promoted the use of paper-and-pencil instruments to measure behaviors and attitudes toward or aptitudes for leadership behavior.

Ohio State Leadership Studies

Beginning with research at Ohio State University, researchers placed the description of leader behavior into the two categories of initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure referred to leader behavior which is task-oriented while consideration was defined as "a type of leader behavior that describes the extent to which a leader is sensitive to subordinates, respects their ideas and feelings, and establishes mutual trust" (Daft, 1994).

During the research process, the staff at Ohio State University developed an instrument, known as the LBDQ (Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire), designed to determine how leaders perform their duties. By checking one of five descriptions, respondents determined the frequency with which leaders

demonstrated specific types of behavior. In the research at Ohio State, the findings showed dimensions of leadership as perceived by others.

While the Ohio State research emphasized the observed behavior of leaders, a leader opinion questionnaire (LQR) was developed to discover perceptions of personal leadership style. In the studies at Ohio State, initiating structure and consideration were determined to be distinct areas. Leadership behavior could involve any mix of the two identified dimensions (Hersey et al., 1996). Due to the findings that leadership behavior is a mix of qualities, profiles of leadership began to be plotted in quadrants to demonstrate the various combinations of leadership behaviors.

Michigan Leadership Studies

Beginning in 1945, while studies were being conducted at Ohio State, researchers at the University of Michigan were also investigating the traits of leadership.   The researchers attempted to locate clusters of related characteristics and to determine indicators of effectiveness. Identifying two concepts, researchers labeled the concepts as employee orientation and production orientation. Employee orientation applied to situations where leaders emphasized the relational aspects of the job. Production orientation applied to those situations where the emphasis was on production and technical components (Hersey et al., 1996).

Research findings indicate that leadership styles vary greatly from person to person (Hersey et al., 1996). Leaders who stressed the completion of tasks were described as authoritarian leaders, while those who stressed relationships were viewed as democratic leaders. Often, however, no dominant style appeared and as at Ohio State, the dimensions of leadership were plotted on two separate axes to demonstrate the combination of styles.

Basing his work on earlier studies completed at the University of Michigan, Likert (1961) conducted research to determine the pattern of leadership used by

high-producing managers. Likert discovered that general supervision of employees led to higher productivity than close supervision. Basing his implementation of organizational change on studies completed by various organizations, Likert developed programs intended to help organizations move from "fostering immature behavior to encouraging and developing mature behavior, from emphasizing only hygiene factors to recognizing and implementing motivators" (Hersey et al., 1996, p. 109).

From his work, Likert (1961) developed a continuum from System 1 through System 4 that showed the various management styles. System 1 was based on a task-oriented authoritarian style of management, with System 4 a relationship-oriented style based on teamwork and mutual trust. Systems 2 and 3 were progressive stages between the two extremes. Likert used his instrument to determine from individuals how an organization was perceived in relation to the management style and what they would like the characteristics of management to be. Likert's writing depicted the most productive style of leader behavior for industry as democratic. His findings, however, suggested that there did not seem to be a single best style for effective leadership performance. As researchers discovered that the style of effective leaders is rarely based in one realm but is a combination of several areas, the situational approach to leadership came to the forefront.

<center>Situational Approach to Leadership</center>

Leadership theories have not been fully supported by research simply because scientific research requires controlling the variables. In the field of leadership, like the other behavioral sciences, it is nearly impossible to control the variables of an organization over a period of time. At least a portion of the difficulty in the validation of a particular theory is that, in most cases, the success of a leader is determined by how that leader responds to a particular situation. A

leader who achieves great success in one situation may be less than effective in another. It is for that reason that situational leadership became accepted by many as the model for determining the effectiveness of a leader.

In the situational approach to leadership, the emphasis is on leader behavior as opposed to leadership traits. The focus of this approach is on the observed behavior of leaders and their followers in a variety of situations. With emphasis on behavior and environment, the options remained open that leaders may emerge as the result of training, education, and development. Situational leadership theory examined the interaction between leader, followers, and the situation. The common threads included in all situational approaches are the requirements of the leader to behave in a flexible manner by diagnosing and applying a leadership style that is appropriate to the situation.

Fiedler's Contingency Model

As developer of the Leadership Contingency Model, Fiedler proposed three interactional variables that determine whether or not a given situation is favorable to leaders. The variables were: (1) leader-member relations – their personal relationships with the members of their group, (2) task structure – degree of structure in the task which has been assigned, and (3) position power – the power and authority provided by their position (Fiedler, 1967).

In the Fiedler (1967) model, eight different combinations of the three interactional variables can occur. As the leader-member relationships vary from good to poor, the task structure from high to low, and the power position from strong to weak, the ratings fall into one of eight categories. After developing the model for classifying group situations, Fiedler tried to identify whether task or relationship oriented leadership was most effective for each of the eight categories. By examining leadership studies, both old and new, Fiedler came to the following conclusions:

1. Task-oriented leaders tend to perform best in group situations that are either favorable or very unfavorable to the leader.

2. Relationship-oriented leaders tend to perform best in situations that are intermediate in favorableness. Fiedler defined favorableness as "the degree to which the situation enables the leader to exert influence over the group" (Fiedler, 1967, p. 13).

The contribution of Fiedler to leadership theory is the focus he placed on situational variables as moderating influences on leader effectiveness. Continuing work in the area of situational leadership was Robert House who was interested in explaining which style of leadership was most effective and why it was most effective.

House's Path-Goal Theory of Leadership

House wanted to find the situations in which leadership styles were most appropriate. Initiating structure described "the degree to which the leader initiates psychological structure for subordinates" (House, 1971, p. 459). Consideration described "the degree to which the leader creates a supportive environment of psychological support, warmth, friendliness, and helpfulness" (House, 1971, p. 459). The major concern in House's theory is "how the leader influences the [followers'] perceptions of their work goals, personal goals and paths to goal attainment" (House & Mitchell, 1974). Leaders are most successful, according to this model, when they provide whatever is missing from the work situation. The Path-Goal theory is a good example of the need for a leader to first look at the situation and then decide on a strategy with which to proceed. While attention to task and attention to relationships are concepts found in much of the leadership writings, Hersey and Blanchard (Hersey et al., 1996) added a third dimension of effectiveness to their leadership model.

Tridimensional Leader Effectiveness Model

      With meanings similar to initiating structure and consideration, Hersey and Blanchard (Hersey et al., 1996) used the terms task behavior and relationship behavior in their model. They displayed the results of the interaction of behaviors in four basic leadership behavior quadrants similar to those first used in the Ohio State leadership studies. The quadrants were: (1) high task and low relationship behavior, (2) high task and high relationship behavior, (3) high relationship and low task behavior, and (4) low relationship and low task behavior.

      Leadership style in the Hersey-Blanchard (Hersey et al., 1996) model was defined as the behaviors, as perceived by others, that a leader exhibited when working to influence the activities of others. As in other models of situational leadership, Hersey and Blanchard surmised that the effectiveness of leaders is dependent on using a leadership style that is appropriate to the situation in which they operate. By adding the third dimension of effectiveness to the task behavior and relationship behavior, Hersey and Blanchard attempted to integrate the concepts of leader style with the demands of the situation in a specific environment. When a style was used which was appropriate to a particular situation, it was described as effective. When a style that was inappropriate for the situation was used, it was described as ineffective.

      One of the major differences in the Tridimensional Model is that the effectiveness of the leader is not necessarily determined by the behaviors of that leader, but whether or not those behaviors are appropriate for the situation. It is the interaction of the behavior with the environment that results in effective or ineffective leadership. In this model, the measurement of effectiveness is an evaluation of the response to the environment or the results, rather than an evaluation of the initial behavior of the leader.

As a part of this model, two instruments were developed to gather data about the behavior of leaders. Two instruments for measuring leader effectiveness, the LEAD (Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description) Self and the LEAD Other, were designed for use in leader training. The LEAD Self was designed to measure self-perception on the following three aspects of leader behavior: (a) style, (b) style range, and (c) style adaptability. The information gained from the LEAD Self is helpful, but to know how a leader influences others, it is important to collect information from others that may include followers, peers, or superiors.   The research of Hersey and Blanchard stressed the difficulty in evaluating effective leadership. One basic leadership style was inadequate because effectiveness was determined by the ability of leaders to change their style in response to differing situations. Other theories, including those that examine leadership based on guiding themes or principles, have influenced thinking about leader effectiveness.

<div align="center">Normative Approach to Leadership</div>

A number of theories have been developed that based the effectiveness of leaders on a specific set of practicing principles.   For the purpose of this study, three theories from the normative approach will be addressed. They will include the work of Kouzes and Posner (1995) based on five fundamental practices and the work of Stephen Covey (1989) founded on seven habits. The third theory, as espoused by Robert K. Greenleaf (1970) and the basis for this research, is that of servant leadership.

Practices of Exemplary Leadership

Based on research that was both quantitative and qualitative, Kouzes and Posner (1995) developed the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI). The framework of the LPI was developed using in-depth interviews and written case studies based on people's personal-best leadership experience. The framework consisted of five leadership practices. The exemplary practices were: (a) challenging the process,

(b) inspiring a shared vision, (c) enabling others to act, (d) modeling the way, and (e) encouraging the heart.

Challenging the process is based on findings of Kouzes and Posner (1995) which showed that every personal-best leadership case used in their research involved some kind of challenge for the leader and therefore involved a change in the status quo. None of the surveyed respondents claimed to have done their personal best while keeping things the same. "Leaders know well that experimentation, innovation, and change all involve risk and failure, but they proceed anyway" (p. 10).

Inspiring a shared vision was a theme derived from reports by managers where they reported the imagining of an exciting future and their visions of how things could be. Without exception, people in the study reported their enthusiasm for a project and saw their own enthusiasm as spreading to influence others. Important to the shared vision, individuals in the study realized that leadership is a team effort. After reviewing 2,500 cases, Kouzes and Posner (1995) reported that a simple test for whether someone would become a leader was the frequency of the word 'we' in their language.

Modeling the way is another important principle of the LPI profile. To model effectively, leaders must demonstrate their beliefs by their actions. Little things in the behavior of leaders seem to accumulate to big rewards, as each step of modeling is a strengthening of the commitment to a more far-reaching future.

The final principle discovered by Kouzes and Posner (1995) is that of encouraging the heart. Encouragement from leaders can be large gestures or simple actions. The goal for a leader is to "make sure people benefit when behavior is aligned with cherished values" (p. 15).

The LPI was based on more than 2,000 responses to the Personal-Best Leadership Experience Questionnaire that was 12 pages long and consisted of 38

open-ended questions. Over 300 interviews were conducted with managers from companies within both the public and private sector. Measurements on the LPI, like many previously discussed theories, report leader effectiveness based on how the leader relates to the followers.

The researchers of practices of exemplary leadership have disputed the theory that leadership is reserved for only a few select people. Kouzes and Posner (1995) reported that "Contrary to the myth that only a lucky few can ever decipher the mystery of leadership, our research has shown us that leadership is an observable, learnable set of practices" (p. 16). Another approach that is based on the belief that leadership can be taught is that of Stephen Covey with his seven habits.

Seven Habits – Stephen Covey

Through a list of seven habits Covey (1989) proposed that a person could be more effective in every area of life. What began as training events for business leaders has now developed into application of the habits to personal and family life. The seven habits include three that represent private victories and precede the next three that represent public victories. The last habit is designed as a renewing force for the first six. The habits or principles to live by are based on integrity and loyalty. "In a sense, the first three Habits represent integrity and the next three loyalty, but they are totally interwoven" (Covey, 1999, p. 302).

The seven habits are: (a) be proactive, (b) begin with the end in mind, (c) put first things first, (d) think win-win, (e) seek first to understand and then to be understood, (f) synergize, and (g) sharpen the saw. Another term used by Covey (1989) is "Emotional Bank Account" which is a metaphor for the amount of trust in a relationship. Our relationship with others is always either making deposits into or withdrawals from the account. In brief, the habits are explained by Covey (1989) in terms of responsibility for one's self and responsibility to others.

Covey (1989) based his practices of effective leadership on the personal goals and responsibilities of the individual and how these practices have a positive effect on followers. He emphasized the importance of taking action, developing a vision, and setting priorities. Leadership that is effective was strongly dependent on viewing the other person's point of view. With this same importance placed on the perspective of the follower, Robert K. Greenleaf, following a successful management career with AT&T, developed the theory of servant leadership.

Servant Leadership – Robert K. Greenleaf

Over a period of years of reflection on personal experiences in leadership roles, Greenleaf began to write on the concept of servant leadership. Greenleaf believed the servant leader is servant first. It begins with a natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then, conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. Greenleaf further suggested that the difference between serving and leading is expressed through the intuitive insights by the servant to first ensure that the highest priorities of others are being served (Greenleaf, 1970).

The best test of servant leadership, and the most difficult to administer, is, "Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants?" (Spears, 1995, p. 4). Greenleaf asked these questions as he pondered the realities of servant leadership, while continuing an exploration into organizations that would evolve over 50 years. Greenleaf claimed to be a student of organizations and how they accomplish their goals. He believed that to deal with any organizational issue, one must first deal with the people involved. He recognized that individuals were the core of any institution and that both leader and followers must have an inclination to inspiration. His writings were reflective of his innermost thoughts.

The discovery of *Journey to the East* (Hesse, 1956) afforded Greenleaf insight into the concept of servant leadership and had great impact on his thinking. The work by Hesse is thought to be autobiographical and related the story of a group of men on a spiritual journey. The men developed great appreciation for the servant, Leo, who accompanied them on the journey. Leo performed numerous duties for the group and therefore allowed them to stay on task. Then, one day, Leo disappeared and the search to find him proved useless. The men attempted to continue the journey but discovered that, without Leo, the group was unable to continue. One member of the group continued his search and after many years, discovered Leo. He was found to be leading a large spiritual colony that sponsored the original group. Upon observing Leo's skills at guiding the colony and his leadership stature, the man was taken in by Leo's group. Over time the man came to understand that leadership was granted to a man who by nature was a servant first and whose primary inclination was to help others.

In developing his own awareness about a caring society, Greenleaf (1970) began to frame his ideas on the subject of servant and leader using Hesse's (1956) work. During the next ten years, Greenleaf sent manuscripts to colleagues and friends and learned that his musings had significant value for others. He developed the ability to share his insights. He believed that one should experience life and write about the experiences that would initiate action to enrich those experiences (DiStefano, 1988). In his insightful sharing, Greenleaf became a practical prophet who spent time contemplating and writing about his own search, creating learning opportunities for other interested seekers.

Beginning with a speech at Ohio University in 1967, Greenleaf developed a premise that defined the personal responsibility necessary for growth that included positive social influence and the opportunity to build on a new ethic. This lecture on the subject of servant leadership dealt with the qualities and characteristics of

building a distinctive way of life. Those same qualities are found throughout his writings with a primary aim at discovering a personal uniqueness in work (Greenleaf, 1960) and dealing with several recurring themes. The themes included: (a) creativity that brings innovations into existence while being open to inspiration; (b) foresight, a continuous connection between past, present moment, and future; and (c) trust.

In 1970, Greenleaf wrote an essay that became the publication on which servant leadership was founded. The essay was written to encourage people to take more personal responsibility.   He believed that to build a more caring society it took those who were willing to risk initiating and providing structure by showing the way. Along with later writings, this essay began to identify certain characteristics found in the practice of servant leadership.

Listening. Listening is the ability to quiet oneself and listen receptively. It is this key to understanding that unlocks the potential for utilization of the other servant leadership characteristics. Covey (1989) reviewed how to be an active listener and how to recognize the vantage point of another person. In studying organizations, DePree (1989) outlined the leader's role in facilitating communication. The important periods of listening occurred during planning sessions and during discussions of innovative concepts. With knowledge gathered from past, present, and future perspectives, the leader then integrates the knowledge with the other servant leadership characteristics and makes decisions that ultimately lead to building community within the organization. In summarizing a case study of servant leadership, Walker (1997) found that servant leaders operated consistently with integrity and respect. Servant leaders were found to be nurturers, holders of trust, and were committed to the personal and professional growth of others both individually and collectively.

Empathy. The basic concept of empathy is the willingness to view a situation from the other person's perspective.   Empathy is based on the need of people to be respected and to be recognized for their uniqueness. Gaining an empathetic view of a situation leads to understanding. When in a conflict situation, it is the responsibility of the servant leader to envision the situation and understand how each role influenced the other. The leader then has the task of appraising the interaction for all participants without being influenced by emotion or bias.

Listening and empathy are concepts that leaders exhibit towards their work community every time they meet with people. These concepts reflect their sense of humility and their connection to humanity. The manner in which they respond to a concern and the way they present their work setting, illustrate what they believe about the organization and its purpose. Wheatley (1994) defined many of these abstract components of leadership in a more organized and concrete way.

Healing. One of the great strengths of servant leadership is the capacity for healing oneself and others. Healing starts within the individual, and as wholeness is found within oneself, so the individual is able to influence others. The servant leader realizes that they can help a variety of emotional hurts of the people with whom they come in contact. Greenleaf (1970) wrote, "There is something subtle communicated to one who is being served and led if, implicit in the compact between servant-leader and led, is the understanding that the search for wholeness is something they share" (p. 27).

Awareness. General awareness, and especially self-awareness, strengthens the servant leader. Greenleaf (1977) believed that "Awareness is not the giver of solace, just the opposite. It awakens and disturbs" (p. 28). Awareness requires an act of faith on the part of the leader. It is the belief that the leader has the strength and ability to face the problem and find a solution.   For just as a servant leader must learn to overcome their own fears, they must learn to influence the fears that

are imbedded in an organization. Vaill (1990) outlined many myths that can be found within organizations and stressed the need to investigate them to see if they represent principles or irrelevant ideas.

Persuasion. One of the most distinctive characteristics of servant leadership is persuasion. Servant leaders seek to convince others, rather than coerce them into compliance. The servant leader relies on persuasion and is effective at building consensus within groups. Taylor-Gillham (1998), when studying school principals who had been trained in the skills of servant leadership, concluded that the basic principles found in this type of leadership were similar to those found in a functionally secure family.   "In both, it is the relationship between each person that strengthens the whole.   The intrinsic desire to invest oneself is influenced by persuasion, due to the personal submission to a purpose and the leadership that facilitates it" (p. 226).

Conceptualization. The ability to look at a problem (or an organization) from a conceptualizing perspective means that a leader must look beyond the realities of daily responsibilities. Aspiring to servant leadership involves the stretching of one's thinking beyond a day-to-day focus and a willingness to look to the future. Conceptualization builds a path into the future and communicates a commitment to all members of the organizational community.

Foresight. Foresight is closely linked to conceptualization. It is this characteristic which enables the servant leader to understand the lessons from the past, the realities of the present, and the likely consequence of a decision made for the future. Foresight allows for difficult experiences to become lessons learned. If a difficulty is not used as a building block to the organization or individual, then avoidance, distraction, and destruction can take hold. Wheatley (1994) demonstrated how this leaves the organization or individual vulnerable to the

elements that may negatively influence the decision-making and the problem-solving processes.

Greenleaf (1977) believed that leaders could be considered unethical if they failed to utilize foresight and subsequently failed to "act constructively when there was freedom to act" (p. 26). A person cannot develop the skills of a servant leader without foresight. Trial and error is a required component for learning this abstract concept. Kouzes and Posner (1995) provided the leader with extensive material on envisioning the future through the use of specific strategies and reflective prompts.

Stewardship. The principals of stewardship are found in the concept of service to others. According to Greenleaf (1977), it was this quality that gave him an advantage in selecting trainees for the management program with AT&T. The people that he found to be significantly more successful were those who put their interest to serve another before their own. Block (1993) created a comprehensive resource on integrating stewardship into the work force of the business world. Greenleaf developed the theoretical foundation for service and Block demonstrated its application. 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 value beyond their contributions as workers. Acting on this belief, a servant leader is committed to the growth of every individual within the organization. The servant leader recognizes the responsibility of nurturing the personal, professional, and spiritual growth of the employees.

Servant leaders are readers and experimenters. Utilizing their servant leader characteristics, they are generally good predictors, listeners, and designers. Together with others they want to build the future, not just accept whatever may come. They want to take the present ingredients in their environment and their

people and develop them so that it may bring greater benefit in return. How an organization grows determines how it may build a community.

      <u>Building community.</u> Servant leadership suggests that true community can be created among those who work in businesses and other institutions. Building community requires skill, a great deal of time, and acceptance of every element of the environment into the process. Greenleaf (1977) advised that one step at a time be taken so that all may benefit from the whole. The ultimate goal of the servant leader is to build a community where mutual purpose and equality prevail. An organization founded on these principles has the potential to generate the greatest reward for the organization as a whole.

      Greenleaf (1977) recognized that servant leaders are not trained but evolve. He believed, along with DePree (1989), that the characteristics of a servant are the results of constant personal growth and commitment to the growth of others. DePree (1987) continued to emphasize this theme when he stated, "The measure of leadership is not the quality of the head, but the tone of the body" (p. 130). Servant leadership starts with a reexamination of one's own belief system and involves intentionally putting people and ethical considerations ahead of short-term institutional or personal self-interest (Shugart, 1997). Greenleaf (1996) concluded that a leader who sets out to accomplish a goal "thinks, speaks, and acts as if personally accountable to all who may be affected by his or her thoughts, words, and deeds" (p. 45).

      Ten personal qualities of servant leaders, identified as characteristics, are found in the writings of Greenleaf and his followers. One research participant observed that Greenleaf's unique contribution is not captured among the ten. Greenleaf "wants us to think about what happens when a true servant gets into a leadership role" (Taylor-Gillham, 1998, p. 282). Servant leadership is more clearly described as "a process made up of interdependent practices. Although each

characteristic and principle can stand alone, it is the combination and complementary events that construct the philosophy and principles of servant leadership" (p. 239). Knicker (1999), when studying elementary principals, concluded that servant leadership is "more about internal motivation than about observable actions" (p. 132).

Greenleaf believed that a quality common to all servant leaders is that they are constantly in the process of becoming. Knicker (1999) observed that there is a visible tension in servant leaders between who they are and the leaders they are striving to be. This "striving" makes their practice more energetic and future oriented.

Servant leaders may be more comfortable in an organization that allows them to serve their ideals. Van Kuik (1998) suggested a more encompassing view of the environments where servant leaders are effective. "It would seem to me, however, that a determined individual on an individual basis might find creative ways to communicate service, giving and caring in any position within any system" (p. 241).

So, who are servant leaders? A review of the literature indicates that the answer to this question is both vague and ambiguous and there is a need for further research to form a more accurate definition.

Delphi Technique

The research in this study will be conducted using the Delphi technique to identify the characteristics and behaviors that distinguish servant leaders. The technique will also be used to determine the effective work environments of servant leaders. The Delphi technique, by definition, is a group process involving an interaction between the researcher and a group of identified experts on a specified topic, usually through a series of questionnaires (Skutsch & Hall, 1973).

Helmer (1967) observed that the Delphi technique replaces committee activity with individual interrogation within a carefully designed framework.

Skutsch and Hall (1973) identified the Delphi technique as a method for gaining judgments on complex matters where precise information is unavailable. According to Linstone and Turoff (1975), "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). This technique is useful where the opinions and judgments of experts and practitioners are needed but time, distance, and other factors make it unlikely or impossible for the panel to work together in the same physical location.

The basic steps of the Delphi process were outlined by Pfeiffer (1968):

1. The first questionnaire which is sent to the panel of experts may ask for a list of opinions involving experiences and judgments, a list of predictions, and a list of recommended activities.

2. On the second round, a copy of the collective list is sent to each expert and the expert is asked to rate or evaluate each item by some criterion of importance.

3. The third questionnaire includes the list, the ratings indicated, and the consensus, if any. The experts are asked to either revise their opinions or discuss their reasons for not coming to consensus with the group.

Dating back to the 1930s a modified version of the Delphi technique was used to make predictions. During the 1950s, Helmer and others at the Rand Corporation developed the Delphi technique, as we now know it. Using seven experts on atomic warfare to gather opinions for the military, Dalkey and Helmer (1962) were the first to use the Delphi technique.

Dalkey (1967) has identified the following basic characteristics of the Delphi technique:

1. Anonymity - - the use of questionnaires or other communication where expressed responses are not identified as being from specific members of the panel allows for anonymity.

2. Controlled feedback from the interaction - - Controlled feedback allows interaction with a large reduction in discord among panel members. Interaction consists of allowing interaction among group members in several stages, with the results of the previous stage summarized and group members asked to reevaluate their answers as compared to the thinking of the group.

3. Statistical group response - - the group opinion is defined as a statistical average of the final opinions of the individual members, with the opinion of every group member reflected in the final group response. (pp. 8-9)

At the same time as Dalkey (1967) was identifying the basic characteristics of the Delphi technique, Helmer (1967) supported the validity and reliability of the technique as an acceptable method of data collection from an identified group.

Several steps, as identified by Brooks (1979), are involved in using the Delphi Technique:

1. Identifying the panel of experts.

2. Determining the willingness of individuals to serve on the panel.

3. Gathering individual input on the specific issue and then compiling it into basic statements.

4. Analyzing data from the panel.

5. Compiling information on a new questionnaire and sending to each panel member for review.

6. Analyzing the new input and returning to the panel members the distribution of the responses.

7. Asking each panel member to study the data and evaluate their own position based on the responses from the group. When individual responses vary significantly from that of the group norm, the individual is asked to provide a rationale for their differing viewpoint while limitations are placed on the length of the remarks in order to keep responses brief.

8. Analyzing the input, and sharing the minority supporting statements with the panel. Panel members are again asked to review their position and if not within a specified range, to justify the position with a brief statement.

Brooks also discovered that three rounds were enough to gain consensus of opinion, with a fourth round eliciting very little change.

Linstone and Turoff (1975) stated two circumstances where the Delphi technique is most appropriate: (a) "the problem does not lend itself to precise analytical techniques but can benefit from subjective judgments on a collective basis" (p. 275), and (b) "individuals who need to interact cannot be brought together in a face-to-face exchange because of time or cost constraints" (p. 275). Both of these circumstances are applicable to the ambiguity found in the theory of servant leadership. Therefore, the Delphi technique is an acceptable method of compiling data to construct a more accurate description of servant leaders.

<div align="center">Summary of Chapter II</div>

The literature, as it related to the topic under research, was reviewed in Chapter II. The review of the literature was subdivided into two major headings: (a) a historical perspective of leadership thought with emphasis on the servant leadership theory of Robert K. Greenleaf, and (b) the Delphi Technique and its applicability to the study of servant leadership.

In the history of leadership thought, four major approaches to leadership were addressed. They were: (a) the trait approach to leadership; (b) the behavioral approach to leadership with emphasis on studies done at Ohio State and the University of Michigan; (c) the situational approach to leadership with attention to Fiedler's Contingency Model, House's Path-Goal Theory, and the Hersey-Blanchard Tridimensional Leadership Model; and (d) the normative approach to leadership with attention to the work of Kouzes and Posner and Stephen Covey, with special emphasis on the theory of servant leadership as espoused by Robert K. Greenleaf.

The Delphi technique was presented. Basic background information relative to the use of the technique, its advantages, steps in using the process, and educational applications of the Delphi were discussed.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to identify key descriptors of the characteristics, behaviors and effective work environments of servant leaders. A discussion of the design and the methodology of the study are presented here.

This chapter includes the procedures that were used in preparing the study and conducting the research. The topic was derived from a review of the literature and discussions with people who were knowledgeable in the field of leadership and specifically in the area of servant leadership. The Delphi technique was the method selected to conduct the research because the researcher was interested in reaching a consensus on the topic of study from experts in a variety of professions.

A Delphi Study

The research procedure consisted of a three-round Delphi to gain consensus on four key research questions: From your experience and observation, what are the key words or phrases that describe (1) the characteristics that distinguish servant leaders, (2) the behaviors that distinguish servant leaders, (3) the work environments in which servant leaders are effective, and (4) the work environments in which servant leaders are ineffective?

In their work for the Rand Corporation, Dalkey and Helmer (1962) identified the use of a four- or five-round Delphi procedure. The research procedure for this study was supported by the work of Brooks (1979) and Pfieffer (1968) who affirmed that a three round Delphi produces credible data and findings.

Panel Identification and Selection

A crucial factor in the success of a Delphi study, according to Linstone and Turoff (1975), is the selection of the panel of experts. When working with experts, Helmer (1967) listed three considerations: (a) wisely selecting the experts, (b) creating conditions under which the experts can perform most ably, and (c) when

using several experts on a particular issue, use caution in inferring a single position from their various opinions.

Selection of the panel of experts was given careful consideration, as it was their combined opinions that determined the outcome of the research. Because the study was designed to identify characteristics, behaviors, and effective work environments of servant leaders in general, representation from each of the following groups was included: (a) appointed and elected officials, (b) authors in the field, (c) business leaders, (d) clergy, (e) educators, (f) leaders of associations, and (g) leaders of volunteer organizations. Four members were chosen to represent each group on the panel. Participants included those identified as servant leaders and those who have written about or trained servant leaders.

After reviewing the literature and receiving recommendations, the researcher compiled a list of five to seven experts who were representatives of each group serving on the Delphi panel. The list for each group was presented to the doctoral committee for further recommendations. The next step was the selection of experts for each group, with selection based on factors such as geographical location, gender, and ethnic background. Panel members were also selected to achieve a balance between theorists on servant leadership, those who write or teach on the subject, and practitioners. Prospective panelists were contacted by telephone to ask if they were willing to serve as a participant in the study. During the telephone conversation, each prospective panelist was given a brief description of the study, and information on the person's experience and knowledge of servant leadership was recorded. If a selected expert was unable to serve, another name from the list was contacted. The researcher continued making contacts until four experts from each group agreed to serve on the panel.

Forty-two prospective panelists were called to obtain the 28 panelists needed for the study. Panelists included 18 males and 10 females representing 16 states;

Washington DC; and Canada. Of the 28 panelists, two were African-Americans, and one was a Native American. From this selection process, the following agreed to participate as panelists in the study:

<div align="center">Appointed and Elected Officials</div>

Joseph P. Johnson, of Abingdon, Virginia, has served as a member of the Virginia House of Delegates for many years. Delegate Johnson has applied the servant leadership philosophy in both his private law practice and his government work.

Judge Jim Rausch, of San Antonio, Texas, has long been regarded as an authority in the field of fathers who do not take responsibility for their families. He has a reputation for serving families through the legal system.

Ruby Rogers, of Gate City, Virginia, has served on the Virginia State Board of Education and is employed by Scott County Public Schools as a resource teacher of the gifted. She viewed her appointment as an opportunity to serve teachers and students in a larger arena.

Edward J. Sullivan, of Fredricksburg, Virginia, has served as a member of the School Board for Stafford County Public Schools. An employee of that school division commented, "His only reason for being on the board is to be of service to the students."

<div align="center">Authors in the Field</div>

Dr. Grace Preedy Barnes, of the Operation Impact Program at Azusa State University in Azusa, California, has created a training book entitled *Servant Leadership: The Working Book and Reader* (1994). The Operation Impact Program has provided educational support to leaders of mission organizations, businesses, and nonprofit enterprises by delivering the Master of Arts in Social Science with an emphasis on leadership studies to sites around the world.

Dr. Nancy C. Huber*, of the University of Arizona, has served as the developer of several leadership courses and has completed a book on leadership entitled *Leading from Within: Finding Personal Direction.* She has grounded most of her work on the principles of servant leadership.

Carol R. Frenier*, of The Advantage Group, Inc. in Chelsea, Vermont, has authored a book entitled *Business and the Feminine Principle: The Untapped Resource.*   She was identified as a servant leader by her peers.

Parker J. Palmer*, of Madison, Wisconsin, has authored *To Know as We are Known: Education as a Spiritual Journey* (1993), *The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher's Life* (1998), and other titles. He also wrote the foreword for *Seeker and Servant* by Robert K. Greenleaf.

<u>Business Leaders</u>

Frank Butler*, former CEO of Eastman-Gelatine, has, since his retirement, served as a consultant to many large companies. At the time of this study, he was a member of the Board of Trustees of the Institute for Servant Leadership in Asheville, North Carolina.

Jack Lowe*, of Dallas, Texas, is CEO of TDIndustries, an employee owned company. TDIndustries is a national mechanical construction and service company that has received numerous awards for quality. Jack Lowe has served for many years as a trustee on The Greenleaf Center's board and currently serves as the chair.

Ken Melrose*, CEO of The Toro Company, headquartered in Bloomington, Minnesota, joined the company in 1970 and was named president in 1981. As author of *Making the Grass Greener on Your Side: A CEO's Journey to Leading by Serving*, Ken Melrose has credited Robert K. Greenleaf with inspiring many of the organizational development changes that have been implemented at Toro.

Karen Speerstra, of Randolph Center, Vermont, retired in October 1999 from the publishing firm of Butterworth-Heinemann after 19 years as publishing director. Her mission was to publish leading edge business books. Others identified her as a servant leader, and she was described as one who "did a wonderful job of midwifing ideas."

Clergy

The Reverend Dr. Max Case, of Indianapolis, Indiana, is an ordained Methodist minister with a Jesuit background. He is director of the Indiana Office of Campus Ministries and has conducted conferences based on the theme of servant leadership in higher education.

The Reverend Alexander Porter, of Kannapolis, North Carolina, is an ordained Presbyterian minister and often speaks on the topic of servanthood. He has explored the idea of service as a part of his doctoral work at McCormick Theological Seminary.

The Most Reverend Walter Sullivan, bishop for the Diocese of Richmond, has practiced the philosophy of servant leadership for many years and is familiar with the work of Robert K. Greenleaf.

Dr. David S. Young, of Ephrata, Pennsylvania, has served as a pastor in the Church of the Brethren and has written *A New Heart and a New Spirit: A Plan for Renewing Your Church* (1994) and *Servant Leadership for Church Renewal: Shepherds by the Living Stream* (1999). In the later years of Robert K. Greenleaf's life, David Young knew him as a personal friend.

Educators

Gary Doyle, of Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, is superintendent of the Bloomfield Hills Schools. He used servant leadership for the foundation of the work done within the school system to identify the core values of its schools. Gary

Doyle has participated in leadership training through the Institute for Servant Leadership.

John Draper, of Montgomery, Alabama, is Executive Director of The Council for Leaders of Alabama Schools. Before serving in his present position, he was a high school principal and a junior high school assistant principal. He is viewed by many as a practitioner of the servant leader philosophy.

Terry Fortin, of Edmonton, Alberta, has served as superintendent of Catholic Schools in Edmonton where everything, including the evaluation of the superintendent, was based on "servant as leader" criteria. Currently, he is serving a two-year term as a government consultant to increase the high school graduation rate of Native Americans.

Dr. Gene Eller returned to Bristol, Virginia, as an elementary principal after serving for a number of years in the mission field where he was chief administrator of an American school.

<u>Leaders of Associations</u>

Bill Jamieson, of Asheville, North Carolina, has worked in the business sector and now serves as director of the Institute of Servant Leadership in Asheville.

Jeanne McCarty, of Silver Springs, Maryland, is director of Roots and Shoots, an educational branch of the Jane Goodall Institute. She was identified as a servant leader by two school administrators who have worked closely with her.

Roy Peterson, of Orlando, Florida, has been trained in servant leadership and heads the Wycliffe Bible Translators, providing translations of the Bible to groups around the world.

Sister Lourdes Sheehan, of Washington, DC, has worked with the National Catholic Education Association and now serves as the Bishop's Secretary of Education working on public policy statements. She has taught in the master's

program at Notre Dame where students were expected to serve in the low-income schools in the area.

<u>Leaders of Volunteer Organizations</u>

De De Damschroder, at the Virginia Office of Volunteerism in Richmond, serves as coordinator for volunteer programs for the state of Virginia. She has worked as a servant leader as she leads others to be of service in their communities.

Mary Foley, of Manassas, Virginia, coordinates volunteer efforts through her work at the Voluntary Action Center of Prince William County. She has used her position to provide service to many in her local community through the use of volunteers.

Rita Gettman, of Houston, Texas, is national director of Inter-faith Community Ministries. She has organized retreats on serving and has worked with agencies across the country to help establish and operate community service organizations.

James A. Laub, of Wellington, Florida, is director of World Servants, an organization that has placed volunteers in locations around the world. He has completed doctoral work in which he developed an assessment for servant leaders.

Data Collection and Analysis

The purpose of this study was to create a well-defined, comprehensive portrait of a servant leader by identifying key descriptors of the characteristics and behaviors of servant leaders and the work environments where they are effective. The Delphi technique was chosen as the tool to gain consensus from a panel of experts without the necessity of bringing the group together.

For each round of the Delphi study, measures were taken to increase the response rate. A number code, placed on each instrument and the return envelope, was assigned to each panel member. Both the envelopes sent to the panelists and

the return envelopes were brightly colored for ease of identification. The Delphi I was mailed to each panelist within one week after all the experts agreed to serve on the panel. The second and third round instruments were also mailed to participants within one week after all responses had been received from the previous round. A follow-up telephone call, fax, or email message was sent to all panelists on the sixth day after the Delphi instrument for that round was mailed. On the days the second and third round instruments were mailed, an email message was sent to each participant to notify him or her of the mailing.   For each panelist whose instrument had not been received two days after the deadline for that round, a telephone call, fax, or email message was sent as follow up.

<div align="center">Development and Testing of Delphi I</div>

The first round was an open-ended instrument with four questions and served to gain general opinions from each of the panelists. Pfeiffer (1968), in outlining the basic Delphi procedure, supported the use of the open-ended questionnaire on the first round. The first two questions were constructed to elicit responses that identified observable characteristics and behaviors of servant leaders. While servant leaders have many characteristics and behaviors in common with other leaders, the questions were carefully worded to gain insight into traits that set servant leaders apart from others in their field. The panel, carefully recruited to include both practitioners and theorists of servant leadership, was asked the following questions: From your experience and observation, what are the key words or phrases that describe (1) the <u>characteristics</u> that distinguish servant leaders, and (2) the <u>behaviors</u> that distinguish servant leaders?

The last two questions were developed in response to discussion with colleagues on the subject of servant leadership. The majority seemed to assume that servant leaders were weak and only suited to specific work environments. To address the perception of the effectiveness of servant leaders, the panel was asked

the following: From your experience and observation, what are the key words and phrases that describe (3) the work environments in which servant leaders are effective, and (4) the work environments in which servant leaders are ineffective?

Detailed instructions, along with responses to sample questions, were developed to clarify for the panelists the type of responses being requested. Through discussions with colleagues, the doctoral advisor, and other professionals, the questions were revised. For clarity, a definition of the key words was included with each question. As a field test, the instructions, sample responses, and questions were then mailed to a group of six professionals who were familiar with servant leadership. The final revision of the instrument was then presented to the doctoral committee (see Appendix A).

Administration of Delphi I

Within one week after the twenty-eight experts agreed to participate, the Delphi I instrument - - along with a letter of explanation, an informed consent form, and a self-addressed stamped envelope - - was mailed to each panelist. To identify which panelists had responded, all pages of the instrument and the return envelopes were marked with a number code. Panelists were asked to return their responses within a two-week period. On the sixth day after the Delphi I instrument was mailed, all panelists whose responses had not yet been received, were contacted by telephone, fax, or email. For those whose instrument had not been received two days after the deadline, follow-up contact was made until all were returned.

Analysis of the Delphi I Returns

Each panelist was asked to answer the four research questions by listing key words or phrases as descriptors. The researcher recorded individual responses to each question and the identifying number code of the panelist on color-coded index cards. The response cards were then sorted, with similar responses being grouped

together. When all responses were received, they were compiled under the appropriate research question. All responses were reviewed to avoid redundancy, careless or incomplete responses, and those caused by misinterpretation of the instructions.

Development of Delphi II

The compiled responses from the Delphi I instrument were randomly listed under the appropriate question, and a four-point rating scale was added to each item. For the first two questions on the characteristics and behaviors of servant leaders, the rating scale was as follows: 1= a poor descriptor, 2 = a fair descriptor, 3 = a good descriptor, and 4 = an excellent descriptor. Sixty items were listed in Question 1 and organized under the two headings of (1) "A servant leader is..." and (2) "A servant leader has…." For Question 2, the 65 compiled items were organized under the heading of "A servant leader is…."

For Questions 3 and 4, focusing on the work environments of servant leaders, the four-point rating scale was as follows: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree. The 38 compiled items for Question 3 were organized under the single heading of "A work environment which has…." An additional item, Number 39, was added to represent responses from two panelists who felt servant leaders can be effective in any work environment. For the 37 items compiled from responses to Question 4, the headings were (1) "A work environment which has…" and (2) A work environment which is…." The items derived from the compiled responses of Delphi I and listed under the appropriate headings, along with the accompanying scale, became the Delphi II instrument (see Appendix B).

Administration of Delphi II

The Delphi II instrument was mailed to 26 of the 28 panel members. At the request of two panelists, the Delphi II instrument was faxed to their work sites.

The faxes were sent on the same day the Delphi II instrument was mailed to other panelists. On the day the instrument was mailed or faxed, an email message was sent to notify each panelist. Panelists were asked to respond within a two-week period. Contact by telephone, fax, or email was made with all panelists whose responses had not been received on the sixth day after the Delphi II instrument was sent. For each panelist whose instrument had not been received two days after the deadline for the second round, a telephone call, fax, or email message served as follow up. Contact with panelists continued until all instruments were returned.

A letter with the description of the purpose and requirements of the second-round instrument was sent to each panelist, along with the Delphi II instrument and a return self-addressed envelope. Both the instrument and the return envelope were identifiable by the number code assigned to the panelist. For each section on the instrument, the panelists were asked to respond to each item using the accompanying scale. For the first two sections, the responses were based on the quality of the characteristics and behaviors as descriptors that distinguish servant leaders. For the last two sections, the responses were based on the strength of agreement to the descriptors for effective and ineffective work environments for servant leaders.

<center>Analysis of Delphi II Returns</center>

Using SPSS 8.0, the responses of individuals to each item were recorded under the appropriate question. Recorded data included the number code for each panelist, a number identifying the professional group each panelist represented, and the individual response to each item on the instrument.

After all responses were received, the mean and standard deviation were calculated for each item. The mean identified the relative position or average of the panelists' responses, and the standard deviation reflected the distribution of responses along the continuum. Along with the mean and standard deviation, the

percentage of responses from the two most favorable categories on the scale was calculated. For the first two questions the calculated percentage represented participants who rated each characteristic or behavior as "a good descriptor" or "an excellent descriptor." For the last two questions the percentage represented participants who chose "agree" or "strongly agree" to each characteristic of the work environment that was considered effective or ineffective. Items that were not rated by 80% of the panelists in the two most favorable categories of the scale were removed from further consideration.

Development of Delphi III

The development of the Delphi III instrument was based on the responses received on the Delphi II. The mean, standard deviation, and the percentage of responses in the two most favorable categories of the scale were reported to all panelists on the Delphi III instrument. Additionally, the third-round instrument was designed to report to each panelist his or her individual rating for each of the characteristics, behaviors, and work environments. All items from the Delphi II were included on the Delphi III instrument. Items that did not meet the 80% criterion were deleted from further consideration. Deleted items and the accompanying scale were shown with a line drawn through them. The mean, standard deviation, individual rating, and the percentage of responses in the two most favorable categories of the scale were reported for deleted items. The same four-point Likert that was used on the Delphi II became a part of the Delphi III instrument (see Appendix C).

Administration of Delphi III

The Delphi III instrument was mailed or faxed to each expert. On the same day the instrument was mailed or faxed, an email message was sent to notify the panelists of the impending arrival. On the sixth day after the Delphi III instrument was mailed or faxed, any panelist who had not responded was contacted by

telephone, fax, or email. When an instrument had not been received two days after the deadline, the panelist was contacted again. Contact with panelists continued until all instruments were returned.

A letter with a description of the requirements of the third-round instrument was sent to each panelist, along with the Delphi III instrument and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. The instrument and the return envelope were marked with the identifying number code. Using the four-point scale from the Delphi II instrument, panelists were asked to rate only the characteristics, behaviors, and work environments that were not crossed out. In responding to the Delphi III, panelists were asked to review individual responses to each item and the statistical information calculated from the second round instrument. In the previous rounds, some panelists had provided explanations as to why their opinion differed from the majority. Panelists who expressed opinions different from the group but had not previously given an explanation were contacted by telephone or email, and the explanations were recorded.

<u>Analysis of Delphi III Returns</u>

Individual responses for each item under each of the four research questions were recorded in an SPSS 8.0 data spreadsheet. Recorded data included the number assigned to each panelist, a number identifying the professional group the panelist represented, and the individual response to each item on the instrument.

After all 28 instruments were returned, the mean, standard deviation, and percentage of respondents rating each item on the two most favorable points of the scale were calculated.   The mean indicated the average of the responses to each item and the standard deviation reflected the distribution of responses along the continuum. The characteristics, behaviors, and work environments that were rated by less than 80% of the panelists in the two most favorable categories of the rating scale were deleted. For any items that panelists did not rate as a good descriptor or

view as important, a written explanation was provided or telephone contact was made and explanations recorded. The characteristics and behaviors of servant leaders, as agreed upon by the panel, were compiled into a comprehensive list of observable traits that distinguish servant leaders.   Specific work environments in which servant leaders were perceived as either effective or ineffective were compiled to give a more complete picture of leaders who are servants first.

Summary of Chapter III

Chapter III was a discussion of the research design and the methodology of the study.   It included justification for use of the Delphi technique and the procedures used in the important process of recruiting a panel. The development and administration of each of the three Delphi instruments was reported. The analysis of returns from each round was discussed.

A three-round Delphi technique was used to conduct the study. A panel of experts was contacted, and four members from each of seven identified groups were selected. The panel included appointed and elected officials, authors in the field, business leaders, clergy, educators, leaders of associations, and leaders of volunteer organizations. The list of prospective panelists was compiled from a review of the literature and from recommendations received during interviews with other panelists.   From a pool of five to seven names, four panelists were contacted for each group and asked to serve as participants in the study.

The first round Delphi instrument was open-ended. By adding a four-point scale to the compiled responses from the first round, opinions of panel members were collected in the second round.   Delphi III was a revision of Delphi II, and panelists were again asked to respond using a four-point scale. In the third round, statistical information calculated from the second round was reported to each panel member. The results of each Delphi round were reviewed and compiled by the researcher. After analyzing the responses from the third round, the characteristics,

behaviors, and effective work environments, as agreed upon by the panel of experts, were organized to create a more complete picture of those traits that distinguish a servant leader.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Using a three-round Delphi Technique, the goal of this study was to identify the observable characteristics, behaviors, and effective work environments of servant leaders.   A panel of 28 experts participated in each of the three rounds of the study. In selecting the panel, attention was given to geographical location, gender, and ethnic background. Panel members were selected to achieve balance between practitioners and theorists in the field of servant leadership. The results of the study are presented here.

Delphi I

The Delphi I was an open-ended instrument based on the research questions that allowed the panel, familiar with servant leadership, to share their knowledge. The first two questions on the instrument were developed to elicit responses that would identify the specific characteristics and behaviors of these leaders: From your experience and observation, what are the key words or phrases that describe (1) the characteristics that distinguish servant leaders and (2) the behaviors that distinguish servant leaders?

Responses for the first round were received from each of the 28 panelists. Responses from each panelist ranged in number from four to 25 for each question. Some participants expressed difficulty in answering the questions, and two apologized for the inadequacy of their responses. Panelists who were identified by others as practitioners of the servant leader philosophy seemed to have more difficulty determining characteristics and behaviors than panelists who were specifically trained or who taught or wrote about servant leadership. Those who practiced the concept of servant leadership seemed to have difficulty expressing the traits that set them apart from others in their field.

Characteristics of Servant Leaders

Panelists produced 205 characteristics of servant leaders. When similar responses were grouped and irrelevant responses eliminated, 60 characteristics of servant leaders were identified (see Table 1). Some characteristics were identified by several panelists, while other characteristics were listed only once.

Greenleaf (1977) wrote that the true test of servant leadership is that those being served will grow as persons. They will become healthier and more autonomous, and society as a whole will benefit. The panel of experts demonstrated the respect servant leaders have for other people when 46% of the 28 panel members identified "a belief in the goodness of individuals" as a distinguishing characteristic. With 36% of the panel identifying "humble" as a characteristic, responses seemed to coincide with Greenleaf's emphasis on the idea of the leader as a servant.

Many of the characteristics, which were identified by several members of the panel, were personal traits of servant leaders. Some of the observed personal qualities included empathy, integrity, honesty, selflessness, trustworthiness, compassion, and an attitude of caring. Other characteristics identified by more than one panel member included traits that depicted the relational characteristics of servant leaders. Servant leaders are described as leaders who do not lead alone but work with others to accomplish goals. Some of the identified relational characteristics included an "openness to others," "effective communication," "collaborative planning," and "collaborative decision making." Three panel members identified the characteristic of "an ethic of service." While the characteristic was listed by more than one panelist, it would seem to be an important and more recognized characteristic of servant leaders than the responses indicated. When identifying the observable, distinguishing characteristics of servant leaders in round one, the responses of panel members included personal

Table 1

Results of Delphi I: Characteristics of Servant Leaders

Characteristics	No. of responses
A belief in the goodness of individuals	13
Humble	10
Empathy	9
Integrity	9
Open to others	9
Selfless	9
Trustworthy	9
Caring	8
A collaborative planner	7
Principle-centered	7
Zeal	6
An effective communicator	6
A collaborative decision-maker	5
A sincere desire to make a difference	5
Compassion	5
A view of the organization as a part of a larger community	5
Spiritual	4
Honest	4
Value-driven	4
Joyful in his or her work	3
Authentic	3
Creative	3
Persistent	3
A feeling of being "called" to the work	3
A sense of humor	3
Insight	3
Self-confidence	3
An ethic of service	3
Respected by peers	2
Courageous enough to tell the truth	2
Knowledgeable	2
Task-oriented	2
A high tolerance for ambiguity	2
A view of self as a part of the whole organization	2
An approachable demeanor	2
A positive outlook	2
Optimistic about people	2
A passion for learning	2
Playful	1
Content in his or her work	1

Table 1 (continued)

Results of Delphi I: Characteristics of Servant Leaders

Characteristics	No. of responses
Accountable to others	1
A win-win thinker	1
Optimistic about outcomes	1
Vulnerable to others	1
Emotionally intelligent	1
Steadfast	1
Prophetic	1
Generous	1
A forceful leader	1
Proactive	1
Curious	1
Patient	1
Energetic	1
Foresight	1
A presence that calms	1
A passion for the goals of the organization	1
A pleasant personality	1
A strong work ethic	1
A sense of the sacredness of the physical world	1

traits and traits that demonstrated how servant leaders work with those being served.

<center>Behaviors of Servant Leaders</center>

Through Question 2 on the Delphi I instrument, panelists were asked to identify observable, distinguishing behaviors of servant leaders. Panelists provided 165 responses representing 65 behaviors. Of the 65 behaviors, 31 were identified by more than one member of the panel of experts. The remaining 34 behaviors were listed by only one of the 28 panelists. The number of responses per behavior ranged from one to 12 (see Table 2).

The most frequent response of "listens respectfully" was identified by 43% of the panelists. Larry Spears (1998), director of the Greenleaf Center in Indianapolis, Indiana, in summarizing characteristics of servant leaders from the writings of Robert K. Greenleaf, identified listening as the first of ten important traits found in the leadership practices of servant leaders. The high number of panelists who included listening as an observable behavior indicated that not only in theory, but also in practice, the ability to quiet oneself and listen receptively is a key behavior in the practice of servant leadership.

As in the identification of characteristics, the panelists placed emphasis on how the leader behaves toward others. "Makes decisions with participation from others" and "communicates vision to everyone involved" were identified as behaviors by 29% and 18% of the panelists, respectively. Several panelists implied, as they did with some of the characteristics, that servant leaders involve others when carrying out their leadership role. Other observed behaviors that demonstrated the attitude of servant leaders towards those being led included, "provides training to help others succeed," "encourages people," and "motivates people." "Models a lifestyle of service" was included in 14% of the responses from

Table 2

Results of Delphi I: Behaviors of Servant Leaders

Behaviors	No. of responses
Listens respectfully	12
Builds community	9
Makes decisions with participation from others	8
Mediates conflict	6
Communicates vision to everyone involved	6
Leads by example	5
Encourages people	5
Values differences	5
Provides training to help others succeed	4
Takes risks to get results	4
Builds relationships	4
Models a lifestyle of service	4
Uses persuasion rather than coercion	3
Motivates people	3
Subordinates his or her own interests to the common good	3
Wisely utilizes skills of others	3
Promotes cooperation	3
Empowers people	3
Shares recognition with entire group	3
Communicates persuasively	3
Views conflict as an opportunity for growth	2
Looks for solutions rather than placing blame	2
Seeks opportunities to support others	2
Sets high but realistic goals for staff	2
Admits personal mistakes	2
Builds team spirit	2
Delegates responsibility	2
Communicates frequently	2
Takes joy in the success of others	2
Recognizes the contribution of others	2
Goes to "bat" for individuals experiencing difficulties	2
Respects the uniqueness of those being served	1
Teaches those being served	1
Allows time for growth of individuals	1
Allows time for growth of organization	1
Respects the giftedness of those being served	1
Remains calm in difficult situations	1
Lets go of what doesn't work	1
Shares possessions freely	1
Inspires calm in others	1

(table continues)

Table 2 (continued)

Results of Delphi I: Behaviors of Servant Leaders

Behaviors	No. of responses
Assists in developing a group mission	1
Challenges others to do their best	1
Asks about individuals' families	1
Encourages risk-taking in others	1
Creates "win-win" scenarios	1
Creates a certain level of disequilibrium	1
Hires superior staff	1
Provides mentorships	1
Accepts criticism	1
Demonstrates firmness when necessary	1
Maintains high ethical standards	1
Challenges the status quo	1
Clarifies goals	1
Makes decisions boldly	1
Treats people with dignity	1
Thinks independently	1
Communicates with excitement	1
Envisions the future	1
Holds individuals accountable	1
Mobilizes hope	1
Spends time with individuals	1
Liberates people	1
Values teamwork and individual initiative simultaneously	1
Seeks the advice of experts	1
Juggles a variety of tasks	1

panelists. Through the identification of behaviors, panelists emphasized the importance of people and the leader's relationship with them. Consistent with Greenleaf's (1977) theory, panelists indicated that the focus on those being served is often the distinguishing attribute of servant leaders.

The last two questions on the Delphi I instrument were constructed to determine the effectiveness of servant leaders in specific work environments. Panelists were asked the following: From your experience and observation, what are the key words and phrases that describe (3) the work environments in which servant leaders are <u>effective</u> and (4) the work environments in which servant leaders are <u>ineffective</u>? These last two questions elicited fewer responses and a greater number of irrelevant responses. Though examples of effective and ineffective work environments were sent with the first round instrument, the questions on work environments were more frequently misinterpreted than the questions on characteristics and behaviors.

<u>Effective Work Environments of Servant Leaders</u>

The 145 responses on effective work environments were compiled into 39 items with 19 of the work environments being identified by more than one panelist (see Table 3). The greatest number of panelists identified "an atmosphere fostering the growth of individuals" as an environment where servant leaders are effective. This idea was listed by 54% of the panelists. This coincides directly with Greenleaf's (1977) theory that the true test of servant leadership is that those being served grow as persons. Responses to Question 3 were consistent with the idea of servant leaders being concerned with the people they serve. An item that reflected this same focus on people was "an atmosphere that emphasizes people rather than profit."

Table 3

Results of Delphi I: Effective Work Environments of Servant Leaders

Effective work environment	No. of responses
An atmosphere fostering the growth of individuals	15
A staff with a team mentality	8
Sufficient financial resources	6
An atmosphere that encourages risk-taking	6
An atmosphere of mutual trust among stakeholders	5
A group with commitment to a broad mission	5
Open communication	5
An atmosphere where people are valued	4
A supportive governing board	3
An emphasis on a balanced lifestyle for employees	3
Freedom for the leader to make decisions with the group	3
A group that honors truth telling	2
An atmosphere where diversity is valued	2
Inclusive work teams	2
An emphasis on values	2
An atmosphere where learning is encouraged	2
A group conscious of its impact on the larger community	2
An atmosphere that emphasizes people rather than profit	2
A servant leader can be effective in any work environment	2
A view of the leader as primus inter pares: first amongst equals	1
An organization that is nonprofit	1
An atmosphere where humor is embraced	1
Democratic decision-making	1
Sufficient human resources	1
An atmosphere free of "belly-aching"	1
A supportive community	1
Attractive work space	1
A need for task clarification	1
Input from the leader in selecting group members	1
360 degree performance evaluations	1
A group that shares a sense of hope	1
An atmosphere that embraces the importance of faith	1
An emphasis on ecological concerns	1
Constituents appreciative of the sacrifice of the leader	1
Equitably shared profits	1
Minimum disparity in salary range	1
A history of good relationships with partner agencies	1
Devoted followers	1
A need for resolution of conflict	1

Other items that were identified by more than one panelist included work environments where the character traits identified in Question 1 were emphasized. These environments included conditions where truth telling, values, learning, and inclusiveness were important. Panelists seemed to believe that servant leaders are effective in environments where their own distinguishing traits are held in high regard.

Two of the panelists had difficulty with the questions on work environments because they believed that servant leaders can be effective in any environment. One of the two panelists listed several environments where servant leaders are effective but did not answer the question on work environments in which servant leaders are ineffective. The other stated emphatically, "I don't agree with the underlying assumption of Questions 3 & 4. Obviously certain work environments can hinder effectiveness (goal achievement) and would hinder regardless of the leadership applied. I don't think that there are work environments that would render servant leadership ineffective."

<div align="center">Ineffective Work Environments of Servant Leaders</div>

With a total of 122 responses, the question on ineffective work environments brought fewer responses than the question on effective work environments. When responses were compiled, 37 ineffective work environments of servant leaders were identified (see Table 4). Of the 37 work environments, 20 were identified by more than one panel member. While some of the servant leaders on the panel were employed in environments where profit was important, 32% of the panelists identified an ineffective work environment for servant leaders as one that is profit-driven.

The focus on people found in responses to the first three questions was repeated in Question 4. Panelists, in identifying ineffective work environments for servant leaders, listed environments where there were negative attitudes toward

Table 4

Results of Delphi I: Ineffective Work Environments of Servant Leaders

Ineffective work environment	No. of responses
Profit-driven	9
A staff that is fearful of authority	8
Hierarchical	6
Centralized power in a few individuals	5
A focus on rules	5
Rigid	4
Top-down decision-making	4
Extreme conflict	3
Excessive internal competition	3
Strong prejudices	3
Insufficient resources	3
Exploitive of people	3
Rapid turnover of staff	2
Narrow strictures on the leader	2
Secretive cultures which promote manipulation	2
A lack of diversity	2
Constant complaining among colleagues	2
Individual agendas taking precedence over group goals	2
A governing board that interferes with daily operations	2
Micromanaged	2
Authoritarian	1
Lacking in a sense of community	1
Autocratic	1
A perception of followers as inferior	1
Autonomous individuals	1
An apathetic community	1
Poor accountabilities	1
A common practice of deceit	1
No clear values	1
No moral standards	1
Performance evaluations by the boss only	1
No guiding operational principles	1
Uncontrolled rapid growth	1
No plan for future needs	1
Poorly chosen goals	1
A closed system based on elitism	1
Unclear job descriptions	1

people.   Ineffective work environments included conditions such as "extreme conflict," "exploitive of people," and the presence of "strong prejudices." In listing key descriptors and phrases for work environments where servant leaders were ineffective, some panelists answered by giving the negative to their responses to Question 3. Other panelists responded to Question 3 with several key descriptors and phrases but had more difficulty in responding to Question 4. Responses seemed to indicate that panelists were able to readily identify work environments that enhanced the effectiveness of servant leaders, but were less able to identify work environments where servant leaders were rendered ineffective.

Delphi II

The Delphi II instrument was developed from the compiled responses of the Delphi I. The characteristics, behaviors, and work environments were randomly listed under the corresponding question, and a four-point Likert scale was added to each item. For the first two questions on the identification of characteristics and behaviors of servant leaders, the rating scale was as follows: 1 = a poor descriptor, 2 = a fair descriptor, 3 = a good descriptor, and 4 = an excellent descriptor. All 28 of the panelists responded to the Delphi II instrument.

Characteristics of Servant Leaders

Panelists were asked to use the rating scale to evaluate the items as descriptors of the characteristics of servant leaders. All 28 panelists rated 14 of the 60 characteristics (see Table 5). Twenty-six of the panelists rated four of the characteristics, and 27 panelists rated all the others. One member of the panel chose to rate only those characteristics that he viewed as important. In a telephone conversation he offered no further comments as to why he responded to only a few of the items.

Table 5

Results of Delphi II: Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages of the Panelists Rating the Items as Good or Excellent Descriptors of the Characteristics of Servant Leaders

Characteristics	N	M[a]	SD	%[b]
1. Joyful in his or her work	27	3.07	.83	67.9
2. An effective communicator	27	3.33	.68	89.3
3. A collaborative decision maker	27	3.52	.70	85.7
4. A collaborative planner	27	3.37	.69	85.7
5. Playful	27	2.07	.83	28.6
6. Trustworthy	27	3.93	.27	96.4
7. Content in his or her work	27	2.81	.83	67.9
8. Respected by peers	27	3.30	.78	78.6
9. Spiritual	28	3.36	.68	89.3
10. Accountable to others	27	3.48	.51	96.4
11. A win-win thinker	26	3.54	.58	89.3
12. Optimistic about people	26	3.69	.55	89.3
13. Optimistic about outcomes	27	3.30	.61	89.3
14. Vulnerable to others	28	2.96	1.04	75.0
15. Courageous enough to tell the truth	27	3.81	.40	96.4
16. Emotionally intelligent	26	3.42	.70	82.1
17. Authentic	28	3.79	.50	96.4
18. Steadfast	27	3.22	.64	85.7
19. Knowledgeable	27	3.19	.56	89.3
20. Prophetic	27	2.63	.88	60.7
21. Open to others	27	3.70	.54	96.4
22. Generous	27	3.41	.57	92.9
23. Honest	27	3.85	.36	96.4
24. Selfless	27	3.59	.64	89.3
25. A forceful leader	27	2.48	1.01	53.6
26. Task-oriented	27	2.52	1.01	57.1
27. Caring	27	3.67	.55	92.9
28. Value-driven	27	3.56	.70	92.9
29. Principle-centered	27	3.70	.54	92.9
30. Proactive	27	3.37	.63	89.3
31. Creative	27	2.89	.80	67.9
32. Curious	28	2.79	.83	57.1
33. Humble	28	3.43	.69	92.9
34. Persistent	27	3.11	.75	75.0
35. Patient	27	3.22	.75	85.7
36. Energetic	28	3.14	.93	64.3
37. Empathy	28	3.71	.46	100.0
38. A feeling of being "called" to the work	27	3.59	.50	96.4
39. Foresight	27	3.15	.53	89.3
40. A presence that calms	27	3.07	.92	75.0

(table continues)

Table 5 (continued)

Results of Delphi II: Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages of the Panelists Rating the Items as Good or Excellent Descriptors of the Characteristics of Servant Leaders

Characteristics	N	M[a]	SD	%[b]
41. A sense of humor	28	3.00	.77	75.0
42. A passion for the goals of the organization	27	3.56	.58	92.9
43. A high tolerance for ambiguity	27	3.11	.89	78.6
44. A belief in the goodness of individuals	27	3.48	.64	89.3
45. A strong personal testimony to share	27	2.74	.86	67.9
46. A sincere desire to make a difference	27	3.52	.64	85.7
47. A view of self as a part of the whole organization	26	3.46	.65	89.3
48. An approachable demeanor	27	3.52	.58	96.4
49. A sense of the sacredness of the physical world	28	2.82	1.02	53.6
50. A pleasant personality	27	2.85	.82	67.9
51. A positive outlook	27	3.48	.64	89.3
52. A strong work ethic	27	3.26	.71	89.3
53. Insight	27	3.30	.61	89.3
54. An ethic of service	28	3.86	.36	100.0
55. Compassion	28	3.89	.31	100.0
56. Integrity	28	3.89	.31	100.0
57. Zeal	27	3.15	.77	82.1
58. Self-confidence	27	3.37	.49	96.4
59. A passion for learning	28	3.57	.57	96.4
60. A view of the organization as a part of a larger community	28	3.68	.55	96.4

_____

[a] The rating scale was 1 = a poor descriptor, 2 = a fair descriptor, 3 = a good descriptor, and 4 = an excellent descriptor.
[b] Percentage of responses in the two most favorable categories of the rating scale (a good descriptor or an excellent descriptor).

The mean for each of the 60 characteristics of servant leaders ranged from 2.07 to 3.93.   Twenty or one-third of the items had a mean of more than 3.50. The standard deviation ranged from .27 for the characteristic of "trustworthy " to 1.04 for the characteristic of being "vulnerable to others." The personal character traits of trustworthiness, honesty, empathy, compassion, and integrity all had a high mean and a low standard deviation indicating that the panel of experts agreed on these as characteristics of servant leaders. Each of these five personal traits was rated by all panelists in the two most favorable categories of the Likert scale. Another characteristic that was rated by all panelists in the top two categories was "an ethic of service." On the Delphi I, only two panel members identified this characteristic. But, when presented with the item and asked to rate "an ethic of service" as a characteristic of servant leaders, all panelists viewed it as essential.

Characteristics were considered to be consensually agreed upon when 80% or more of the panel members rated the characteristic in the two most favorable categories of the scale. While the characteristic of "being 'called' to the work" received favorable responses from all responding panelists, other items that could be interpreted as having a religious connotation did not meet the 80% criterion. These characteristics included "prophetic" and "a strong personal testimony to share." Neither were the characteristics of playful, creative, curious, energetic, and having a sense of humor viewed by panelists as distinguishing traits of servant leaders. While servant leaders may possess these characteristics, the panel of experts did not view such leaders as imaginative or fanciful in their leadership.

Item 26, "task-oriented," with a standard deviation of 1.01, showed a wide variation in responses among the panelists. This characteristic seemed to be rated with the idea that task-oriented was in opposition to people-oriented leadership. Possibly because servant leaders are identified so strongly with relating to the

people who are served, many panelists rated this item within the lower two categories of the rating scale.

The researcher noted earlier that servant leaders are not viewed as being respected by their peers. In the original discussions leading to this study of servant leaders, many perceived servant leaders to be weak and often ineffective. In a study on elementary school principals as servant leaders (Knicker, 1999), the subjects of the study shared that they were sometimes viewed by those they tried hardest to serve as being weak and indecisive. The misconceptions that often accompany the role of servant leader may be the same misconceptions that led only 78% of panel members to rate "respected by peers" as a good descriptor of servant leaders. Responses may indicate that the servant leaders participating in this study feel a lack of respect from peers in their own environment.

<div align="center">Behaviors of Servant Leaders</div>

Question 2 of the Delphi II instrument was designed to identify observable behaviors that distinguish servant leaders. Of the 65 identified behaviors in Question 2, eight were rated by 28 of the panelists. One panelist chose to respond to only a few items. The mean for each of the behaviors ranged from 2.38 to 3.89 (see Table 6). The standard deviation ranged from .32 for the behavior of "models a lifestyle of service" to 1.00 for "asks about individuals' families."

Many of the behaviors rated by each respondent in the two most favorable categories of the rating scale reflected the focus of servant leaders on others. Items with high ratings by panelists included the behaviors of "takes joy in the success of others," "recognizes the contributions of others," "encourages people," and "promotes cooperation." While communication seems an essential skill for servant leaders, the behaviors of "communicates with excitement" and "communicates vision to everyone involved" were not agreed upon by 80% of the panelists. Another item involving communication skills, "communicates persuasively," did

Table 6

Results of Delphi II: Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages of the Panelists Rating the Items as Good or Excellent Descriptors of the Behaviors of Servant Leaders

Behaviors	N	M^a	SD	$\%^b$
1. Respects the uniqueness of those being served	28	3.79	.42	100.0
2. Motivates people	27	3.44	.64	89.3
3. Teaches those being served	27	3.44	.64	89.3
4. Listens respectfully	28	3.82	.48	96.4
5. Allows time for growth of individuals	27	3.48	.64	89.3
6. Allows time for growth of the organization	27	3.33	.48	96.4
7. Admits personal mistakes	28	3.64	.68	89.3
8. Takes risks to get results	27	3.26	.66	85.7
9. Respects the giftedness of those being served	28	3.64	.62	92.9
10. Remains calm in difficult situations	27	3.22	.85	78.6
11. Inspires calm in others	27	3.19	.68	82.1
12. Lets go of what doesn't work	27	3.15	.77	75.0
13. Shares possessions freely	27	3.00	.83	71.4
14. Assists in developing a group mission	27	3.30	.54	92.9
15. Challenges others to do their best	27	3.52	.70	85.7
16. Asks about individuals' families	27	2.81	1.00	67.9
17. Encourages risk-taking in others	27	2.93	.78	71.4
18. Creates "win-win" scenarios	27	3.33	.83	82.1
19. Leads by example	27	3.85	.36	96.4
20. Sets high but realistic goals for staff	27	3.15	.86	75.0
21. Creates a certain level of disequilibrium	26	2.38	.85	42.9
22. Builds relationships	27	3.70	.47	96.4
23. Models a lifestyle of service	27	3.89	.32	96.4
24. Seeks opportunities to support others	27	3.70	.47	96.4
25. Hires superior staff	27	2.85	.95	67.9
26. Provides mentorships	25	3.40	.58	85.7
27. Accepts criticism	26	3.50	.65	85.7
28. Uses persuasion rather than coercion	27	3.74	.53	92.9
29. Looks for solutions rather than placing blame	27	3.74	.53	89.3
30. Demonstrates firmness when necessary	26	3.35	.75	78.6
31. Maintains high ethical standards	27	3.74	.45	96.4
32. Views conflict as an opportunity for growth	27	3.30	.54	92.9
33. Subordinates his or her own interests to the common good	28	3.64	.56	96.4
34. Wisely utilizes skills of others	27	3.52	.58	92.9
35. Challenges the status quo	27	3.11	.89	78.6
36. Builds community	28	3.82	.39	100.0
37. Builds team spirit	27	3.59	.57	92.9
38. Clarifies goals	27	3.26	.86	78.6
39. Makes decisions boldly	26	2.96	.87	75.0
40. Delegates responsibility	27	3.41	.80	78.6

(table continues)

Table 6 (continued)

Results of Delphi II: Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages of the Panelists Rating the Items as Good or Excellent Descriptors of the Behaviors of Servant Leaders

Behaviors	N	M[a]	SD	%[b]
41. Treats people with dignity	27	3.81	.48	92.9
42. Thinks independently	27	3.07	.83	75.0
43. Communicates frequently	27	3.48	.58	92.9
44. Communicates with excitement	27	2.81	.79	64.3
45. Communicates vision to everyone involved	27	3.41	.80	78.6
46. Mediates conflict	27	3.19	.62	85.7
47. Promotes cooperation	27	3.59	.50	96.4
48. Envisions the future	27	3.56	.70	85.7
49. Encourages people	27	3.85	.36	96.4
50. Holds individuals accountable	27	3.44	.64	89.3
51. Takes joy in the success of others	27	3.85	.36	96.4
52. Empowers people	26	3.73	.45	89.3
53. Values differences	28	3.71	.46	100.0
54. Recognizes the contributions of others	27	3.85	.36	96.4
55. Mobilizes hope	27	3.59	.57	92.9
56. Spends time with individuals	27	3.48	.58	92.9
57. Liberates people	25	3.48	.59	85.7
58. Goes "to bat" for individuals experiencing difficulties	27	3.30	.67	85.7
59. Provides training to help others succeed	27	3.44	.75	82.1
60. Shares recognition with the entire group	27	3.56	.58	92.9
61. Communicates persuasively	27	3.33	.68	85.7
62. Values teamwork and individual initiative simultaneously	27	3.70	.47	96.4
63. Seeks the advice of experts	28	3.32	.77	82.1
64. Juggles a variety of tasks	27	3.07	.83	75.0
65. Makes decisions with participation from others	27	3.56	.64	85.7

[a] The rating scale was 1 = a poor descriptor, 2 = a fair descriptor, 3 = a good descriptor, and 4 = an excellent descriptor.
[b] Percentage of responses in the two most favorable categories of the rating scale (good or excellent).

meet the 80% criterion. Persuasion is one of the ten characteristics of servant leaders identified by Larry Spears (1998) from the writings of Robert K. Greenleaf. The adverb "persuasively" may be what set this behavior apart from the other items related to communication skills.

The panelists agreed that the manner in which leaders conduct themselves in daily activities is a behavior that distinguishes servant leaders from other leaders in the same field. Rated by all responding panelists in the two most favorable categories of the rating scale are the behaviors of "leads by example" and "models a lifestyle of service." The ratings indicated that servant leaders demonstrate a daily lifestyle of service that in turn is a part of their unique leadership style.

Item 39, "makes decisions boldly," and Item 42, "thinks independently," received ratings across the rating scale but did not meet the 80% criterion. Some panelists seemed to believe that such behaviors indicated that servant leaders act without input from others. It follows that these behaviors were not rated by the panel of experts as distinguishing traits of servant leaders since a priority of the servant leadership philosophy is a focus on people, indicating a responsive and caring attitude toward those being served.

<div align="center">Effective Work Environments of Servant Leaders</div>

For Questions 3 and 4 on the effective work environments of servant leaders, the rating scale was as follows: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree. Thirty-nine work environments in which panelists viewed servant leaders as effective were compiled from the responses on the Delphi I. Five of the work environments were rated by all 28 panelists (see Table 7). The number of responses for other items on Question 3 of the Delphi II ranged from 24 to 27 per item.

Table 7

Results of Delphi II: Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages of the Panelists Rating the Items as Agree or Strongly Agree as Descriptors of Effective Work Environments of Servant Leaders

Effective work environments	N	M[a]	SD	%[b]
1. Devoted followers	26	3.00	.89	71.4
2. Sufficient financial resources	26	2.92	.74	71.4
3. A history of good relationships with partner agencies	26	3.12	.71	82.1
4. Minimum disparity	27	2.74	.90	57.1
5. Equitably shared profits	27	3.11	.85	75.0
6. Constituents appreciative of the sacrifice of the leader	25	3.04	.73	67.0
7. An emphasis on ecological concerns	27	2.74	.86	60.7
8. An atmosphere that encourages risk-taking	26	3.27	.53	89.3
9. An atmosphere that embraces the importance of faith	26	3.35	.75	78.6
10. A group that shares a sense of hope	25	3.76	.44	89.3
11. A staff with a team mentality	26	3.62	.50	92.9
12. A group with a commitment to a broad mission	26	3.62	.57	89.3
13. 360 degree performance evaluations	24	3.00	.83	64.3
14. Input from the leader in selecting the group members	26	3.04	.72	78.6
15. A need for task clarification	26	2.85	.78	57.1
16. Attractive work space	26	2.88	.77	67.9
17. A supportive community	26	3.58	.50	92.9
18. A supportive governing board	26	3.46	.51	92.9
19. An atmosphere free of "belly-aching"	26	3.19	.80	78.6
20. A need for resolution of conflict	26	3.23	.71	78.6
21. A group that honors truth telling	26	3.81	.40	92.9
22. An atmosphere where diversity is valued	27	3.85	.36	96.4
23. Sufficient human resources	26	3.35	.75	78.6
24. Open communication	27	3.78	.42	96.4
25. An atmosphere where people are valued	27	3.96	.19	96.4
26. Democratic decision making	26	3.23	.59	85.7
27. An atmosphere of mutual trust among stakeholders	27	3.78	.42	96.4
28. An emphasis on a balanced lifestyle for employees	25	3.32	.63	82.1
29. Inclusive work teams	27	3.44	.51	96.4
30. An atmosphere where learning is encouraged	28	3.82	.39	100.0
31. An atmosphere fostering the growth of individuals	28	3.89	.31	100.0
32. An atmosphere where humor is embraced	28	3.46	.51	100.0
33. An organization that is nonprofit	26	2.42	.95	46.4
34. An emphasis on values	28	3.75	.52	96.4
35. A group conscious of its impact on the larger community	28	3.75	.52	96.4
36. Freedom for the leader to make decisions with the group	27	3.56	.51	96.4
37. An atmosphere that emphasizes people rather than profit	26	3.62	.50	92.9
38. The leader as primus inter pares: first amongst equals	27	3.19	.79	82.1
39. Any work environment	26	2.96	1.00	60.7

[a] The rating scale was 1 =strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree.
[b] Percentage of responses in the two most favorable categories of the rating scale (agree or strongly agree).

The means for effective work environments of servant leaders ranged from 2.42 to 3.96. The highest means were associated with work environments in which people and their needs were perceived as important. The two items with the highest mean score and the lowest standard deviations included "an atmosphere where people are valued" and "an atmosphere fostering the growth of individuals." The ratings on the first two questions of the Delphi II demonstrated that servant leaders value people. The ratings from Question 3 implied that servant leaders are effective in work environments where values similar to their own are a priority.

Standard deviations for effective work environments ranged from .19 to 1.00. The item that received the greatest variance in ratings was the statement, "a servant leader is effective in any environment." While some panel members felt strongly that this statement was accurate, only 60% of the respondents rated the item in the two most favorable categories of the rating scale.

Panelists agreed that it is important to the effectiveness of servant leaders to foster "an atmosphere that emphasizes people rather than profit." However, less than 50% of the panel agreed that "an organization that is nonprofit" is an effective work environment specific to servant leaders. The responses of panelists indicated that servant leaders can be effective in the business arena, but people rather than profit are the first priority of such leaders.

In rating the characteristics of servant leaders, having "a sense of humor" did not meet the 80% criterion. Although panelists did not rate this as a distinguishing characteristic, a work environment "where humor is embraced" was rated in the two most favorable categories by 100% of the respondents. Servant leaders are not distinguished from other leaders by their sense of humor, but an atmosphere that embraces humor is a work environment in which servant leaders are effective.

Some respondents from the Delphi I identified conditions that enhance the effectiveness of any leader. On the Delphi II the panel of experts did not agree

upon "attractive work space," "sufficient financial resources," and "sufficient human resources." Environments that placed value on truth telling, diversity, communication, and learning were rated by at least 92% of the panel of experts as environments that contribute to the effectiveness of servant leaders. The results from Question 3 on the Delphi II indicated that panelists were discerning in their ratings. They did not reach consensus on work environments that enhance the success of leaders in general, but identified work environments that were specific to the effectiveness of servant leaders.

<center>Ineffective Work Environments of Servant Leaders</center>

Question 4 asked panelists to rate work environments in which servant leaders are ineffective. This last question elicited the greatest number of written comments from panel members. Two panelists did not agree with the premise of the question so did not respond. One wrote, "I struggle with the question." Others rated the items but added qualifying statements such as the one received from a business leader: "Having agreed with most of these environment descriptors in which a servant leader is ineffective, I believe a servant leader can change the environment." An elected official agreed by stating, "I agree with all but feel a good leader can overcome much."

For several, the rating of the items to determine ineffective work environments brought discomfort. One leader of an association wrote, "I am uncomfortable with these questions. I believe that a servant leader is needed in difficult environments such as these. I am answering them with the following assumption: The environment is set and the servant leader does not have the power or authority to change it." Another panelist responded to the question with "I found the phrase 'is ineffective' too defining and narrow for evaluation. I believe a servant leader can have some level of effectiveness in any situation."

While 28 panelists responded to the Delphi II instrument, the greatest number of responses to any item on Question 4 was 26 (see Table 8). The means for work environments in which servant leaders are ineffective ranged from 2.62 to 3.58. The standard deviations ranged from .66 to .95 indicating that for every item there was a wide range of ratings. Only four work environments from the 37 items were rated by more than 80% of the panelists as work environments in which servant leaders are ineffective. One expert, struggling to rate the items, wrote, "I tried to indicate that it is easier in some (environments) but even then servant leadership is probably more essential in difficult environments."

Delphi III

On the Delphi III instrument the mean, the standard deviation, the percentage of favorable responses, and the individual rating of the panelist from the Delphi II were reported for each item. Using the rating scale from the Delphi II instrument, panelists were asked to rate only those items that met the 80% criterion in the previous round. The items that did not meet the criterion were shown on the Delphi III instrument with a line drawn through them. All 28 panelists responded to the Delphi III.

Characteristics of Servant Leaders

In Question 1 panelists were asked to rate characteristics that distinguish servant leaders. Of the 60 characteristics identified from the Delphi I, 42 characteristics were rated by at least 80% of the panelists in the two most favorable categories of the rating scale on the Delphi II. When results of the Delphi II were presented to panelists, two of the 42 remaining characteristics were rated by fewer than 80% of the panelists as being distinguishing characteristics of servant leaders (see Table 9). Panelists did not reach consensus on servant leaders as being "patient," and the characteristic of "zeal" achieved only 75% of the favorable ratings.

Table 8

Results of Delphi II: Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages of the Panelists Rating the Items as Agree or Strongly Agree as Descriptors of Ineffective Work Environments of Servant Leaders

Ineffective work environments	N	M[a]	SD	%[b]
1. Extreme conflict	24	2.92	.88	57.1
2. Excessive internal competition	25	3.00	.65	71.4
3. Unclear job descriptions	25	2.80	.87	53.6
4. Top down decision making	25	3.12	.73	78.6
5. Centralized power in a few individuals	25	3.32	.75	75.0
6. Rapid turnover of staff	25	2.96	.73	64.3
7. A closed system based on elitism	26	3.42	.86	78.6
8. Strong prejudices	25	3.40	.87	75.0
9. Poorly chosen goals	25	3.04	.93	67.9
10. No plan for future needs	25	2.96	.89	60.7
11. Insufficient resources	25	2.72	.79	46.4
12. Uncontrolled rapid growth	25	2.72	.74	50.0
13. A staff that is fearful of authority	26	3.04	.82	71.4
14. A focus on rules	25	2.76	.72	60.7
15. Narrow strictures on the leader	25	3.00	.76	71.4
16. No guiding operational principles	25	3.16	.80	75.0
17. Performance evaluations by the boss only	25	2.76	.60	60.7
18. No moral standards	25	3.40	.87	75.0
19. No clear values	25	3.24	.83	75.0
20. A common practice of deceit	24	3.54	.83	75.0
21. Secretive cultures which promote manipulation	26	3.50	.81	82.1
22. Poor accountabilities	25	2.96	.79	67.9
23. An apathetic community	25	2.88	.67	64.3
24. A lack of diversity	25	2.76	.66	57.1
25. Constant complaining among colleagues	25	2.84	.69	67.9
26. Autonomous individuals	25	2.64	.95	50.0
27. A perception of followers as inferior	26	3.38	.80	82.1
28. Individual agendas taking precedence over group goals	25	3.28	.79	78.6
29. A governing board that interferes with daily operations	25	3.24	.78	78.6
30. Profit-driven	26	2.62	.80	46.4
31. Hierarchical	26	3.04	.66	75.0
32. Exploitive of people	26	3.58	.81	82.1
33. Rigid	26	3.12	.77	78.6
34. Micromanaged	25	3.20	.82	75.0
35. Autocratic	26	3.23	.76	82.1
36. Lacking in a sense of community	26	3.15	.78	78.6
37. Authoritarian	26	3.27	.83	78.6

[a] The rating scale was 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree.
[b] Percentage of responses in the two most favorable categories of the rating scale (agree or strongly agree).

Table 9

Results of Delphi III: Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages of the Panelists Rating the Items as Good or Excellent Descriptors of the Characteristics of Servant Leaders

Characteristics	N	M[a]	SD	%[b]
1. ~~Joyful in his/her work~~				
2. An effective communicator	28	3.50	.58	96.4
3. A collaborative decision-maker	28	3.57	.57	96.4
4. A collaborative planner	28	3.43	.57	96.4
5. ~~Playful~~				
6. Trustworthy	28	3.89	.31	100.0
7. ~~Content in his/her work~~				
8. ~~Respected by peers~~				
9. Spiritual	27	3.26	.71	82.1
10. Accountable to others	27	3.41	.64	89.3
11. A win-win thinker	27	3.44	.64	89.3
12. Optimistic about people	27	3.67	.48	96.4
13. Optimistic about outcomes	28	3.36	.56	96.4
14. ~~Vulnerable to others~~				
15. Courageous enough to tell the truth	28	3.79	.42	100.0
16. Emotionally intelligent	28	3.46	.64	92.9
17. Authentic	28	3.71	.46	100.0
18. Steadfast	28	3.21	.74	89.3
19. Knowledgeable	27	3.15	.60	92.9
20. ~~Prophetic~~				
21. Open to others	28	3.79	.42	100.0
22. Generous	28	3.39	.63	92.9
23. Honest	28	3.86	.36	100.0
24. Selfless	28	3.64	.73	92.9
25. ~~A forceful leader~~				
26. ~~Task-oriented~~				
27. Caring	28	3.82	.48	96.4
28. Value-driven	28	3.68	.55	96.4
29. Principle-centered	28	3.75	.44	100.0
30. Proactive	28	3.39	.57	96.4
31. ~~Creative~~				
32. ~~Curious~~				
33. Humble	28	3.32	.77	89.3
34. ~~Persistent~~				
35. Patient	25	3.04	.89	71.4
36. ~~Energetic~~				
37. Empathy	28	3.71	.53	96.4
38. A feeling of being "called" to the work	28	3.54	.64	92.9
39. Foresight	28	3.14	.59	89.3
40. ~~A presence that calms~~				

(table continues)

Table 9 (continued)

Results of Delphi III: Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages of Panelists Rating the Items as Good or Excellent Descriptors of the Characteristics of Servant Leaders

Characteristics	N	M[a]	SD	%[b]
41. ~~A sense of humor~~				
42. A passion for the goals of the organization	27	3.59	.57	92.9
43. ~~A high tolerance for ambiguity~~				
44. A belief in the goodness of individuals	27	3.52	.58	92.9
45. ~~A strong personal testimony to share~~				
46. A sincere desire to make a difference	25	3.68	.48	89.3
47. A view of self as a part of the whole organization	27	3.59	.50	96.4
48. An approachable demeanor	27	3.63	.49	96.4
49. ~~A sense of the sacredness of the physical world~~				
50. ~~A pleasant personality~~				
51. A positive outlook	28	3.50	.64	92.9
52. A strong work ethic	28	3.32	.72	85.7
53. Insight	28	3.36	.62	92.9
54. An ethic of service	28	3.96	.19	100.0
55. Compassion	28	3.86	.36	100.0
56. Integrity	28	3.89	.31	100.0
57. Zeal	28	3.07	.86	75.0
58. Self-confidence	28	3.32	.48	100.0
59. A passion for learning	28	3.61	.50	100.0
60. A view of the organization as a part of a larger community	28	3.68	.55	96.4

Note. Items with a strike through were omitted in round II because they did not meet the 80% criterion.
[a] The rating scale was 1 = a poor descriptor, 2 = a fair descriptor, 3 = a good descriptor, and 4 = and excellent descriptor.
[b] Percentage of responses in the two most favorable categories of the rating scale (a good descriptor or an excellent descriptor).

The characteristic of "zeal," like the characteristics of "prophetic" and "a strong personal testimony to share" that were eliminated in the second round, has a religious connotation. While some of the panelists view religion as an important part of their work, many others feel that servant leadership is not defined within a religious context. In a telephone conversation, one panelist emphatically stated her opposition to linking religion with servant leadership. She stated, "I do not know why people limit servant leaders to within a religious framework. I, myself, am not at all religious, but would describe myself as extremely spiritual." The results of the Delphi III confirmed the comments of this panelist. While many of the characteristics relating to religion were not agreed upon, the characteristic of "spiritual" received favorable ratings from 82% of the panelists. It is important to note that an 82% rating for this characteristic was the lowest rating of any of the 40 characteristics identified through consensus in round two.

The rating results of the characteristics on this third round showed means that ranged from a low of 3.04 to a high of 3.96. The standard deviations ranged from .19 to .89. It is not surprising that the low standard deviation of .19, indicating very little variance in the ratings, and the high mean of 3.96 for "an ethic of service." The panelists, in their ratings, demonstrated that this characteristic is the one, above all others, that distinguishes servant leaders.

Characteristics that were agreed upon by the panelists as those that distinguish servant leaders fall into the two major categories: personal character traits and relational traits. Personal traits are the qualities that distinguish the leader as a person. Relational traits are those that define how the leader relates to others.

Many of the personal characteristics were rated as good descriptors by 100% of the panelists indicating a strong belief in these characteristics as distinguishing traits of those described as servant leaders. The characteristics rated favorably by

all panelists and with means above 3.75 included trustworthiness, truthfulness, honesty, compassion, and integrity. In addition to positive personal characteristics, servant leaders were viewed as "steadfast," indicating such leaders are viewed as reliable, firm of purpose, and consistent in exhibiting these characteristics.

Other characteristics agreed upon by the panelists were relational in nature. They demonstrate how servant leaders view themselves in the work environment and how they interact with others. The relational characteristic of "open to others" that received favorable ratings from all 28 panelists is key to the nature of a servant leader. This openness to others is foundational to the identified characteristics of collaborative planning, collaborative decision-making, optimistic about people, and optimistic about outcomes. Results indicate that servant leaders view themselves, not as leaders separated from the group, but leaders who are a part of the group. By identifying the characteristics of "a view of self as a part of the organization" and "a view of the organization as a part of a larger community" panelists supported this idea. The distinguishing characteristic of "an approachable demeanor," identified by 100% of the responding panelists seems crucial to this style of leadership. The servant leader is open to others and views the leader as a part of the whole. Important to the effectiveness of the servant leader is the ability to demonstrate both an openness and an inclusive view of others by exhibiting an approachable demeanor.

While positive personal and relational characteristics are important to identifying a servant leader, some of the basic beliefs that set such leaders apart from others in their field seem more elusive. Important to servant leadership seems to be the characteristic of "a feeling of being 'called' to the work." This belief, coupled with "an ethic of service" influences everything they do as a leader. This combination of characteristics seems to influence how the servant leader views the work at hand. Such leaders have an intensity or passion for their work.

This passion is demonstrated in the characteristics identified by the panelists as "a passion for learning," "a sincere desire to make a difference," and "a passion for the goals of the organization."

Servant leaders are also viewed as "knowledgeable," but results of the study indicated that such leaders go beyond factual knowledge. The panelists agreed that they possess both "insight" and "foresight." An ethic of service and a feeling of being called to their work guide servant leaders. This combination of characteristics makes them passionate about what they do, and they possess positive personal traits that allow them to interact effectively with others. They accomplish this by using both insight, their ability to understand people, and foresight, their ability to think about the future in the context of the present.

<center>Behaviors of Servant Leaders</center>

In Question 2 panelists were asked to rate the distinguishing behaviors of servant leaders. Of the 65 behaviors identified from the Delphi I, 47 behaviors were rated by at least 80% of the panelists in the two most favorable categories of the rating scale on the Delphi II. When results of the Delphi II were presented to panelists, only one of the remaining 47 behaviors did not meet the 80% criterion (see Table 10). Panelists did not reach consensus on servant leaders as "inspiring calm in others." In the previous round the behavior of "remains calm in difficult situations" did not gain consensus from panelists. Results seem to indicate that the work place of a servant leader is not always a calm environment.

The rating results of the behaviors in the third round showed means that ranged from 3.04 to 3.93. The standard deviations ranged from .26 to .73. The low standard deviation of .26 and high mean of 3.93 were for the behavior "treats people with dignity." All 28 panelists rated this as a behavior of servant leaders. This reinforces the idea of the servant leader as one who places emphasis on relationships with people. The results indicate that a servant leader encourages,

Table 10

Results of Delphi III: Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages of the Panelists Rating the Items as Good or Excellent Descriptors of the Behaviors of Servant Leaders

Behaviors	N	M[a]	SD	%[b]
1. Respects the uniqueness of those being served	27	3.85	.36	96.4
2. Motivates people	26	3.42	.58	89.3
3. Teaches those being served	27	3.48	.58	92.9
4. Listens respectfully	27	3.78	.51	92.9
5. Allows time for growth of individuals	27	3.59	.57	92.9
6. Allows time for growth of the organization	27	3.44	.51	96.4
7. Admits personal mistakes	27	3.63	.56	92.9
8. Takes risks to get results	27	3.26	.71	82.1
9. Respects the giftedness of those being served	27	3.70	.47	96.4
10. ~~Remains calm in difficult situations~~				
11. Inspires calm in others	27	3.04	.71	75.0
12. ~~Lets go of what doesn't work~~				
13. ~~Shares possessions freely~~				
14. Assists in developing a group mission	26	3.38	.57	89.3
15. Challenges others to do their best	27	3.56	.58	92.9
16. ~~Asks about individuals' families~~				
17. ~~Encourages risk-taking in others~~				
18. Creates "win-win" scenarios	26	3.42	.58	89.3
19. Leads by example	27	3.93	.27	96.4
20. ~~Sets high but realistic goals for staff~~				
21. ~~Creates a certain level of disequilibrium~~				
22. Builds relationships	27	3.78	.42	96.4
23. Models a lifestyle of service	26	3.92	.27	92.9
24. Seeks opportunities to support others	26	3.62	.50	92.9
25. ~~Hires superior staff~~				
26. Provides mentorships	27	3.37	.56	92.9
27. Accepts criticism	27	3.48	.64	89.3
28. Uses persuasion rather than coercion	27	3.70	.54	92.9
29. Looks for solutions rather than placing blame	26	3.77	.43	92.9
30. ~~Demonstrates firmness when necessary~~				
31. Maintains high ethical standards	27	3.85	.36	96.4
32. Views conflict as an opportunity for growth	27	3.37	.56	92.9
33. Subordinates his or her own interests to the common good	27	3.70	.47	96.4
34. Wisely utilizes skills of others	27	3.59	.50	96.4
35. ~~Challenges the status quo~~				
36. Builds community	28	3.89	.31	100.0
37. Builds team spirit	28	3.50	.64	92.9
38. ~~Clarifies goals~~				
39. ~~Makes decisions boldly~~				
40. ~~Delegates responsibility~~				

(table continues)

Table 10 (continued)

<u>Results of Delphi III: Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages of the Panelists Rating the Items as Good or Excellent Descriptors of Behaviors of Servant Leaders</u>

Behaviors	N	M^a	SD	%[b]
41. Treats people with dignity	28	3.93	.26	100.0
42. ~~Thinks independently~~				
43. Communicates frequently	27	3.56	.58	92.9
44. ~~Communicates with excitement~~				
45. ~~Communicates vision to everyone involved~~				
46. Mediates conflict	28	3.18	.67	85.7
47. Promotes cooperation	28	3.57	.50	100.0
48. Envisions the future	28	3.64	.62	92.9
49. Encourages people	28	3.86	.36	100.0
50. Holds individuals accountable	27	3.41	.69	85.7
51. Takes joy in the success of others	28	3.79	.42	100.0
52. Empowers people	28	3.79	.50	96.4
53. Values differences	28	3.82	.39	100.0
54. Recognizes the contributions of others	28	3.79	.42	100.0
55. Mobilizes hope	28	3.71	.46	100.0
56. Spends time with individuals	28	3.54	.51	100.0
57. Liberates people	27	3.22	.64	85.7
58. Goes "to bat" for individuals experiencing difficulties	28	3.32	.67	89.3
59. Provides training to help others succeed	28	3.35	.73	85.7
60. Shares recognition with the entire group	28	3.71	.46	100.0
61. Communicates persuasively	28	3.39	.69	89.3
62. Values teamwork and individual initiative simultaneously	28	3.79	.42	100.0
63. Seek the advice of experts	28	3.36	.73	85.7
64. ~~Juggles a variety of tasks~~				
65. Makes decisions with participation from others	28	3.61	.57	96.4

<u>Note</u>. Items with a strike through were omitted in round II because they did not meet the 80% criterion.
[a] The rating scale was 1 = a poor descriptor, 2 = a fair descriptor, 3 = a good descriptor, and 4 = and excellent descriptor.
[b] Percentage of responses in the two most favorable categories of the rating scale (good or excellent).

empowers, and liberates people. Other relational behaviors as agreed upon by 100% of the panelists include "builds community," "promotes cooperation," "takes joy in the success of others," "recognizes the success of others," "spends time with individuals," "shares recognition with the entire group," and "values teamwork and individual initiative simultaneously." When asked to identify the observable behaviors that distinguish servant leaders from other leaders, the behaviors identified by the panelists demonstrate the positive interaction of servant leaders with others.

Other identified behaviors serve to emphasize the previously identified positive personal characteristics of servant leaders. These behaviors include "admits personal mistakes," "leads by example," "accepts criticism," and "maintains high ethical standards." The behavior that, above all others, seems to distinguish the servant leader is that of "models a lifestyle of service." It was rated as a good or excellent descriptor by 100% of responding panelists. The servant leader not only views service to others as important but models this concept in his or her lifestyle.

The characteristics of servant leaders, identified earlier in the study, seem to indicate that reflection is a part of servant leadership. Panelists reinforced the characteristic of "foresight" when they rated "envisions the future" as a distinguishing behavior. Servant leaders not only hold people and their needs in high regard, they spend time planning and thinking about how their actions will affect the future.

<u>Effective Work Environments of Servant Leaders</u>

In Question 3, panelists were asked to rate work environments where servant leaders are effective. Of the 39 effective work environments identified from the Delphi I, 23 work environments were rated by at least 80% of the panelists in the two most favorable categories of the rating scale on the Delphi II. When results of

the Delphi II were presented to panelists, the same work environments met the 80% criterion. The rating consensus of the panelists improved for 19 of the 23 items, with 12 work environments receiving favorable ratings from 100% of the panelists.

Effective work environments on this third round had means that ranged from 3.11 to 3.96 (see Table 11). The standard deviations ranged from .19 to .79. The low standard deviation of .19 and the high mean of 3.96 were for "an atmosphere where people are valued." Another identified environment that emphasized this same idea is "an atmosphere fostering the growth of individuals." This is consistent with the results of the characteristics and behaviors of servant leaders where the focus was on positive, responsive interaction with people.

Findings indicated that servant leaders are effective in environments where their values and priorities are emphasized. Some of the environments reflect the personal characteristics of servant leaders as identified earlier in this study. The panelists agreed that effective work environments included "an atmosphere that honors truth telling," "an atmosphere of mutual trust among stakeholders," and "an emphasis on values." Servant leaders, in their characteristics and behaviors, were distinguished from other leaders in their field by the traits of truthfulness, trustworthiness, and an emphasis on values.

Other identified work environments reflect the relational aspects of servant leaders. Two work environments, "a supportive community" and "a supportive governing board" seem to be positive elements for any leader. In agreeing upon other work environments, panelists showed that an effective work environment, consistent with servant leadership, provides for positive interaction with others in the organization. Some of these work environments included "a staff with a team mentality," "open communication," "democratic decision making," and "an atmosphere that emphasizes people rather than profit." Whether in identifying

Table 11

Results of Delphi III: Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages of the Panelists Rating the Items as Agree or Strongly Agree as Descriptors of Effective Work Environments of Servant Leaders

Effective work environments	N	M[a]	SD	%[b]
1. ~~Devoted followers~~				
2. ~~Sufficient financial resources~~				
3. A history of good relationships with partner agencies	28	3.11	.79	89.3
4. ~~Minimum disparity~~				
5. ~~Equitably shared profits~~				
6. ~~Constituents appreciative of the sacrifice of the leader~~				
7. ~~An emphasis on ecological concerns~~				
8. An atmosphere that encourages risk-taking	25	3.32	.56	85.7
9. ~~An atmosphere that embraces the importance of faith~~				
10. A group that shares a sense of hope	27	3.67	.48	96.4
11. A staff with a team mentality	28	3.61	.50	100.0
12. A group with a commitment to a broad mission	28	3.71	.53	96.4
13. ~~360 degree performance evaluations~~				
14. ~~Input from the leader in selecting the group members~~				
15. ~~A need for task clarification~~				
16. ~~Attractive work space~~				
17. A supportive community	28	3.61	.57	96.4
18. A supportive governing board	27	3.37	.69	92.9
19. ~~An atmosphere free of "belly-aching"~~				
20. ~~A need for resolution of conflict~~				
21. A group that honors truth telling	28	3.79	.42	100.0
22. An atmosphere where diversity is valued	28	3.82	.39	100.0
23. ~~Sufficient human resources~~				
24. Open communication	28	3.82	.39	100.0
25. An atmosphere where people are valued	28	3.96	.19	100.0
26. Democratic decision making	28	3.25	.59	92.9
27. An atmosphere of mutual trust among stakeholders	28	3.82	.39	100.0
28. An emphasis on a balanced lifestyle for employees	28	3.29	.60	92.9
29. Inclusive work teams	28	3.50	.51	100.0
30. An atmosphere where learning is encouraged	28	3.71	.46	100.0
31. An atmosphere fostering the growth of individuals	28	3.82	.39	100.0
32. An atmosphere where humor is embraced	28	3.36	.56	96.4
33. ~~An organization that is nonprofit~~				
34. An emphasis on values	28	3.75	.44	100.0
35. A group conscious of its impact on the larger community	28	3.68	.48	100.0
36. Freedom for the leader to make decisions with the group	28	3.61	.50	100.0
37. An atmosphere that emphasizes people rather than profit	28	3.68	.61	92.9
38. A view of the leader as primus pares: first amongst equals	28	3.29	.60	92.9
39. ~~Any work environment~~				

Note. Items with a strike through were omitted in round II because they did not meet the 80% criterion.
[a] The rating scale was 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree.
[b] Percentage of responses in the two most favorable categories of the rating scale (agree or strongly agree).

characteristics, behaviors, or effective work environments of servant leaders, the emphasis on positive interaction with people is a recurrent theme.

<div align="center">Ineffective Work Environments of Servant Leaders</div>

In Question 4, panelists were asked to rate work environments where servant leaders are ineffective. Of the 37 ineffective work environments identified from the Delphi I, only four work environments were rated by at least 80% of the panelists in the two most favorable categories of the rating scale on the Delphi II. When results of the Delphi II were presented to panelists, none of the four work environments met the 80% criterion (see Table 12). This question on ineffective work environments was the most difficult for panelists to answer and caused the most confusion and frustration among participants. Several panelists felt that servant leaders were effective in any environment. While the panel did not reach consensus on the idea of servant leaders being "effective in any environment," as a group they were hesitant to identify environments that rendered a servant leader ineffective.

While all 28 panelists returned the Delphi III instrument, the number who responded to this section ranged in number from 20 to 24. Some panelists chose not to answer this part of the instrument, and others, due to the arrangement on the page, overlooked some of the items. The means ranged from 3.29 to 3.59 and the standard deviations from .59 to .91. The percentage of favorable responses ranged from 64% to 75%.

The panelists did not agree on any work environments where servant leaders are ineffective. The panelists were able to identify effective work environments but failed to identify ineffective work environments. Respondents raised the issue as to whether or not servant leaders have the power to change the environment. Several panelists commented that they felt a servant leader would certainly be

Table 12

Results of Delphi III: Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages of the Panelists Rating the Items as Agree or Strongly Agree as Descriptors of Ineffective Work Environments of Servant Leaders

Ineffective work environments	N	M[a]	SD	%[b]
1. ~~Extreme conflict~~				
2. ~~Excessive internal competition~~				
3. ~~Unclear job descriptions~~				
4. ~~Top down decision making~~				
5. ~~Centralized power in a few individuals~~				
6. ~~Rapid turnover of staff~~				
7. ~~A closed system based on elitism~~				
8. ~~Strong prejudices~~				
9. ~~Poorly chosen goals~~				
10. ~~No plan for future needs~~				
11. ~~Insufficient resources~~				
12. ~~Uncontrolled rapid growth~~				
13. ~~A staff that is fearful of authority~~				
14. ~~A focus on rules~~				
15. ~~Narrow strictures on the leader~~				
16. ~~No guiding operational principles~~				
17. ~~Performance evaluations by the boss only~~				
18. ~~No moral standards~~				
19. ~~No clear values~~				
20. ~~A common practice of deceit~~				
21. Secretive cultures which promote manipulation	22	3.59	.59	75.0
22. ~~Poor accountabilities~~				
23. ~~An apathetic community~~				
24. ~~A lack of diversity~~				
25. ~~Constant complaining among colleagues~~				
26. ~~Autonomous individuals~~				
27. A perception of followers as inferior	21	3.38	.80	67.9
28. ~~Individual agendas taking precedence over group goals~~				
29. ~~A governing board that interferes with daily operations~~				
30. ~~Profit driven~~				
31. ~~Hierarchical~~				
32. Exploitive of people	20	3.55	.83	64.3
33. ~~Rigid~~				
34. ~~Micromanaged~~				
35. Autocratic	24	3.29	.91	75.0
36. ~~Lacking in a sense of community~~				
37. ~~Authoritarian~~				

Note. Items with a strike through were omitted in round II because they did not meet the 80% criterion.
[a] The rating scale was 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree.
[b] Percentage of responses in the two most favorable categories of the rating scale (agree or strongly agree).

hindered in the work environments identified in Question 4, but they believed such leaders are capable of changing the environment. One panelist felt that such work environments are where servant leaders are most needed. The inability of the panelists to identify specific work environments where servant leaders are ineffective suggests that while any leader may be hindered by negative conditions within the work environment, there is not a specific work environment where a servant leader is completely ineffective.

Summary of Chapter IV

The data from the three rounds of the Delphi study designed to identify the observable characteristics, behaviors, and effective work environments of servant leaders. A panel of 28 experts participated in each round of the study were presented and analyzed in Chapter IV. Panelists were chosen with consideration given to geographical location, gender, ethnic background, and a balance of practical and theoretical viewpoints.

The Delphi I was an open-ended instrument based on the research questions on servant leaders. The first two questions were developed to identify specific characteristics and behaviors of servant leaders: From your experience and observation, what are the key words or phrases that describe (1) the <u>characteristics</u> that distinguish servant leaders and (2) the <u>behaviors</u> that distinguish servant leaders? From the responses, 60 characteristics and 65 behaviors were identified. The identified characteristics included personal traits of servant leaders and traits that demonstrated how servant leaders work with those being served. The identified behaviors placed emphasis on how the leader behaves toward others.

The last two questions on the Delphi I were constructed to determine the effectiveness of servant leaders in specific work environments. Panelists were asked the following: From your experience and observation, what are the key words or phrases that describe (3) the work environments in which servant leaders

are <u>effective</u> and (4) the work environments in which servant leaders are <u>ineffective</u>? From the compiled responses, 39 effective and 37 ineffective work environments were identified. Responses to Question 3 included environments where truth telling, values, learning, and inclusiveness were important. Panelists believed that servant leaders were effective in work environments where their own distinguishing traits were held in high regard. Identifying ineffective work environments of servant leaders proved to be more of a challenge. Panelists were readily able to identify work environments that enhanced the effectiveness of servant leaders but were less able to identify work environments where servant leaders were rendered ineffective.

The Delphi II was developed from the compiled responses of the Delphi I. The characteristics, behaviors, and work environments were randomly listed under the corresponding question, and a four-point scale was added. For the first two questions on characteristics and behaviors of servant leaders, the rating scale was as follows: 1 = a poor descriptor, 2 = a fair descriptor, 3 = a good descriptor, and 4 = an excellent descriptor. Items were considered to be consensually agreed upon when 80% or more of the panel members rated the item in the two most favorable categories of the scale. The characteristic, "an ethic of service," received the most favorable response rate. The panel agreed that the manner in which leaders conduct themselves in daily activities is a behavior that distinguishes servant leaders from others in the same field.

For the questions on effective and ineffective work environments the rating scale was as follows: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree. The highest means for effective work environments were items where people and their needs were perceived as important. Only four work environments from the 37 items were rated by more than 80% of the panelists as work environments in which servant leaders are ineffective.

On the Delphi III instrument, the mean, standard deviation, percentage of favorable responses and the individual rating of each panelist from the Delphi II were reported to the panelist. In this round, panelists were asked to rate only those items that met the 80% criterion on the previous round. Items that did not meet the criterion were shown with a line drawn through them. Servant leaders are distinguished first and foremost by an ethic of service. They also have a feeling of being "called" to the work. Combining these distinguishing traits makes such leaders passionate about what they do. In addition to personal and relational characteristics, servant leaders were also viewed as knowledgeable, possessing both insight and foresight.

The majority of behaviors identified for servant leaders are relational in nature. A servant leader is one who encourages, empowers, and liberates people. The identified behaviors emphasize the positive interaction of servant leaders with others. The most distinctive behavior of servant leaders is that they model a lifestyle of service. The servant leader not only views service to others as important, but models this concept in the daily interaction with others.

In identifying effective work environments, results showed that servant leaders are effective in environments where their values and priorities are emphasized. Some of the identified work environments reflected the personal and relational traits identified earlier. While effective work environments were identified, the panelists were unable to reach consensus on ineffective work environments. Servant leaders may be hindered by negative conditions within the work environment, but there is not a specific work environment where a servant leader is completely ineffective. Whether in identifying characteristics, behaviors, or effective work environments of servant leaders, the emphasis on service to and positive interaction with people are recurrent ideas found in the results of this study.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR

PRACTICE AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Robert K. Greenleaf (1977) dedicated his life to conceptualizing and defining the humanistic philosophy of "servant leadership." Greenleaf did not actually define servant leadership but discussed what the servant leader does and how those actions affect others. He believed that if servant leadership was being practiced that "all men and women who are touched by the effort grow taller, and become healthier, stronger, more autonomous, and more disposed to serve" (p. 47). The purpose of this study was to create a comprehensive description of a servant leader by identifying the characteristics and behaviors that distinguish such leaders and the work environments where they are effective.

A three-round Delphi technique was used to gather information for the study. The Delphi instruments were administered to 28 expert panelists with four panelists representing each of seven groups: (a) appointed and elected officials, (b) authors in the field, (c) business leaders, (d) clergy, (e) educators, (f) leaders of associations, and (g) leaders of volunteer organizations. The panel of experts included those identified by others as servant leaders and those who have written about or trained servant leaders.

Conclusions and Discussion

This study focused on the observable characteristics and behaviors that distinguish servant leaders and the work environments where they are effective. Discussion of results will show servant leaders as those who possess an ethic of service, a feeling of being "called" to their work, positive personal characteristics, and positive relational behaviors. The discussion will then focus on the results as compared to the ten characteristics identified in the literature. Of the ten

characteristics, six were identified directly in this study, three indirectly, and one was not found in the results. Finally, the effective work environments identified in this study will be discussed.

The distinguishing trait of servant leaders, upon which all else rests, is a strong ethic of service. Service provides for such leaders a significant degree of personal fulfillment because it is a vital part of their belief system. It is this ethic of service that influences the attitudes, decisions, and actions of the leader. While identification of positive personal and relational traits are important in developing a comprehensive description of servant leaders, central to the description is the importance these leaders place on service to others. With service being a strong motivational force, many servant leaders find job satisfaction in service-oriented professions where serving others is a part of the job description.

In addition to possessing an ethic of service, servant leaders are distinguished by a feeling of being "called" to the work. Servant leaders do not view their work simply as a job, but, instead, there is a feeling of being the right person to lead in a particular time and place. The feeling of being "called" adds depth and meaning to the ethic of service. Being "called" gives servant leaders a passion for their work, and the passion is often the driving force to accomplish specific goals.

Servant leaders, exemplifying the highest personal standards, are distinguished from others by their personal traits. They are leaders who epitomize trustworthiness, truthfulness, honesty, compassion, and integrity. They are steadfast and dependable. While high personal standards are recognized as distinguishing characteristics of servant leaders, the data do not confirm that servant leaders are respected by their peers. This may relate to the perception of servant leaders as being weak, or it may reflect the feelings of participants in the study who do not feel they are respected in their own leadership roles.

Characteristics and behaviors of any group are closely related. A specific characteristic is not attributed to a leader until the leader, in interaction with others, demonstrates that characteristic. By observing the behaviors of servant leaders, the presence of the personal characteristics of these leaders is confirmed. Servant leaders are willing to accept criticism, admit mistakes, and maintain high ethical standards in all circumstances. For servant leaders, the presence of the positive personal characteristics identified in this study can be found in their behavior.

Servant leaders are distinguished by positive relational behaviors. Because servant leaders value people, they treat others with dignity and relate to them in ways that teach, empower, liberate, mobilize, and encourage. Servant leaders rely on a giving style of leadership rather than a style that relies on getting and taking. Such leaders build community within the organization by promoting cooperation and sharing recognition with the entire group.

Building community is accomplished, in part, by skillful communication. Through frequent and persuasive communication, servant leaders demonstrate the inclusiveness of their leadership and promote cooperative decision making and planning. Servant leaders use communication to envision the future and encourage others to assist in achieving that vision. They accomplish their goals as leaders who view themselves as a part of the whole organization. Through use of positive relational behaviors, they are able to establish an environment where the lives of people are enriched by the presence of such leaders.

Servant leaders are those who possess an ethic of service, a feeling of being "called" to their work that adds passion to their actions, and positive personal and relational traits. A list of characteristics and behaviors can be identified, but to create a comprehensive description of a servant leader, one must look at the interaction of all the identified parts. Servant leaders do indeed demonstrate particular characteristics and behaviors, but it is the motivational forces of an ethic

of service and a feeling of being "called" to their work that distinguishes servant leaders.

Ten characteristics found in the practice of servant leadership have been identified in the literature (Spears, 1998). The results of this study are consistent with six of the characteristics: listening, empathy, persuasion, foresight, commitment to the growth of people, and building community. All of these specific characteristics were consensually agreed upon by the panel of experts as being distinguishing characteristics or behaviors of servant leaders.

Three other characteristics were not as clearly identified in this study: awareness, conceptualization, and stewardship. Awareness is defined in the literature as the belief that the leader has the strength and ability to face a problem and find a solution. Awareness involves the view that conflict is not something to be feared but an opportunity for growth. One who chooses to directly address an unpleasant situation and facilitate a satisfactory outcome has the strength of a servant leader. Similar to the characteristic of awareness found in the literature is the characteristic of self-confidence identified by the panel of experts in this study. As with awareness, servant leaders are viewed as confident of their ability to lead and find solutions to any problems they may encounter.

Conceptualization is another characteristic that is not specifically identified but is implied in the results of this study. Conceptualization is the ability of the servant leader to look beyond the realities of daily responsibilities and to create a realistic vision of what the organization can become. A servant leader is one who is able to view the present and to construct a path between the future and present. Coinciding with the idea of conceptualization, the panel in this study agreed that servant leaders see themselves as a part of a bigger picture. They view themselves as a part of the whole organization, and they view the organization as a part of a larger community. In addition to a realistic view of themselves as a part of a larger

group, the panel identified servant leaders as those who envision the future. These characteristics, identified by the panel, are all parts of the idea of conceptualization found in the literature.

A third characteristic, not specifically identified but implied in this study, is that of stewardship. Stewardship is defined as a leader putting the interest to serve another before personal interests. This characteristic is built upon the belief that the more the leader gives, the greater the gain. Stewardship is an idea that grows within an organization and as it grows it enhances the opportunities of everyone involved. The idea encourages people to work together, giving to one another without expectation of return. Where stewardship is fostered, people begin to work together, the environment becomes energized, and people have a place where they want to invest their best efforts. An environment where stewardship is valued begins with the leader. The panel in this study emphasized the value and importance that servant leaders place on people. The literature and the panel of experts in this study seem to agree that stewardship, or placing the interest of others above one's own, is a foundational attribute of those who practice servant leadership.

The characteristic of healing was not found in this study. Healing is defined as finding wholeness within oneself, with the implication that servant leaders help others to become whole. While the results of this study show that servant leaders are consistently interested in the well being of others, the findings do not specifically address the idea of the servant leader demonstrating the capacity to heal oneself and others. With the exception of healing, the results of this study confirm that servant leaders are distinguished by the characteristics found in the literature.

Other questions of this study were designed to ascertain the effective work environments of servant leaders. The panel of experts was asked to identify

descriptors of both effective and ineffective work environments. Data indicate that servant leaders are effective in environments where their values and priorities are emphasized. In such work environments truth telling is honored, open communication is the rule, and the emphasis is on people rather than profit. Servant leaders, like other leaders, are viewed as effective in environments in which the recognized priorities and values match their own.

Results on ineffective work environments are inconclusive. While panelists indicated that servant leaders are effective in environments where their values and priorities are emphasized, they were unable to reach consensus on work environments in which a servant leader is ineffective. The panelists were all proponents of the servant leadership philosophy and may have hesitated to identify any weakness of such leaders or, perhaps, it is as some panelists suggested, servant leaders are able to create positive change in any environment.

Recommendations for Practice and Future Research

Servant leaders, operating from their ethic of service, provide an answer to the need for leadership that is responsive to both the situation and the people involved. Education, for example, from preschool to the university level, is a service-oriented profession, and leaders who perceive their work as an opportunity to serve are well suited to such a field. Becoming a servant leader involves a personal choice. The idea of service cannot be dictated, but it can be modeled. The practice of administrative internships, with servant leaders as mentors, provides a setting for the modeling of behaviors based on an ethic of service.

For many, the idea of servant leadership may become a part of their leadership repertoire. Presenting the philosophy of servant leadership to classes of aspiring administrators provides a view of leadership that differs from other leadership theories. Many of the behaviors of servant leaders are directly related to skills needed for administrators where site-based decision making is being

practiced. With training and practice, the skills of persuasion, communication, consensus building, and team building that are common to servant leaders can make any leader more effective.

Servant leaders are not unique because of their leadership style, but rather in their way of being and relating to the world around them. While some leadership styles, environments, and organizations are obviously more adaptable to service than others, service is an inward attitude that can be cultivated within an individual and applied to some degree in any situation.

In terms of further studies, my research was designed to identify the observable characteristics and behaviors of servant leaders and their effective work environments. Results of this study and conversations with participants imply that the motivational force for servant leaders is unique and that servant leaders evolve into leaders who make service a priority. Case studies of servant leaders and their life experiences could provide insight into the interaction of training, experiences, and successes that lead to the development of such leaders.

This study used a panel of experts from seven groups but did not compare the responses of one group to another. It may be that servant leaders in the business world or political arena view servant leadership differently from those who lead community agencies or associations. Issues surrounding job satisfaction and the relationship of service to profit could be discovered by comparing and contrasting responses of servant leaders from different professions.

The research on servant leaders is most frequently a study from the perspective of the servant leader. A study that examined the perceptions of those who work in organizations headed by identified servant leaders could add perspective to the field of servant leadership. A study that compares the data from this study with the characteristics and behaviors identified by those who work under servant leaders would create a more complete description of servant leaders.

Servant leadership is one of many philosophies of leadership available for study. It is unique in that the distinguishing feature of such leaders is their emphasis on service to others. As I conducted research for this study and spoke with panel members by telephone, it became increasingly obvious to me that there are numerous organizations that are ideal arenas for the practice of servant leadership skills. In most leadership roles there is the potential for service to people both within the organization and the surrounding community.

I realized that many of the behaviors and characteristics identified by the panel in this study are attributes of successful administrators. The question then became what I could do to share what I learned from this study in a way that would be helpful to those practicing or aspiring to leadership roles. For most, servant leadership will never become their primary leadership style. However, many of the characteristics and behaviors identified in this study have potential to enhance the leadership of any administrator. It is for this reason that the following checklist was developed. It is a simple way for someone to evaluate his or her leadership style in respect to servant leadership. It is my hope that the instrument will create discussion and increase awareness about the potential for successful leadership based on service to others.

Servant Leadership Inventory
A Self-Rating Scale

Listed below are attributes of servant leaders. Rate yourself according to the frequency that you exhibit each characteristic or behavior. The rating scale is 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = sometimes, 4 = most of the time, 5 = always. Please circle the number of your response.

As a leader, I am…

1.	An effective communicator	1	2	3	4	5
2.	A collaborative decision-maker	1	2	3	4	5
3.	A collaborative planner	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Trustworthy	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Spiritual	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Accountable to others	1	2	3	4	5
7.	A win-win thinker	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Optimistic about people	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Optimistic about outcomes	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Courageous enough to tell the truth	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Emotionally intelligent	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Authentic	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Steadfast	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Knowledgeable	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Generous	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Honest	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Selfless	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Caring	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Value-driven	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Principle-centered	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Proactive	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Humble	1	2	3	4	5

As a leader, I have…

23.	Empathy	1	2	3	4	5
24.	A feeling of being "called" to the work	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Foresight	1	2	3	4	5
26.	A passion for the goals of the organization	1	2	3	4	5
27.	A belief in the goodness of individuals	1	2	3	4	5
28.	A sincere desire to make a difference	1	2	3	4	5
29.	A view of self as a part of the whole organization	1	2	3	4	5
30.	An approachable demeanor	1	2	3	4	5
31.	A positive outlook	1	2	3	4	5
32.	A strong work ethic	1	2	3	4	5
33.	Insight	1	2	3	4	5
34.	An ethic of service	1	2	3	4	5
35.	Compassion	1	2	3	4	5
36.	Integrity	1	2	3	4	5
37.	Self-confidence	1	2	3	4	5

(scale continues)

Servant Leadership Inventory (continued)
A Self-Rating Scale

Listed below are attributes of servant leaders. Rate yourself according to the frequency that you exhibit each characteristic or behavior. The rating scale is 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = sometimes, 4 = most of the time, 5 = always. Please circle the number of your response.

<u>**As a leader, I have…**</u>

38. A passion for learning   1   2   3   4   5
39. A view of the organization as a part of a larger community   1   2   3   4   5

<u>**As a leader, I…**</u>

40. Respect the uniqueness of those being served   1   2   3   4   5
41. Motivate people   1   2   3   4   5
42. Teach those being served   1   2   3   4   5
43. Listen respectfully   1   2   3   4   5
44. Allow time for growth of individuals   1   2   3   4   5
45. Allow time for growth of the organization   1   2   3   4   5
46. Admit personal mistakes   1   2   3   4   5
47. Take risks to get results   1   2   3   4   5
48. Respect the giftedness of those being served   1   2   3   4   5
49. Assist in developing a group mission   1   2   3   4   5

50. Challenge others to do their best   1   2   3   4   5
51. Create "win-win" scenarios   1   2   3   4   5
52. Lead by example   1   2   3   4   5
53. Build relationships   1   2   3   4   5
54. Model a lifestyle of service   1   2   3   4   5
55. Seek opportunities to support others   1   2   3   4   5
56. Provide mentorships   1   2   3   4   5
57. Accept criticism   1   2   3   4   5
58. Use persuasion rather than coercion   1   2   3   4   5
59. Look for solutions rather than placing blame   1   2   3   4   5

60. Maintain high ethical standards   1   2   3   4   5
61. View conflict as an opportunity for growth   1   2   3   4   5
62. Build team spirit   1   2   3   4   5
63. Treat people with dignity   1   2   3   4   5
64. Build community   1   2   3   4   5
65. Subordinate my own interests to the common good   1   2   3   4   5
66. Wisely utilize skills of others   1   2   3   4   5
67. Communicate frequently   1   2   3   4   5
68. Mediate conflict   1   2   3   4   5
69. Promote cooperation   1   2   3   4   5

70. Envision the future   1   2   3   4   5
71. Encourage people   1   2   3   4   5
72. Hold individuals accountable   1   2   3   4   5
73. Take joy in the success of others   1   2   3   4   5
74. Empower people   1   2   3   4   5
75. Value differences   1   2   3   4   5
76. Recognize the contributions of others   1   2   3   4   5
77. Mobilize hope   1   2   3   4   5

(scale continues)

Servant Leadership Inventory (continued)
A Self-Rating Scale

Listed below are attributes of servant leaders. Rate yourself according to the frequency that you exhibit each characteristic or behavior. The rating scale is 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = sometimes, 4 = most of the time, 5 = always. Please circle the number of your response.

<u>**As a leader, I…**</u>

78.	Spend time with individuals	1	2	3	4	5
79.	Liberate people	1	2	3	4	5
80.	Go "to bat" for individuals experiencing difficulties	1	2	3	4	5
81.	Provide training to help others succeed	1	2	3	4	5
82.	Share recognition with the entire group	1	2	3	4	5
83.	Communicate persuasively	1	2	3	4	5
84.	Value teamwork and individual initiative simultaneously	1	2	3	4	5
85.	Seek the advice of experts	1	2	3	4	5
86.	Make decisions with participation from others	1	2	3	4	5

REFERENCES

Block, P. (1993). <u>Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest</u>. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Brooks, K. W. (1979). Delphi technique: Expanding applications. <u>North Central Association Quarterly, 53</u>, 377-385.

Covey, S. R. (1989). <u>The 7 habits of highly effective people</u>. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Covey, S. R. (1999). <u>Living the 7 Habits</u>. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Daft, R. L. (1994). <u>Management</u>. Fort Worth, TX: The Dryden Press.

Dalkey, N. C. (1967). <u>Delphi</u>. Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation.

Dalkey, N. C., & Helmer, O. (1962). <u>An experimental application of the Delphi method to the use of experts </u>(Report No. RM-727-PR) (Abridged). Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation.

DePree, M. (1987). What is leadership? In Hickman, G. R. (Ed.), <u>Leading organizations: Perspectives for a new era </u>(pp.130-132).   Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

DePree, M. (1989). <u>Leadership is an art</u>. New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell.

DiStefano, J. J. (1988). <u>Tracing the vision and impact of Robert K. Greenleaf</u>. Indianapolis, IN: The Robert K. Greenleaf Center.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). <u>A theory of leadership effectiveness</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fiedler, F. E., & Chemers, M. M. (1984). <u>Improving leadership effectiveness: The leader match concept</u>. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Gardner, H. (1995). <u>Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership</u>. New York: BasicBooks.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1960). <u>Education and maturity</u>. Indianapolis, IN: The Robert K. Greenleaf Center.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). <u>The servant as leader</u>. Indianapolis, IN: The Robert K. Greenleaf Center.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). <u>Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness</u>. Mohwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1996). <u>On becoming a servant leader</u>. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Helmer, O. (1967). <u>Systematic use of expert</u> opinions (Report No. P-3721). Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation.

Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Johnson, D. E. (1996). <u>Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human</u> resources. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hesse, H. (1956). <u>Journey to the East</u>. New York: Noonday Press.

House, R. J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. <u>Administrative Science Quarterly, 16</u>.

House, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. <u>Journal of Contemporary Business</u>, p. 81.

Knicker, C. M. (1999). <u>The elementary school principal as servant leader</u>. Unpublished manscript. University of St. Thomas.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1995). <u>The leadership challenge: How to keep getting extraordinary things done in organizations</u>. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Laub, J.A. (1999). <u>Assessing the servant organization: Development of the Servant Organizational Leadership Assessment (SOLA) Instrument</u>. Unpublished manuscript. Florida Atlantic University.

Linstone, H. A., & Turoff, M. (Eds.). (1975). <u>The Delphi method: Techniques and applications</u>. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Likert, R. (1961). <u>New patterns of management</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Mayo, E. (1945). <u>The social problems of an industrial civilization</u>. Boston: Harvard Business School.

Pfeiffer, J. (1968). <u>New look at education</u>. Poughkeepsie, NY: Odyssey Press.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). <u>Moral leadership</u>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shugart, S. (1997, February). <u>Servant leadership: Robert K. Greenleaf's legacy and the community college</u>. Paper presented at the Annual International Conference of the Leadership Academy, Reno, NV.

Skutsch, M., & Hall, D. (1973). Delphi: Potential uses in education planning. <u>Project Simu-School: Chicago component</u>. Chicago, IL: Chicago Board of Education, Illinois Department of Facility Planning.

Spears, L. (Ed.). (1998). <u>Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership</u>. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Spears, L. (Ed.). (1995). <u>Reflections on leadership</u>. New York: John Wiley.

Stodgill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership. <u>Journal of Psychology, 25</u>, 35-71.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). <u>The principles of scientific management</u>. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Taylor, S. R. (1997). Servant-leadership. <u>Catalyst for Change, 26</u>, 5-7.

Taylor-Gillham, D. J. (1998). <u>Images of servant leadership in education</u>. Unpublished manuscript, Northern Arizona University.

Vaill, P. (1990). <u>Managing as a performing art: New ideas for a world of chaotic change</u>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Van Kuik, A. (1997). <u>The meaning of servant leadership</u>. Unpublished manuscript, University of Manitoba.

Walker, P. D. (1997). <u>A case study of servant leadership</u>. Unpublished manuscript, The University of San Francisco.

Wheatley, M. (1994). <u>Leadership and the new science: Learning about organizations from an orderly universe</u>. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

APPENDIX A

Delphi I Instrument

December 1, 1999

Dear

Thank you for your willingness to serve as an expert for the study on the characteristics, behaviors, and environments of effectiveness for servant leaders.   As we discussed in our recent telephone conversation, you will be involved in a three round Delphi study to examine four research questions. From your experience and observation, what are the key words or phrases that describe (1) the <u>characteristics</u> which distinguish servant leaders, (2) the <u>behaviors</u> which distinguish servant leaders, (3) the <u>work environments</u> where servant leaders are <u>effective</u>, and (4) the <u>work environments</u> where servant leaders are <u>ineffective?</u>

The attached first round (Delphi I) is open-ended. The second round (Delphi II) will ask you to rate, using a four-point Likert scale, the compiled responses from the previous round.   This will be mailed to you on **January 3, 2000,** with a due date of **January 17**. The third round (Delphi III) will again ask you to use a four-point Likert scale to rate the results of the previous round. With the third mailing you will receive the mean and standard deviation for each item, your rating response from round two, and the overall percentage rating for each item. This will be mailed to you on **January 24,** with a due date of **February 7.** Once the study is complete you may request a copy of the research results.

Enclosed please find the Delphi I instrument with its instructions and an example. Please read the instructions carefully, complete the instrument along with the Informed Consent and return it by **December 17.** Enclosed you will find a self-addressed, stamped envelope for this purpose.

Again, thank you for agreeing to participate in the study on servant leadership. We look forward to your prompt response.

Sincerely,

Ann T. Abel   David J. Parks, Professor
Doctoral Candidate at Virginia Tech   Educational Leadership
20425 Green Spring Road   209 East Eggleston (0302)
Abingdon , VA 24211   Virginia Tech
                                                   Blacksburg, VA 24061

Delphi I

<u>**Instructions:**</u>

This study is designed to determine the characteristics, behaviors, and environments of effectiveness that distinguish servant leaders. The key words or phrases must reflect the distinguishing characteristics, behaviors, and environments of effectiveness of servant leaders; must cover the range of characteristics, behaviors, and environments of effectiveness; and must have as little overlap as possible. You will be asked to respond to four questions. From your experience and observation, what are the key words or phrases that describe (1) the <u>characteristics</u> that distinguish servant leaders, (2) the <u>behaviors</u> that distinguish servant leaders, (3) the <u>work environments</u> in which servant leaders are <u>effective,</u> and (4) the <u>work environments</u> in which servant leaders are <u>ineffective?</u>

For clarity, please review the examples cited below.

<u>**Key words and phrases that describe**</u>

<u>Characteristics</u> (distinctive qualities or traits) of an orchestra conductor:
- enthusiasm for music
- flair for performance
- a commanding presence
- ability to charm the audience

<u>Behaviors</u> (actions taken to facilitate work) of an orchestra conductor:
- shows concern for welfare of musicians
- resolves conflict among musicians
- encourages musicians to strive for excellence in performance
- communicates specific expectations to musicians

<u>**Work environments**</u> in which orchestra conductors are **<u>effective:</u>**
(where the leader is able to move the group toward achievement of goals.)
- supportive community
- appreciative audiences
- adequate performance facilities
- good working relationships with musicians

<u>**Work environments**</u> in which orchestra conductors are **<u>ineffective:</u>**
(where the leader is unable to move the group toward achievement of goals.)
- restrictions on selection of music
- shortage of trained musicians
- disinterested community
- poor relationship with Board of Directors

Delphi I

Question I

<table>
<tr><td>

Directions: Please answer this question completely. If more room is needed for your response, please use the back of this page or use additional paper. If additional paper is used, please mark the paper **Question I**.

</td></tr>
</table>

From your experience and observation, what are the key words or phrases that describe the <u>characteristics</u> that distinguish servant leaders?
(*Characteristics* are distinctive qualities or traits.)

Delphi I

Question II

      From your experience and observation, what are the key words or phrases that describe the <u>behaviors</u> that distinguish servant leaders?
(*Behaviors* are any actions taken by the leader to facilitate achievement of goals.)

Delphi I

Question III

From your experience and observation, what are the key words or phrases that describe the <u>work environments</u> in which servant leaders are EFFECTIVE?
(An *effective work environment* is one in which the knowledge, characteristics, and behaviors of the leader can be used to move the group toward the achievement of goals.)

Delphi I

Question IV

Directions: Please answer this question completely. If more room is needed for your response, please use the back of this page or use additional paper. If additional paper is used, please mark the paper **Question IV**.

   From your experience and observation, what are the key words or phrases that describe the <u>work environments</u> where servant leaders are INEFFECTIVE?
(An *ineffective work environment* is one in which the knowledge, characteristics, and behaviors of the leader cannot be used to move the group toward the achievement of goals.)

APPENDIX B

Delphi II Instrument

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

January 24, 2000

Dear

Thank you for your response to the first round (Delphi I) questions on the characteristics, behaviors, and effective work environments of servant leaders. Enclosed in this mailing is the compilation of responses to each of the four questions from Delphi I.   In this round you are asked to rate characteristics and descriptors of behaviors on the following scale: 1 = a poor descriptor, 2 = a fair descriptor, 3 = a good descriptor, or 4 = an excellent descriptor. For work environments you are asked to rate items according to the strength of your agreement that the item describes an environment in which a servant leader is either effective or ineffective. The following scale is used: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, or 4 = strongly agree.

For the third round (Delphi III) you will again be asked to use a four-point Likert scale. With the third mailing you will receive the mean and standard deviation for each item, your rating response from round two, and the overall percentage rating for each item.

Enclosed please find the Delphi II instrument with its instructions. Please read the instructions carefully, complete the instrument and return it by **February 4, 2000.** Enclosed you will find a self-addressed, stamped envelope for this purpose. If it is more convenient, please fax your responses to (**540) 628**-**8343.**

Again, thank you for agreeing to participate in the study on servant leadership. We look forward to your prompt response.

Sincerely,

Ann T. Abel   David J. Parks, Professor
Doctoral Candidate at Virginia Tech   Educational Leadership
20425 Green Spring Road   209 East Eggleston (0302)
                Abingdon, VA 24211   Virginia Tech
(540) 676-1957 (work)   Blacksburg, VA 24061
(540) 628-3788 (home)
Email: aabel@naxs.com
        anna@wcs.k12.va.us
FAX: (540) 628-8343

Please use the following scale to rate each <u>characteristic</u> as a descriptor of a servant leader: 1 = a poor descriptor, 2 = a fair descriptor, 3 = a good descriptor, or 4 = an excellent descriptor. Please circle the number of your response.

<u>**A servant leader is...**</u>

1.	Joyful in his/her work	1	2	3	4
2.	An effective communicator	1	2	3	4
3.	A collaborative decision-maker	1	2	3	4
4.	A collaborative planner	1	2	3	4
5.	Playful	1	2	3	4
6.	Trustworthy	1	2	3	4
7.	Content in his/her work	1	2	3	4
8.	Respected by peers	1	2	3	4
9.	Spiritual	1	2	3	4
10.	Accountable to others	1	2	3	4
11.	A win-win thinker	1	2	3	4
12.	Optimistic about people	1	2	3	4
13.	Optimistic about outcomes	1	2	3	4
14.	Vulnerable to others	1	2	3	4
15.	Courageous enough to tell the truth	1	2	3	4
16.	Emotionally intelligent	1	2	3	4
17.	Authentic	1	2	3	4
18.	Steadfast	1	2	3	4
19.	Knowledgeable	1	2	3	4
20.	Prophetic	1	2	3	4
21.	Open to others	1	2	3	4
22.	Generous	1	2	3	4
23.	Honest	1	2	3	4
24.	Selfless	1	2	3	4
25.	A forceful leader	1	2	3	4
26.	Task-oriented	1	2	3	4
27.	Caring	1	2	3	4
28.	Value-driven	1	2	3	4
29.	Principle-centered	1	2	3	4
30.	Proactive	1	2	3	4
31.	Creative	1	2	3	4

32.	Curious	1	2	3	4
33.	Humble	1	2	3	4
34.	Persistent	1	2	3	4
35.	Patient	1	2	3	4
36.	Energetic	1	2	3	4

<u>**A servant leader has...**</u>

37.	Empathy	1	2	3	4
38.	A feeling of being "called" to the work	1	2	3	4
39.	Foresight	1	2	3	4
40.	A presence that calms	1	2	3	4
41.	A sense of humor	1	2	3	4
42.	A passion for the goals of the organization	1	2	3	4
43.	A high tolerance for ambiguity	1	2	3	4
44.	A belief in the goodness of individuals	1	2	3	4
45.	A strong personal testimony to share	1	2	3	4
46.	A sincere desire to make a difference	1	2	3	4
47.	A view of self as a part of the whole organization	1	2	3	4
48.	An approachable demeanor	1	2	3	4
49.	A sense of the sacredness of the physical world	1	2	3	4
50.	A pleasant personality	1	2	3	4
51.	A positive outlook	1	2	3	4
52.	A strong work ethic	1	2	3	4
53.	Insight	1	2	3	4
54.	An ethic of service	1	2	3	4
55.	Compassion	1	2	3	4
56.	Integrity	1	2	3	4
57.	Zeal	1	2	3	4
58.	Self-confidence	1	2	3	4
59.	A passion for learning	1	2	3	4
60.	A view of the organization as a part of a larger community	1	2	3	4

Please use the following scale to rate each item as a descriptor of the <u>behavior</u> of a servant leader: 1 = a poor descriptor, 2 = a fair descriptor, 3 = a good descriptor, or 4 = an excellent descriptor. Please circle the number of your response.

<u>A servant leader…</u>

1.	Respects the uniqueness of those being served	1	2	3	4
2.	Motivates people	1	2	3	4
3.	Teaches those being served	1	2	3	4
4.	Listens respectfully	1	2	3	4
5.	Allows time for growth of individuals	1	2	3	4
6.	Allows time for growth of the organization	1	2	3	4
7.	Admits personal mistakes	1	2	3	4
8.	Takes risks to get results	1	2	3	4
9.	Respects the giftedness of those being served	1	2	3	4
10.	Remains calm in difficult situations	1	2	3	4
11.	Inspires calm in others	1	2	3	4
12.	Lets go of what doesn't work	1	2	3	4
13.	Shares possessions freely	1	2	3	4
14.	Assists in developing a group mission	1	2	3	4
15.	Challenges others to do their best	1	2	3	4
16.	Asks about individuals' families	1	2	3	4
17.	Encourages risk-taking in others	1	2	3	4
18.	Creates "win-win" scenarios	1	2	3	4
19.	Leads by example	1	2	3	4
20.	Sets high but realistic goals for staff	1	2	3	4
21.	Creates a certain level of disequilibrium	1	2	3	4
22.	Builds relationships	1	2	3	4
23.	Models a lifestyle of service	1	2	3	4
24.	Seeks opportunities to support others	1	2	3	4
25.	Hires superior staff	1	2	3	4
26.	Provides mentorships	1	2	3	4
27.	Accepts criticism	1	2	3	4
28.	Uses persuasion rather than coercion	1	2	3	4
29.	Looks for solutions rather than placing blame	1	2	3	4
30.	Demonstrates firmness when necessary	1	2	3	4
31.	Maintains high ethical standards	1	2	3	4
32.	Views conflict as an opportunity for growth	1	2	3	4

33.	Subordinates his/her own interests to the common good	1	2	3	4
34.	Wisely utilizes skills of others	1	2	3	4
35.	Challenges the status quo	1	2	3	4
36.	Builds community	1	2	3	4
37.	Builds team spirit	1	2	3	4
38.	Clarifies goals	1	2	3	4
39.	Makes decisions boldly	1	2	3	4
40.	Delegates responsibilities	1	2	3	4
41.	Treats people with dignity	1	2	3	4
42.	Thinks independently	1	2	3	4
43.	Communicates frequently	1	2	3	4
44.	Communicates with excitement	1	2	3	4
45.	Communicates vision to everyone involved	1	2	3	4
46.	Mediates conflict	1	2	3	4
47.	Promotes cooperation	1	2	3	4
48.	Envisions the future	1	2	3	4
49.	Encourages people	1	2	3	4
50.	Holds individuals accountable	1	2	3	4
51.	Takes joy in the success of others	1	2	3	4
52.	Empowers people	1	2	3	4
53.	Values differences	1	2	3	4
54.	Recognizes the contributions of others	1	2	3	4
55.	Mobilizes hope	1	2	3	4
56.	Spends time with individuals	1	2	3	4
57.	Liberates people	1	2	3	4
58.	Goes "to bat" for individuals experiencing difficulties	1	2	3	4
59.	Provides training to help others succeed	1	2	3	4
60.	Shares recognition with the entire group	1	2	3	4
61.	Communicates persuasively	1	2	3	4
62.	Values teamwork and individual initiative simultaneously	1	2	3	4
63.	Seeks the advice of experts	1	2	3	4
64.	Juggles a variety of tasks	1	2	3	4
65.	Makes decisions with participation from others	1	2	3	4

Delphi II/Question 3
Key descriptors of the work environment in which a servant leader is effective

Think carefully about <u>servant leaders</u>. Distinguish them from leaders generally.   Please use the following scale to rate each item according to the strength of your agreement that the item describes an environment in which a servant leader is <u>effective</u>. Please circle the number of your response.

1 = Strongly disagree   2 = Disagree   3 = Agree   4 = Strongly agree

<u>A work environment which has…</u>

1.	Devoted followers	1	2	3	4
2.	Sufficient financial resources	1	2	3	4
3.	A history of good relationships with partner agencies	1	2	3	4
4.	Minimum disparity in salary range	1	2	3	4
5.	Equitably shared profits	1	2	3	4
6.	Constituents appreciative of the sacrifice of the leader	1	2	3	4
7.	An emphasis on ecological concerns	1	2	3	4
8.	An atmosphere that encourages risk-taking	1	2	3	4
9.	An atmosphere that embraces the importance of faith	1	2	3	4
10.	A group that shares a sense of hope	1	2	3	4
11.	A staff with a team mentality	1	2	3	4
12.	A group with commitment to a broad mission	1	2	3	4
13.	360 degree performance evaluations	1	2	3	4
14.	Input from the leader in selecting group members	1	2	3	4
15.	A need for task clarification	1	2	3	4
16.	Attractive work space	1	2	3	4
17.	A supportive community	1	2	3	4
18.	A supportive governing board	1	2	3	4
19.	An atmosphere free of "belly-aching"	1	2	3	4
20.	A need for resolution of conflict	1	2	3	4

21.	A group that honors truth telling	1	2	3	4
22.	An atmosphere where diversity is valued	1	2	3	4
23.	Sufficient human resources	1	2	3	4
24.	Open communication	1	2	3	4
25.	An atmosphere where people are valued	1	2	3	4
26.	Democratic decision making	1	2	3	4
27.	An atmosphere of mutual trust among stakeholders	1	2	3	4
28.	An emphasis on a balanced lifestyle for employees	1	2	3	4
29.	Inclusive work teams	1	2	3	4
30.	An atmosphere where learning is encouraged	1	2	3	4
31.	An atmosphere fostering the growth of individuals	1	2	3	4
32.	An atmosphere where humor is embraced	1	2	3	4
33.	An organization that is nonprofit	1	2	3	4
34.	An emphasis on values	1	2	3	4
35.	A group conscious of its impact on the larger community	1	2	3	4
36.	Freedom for the leader to make decisions with the group	1	2	3	4
37.	An atmosphere that emphasizes people rather than profit	1	2	3	4
38.	A view of the leader as primus inter pares: first amongst equals	1	2	3	4

<u>A servant leader can be effective…</u>

39.	In any work environment	1	2	3	4

Delphi II/Question 4
Key descriptors of the work environment in which a servant leader is ineffective

Think carefully about <u>servant leaders</u>. Distinguish them from leaders generally.   Please use the following scale to rate each item according to the strength of your agreement that the item describes an environment in which a servant leader is <u>ineffective</u>. Please circle the number of your response.

1 = Strongly disagree   2 = Disagree   3 = Agree   4 = Strongly agree

<u>A work environment which has…</u>

1.	Extreme conflict	1	2	3	4
2.	Excessive internal competition	1	2	3	4
3.	Unclear job descriptions	1	2	3	4
4.	Top-down decision making	1	2	3	4
5.	Centralized power in a few individuals	1	2	3	4
6.	Rapid turnover of staff	1	2	3	4
7.	A closed system based on elitism	1	2	3	4
8.	Strong prejudices	1	2	3	4
9.	Poorly chosen goals	1	2	3	4
10.	No plan for future needs	1	2	3	4
11.	Insufficient resources	1	2	3	4
12.	Uncontrolled rapid growth	1	2	3	4
13.	A staff that is fearful of authority	1	2	3	4
14.	A focus on rules	1	2	3	4
15.	Narrow strictures on the leader	1	2	3	4
16.	No guiding operational principles	1	2	3	4
17.	Performance evaluations by the boss only	1	2	3	4
18.	No moral standards	1	2	3	4
19.	No clear values	1	2	3	4
20.	A common practice of deceit	1	2	3	4

21.	Secretive cultures which promote manipulation	1	2	3	4
22.	Poor accountabilities	1	2	3	4
23.	An apathetic community	1	2	3	4
24.	A lack of diversity	1	2	3	4
25.	Constant complaining among colleagues	1	2	3	4
26.	Autonomous individuals	1	2	3	4
27.	A perception of followers as inferior	1	2	3	4
28.	Individual agendas taking precedence over group goals	1	2	3	4
29.	A governing board that interferes with daily operations	1	2	3	4

<u>A work environment which is…</u>

30.	Profit-driven	1	2	3	4
31.	Hierarchical	1	2	3	4
32.	Exploitive of people	1	2	3	4
33.	Rigid	1	2	3	4
34.	Micromanaged	1	2	3	4
35.	Autocratic	1	2	3	4
36.	Lacking in a sense of community	1	2	3	4
37.	Authoritarian	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX C

Delphi III Instrument

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

March 3, 2000

Dear ,

Thank you for your response to the second round (Delphi II) questions on the characteristics, behaviors, and effective work environments of servant leaders. Listed for each item in round three (Delphi III) is the mean, the standard deviation, the overall percentage, as well as your response from the previous round. Please rate only the items that have met the 80% criteria for responses in the 3 or 4 range. Items that did not receive the minimum rating are marked as ~~deleted~~ on your response sheets.

The panel participating in this study is comprised of 28 members and in both rounds the response rate was 100%. Please read the instructions on the enclosed Delphi III instrument carefully, and complete and return by **March 20, 2000.** Enclosed you will find a self-addressed, stamped envelope for this purpose. If it is more convenient, please send your responses to FAX: **(540) 628-8343.**

Again, thank you for your participation in the study on servant leadership. We look forward to your prompt response.

Sincerely,

Ann T. Abel   David J. Parks, Professor
Doctoral Candidate at Virginia Tech   Educational Leadership
20425 Green Spring Road   209 East Eggleston (0302)
Abingdon, VA 24211   Virginia Tech
(540) 676-1957 (work)   Blacksburg, VA 24061
(540) 628-3788 (home)
Email: aabel@naxs.com
        anna@wcs.k12.va.us
FAX: (540) 628-8343

Delphi III/Question 1

Please use the following scale to rate each <u>characteristic</u> as a descriptor of a servant leader:
1 = a poor descriptor, 2 = a fair descriptor, 3 = a good descriptor, or 4 = an excellent descriptor. Please respond only to the items that have not been deleted. Please circle the number of your response.

A servant leader is…	Your rating	Mean[a]	Standard[b] deviation	Overall percentage	Rating scale			
1. ~~Joyful in his/her work~~		3.07	.83	67.9	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
2. An effective communicator		3.33	.68	89.3	1	2	3	4
3. A collaborative decision-maker		3.52	.70	85.7	1	2	3	4
4. A collaborative planner		3.37	.69	85.7	1	2	3	4
5. ~~Playful~~		2.07	.83	28.6	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
6. Trustworthy		3.93	.27	96.4	1	2	3	4
7. ~~Content in his/her work~~		2.81	.83	67.9	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
8. ~~Respected by peers~~		3.30	.78	78.6	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
9. Spiritual		3.36	.68	89.3	1	2	3	4
10. Accountable to others		3.48	.51	96.4	1	2	3	4
11. A win-win thinker		3.54	.58	89.3	1	2	3	4
12. Optimistic about people		3.69	.55	89.3	1	2	3	4
13. Optimistic about outcomes		3.30	.61	89.3	1	2	3	4
14. ~~Vulnerable to others~~		2.96	1.04	75.0	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
15. Courageous enough to tell the truth		3.81	.40	96.4	1	2	3	4
16. Emotionally intelligent		3.42	.70	82.1	1	2	3	4
17. Authentic		3.79	.50	96.4	1	2	3	4
18. Steadfast		3.22	.64	85.7	1	2	3	4
19. Knowledgeable		3.19	.56	89.3	1	2	3	4
20. ~~Prophetic~~		2.63	.88	60.7	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
21. Open to others		3.70	.54	96.4	1	2	3	4
22. Generous		3.41	.57	92.9	1	2	3	4
23. Honest		3.85	.36	96.4	1	2	3	4
24. Selfless		3.59	.64	89.3	1	2	3	4
25. ~~A forceful leader~~		2.48	1.01	53.6	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
26 ~~Task-oriented~~		2.52	1.01	57.1	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
27. Caring		3.67	.55	92.9	1	2	3	4
28. Value-driven		3.56	.70	92.9	1	2	3	4
29. Principle-centered		3.70	.54	92.9	1	2	3	4
30. Proactive		3.37	.63	89.3	1	2	3	4
31. ~~Creative~~		2.89	.80	67.9	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
32. ~~Curious~~		2.79	.83	57.1	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
33. Humble		3.43	.69	92.9	1	2	3	4
34. ~~Persistent~~		3.11	.75	75.0	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
35. Patient		3.22	.75	85.7	1	2	3	4
36. ~~Energetic~~		3.14	.93	64.3	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~

Note.   Strike through indicates items which do not meet the 80% criteria.
[a] **Position or average of responses.**   [b] **Distribution of responses along the continuum.**

A servant leader has….	Your rating	Mean[a]	Standard[b] deviation	Overall percentage	Rating scale			
37. Empathy		3.71	.46	100.0	1	2	3	4
38. A feeling of being "called" to the work		3.59	.50	96.4	1	2	3	4
39. Foresight		3.15	.53	89.3	1	2	3	4
40. ~~A presence that calms~~		3.07	.92	75.0	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
41. ~~A sense of humor~~		3.00	.77	75.0	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
42. A passion for the goals of the organization		3.56	.58	92.9	1	2	3	4
43. ~~A high tolerance for ambiguity~~		3.11	.89	78.6	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
44. A belief in the goodness of individuals		3.48	.64	89.3	1	2	3	4
45. ~~A strong personal testimony to share~~		2.74	.86	67.9	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
46. A sincere desire to help others		3.52	.64	85.7	1	2	3	4
47. A view of self as a part of the whole organization		3.46	.65	89.3	1	2	3	4
48. An approachable demeanor		3.52	.58	96.4	1	2	3	4
49. ~~A sense of the sacredness of the physical world~~		2.82	1.02	53.6	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
50. ~~A pleasant personality~~		2.85	.82	67.9	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
51. A positive outlook		3.48	.64	89.3	1	2	3	4
52. A strong work ethic		3.26	.71	89.3	1	2	3	4
53. Insight		3.30	.61	89.3	1	2	3	4
54. An ethic of service		3.86	.36	100.0	1	2	3	4
55. Compassion		3.89	.31	100.0	1	2	3	4
56. Integrity		3.89	.31	100.0	1	2	3	4
57. Zeal		3.15	.77	82.1	1	2	3	4
58. Self-confidence		3.37	.49	96.4	1	2	3	4
59. A passion for learning		3.57	.57	96.4	1	2	3	4
60. A view of the organization as a part of the larger community		3.68	.55	96.4	1	2	3	4

Note. **Strike through** indicates items which do not meet the 80% criteria.
[a] **Position or average of responses.** [b] **Distribution of responses along the continuum.**

Delphi III/Question 2

Please use the following scale to rate each item as a descriptor of the <u>behavior</u> of a servant leader: 1 = a poor descriptor, 2 = a fair descriptor, 3 = a good descriptor, or 4 = an excellent descriptor. Please respond only to the items that have not been deleted. Please circle the number of your response.

A servant leader ….	Your Rating	Mean[a]	Standard[b] Deviation	Overall Percent	Rating Scale			
1. Respects the uniqueness of those being served		3.79	.42	100.0	1	2	3	4
2. Motivates people		3.44	.64	89.3	1	2	3	4
3. Teaches those being served		3.44	.64	89.3	1	2	3	4
4. Listens respectfully		3.82	.48	96.4	1	2	3	4
5. Allows time for growth of individuals		3.48	.64	89.3	1	2	3	4
6. Allows time for growth of the organization		3.33	.48	96.4	1	2	3	4
7. Admits personal mistakes		3.64	.68	89.3	1	2	3	4
8. Takes risks to get results		3.26	.66	85.7	1	2	3	4
9. Respects the giftedness of those being served		3.64	.62	92.9	1	2	3	4
10. ~~Remains calm in difficult situations~~		3.22	.85	78.6	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
11. Inspires calm in others		3.19	.68	82.1	1	2	3	4
12. ~~Lets go of what doesn't work~~		3.15	.77	75.0	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
13. ~~Shares possessions freely~~		3.00	.83	71.4	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
14. Assists in developing a group mission		3.30	.54	92.9	1	2	3	4
15. Challenges others to do their best		3.52	.70	85.7	1	2	3	4
16. ~~Asks about individuals' families~~		2.81	1.00	67.9	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
17. ~~Encourages risk-taking in others~~		2.93	.78	71.4	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
18. Creates "win-win" scenarios		3.33	.83	82.1	1	2	3	4
19. Leads by example		3.85	.36	96.4	1	2	3	4
20. ~~Sets high but realistic goals for staff~~		3.15	.86	75.0	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
21. ~~Creates a certain level of disequilibrium~~		2.38	.85	42.9	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
22. Builds relationships		3.70	.47	96.4	1	2	3	4
23. Models a lifestyle of service		3.89	.32	96.4	1	2	3	4
24. Seeks opportunities to support others		3.70	.47	96.4	1	2	3	4
25. ~~Hires superior staff~~		2.85	.95	67.9	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
26. Provides mentorships		3.40	.58	85.7	1	2	3	4
27. Accepts criticism		3.50	.65	85.7	1	2	3	4
28. Uses persuasion rather than coercion		3.74	.53	92.9	1	2	3	4
29. Looks for solutions rather than placing blame		3.74	.53	89.3	1	2	3	4
30. ~~Demonstrates firmness when necessary~~		3.35	.75	78.6	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
31. Maintains high ethical standards		3.74	.45	96.4	1	2	3	4
32. Views conflict as an opportunity for growth		3.30	.54	92.9	1	2	3	4
33. Subordinates his/her own interests to the common good		3.64	.56	96.4	1	2	3	4
34. Wisely utilizes skills of others		3.52	.58	92.9	1	2	3	4
35. ~~Challenges the status quo~~		3.11	.89	78.6	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~

Note. **~~Strike through~~ indicates items which do not meet the 80% criteria.**
[a] **Position or average of responses.** [b] **Distribution of responses along the continuum.**

A servant leader …	Your rating	Mean[a]	Standard[b] deviation	Overall percentage	Rating scale			
36. Builds community		3.82	.39	100.0	1	2	3	4
37. Builds team spirit		3.59	.57	92.9	1	2	3	4
38. ~~Clarifies goals~~		3.26	.86	78.6	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
39. ~~Makes decision boldly~~		2.96	.87	75.0	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
40. ~~Delegates responsibility~~		3.41	.80	78.6	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
41. Treats people with dignity		3.81	.48	92.9	1	2	3	4
42. ~~Thinks independently~~		3.07	.83	75.0	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
43. Communicates frequently		3.48	.58	92.9	1	2	3	4
44. ~~Communicates with excitement~~		2.81	.79	64.3	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
45. ~~Communicates vision to everyone involved~~		3.41	.80	78.6	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
46. Mediates conflict		3.19	.62	85.7	1	2	3	4
47. Promotes cooperation		3.59	.50	96.4	1	2	3	4
48. Envisions the future		3.56	.70	85.7	1	2	3	4
49. Encourages people		3.85	.36	96.4	1	2	3	4
50. Holds individuals accountable		3.44	.64	89.3	1	2	3	4
51. Takes joy in the success of others		3.85	.36	96.4	1	2	3	4
52. Empowers people		3.73	.45	89.3	1	2	3	4
53. Values differences		3.71	.46	100.0	1	2	3	4
54. Recognizes the contributions of others		3.85	.36	96.4	1	2	3	4
55. Mobilizes hope		3.59	.57	92.9	1	2	3	4
56. Spends time with individuals		3.48	.58	92.9	1	2	3	4
57. Liberates people		3.48	.59	85.7	1	2	3	4
58. Goes "to bat" for individuals experiencing difficulties		3.30	.67	85.7	1	2	3	4
59. Provides training to help others succeed		3.44	.75	82.1	1	2	3	4
60. Shares recognition with the entire group		3.56	.58	92.9	1	2	3	4
61. Communicates persuasively		3.33	.68	85.7	1	2	3	4
62. Values teamwork and individual initiative simultaneously		3.70	.47	96.4	1	2	3	4
63. Seeks the advice of experts		3.32	.77	82.1	1	2	3	4
64. ~~Juggles a variety of tasks~~		3.07	.83	75.0	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
65. Makes decisions with participation from others		3.56	.64	85.7	1	2	3	4

Note. ~~**Strike through**~~ **indicates items which do not meet the 80% criteria.**
[a] **Position or average of responses.** [b] **Distribution of responses along the continuum.**

Delphi III/Question 3

Think carefully about <u>servant leaders.</u> Distinguish them from leaders generally. Please use the following scale to rate each item according to the strength of your agreement that the item describes an environment in which a servant leader is <u>effective.</u> Please respond only to the items that have not been deleted. Please circle the number of your response

1 = Strongly disagree   2 = Disagree   3 = Agree   4 = Strongly agree

A work environment which has….	Your Rating	Mean[a]	Standard[b] Deviation	Overall Percent	Rating Scale			
1. ~~Devoted followers~~		3.00	.89	71.4	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
2. ~~Sufficient financial resources~~		2.92	.74	71.4	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
3. A history of good relationships with partner agencies		3.12	.71	82.1	1	2	3	4
4. ~~Minimum disparity~~		2.74	.90	57.1	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
5. ~~Equitably shared profits~~		3.11	.85	75.0	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
6. ~~Constituents appreciative of the sacrifice of the leader~~		3.04	.73	67.0	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
7. ~~An emphasis on ecological concerns~~		2.74	.86	60.7	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
8. An atmosphere that encourages risk-taking		3.27	.53	89.3	1	2	3	4
9. ~~An atmosphere that embraces the importance of faith~~		3.35	.75	78.6	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
10. A group that shares a sense of hope		3.76	.44	89.3	1	2	3	4
11. A staff with a team mentality		3.62	.50	92.9	1	2	3	4
12. A group with commitment to a broad mission		3.62	.57	89.3	1	2	3	4
13. ~~360 degree performance evaluations~~		3.00	.83	64.3	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
14. ~~Input from the leader in selecting group members~~		3.04	.72	78.6	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
15. ~~A need for task clarification~~		2.85	.78	57.1	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
16. ~~Attractive work space~~		2.88	.77	67.9	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
17. A supportive community		3.58	.50	92.9	1	2	3	4
18. A supportive governing board		3.46	.51	92.9	1	2	3	4
19. ~~An atmosphere free of "belly-aching"~~		3.19	.80	78.6	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
20. ~~A need for resolution of conflict~~		3.23	.71	78.6	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
21. A group that honors truth telling		3.81	.40	92.9	1	2	3	4
22. An atmosphere where diversity is valued		3.85	.36	96.4	1	2	3	4
23. ~~Sufficient human resources~~		3.35	.75	78.6	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
24. Open communication		3.78	.42	96.4	1	2	3	4
25. An atmosphere where people are valued		3.96	.19	96.4	1	2	3	4
26. Democratic decision making		3.23	.59	85.7	1	2	3	4
27. An atmosphere of mutual trust among stakeholders		3.78	.42	96.4	1	2	3	4
28. An emphasis on a balanced lifestyle for employees		3.32	.63	82.1	1	2	3	4
29. Inclusive work teams		3.44	.51	96.4	1	2	3	4
30. An atmosphere where learning is encouraged		3.82	.39	100.0	1	2	3	4
31. An atmosphere fostering the growth of individuals		3.89	.31	100.0	1	2	3	4
32. An atmosphere where humor is embraced		3.46	.51	100.0	1	2	3	4
33. ~~An organization that is nonprofit~~		2.42	.95	46.4	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~
34. An emphasis on values		3.75	.52	96.4	1	2	3	4
35. A group conscious of its impact on the larger community		3.75	.52	96.4	1	2	3	4

[a] position or average of responses   [b] distribution of responses along the continuum
~~Strike through~~ indicates items which do not meet the 80% criteria.

A work environment which has….	Your Rating	Mean[a]	Standard[b] Deviation	Overall Percent	Rating Scale			
36. Freedom for the leader to make decisions with the group		3.56	.51	96.4	1	2	3	4
37. An atmosphere that emphasizes people rather than profit		3.62	.50	92.9	1	2	3	4
38. A view of the leader as primus inter pares: first amongst equals		3.19	.79	82.1	1	2	3	4
A servant leader can be effective….								
39. ~~In any work environment~~		2.96	1.00	60.7	~~1~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~

[a] **position or average of responses**   [b] **distribution of responses along the continuum**

~~Strike through~~ **indicates items which do not meet the 80% criteria.**

Delphi III/Question 4

Think carefully about <u>servant leaders.</u> Distinguish them from leaders generally. Please use the following scale to rate each item according to the strength of your agreement that the item describes an environment in which a servant leader is <u>ineffective.</u> Please respond only to the items that have not been deleted. Please circle the number of your response.

1 = Strongly disagree   2 = Disagree   3 = Agree   4 = Strongly agree

A work environment which has…	Your rating	Mean[a]	Standard[b] deviation	Overall percent	Rating scale
1. ~~Extreme conflict~~		2.92	.88	57.1	~~1 2 3 4~~
2. ~~Excessive internal competition~~		3.00	.65	71.4	~~1 2 3 4~~
3. ~~Unclear job descriptions~~		2.80	.87	53.6	~~1 2 3 4~~
4. ~~Top-down decision-making~~		3.12	.73	78.6	~~1 2 3 4~~
5. ~~Centralized power in a few individuals~~		3.32	.75	75.0	~~1 2 3 4~~
6. ~~Rapid turnover of staff~~		2.96	.73	64.3	~~1 2 3 4~~
7. ~~A closed system based on elitism~~		3.42	.86	78.6	~~1 2 3 4~~
8. ~~Strong prejudices~~		3.40	.87	75.0	~~1 2 3 4~~
9. ~~Poorly chosen goals~~		3.04	.93	67.9	~~1 2 3 4~~
10. ~~No plan for future needs~~		2.96	.89	60.7	~~1 2 3 4~~
11. ~~Insufficient resources~~		2.72	.79	46.4	~~1 2 3 4~~
12. ~~Uncontrolled rapid growth~~		2.72	.74	50.0	~~1 2 3 4~~
13. ~~A staff that is fearful of authority~~		3.04	.82	71.4	~~1 2 3 4~~
14. ~~A focus on rules~~		2.76	.72	60.7	~~1 2 3 4~~
15. ~~Narrow strictures on the leader~~		3.00	.76	71.4	~~1 2 3 4~~
16. ~~No guiding operational principles~~		3.16	.80	75.0	~~1 2 3 4~~
17. ~~Performance evaluations by the boss only~~		2.76	.60	60.7	~~1 2 3 4~~
18. ~~No moral standards~~		3.40	.87	75.0	~~1 2 3 4~~
19. ~~No clear values~~		3.24	.83	75.0	~~1 2 3 4~~
20. ~~A common practice of deceit~~		3.54	.83	75.0	~~1 2 3 4~~
21. Secretive cultures which promote manipulation		3.50	.81	82.1	1 2 3 4
22. ~~Poor accountabilities~~		2.96	.79	67.9	~~1 2 3 4~~
23. ~~An apathetic community~~		2.88	.67	64.3	~~1 2 3 4~~
24. ~~A lack of diversity~~		2.76	.66	57.1	~~1 2 3 4~~
25. ~~Constant complaining among colleagues~~		2.84	.69	67.9	~~1 2 3 4~~
26. ~~Autonomous individuals~~		2.64	.95	50.0	~~1 2 3 4~~
27. A perception of followers as inferior		3.38	.80	82.1	1 2 3 4
28. ~~Individual agendas taking precedence over group goals~~		3.28	.79	78.6	~~1 2 3 4~~
29. ~~A governing board that interferes with daily operations~~		3.24	.78	78.6	~~1 2 3 4~~
A work environment which is….					
30. ~~Profit-driven~~		2.62	.80	46.4	~~1 2 3 4~~
31. ~~Hierarchical~~		3.04	.66	75.0	~~1 2 3 4~~
32. Exploitive of people		3.58	.81	82.1	1 2 3 4

<u>Note.</u> ~~Strike through~~ indicates items which do not meet the 80% criteria.
[a] Position or average of responses.   [b] Distribution of responses along the continuum.

A work environment which is…	Your rating	Mean[a]	Standard[b] deviation	Overall percent	Rating scale
33. ~~Rigid~~		3.12	.77	78.6	~~1 2 3 4~~
34. ~~Micromanaged~~		3.20	.82	75.0	~~1 2 3 4~~
35. Autocratic		3.23	.76	82.1	1 2 3 4
36. ~~Lacking in a sense of community~~		3.15	.78	78.6	~~1 2 3 4~~
37. ~~Authoritarian~~		3.27	.83	78.6	~~1 2 3 4~~
Note. **~~Strike through~~** indicates items which do not meet the 80% criteria. [a] **Position or average of responses.** [b] **Distribution of responses along the continuum.**					

VITA

Ann Todd Abel

20425 Green Spring Road
Abingdon, Virginia 24211
(540) 628-3788 ● (540) 628-8343
anna@wcs.k12.va.us
aabel@naxs.com
August, 2000

Education

2000	Doctor of Education (Ed. D.) Degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
1998	Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) Degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
1973	Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) Degree in early childhood and elementary education from East Tennessee State University
1971	Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) Degree in Psychology from Maryville College

Employment History

2000 – Present	Elementary Principal, Washington County Public Schools, Abingdon, Virginia.
1998 – 2000	Coordinator of Gifted and Talented Programs, Washington County Public Schools, Abingdon, Virginia. In this position, I coordinated the K-12 program for gifted and talented students overseeing 23 site coordinators and working directly with the Parent Advisory Committee. While in the position of coordinator, I served as chairperson for the regional organization and as a member of the statewide Gifted Consortium.
1997 – 1998	Emerging Literacy Lead Teacher, Washington County Public Schools, Abingdon, Virginia. As lead teacher I worked directly with 56 kindergarten and first grade teachers to implement the addition of a phonics component to the reading program.

1989 – 1997	<u>Elementary Librarian/Media Specialist</u>, Washington County Public Schools, Abingdon, Virginia. While providing the library program for K-5, I initiated the use of a reading program designed to increase student achievement, traveled as a consultant to other divisions, completed the automation of library services for the school, and served as technology coordinator.
1988 – 1989	<u>Remedial Reading and Math Teacher/ Librarian</u>, Washington County Public Schools, Abingdon, Virginia. In this position I provided library services for a small rural K-7 school in addition to offering remedial services to students in grades 2-5.
1971 – 1881	<u>Elementary Teacher</u>, Bristol, Virginia, Public Schools. As a teacher I taught in both low-income and middle class areas. During the opening of a K-6 elementary school I served as grade leader responsible for coordinating the curriculum and as a member of the school council.