



Evaluating the Instrumento de Contribución al Liderazgo de Siervo (ICLS) for Reliability in Latin America

Timothy A. McIntosh
ProMETA, Trinity Western University

Justin A. Irving
Bethel Seminary, Bethel University

With interest in servant leadership growing beyond North America and Europe, there is a need for reliable instruments in languages beyond English to research the construct in other regions of the world. This study was designed to examine the reliability of the Spanish translation of the Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument. Research in Lima, Peru, demonstrated that the translated instrument was reliable in three of its scales—(a) love (.8373), (b) empowerment (.9167), and (c) vision (.9047)—paving the way for increased servant leadership study in that country and other parts of Latin America. The instrument had a lower reliability rating in its humility scale (.4987) and the authors suggest that this finding may be associated with culturally established patterns of leadership in Peru.

Servant leadership continues to grow in credibility in the U.S. and Europe as a serious option for those attaining to effective leadership in many contexts (Blanchard & Hodges, 2003; Elmer, 2006). While interest in servant leadership is growing in the non-English speaking world, much less scholarly literature is coming from those areas on the subject due in part to the lack of reliable servant leadership empirical research instruments in the native languages. This study proposed to find if the Instrumento de Contribución al Liderazgo de Siervo (ICLS)—a Spanish translation of the Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (SLAI)—was a reliable instrument that could be of use in measuring servant leadership in the Latin American context, thus encouraging further study of servant leadership in the region. Research in Lima, Peru, demonstrated that the Spanish translation of the SLAI is reliable in three of its constructs, paving the way for increased servant leadership study in that country and other parts of Latin American.

The study took place in 2005 in Lima, Peru's capital, with participants from the Evangelical Seminary of Lima (Seminario Evangélico de Lima [SEL], 2007). SEL students and professors had previously shown interest in servant leadership (Irving & McIntosh, 2006) and 78 people willingly took part in this study. The authors know of no other research in Latin America using the SLAI.

In 2007, a focus group of SEL graduates indicated that they believed that servant leadership was not only a viable, but also a needed option for Peruvian leadership practices (McIntosh, 2008). They stated the growth of servant leadership was slow due to lack of models in the country. Anderson (2006) interviewed 23 leaders across Latin America and, while finding many who accepted servant leadership as an effective model of leadership, found that few believed they had seen servant leadership in practice in the region. The use of the SLAI may lead to increased interest in and growth of servant leadership in Peru and the region as well as opening doors to future research on various nuances of the model. Irving and McIntosh (2007) found that Laub's (1999) Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) was reliable for measuring both servant leadership and job satisfaction in Latin America and desired to see if the SLAI, used to study some of Patterson's (2003) servant leadership constructs, would be an aid to understanding servant leadership in the region.

The appropriateness of using a research instrument in a culture other than the one where it was originally tested is always an important issue (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004). However, at the very least the SLAI provided a starting point for gathering empirical data with the first step being that of evaluating reliability. It was important to administer the SLAI in a Spanish-speaking country to find another valuable tool in understanding servant leadership in that segment of the world.

Literature Review

Servant Leadership

The past 15 years since the early 1990s has seen a dramatic increase in both the study and organizational practice of servant leadership. Servant leadership, as a discipline of study, traces its roots to Robert Greenleaf's description and definition of servant leadership. In response to the question "Who is the servant-leader?" Greenleaf (1977) provided his now frequently quoted response:

The servant-leader *is* servant first. . . . It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve *first*. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. That person is sharply different from one who is *leader* first. . . . The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant-first to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served. The best test, and difficult to administer, is this: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, *while being served*, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? *And*, what is the effect on the least privileged in society; will they benefit, or, at least, not be further deprived? (p. 27)

Since Greenleaf's important treatment of servant leadership in the 20th century, the number of studies focused on servant leadership continues to grow exponentially. Some of the more recent treatments include (a) Omoh's (2007) examination of the presence of servant

leadership characteristics in the community college presidency, (b) Irving and Longbotham's (2007a, 2007b) analyses of servant leadership predictors of team effectiveness, (c) Dingman's (2007) exploration of the role of servant leadership in the succession planning process, (d) Amaral's (2007) affirmation of servant leadership effectiveness in the Brazilian context, and (e) Molnar's (2007) cross-cultural study of national culture dimensions and servant leadership. Molnar's study, which included 3,282 respondents from 23 countries in the Northern Hemisphere, represents a significant look at servant leadership from an international perspective.

The growing interest in servant leadership studies is also observed in the wide range of sectors found in the expanding literature. Of the small sampling of theoretical and research-based pieces listed in this section of the paper, cited authors reflect on the application of servant leadership in sectors and contexts diverse as (a) government, (b) education, (c) historic pioneers, (d) business, (e) firefighting, (f) professional safety management, (g) faith-based, (h) not-for-profit, (i) North American, (j) African, and (k) Brazilian.

Focusing on servant leadership in the Manitoban context, Crippen (2005a, 2005b, 2006) engaged servant leadership in both the domains of education and history. First, Crippen (2006) examined a legacy of servant leadership in three Manitoba pioneer women, identifying how they made history through their service, leadership, and determination to serve their communities. In addition to this, Crippen (2005b) identified Greenleaf's *first to serve, then to lead* concept as being an effective model for educational leadership and management, arguing for its importance specifically in the Manitoban educational community. Also focused on the educational community, Crippen (2005a) presented a servant leader perspective on inclusive education, noting its application to provincial legislation requiring an inclusive philosophy of education focused on meeting the needs of each student.

Neill, Hayward, and Peterson (2007) examined students' perceptions of interprofessional teams in practice through the application of servant leadership principles and identified a significant pre-test to post-test effect on students' perceptions deemed essential to effective interprofessional practice. Bryant (2005) presented servant leadership as the foundation from which many communities of hope are emerging, noting that servant leadership practices have led to some of the best companies in which to work. Koch (2004) identified servant leadership as a method of leadership that the Catholic Church, bishops, and other church leaders could learn from, particularly in light of the church scandals in the U.S. in recent years. Also providing an examination of the importance of servant leadership in the Catholic Church, Ebener (2007) provided evidence of organizational citizenship behaviors and servant leader behaviors in three high-performing Catholic parishes.

Stanley (1995) and Manning (2004) both engaged the connection between servant leadership and leadership in firefighting organizations. Manning specifically argued that servant leadership provides a context in which resonant trust, achieved reciprocally through individual empowerment, can be realized. Sarkus (1996) discussed the connection between servant leadership and professional safety practice, a concept picked up 10 years later by Krebs (2006). Humphreys (2005) provides a historical investigation of the military leadership of Xenophon and Chief Joseph (transformational and servant leaders respectively) in order to evaluate the proposal of B. N. Smith, Montagno, and Kuzmenko (2004) on their contextual contrast of transformational and servant leadership. Parolini (2007) also focused on the distinction between transformational and servant leadership and identified five statistically significant discriminant

items associated with this difference.

Focused specifically on Livingstone College in North Carolina, Freeman (2004) identified servant leadership in the community as a basis from which family involvement in education has arisen. Stephen (2007) provided an examination of public school principals' perceptions of servant leadership as a successful leadership style. In the examination, Stephen identified 60 specific servant leadership actions and found that all of the principals spoke favorably of servant leadership as a successful leadership style for public schools. Complementing the work of Contee-Borders' in developing an operational definition of servant leadership for a for-profit business, Walker (2007) examined servant leadership in the non-profit world, focusing on defining servant leadership in a not-for-profit social service organization.

Focus on servant leadership in environments outside of North American contexts continues to grow. In his article, Kumuyi (2007) presented a case for servant leadership in the African context. Kumuyi argued that "what Africa needs for its redemption is servant leadership instead of the self-serving governance that the continent is famed for" (p. 18). In keeping with Greenleaf's description of servant leadership beginning with a natural desire to serve—to serve first—Kumuyi noted that the primary motivation for African leaders seeking to lead should be grounded in a deep desire to serve and help. Kumuyi even went so far to state that no leadership style succeeds in creating enabling environments for corporate trust and a fertile nursery for viable seeds of all-round growth like servant leadership. In light of this, Kumuyi argued that African politicians in particular must study servant leadership in order to discern how its core principles are to be injected into their personality and politicking.

Researchers further exploring servant leadership in the global context include: (a) Irving (2007) evaluated the reliability of the Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument in the French-speaking Rwandan context; (b) Amaral (2007) explored servant leadership in the Brazilian context, where he found that the servant leadership emphases of leadership focus, influence, character, and heart had a significant impact on the lives of research participants and positively affected leaders serving under them as well; and (c) Molnar (2007) engaged in a cross-cultural study of national culture dimensions and servant leadership, focused on the correlative and influential relationship gender has upon the applicability of servant leadership to the sample population.

Leadership in Latin America

According to a number of studies on leadership in the region (Amaral, 2007; Anderson, 2006; McIntosh, 2008; Romero, 2004), traditional Latin America leadership styles are the opposite of Greenleaf's (1977) servant leadership model. The predominant leadership style in Latin America coming from the Spanish conquest, continuing through the colonial and early independence periods, and extending to today is *caudillaje* or *caudillismo* (Dealy, 1992a, 1992b). Hamill (1992) defined caudillo and caudillismo as dictator and dictatorship respectively. Hamill reported the word caudillo comes from the Latin *capitellum*, the diminutive of *caput* or head. The caudillo is the head, the only head of the entity he leads. Dealy (1992a) stated that caudillaje is a style of life that arose out of the Renaissance era with the domination of one man, the caudillo. Amaral (2007) said the authoritarian style holds true for Brazil, a former Portuguese colony, as well.

Another term often used in the literature on Latin America is *cacique* and it is most often seen as a caudillo on the local level such as the town or particular organization while the caudillo operates on a broader stage such as an area of the country or the country itself (Hamill, 1992). Chevalier (1992) quoted the 1729 definition of cacique from the *Spanish Dictionary of the Real Academia*: “The first of his village or the republic, the one who more authority or power and who because of his prides wants to make himself feared and obeyed by all of his inferiors” (p. 30).

Montaner (2001) saw the roots of the Spanish view of leadership coming from Thomas Aquinas who held that under collective interest individual rights are not absolute, but relative. Morse (1992) agreed with that evaluation but believed that in the 16th century the Thomistic component becomes less important and the Machiavellian component becomes dominant. Machiavelli’s *The Prince* is a blue print for how dictators achieve power. Morse stated, “On nearly every page of Machiavelli appears practical advice which almost seems to be distilled from the careers of scores of Spanish American caudillos” (p. 79).

P. H. Smith (1992) viewed caudillismo as an example of Weber’s (1947) charismatic leader. Weber called charisma the gift of grace with some leaders having a special ability to inspire intense loyalty to some sort of higher ideal. According to Smith, Fidel Castro of Cuba and Juan Perón of Argentina are prime examples of such leaders. He believed that Latin Americans accept this type of leadership approach because the people view it as legitimate, which Weber believed is necessary for any leadership style to be accepted. Smith stated that the typical Anglo view that Latin America has a deficient view of leadership is not accurate because the people themselves have embraced this approach for their own context.

Caudillaje is a mode of being that is elitist (Dealy, 1992b), measuring one’s worth in terms of accumulated power. That power comes from one’s family and friends. Dealy (1992a) gave an example of the conqueror Francisco Pizarro’s army in Peru. The men from Trujillo, Spain—Pizarro’s home—occupied the first 37 of 180 positions while the top five were held by Pizarro, his two illegitimate brothers, a half-brother, and a legitimate brother. Dealy called the caudillo the public man or the surrounded man due to his need for connections with other people. He stated the caudillo takes two steps to leadership in refusing to delegate authority and then become accessible as he does favors for others and in general seeks to cement his alliances. Chevalier (1992) believed the caudillo cannot refuse assistance in the form of positions and favors to relatives because they are his surest form of support.

Wolf and Hansen (1992) pointed out the aim of the caudillo is to gain wealth. High value is placed on interpersonal skills as the means of getting the wealth. One interpersonal skill is the capacity to dominate woman or *machismo*. Caudillos are almost always male and leadership in Latin America reflects that domination. Machismo is also defined as the readiness to use violence. The qualities of successful leadership rest in the person, not in the office, as the person only maintains his position through his machismo and his connectedness. There is a history of constant turnover of leadership in Latin America due to power struggles that see the person as more important than the position. The caudillo must be able to band a number of smaller groups into a stronger band, using a few key lieutenants. Holding power is difficult and caudillos are often pressed by the need to seek more finances.

Since the sampling of the SLAI is taken from Peru, it is important to note that caudillismo is an important theme in the history of Peruvian leadership (Aljovin, 2000; Basadre, 1962; Gootenberg, 1997; Salinas, 2001). Aljovin proposed the newly formed Peruvian

government actually relied on caudillos to keep order as the nation was searching for identity. Peru's last military coup in 1967 is an example of how a caudillo, Velasco, was able to wield power well in the 20th century. Salinas stated that the Fujimori government (1990-2001), under the guidance of the strong-armed Montecinos, continued the authoritarian tradition.

The Shinning Path, a violent Peruvian communist terrorist movement, used and presumably still uses, a typical caudillo style in its top-down leadership style (Gorriti, 1999). Paredes (2003) disagreed with this analysis and says that the Shinning Path puts more emphasis on empowerment than other Peruvian entities by making leadership more diffuse. He says the Shinning Path is one of the few Latin America examples of participatory leadership. His claim needs further study as the Shinning Path sharply decreased in influence in Peru after the fall of their caudillo, Abimael Guzmán, in 1992. Having noted this, Paredes still calls the Shinning Path a dictatorship with similarities to the caudillo style of leadership.

A review of the empirical literature on leadership comes largely from the following resources: (a) Hofstede's (1980, 1997, 2001) dimensions of culture; (b) the nine themes of Osland, De Franco, and Osland (1999); (c) the extensive research of the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness Research Project (GLOBE; House et al., 2004); and (d) Romero (2004, 2005). All four studies have at least one of their goals as the understanding of the relationship between culture and leadership with different models being appropriate in different cultures. House et al. called these culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership (CLTs). Hofstede and House et al. gave considerable information on numerous Latin American countries while Osland et al. and Romero (2004, 2005) conducted their research exclusively on Latin America.

Romeo (2004) saw the possibility for a significant shift in Latin America leadership in the current era from the *patrón* style to modern leadership. Cantor and Mischel (1979) and Nye and Forsyth (1991) called the leader prototype the most common concept of what a leader should be within a given culture. Romeo saw the *patrón* style as the Latin American prototype, and gave this characterization saying traditional leaders:

1. Can be described as autocratic and directive.
2. Seldom delegate work.
3. Seldom use teams.
4. Use formal top-down communication as the normal mode of communication.
5. Avoid conflict and are relationship oriented.
6. Are expected to be assertive and aggressive. (p. 30)

Romeo (2004) conducted a study with the Business Association of Latin American Studies (BALAS), Iberoamerican Academy of Management, and the Academy of Management's International Division on whether countries tended more toward the patron or toward the modern style. Leader A represented the traditional leader (*El Patrón*) and leader B represented the modern leader. He used a 5-point scale with the following values: 1 (*Totally A*), 2 (*Almost A*), 3 (*Between A & B*), 4 (*Almost B*), and 5 (*Totally B*). Romeo called the results preliminary and exploratory in nature, with seven countries studied and a total of 74 participants.

Romeo (2004) listed the following propositions as reasons for a possible shift from the patron to the modern leader:

1. High levels of interaction with multinational firms and more economically developed countries will influence leaders to emulate the leadership styles of leaders from these

- companies and countries.
2. Participative leadership style will be more prevalent and effective in Latin America countries with strong economic growth and a modernizing economy.
 3. Participative and supportive leadership will be more accepted in countries that have a high proportion of women in leadership positions.
 4. The longer women have exercised leadership roles, the stronger the effect women will have on follower expectations of participative and supportive leadership in a particular country. (p. 31)

As Romeo (2004) developed the theme of shifts in leadership, he also needed to show evidence for the modern style being the preferred style. He needed to document a shift in Latin America to more female leadership and in turn show how this shift influences leadership style. It will take a significant longitudinal study to show how a shift in leadership directly affects the economic growth of a particular country.

Hofstede (1980, 1984, 1997) theorized that a culture consists of dimensions that predict behavior. His original study (1980) included IBM middle managers in 53 countries. He found four culture dimensions: (a) power distance, (b) individualism-collectivism, (c) uncertainty avoidance, and (d) masculinity-femininity. Hofstede (1997) added a fifth dimension and eventually called it long-term orientation. Hofstede received criticism for being overly simplistic, concentrating on one company, being inattentive to the considerable significant cultural differences within countries, and ignoring the ongoing changes within cultures (McSweeney, 2002). Despite such criticisms, Hofstede's work dominated the study of how culture affects leadership up to the time of GLOBE studies.

GLOBE is a 10-year research program that is likely to be at the center of cross-cultural leadership discussions for some time. House et al. (2004) noted that, "Thousands of doctoral dissertations in the future will start with these findings" (p. 727). With over 150 researchers and 62 countries from all major regions of the world, Dickson, Hartog, and Mitchelson (2003) argued that it is probably the most extensive investigation of cross-cultural aspects of leadership to date.

In their research, GLOBE used a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods. A 735-item instrument measured nine dimensions of culture and six dimensions of leadership. The Alpha coefficient of the instrument was .85, indicating high reliability.

The GLOBE report used nine cultural dimensions as opposed to Hofstede's five. The GLOBE dimensions are: (a) assertiveness, (b) collectivism (institutional), (c) collectivism (in-group), (d) gender egalitarianism, (e) humane orientation, (f) power distance, (g) performance orientation, (h) uncertainty avoidance, and (i) future orientation. The GLOBE study identified six global leader behaviors: (a) charismatic/value based leadership, (b) team orientated leadership, (c) participative leadership, (d) humane-orientated leadership, (e) autonomous leadership, and (f) self protective leadership.

The GLOBE findings concurred with the Hofstede studies in indicating that one should be very careful in placing all the cultures of Latin America into one large stereotype. The GLOBE study found that there was high probability for grouping areas of the world into clusters but significant difference between the various countries still remains. The Cronbach alpha probability for Latin America was .75. The study combined Spanish-speaking Latin America with Brazil. The ten Latin American countries studied were Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, and Venezuela. Clustering

was broken down for various parts of the world by high-score, mid-score, and low-score clusters. There were two classifications of clusters: (a) societal cultural practices (as is), and (b) societal cultural practices (should be). The first dealt with practices in the society and the second with the values of the society. The conclusion was that practices and values of the societies did not match up in most of the clusters. That was often the case in the Latin America cluster.

Osland et al. (1999) presented nine leadership themes that are important in Latin America: (a) “simpatia” (empathy), personal dignity, and classism; (b) personalism; (c) particularism; (d) trust; (e) collectivism and in-group/out-group behavior; (f) paternalism; (g) power; (h) humor and joy; and (i) fatalism. Their comments are directed to the expatriate doing business in Latin America but all who want to exercise leadership in Latin America should pay close attention to these themes.

Servant Leadership in Latin America

The growing body of literature suggests interest in servant leadership is increasing in Latin America. Amaral (2007), Anderson (2006), Cote (2003), Ruloff (2006), Segura (2005), and Serrano (2006) are examples of recent significant contributions to the topic based on research coming from Latin America. This is in spite of historical skepticism to the concept. When Amaral began his course on servant leadership to Brazilian pastors he reported that one called servant leadership utopian and that others later shared they had the same sentiments.

Amaral (2007) found that while servant leadership principles run counter to Brazilian leadership values, pastors are open to behavioral change after exposure to teaching on the subject. Amaral taught a one-week course on servant leadership in Brazil and reported that after the week that some of the pastors still saw servant leadership as utopian but most saw the exercise of that model as a call from Jesus and that they were more willing to apply the model after taking the course than before the course.

Amaral (2007) sought to see how the servant leadership course would change behavior in what he called four emphases of leadership: (a) focus, (b) influence, (c) character, and (d) heart. He stated the focus of servant leadership is serving people. Amaral called the servant leadership influence as referring to the ability of the leader to impact others. According to Amaral, servant leadership character refers to the attitudes and behaviors that express the values of the leaders. He states that the heart of the servant leader refers to the dominant passion and understanding of power that drive his or her efforts.

Amaral (2007) did two evaluations of the pastors and the people they lead, one 6 months after the course and another 12 months later. He found that the pastors believed they changed their behavior in all four areas but the followers did not necessarily recognize the change. An especially interesting observation is that after 6 months the followers actually believed their leader’s influence had declined due to the application of the servant leadership model. It is likely that the new servant leadership influence did not meet the cultural expectations of the followers who were looking for the authoritarian rule model to match what they normally experience in and out of the church. Amaral did not have statistics for the 12-month evaluation but believed that the focus of the pastors continued to change over that period of time to a commitment to servant leadership. While Amaral does not state this as such, it is probably unrealistic to think of major paradigm shifts in leadership style and leadership style expectations over that period of

time.

A major contribution of the Amaral (2007) study is that it supplied data on how training on servant leadership can effect a change of values. It is worth doing further research of this nature on the influence of teaching/training on servant leadership to see how it will affect the implication of the construct in Latin American societies as well as other contexts.

Anderson (2006) detailed obstacles to servant leadership in Latin America. He interviewed 23 Latin America leaders and found that nearly half could not name an example of servant leadership in their context. He studied the following areas as they pertained to servant leadership: (a) character issues, (b) socio-cultural elements, (c) family dynamics, (d) issues pertaining to female leadership, (e) disobedience to Scripture, (f) spirituality issues particular to Evangelicals, (g) servant leadership terminology and practice, (h) the academic and intellectual development of a leader, (i) lack of vision, and (j) issues related to follower. Each of the leaders saw value in the servant leadership model but there were doubts concerning how well the model would work in an area where the caudillo or cacique approach has long dominated.

Cote (2003) and Segura (2005) viewed servant leadership as the preferred model of Jesus Christ. In their writings, addressed primarily to Christian leaders, they saw the servant leadership model as not only practical, but also the only real hope for the kind of leadership needed in the Latin American church. Batista (1998) presented another original work on servant leadership from a Puerto Rican perspective. He mentioned that a leader's motives may be an obstacle to obeying Christian principles and laments the fact that many leaders are not consistent with their beliefs and values when they adopt particular leadership theories. Although Batista's work is an important contribution, it is difficult to obtain copies due to it not being published by a major distributor. Cote and Segura are sure to have a much greater influence in the future.

Serrano (2006) studied the attitudes of Panamanians concerning servant leadership and found those studied to be extremely positive toward a servant leadership model. She called Latin America "fertile soil for the teaching and development of leaders who exercise the traits of servant leadership and lead through the applying of the seven constructs of Patterson's theory" (p. 165).

Serrano's (2006) findings are very significant in the light of other Latin American studies (e.g., Irving & McIntosh, 2006). Of particular note, while research participants often intellectually accepted servant leadership as valid, they are also skeptical of how well it will work in everyday leadership situations. Marinho (2005) noted that while the Brazilian corporate environment recognizes that the principles of servant leadership have "an incontestable appeal" (p. 115), at the same time the term *servant* is not terribly attractive to Brazilians due to associated religious and historical factors. Amaral (2007) said that when Brazilians think of the word servant they think of one of two words, *servo* or *servente*. *Servo* brings the idea of working in the sugar cane plantations. *Servente* is one who has little formal education and serves as domestic help. Neither has a positive connotation in Brazilian society. Arroyo (2005), while agreeing that Jesus was a servant leader, asked, "Does it work?" (p. 11). Irving and McIntosh found considerable doubts among Peruvian students about the applicability of servant leadership, but Serrano's pioneer work shows that at least one segment of Latin American society feels that yes, it does work.

The Servant Leader Assessment Instrument (SLAI)

Based upon Patterson's (2003) model of servant leadership that includes the constructs of (a) love, (b) humility, (c) altruism, (d) vision, (e) trust, (f) empowerment, and (g) service, Dennis (2004) developed the Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (SLAI). While Dennis was not able to capture all seven of Patterson's servant leadership constructs in the SLAI, he was able to develop an instrument that approximately measured five constructs from Patterson's model: (a) love, (b) empowerment, (c) vision, (d) humility, and (e) trust. Table 1 provides Dennis' reliability coefficient for the Patterson constructs tested in this study.

Table 1: Reliability Coefficients for Patterson's (2003) Constructs in Dennis' (2004) Instrument

Construct	Reliability coefficient
Love	.94
Empowerment	.83
Vision	.89
Humility	.92
Trust	N/A

Note. Adapted from "Development of the Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument," by R.S. Dennis, 2004, *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(05), 1857. (UMI No. 3133544). Adapted with permission.

The reliability coefficients from the SLAI range from .89-.94 for four of the SLAI scales. Because the trust scale only has two items, a Cronbach alpha coefficient could not be calculated for this scale. The trust scale is included in the SLAI because the two items loaded together in two independent data collections with the instrument.

Dennis and Bocarnea (2005) stated that the SLAI "has the ability to predict or give measurement to the concepts of Patterson's theory of servant leadership so that a servant leader can measure his effectiveness as a servant leader" (p. 600). Table 2 shows the results from Dennis and Bocarnea in regard to the four constructs studied in this research.

The present study represented the first time the SLAI was translated into Spanish and tested in this region of the world. While not using the SLAI, it is important to note that Patterson's (2003) constructs were studied in three different contexts—two of which were outside the U.S.—including government officials (Bryant, 2003), Australian church leaders (Dillman, 2003) and black African leaders in South African (Nelson, 2003). While Bryant found that government managers, specifically 38 managers of the Virginia local government, generally accept servant leadership as a viable option, the managers did not have favorable opinions of altruism, humility, and love. Dillman did not find strong support for vision and trust. According to Nelson there was support for all seven of Patterson's constructs. These studies were all done before the SLAI existed. Serrano (2006) used qualitative research to show that Patterson's construct was viable in the Panamanian context. Irving (2005) administered the SLAI, the Organizational Leadership Assessment (Laub, 1999), and the Team Effectiveness Questionnaire

Table 2: Reliability Coefficients and Principle Components Factor Analyses with Oblimin Rotation of Items (N=300)

Scale	Cronbach Alpha	Load	Items
Love	.94	.79	My leader is genuinely interested in me as a person
		.84	My leader creates a culture that fosters high standards of ethics
		.85	My leader has shown his or her care for me by encouraging me
		.79	My leader has shown compassion in his or her actions toward me
		.83	My leader shows concern for me
Empowerment	.94	.85	My leader lets me make decisions with increasing responsibility
		.91	My leader gives me the authority I need to do my job
		.92	My leader turns over some control to me so that I may accept more responsibility
		.80	My leader empowers me with opportunities so that I develop skills
		.91	My leader entrusts me to make decisions
Vision	.89	.80	My leader has sought my vision regarding the organization's vision
		.78	My leader and I have written a clear and concise vision statement for our company
		.86	My leader has asked me what I think the future direction of our company should be
		.81	My leader has shown that he or she wants to include employees' vision into the firm's goals and objectives
		.87	My leader seeks my commitment concerning the shared vision of our company
Humility	.92	.83	My leader does not overestimate his or her merits
		.87	My leader is not interested in self-glorification
		.75	My leader is humble enough to consult others in the organization when he or she may not have all the answers
		.88	My leader does not center attention on his or her own accomplishments
Trust	N/A	.82	My leader's demeanor is one of humility
		.90	My leader trusts me to keep a secret
		.79	My leader knows I am above corruption

Note. Adapted from "Development of the Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument," by R. S. Dennis and M. Bocamea, 2005, *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 26(8), pp. 606-608. Adapted with permission.

(Larson & LaFasto, 2001), and found a relationship between servant leadership and team effectiveness. A panorama of quantitative and qualitative research indicates strong support for the construct.

While there is evidence that Latin Americans respect servant leadership (Serrano 2006), there is skepticism as to whether or not it is effective in the Latin context (Irving & McIntosh, 2006). The SLAI is an important tool that may be utilized to measure servant leadership in Latin America. The translating and testing of the instrument in Spanish is important because it provides, along with the OLA, a reliable quantitative instrument to test servant leadership in Latin America.

Method

The Spanish version of the SLAI—the *Instrumento de Contribución al Liderazgo de Siervo* (ICLS)—was translated by a professional Peruvian translator and then translated back to English by another professional translator to test for accuracy of translation. The final product was deemed accurate by the translators.

Population/Demographics/Data Collection

The sample of 78 participants came from students and professors of SEL with many of the students and professors serving in full-time Christian ministry, mostly in Lima, but some coming from other parts of Peru. These sample participants meet in a special session of the seminary and received a hard copy of the ICLS. After taking the instrument, research participants submitted it directly to our research team. Of the research participants, 76.5% were male and 22.2% were female. Of the participants, 1.3% did not identify their gender. The research participants were between the ages of 17 and 65, with a mean age of 35.98. The level of education for the participants was: (a) secondary—16.3%, (b) technical—46.3%, (c) university—28.8.3%, (d) licentiate—5.0%, (e) masters—2.5%, and (f) doctorate—1.3%.

Findings

The reliability of three of the ICLS scales is strongly supported by the data with alphas of .9167 for empowerment, .9047 for vision, and .8373 for love (see Table 3). The reliability of the humility scale was much lower with an alpha of .4987. The trust scale has a .7058 coefficient but reliability could not be truly tested due to the two items in the construct.

Table 3: Reliability Coefficients of the ISCS as Tested in Lima, Peru

Construct	Reliability coefficient	N
Love	.8373	77
Empowerment	.9167	76
Vision	.9047	77
Humility	.4987	77

Discussion

Humility and Servant Leadership in Latin America

It is significant that humility scored considerably lower than the other constructs and it may be that humility contrasts more with typical Peruvian leadership style (McIntosh, 2008) than the other constructs. Dealy (1992a) said that caudillos, the typical leaders in Latin America, would do everything they could to gain and keep power. The literature review outlines what a dominant influence caudillaje has been throughout history of Latin America. Triandis (1994) stated that identification with the dominant societal values of one's culture may be a particularly important variable that influences the relationship between leaders' behavior and subordinate outcomes. It is the opinion of the authors that humility is not seen as a positive leadership trait, even in the SEL community that was studied, due to dominant cultural themes.

House et al. (2004), as Hofstede (1980) did earlier, categorized societies into individualistic and collectivistic societies. It is paradoxical that Latin America scored the highest among nine regions of the world on institutional collectivistic values but the lowest of the nine on institutional collectivistic practices. The Latin American claims to have a high emphasis on collectivistic behavior but does not live out his or her values in his or her practice. It could be that the humility is an example of collectivistic values not being practiced in society even though members say they value collective society over the individual.

Does the Latin American culture esteem humility in leadership? House et al. (2004) pointed out that researchers have posited that collectivism at the societal and organizational levels is associated with charismatic leadership. The authors believe that Latin America is a prime example of that theory and the caudillo is the prototypic charismatic leader. While House et al. stated that much needs to be learned about the process by which charismatic leaders affect followers, it is important to note that according to Peruvians the number one way leaders affect followers is through oratory and rhetoric. House et al. stated, "In addition, it would be wise not to forget that individuals in societies previously dominated by charismatic leadership as undesirable" (p. 61). The House et al. statement is open to challenge as authoritarian caudillo style rulers in Latin America still control through rhetoric just as they did dating back to the colonial history of the region (Dealy, 1992b; Johnson, 1982; McIntosh, 2008). Very little has changed as strong leaders on all sides of the politician spectrum are still in control throughout the region such as Chavez of Venezuela, Uribe of Colombia, Morales of Bolivia, and Da Silva of Brazil. It would be difficult to picture any of them desiring to be humble in practice, including

handing over of power.

Mayers (1976) and Nida (1974) stated that Jesus, the example to many of servant leadership (Blanchard & Hodges, 2003), actually is rejected by the Latin populace as a model due to not having the desirable traits such as having many sexual conquests, drinking heavily, being a good fighter, etc. The question of what would Jesus do is not an issue for a majority of Latin males as they desire do “manly” things (Nida). The meek are not blessed by a high percentage of Latin males; they are taken advantage of.

Implications for Future Research and Practice in Latin America

The field of servant leadership studies is continuing to mature. As the days of theory building transition to researching servant leadership constructs, the need for valid and reliable instruments will become increasingly important. While the English-speaking world has access to such instruments, the need for a broader range of instruments to be used in other ethno-linguistic environments is critical. The authors’ evaluation of the reliability of the SLAI in a Latin American context provides key servant leadership scales that may be used to measure servant leadership at the individual leader level. This addition complements the use of the Organizational Leadership Assessment designed to measure servant leadership at the organizational level—an instrument that has also been measured in the Latin American context (Irving & McIntosh, 2007). Since research on servant leadership in Latin America is still in its early days, having another instrument should encourage increased study of dimensions of Patterson’s (2003) servant leadership model. The Lima study indicates that the ICLS could be used for future research in Latin American contexts concerning love, empowerment, and vision.

Recommendations for Further Research

The reliability of the ICLS in three scales opens the door for other research that previously was not possible due to the lack of quantitative instruments. Opportunities for further research are many. First, the ICLS should be tested in a variety of countries and organizations in the region to help analyze the actual practice of servant leadership in Latin America. Second, organizations can use the ISCS to measure whether their people are practicing love, empowerment, and vision as servant leaders. Leadership formation programs can be considered that will help organizational leaders grow in these servant leadership factors.

Third, the ISCS will also help measure to what extent servant leadership is viewed positively in the region. Serrano (2006) found that Panamanians have a positive view of servant leadership, but do others? More research in other countries could add to the theory that Latin Americans are eager for a change in the leaders from the caudillo style (Dealy, 1992a) to servant leadership. McIntosh (2008) found great disenchantment among Peruvians in regard to their current leaders, indicating that change would be more welcome now than at any time in the country’s history. Given Serrano’s important findings it could be that other countries, as well as sub-cultures within the countries, are open for change. A significant shift to servant leadership may greatly increase leadership effectiveness. Irving (2005) found that servant leaders make for more effective team leaders providing one example of where servant leadership makes a significant contribution to increasing effectiveness. Other areas of leadership may be enhanced

as well.

Individuals can find out by studying the data concerning how they measure up in terms of the love, empowerment, and vision constructs and seek to change behavior if they are not seen by followers, in the view of Greenleaf, as servants first and leaders second. The ICLS may increase self awareness. Roberts (2006) linked service learning opportunities to an understanding of servant leadership and that such opportunities increase self awareness. Spears (1998) believed that self awareness is defined by being in touch with feelings, having clear personal values, and understanding one's own strengths and limitations; being open to feedback as a means to further personal development is one of the ten key competencies for developing servant leadership. It could be that the ICLS will help Latin American leaders evaluate their own tendencies. Chemers, Watson, and May (2000) found evidence that self awareness contributes to effectiveness. In short, individuals may know where to change whether they are servant leaders or not.

Finally, the ISCS could be used in conjunction with other instruments to find out how servant leadership affects areas of leadership in Latin America such as team effectiveness (Irving, 2005), organizational satisfaction, and a variety of organizational performance measures. For most societies, servant leadership will be important not only for the values that the servant leadership is based on, but also for servant leadership's capacity to bring about effective results in organizations and society.

Summary

This study demonstrates the reliability for the SLAI's Spanish translation, the ICLS, in three constructs—love, empowerment, and vision. The ICLS provides a unique opportunity to quantitatively research the use and effectiveness of servant leadership models as opposed to leadership models that Peruvians and Latin Americans in general are disappointed in (McIntosh, 2008). The use of the ICLS may result in increased use and understanding of the Patterson (2003) constructs in Latin America. Its use could also stimulate research on servant leadership in general at a time when the people of the area appear to ready for a change from the region's old authoritarian leadership style.

About the Authors

Timothy A. McIntosh (M.Div., Ph.D.) is the director of the leadership department of ProMETA (Programas de Maestría en Estudios Teológicos Accesibles [Master's Programs en Accessible Theological Education]). He is also an adjunct professor at Trinity Western University. He and his wife Debbie have served as missionaries in Lima, Peru for 25 years. He received a Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership from Regent University in 2008. His dissertation was titled "How Peruvians Define and Practice Leadership."
Email: Timothy.McIntosh@twu.ca

Justin A. Irving (M.Div., Ph.D.) serves as associate academic dean and associate professor of ministry leadership at Bethel Seminary, a school of Bethel University (St. Paul, MN). His role at Bethel Seminary and with the Center for Transformational Leadership is focused on preparing people

for effective leadership in a variety of ministry contexts. He has a special interest in servant and self-sacrificial leadership studies, team leadership, and the research and application of these disciplines in cross-cultural contexts. More information is available at <http://www.bethel.edu/~irvjus/CV.htm>.
Email: j-irving@bethel.edu

References

- Aljovin, C. (2000). *Caudillos y constituciones: Perú 1821-4* [Bosses and constitutions]. Lima, Peru: Fondo de Cultura Económica, Pontificia Católica del Perú, Instituto Riva-Agüero.
- Amaral, A. F. D. (2007). A servant leadership model for the church of Brazil. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(6-A). (UMI No. AAI3269691)
- Anderson, K. (2006). *An exploration of the barriers which impede the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations: A grounded theory study*. Unpublished manuscript. Miami, FL: Barry University.
- Arroyo, D. (2005). *Liderazo de siervo y sus implicaciones para el Perú* [Servant leadership and its implications for Peru]. Paper presented at Seminario Evangélico de Lima, Lima, Perú.
- Basadre, J. (1962). *Historia de la república del Perú* [History of the Republic of Peru]. Lima, Peru: Editorial Universitaria.
- Batista, J. D. (1998). *Atrévete a ser un líder: Un reto a un nuevo, pero antiguo modelo de servir* [Dare to be a leader: A new challenge but an old model to serve]. Isabella, Puerto Rico: Self published.
- Blanchard, K., & Hodges, P. (2003). *The servant leader: Transforming your heart, head, hands & habits*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc.
- Bryant, S. R. (2003). Servant leadership and public managers. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(02), 634. (UMI No. 3082716)
- Bryant, S. R. (2005). Emerging communities of hope: Servant leadership. *Nation's Cities Weekly* 28(10), 9.
- Cantor, N., & Mischel, W. (1979). Prototypes in person perception. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 12, 291-317.
- Chemers, M. M., Watson, C. B., & May, S. T. (2000). Dispositional affect and leadership effectiveness: A comparison of self self-esteem, optimism and efficacy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(3), 267-277.
- Chevalier, F. (1992). The roots of caudillismo. In H. M. Hamill (Ed.), *Caudillos: Dictators in Spanish America* (pp. 27-41). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Cote, J. (2003). *El liderazgo de Jesús* [The leadership of Jesus]. Lima, Peru: Puma.
- Crippen, C. (2005a). Inclusive education: A servant-leadership perspective. *Education Canada*, 19(4), 1045.
- Crippen, C. (2005b). Servant-leadership as an effective model for educational leadership and management: first to serve, then to lead. *Management in Education*, 11(6), 18.
- Crippen, C. (2006). Three Manitoba pioneer women: A legacy of servant-leadership. *Manitoba History*, 11(11), 1053.
- Dealy, G. (1992a). *The Latin Americans: Spirit and ethos*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Dealy, G. (1992b). The public man. In H. M. Hamill (Ed.), *Caudillos: Dictators in Spanish America* (pp. 42-61). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Dennis, R. S. (2004). Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(05), 1857. (UMI No. 3133544)
- Dennis, R. S. & Bocarnea, M. (2005). Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 26(8), 600-617.
- Dickson, M. W., Den Hartog, D. K., & Mitchelson, J. K. (2003). Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress, and raising new questions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 4(6), 729-768.
- Dillman, S. W. (2003). Leading in the land of Oz: Cross-cultural study of servant leadership in Australia. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65 (06), 2273A. (AAT3136215)
- Dingman, W. A. (2007). Servant leadership's role in the succession planning process: A case study. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67(11-A), 4246. (UMI No. AAI3243510)
- Ebener, D. R. (2007). The servant parish: A case study of servant leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors in high-performing catholic parishes. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(3-A), 1066. (UMI No. AAI3255453)
- Elmer, D. (2006). *Cross-cultural servanthood: Serving the world in Christlike humility*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Freeman, A. W. (2004). Introduction: Focus on family involvement as an extension of servant leadership at Livingstone College. *Negro Educational Review*, 55(1), 7-8.
- Gootenberg, P. (1997). *Caudillos y comerciantes: La formación económica del estado Peruano 1820-1860* [Bosses and businessmen: The economic formation of Peru 1820-1860]. Lima, Peru: CBC.
- Gorriti, G. (1999). *The shinning path: A history of the millenarian war in Peru*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Graen, G. B. (1976). Role-making processes within complex organizations. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1202-1245). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.
- Hamill, H. M. (Ed.). (1992). *Caudillos: Dictators in Spanish America*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values: Vol. 5. Cross-cultural research and methodology series* (Abridged ed.). London, United Kingdom: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1997). *Culture and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Humphreys, J. H. (2005). Contextual implications for transformational and servant leadership: A historical investigation. *Management Decision*, 43(10), 1410-1431.
- Irving, J. A. (2005). Exploring the relationship between servant leadership and team effectiveness: Findings from the nonprofit sector. *Proceedings of the 2005 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved from http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/2005/irving_exploring.pdf
- Irving, J. A. (2007, November 2). *Evaluating the reliability of the Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (Instrument d'Evaluation du Serviteur Dirigeant) among French speaking Rwandans: An exploratory study*. Paper presented at the 9th Annual Global Conference of the International Leadership Association, Vancouver, Canada.
- Irving, J. A., & Longbotham, G. (2007a). Servant leadership predictors of team effectiveness: Findings and implications. *Journal of Business and Behavioral Sciences*, 15(2), 82-94.
- Irving, J. A., & Longbotham, G. (2007b). Team effectiveness and six essential servant leadership themes: A regression model based on items in the Organizational Leadership Assessment. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2(2), 98-113.
- Irving, J. A., & McIntosh, T. A. (2006). Investigating value of and hindrances to servant leadership in Latin America: Initial findings from Peruvian leaders. *Proceedings of the American Society of Business and Behavioral Sciences USA*, 13(1), 874-887.
- Irving, J. A., & McIntosh, T. A. (2007). Evaluating the reliability of the Evaluación Organizacional de Liderazgo among Spanish speaking Latin Americas. *Proceedings of the American Society of Business and Behavioral Sciences USA*, 14(1), 786-805.
- Johnson, G. E. (1982). *Social structures and leadership*. Unpublished manuscript, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL.
- Koch, C. (2004). Servant leadership. *America*, 191(1), 17-19.
- Krebs, K. D. (2006). Can servant-leaders be safety indicators? Development and test of a model linking servant-leadership to occupational safety. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66(12-B), 6960. (UMI No. AAI3200241)
- Kumuyi, W. F. (2007, June). The case for servant leadership. *New Africa*, 18-19.
- Larson, C. E., & LaFasto, F. M. J. (2001). The Team Effectiveness Questionnaire. In P. G. Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and practice* (2nd ed., p. 184). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Laub, J. (1999). Assessing the servant organization: Development of the servant organizational leadership (SOLA) instrument. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(02), 308. (UMI No. 9921922)
- Machiavelli, N. (1998). *The prince*. London, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Manning, B. (2004). Firefighting servant leadership: The right medicine. *Fire Engineering*, 157(5), 6.
- Marinho, R. (2005). Servant-leadership in a changing culture: Reflections on the Brazilian context. *The International Journal of Servant-Leadership* (1)1, 115-122.
- Mayers, M. K. (1976). *A look at Latin American lifestyles*. Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- McIntosh, T. A. (2007). How Peruvians define and practice leadership (Regent University, Virginia). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(11). (AAT 3292258)

- McSweeney, B. (2002). Hofstede's model of national culture differences and their consequences: A triumph of faith and a failure of analysis. *Human Relations*, 55(1), 89-118.
- Molnar, D. R. (2007). Serving the world: A cross-cultural study of national culture dimensions and servant leadership. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(5-A), 2052. (UMI No. AAI3266277)
- Montaner, C. (2001). *Las raíces torcidas de América Latina* [Latin America's twisted roots]. Barcelona, Spain: Plaza and Janés.
- Morse, R. M. (1992). Political theory and the caudillo. In H. M. Hamill (Ed.), *Caudillos: Dictators in Spanish America* (62-81). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Neill, M., Hayward, K. S., Peterson, T. (2007). Students' perceptions of the interprofessional team in practice through the application of servant leadership principles. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 425(8), 821.
- Nelson, L. (2003). An exploratory study of the application and acceptance of servant-leadership theory among black leaders in South Africa. *Dissertation Abstracts Online*, 64(03), 944A. (ATT 3086676)
- Nida, E. A. (1974). *Understanding Latin Americans: With special reference to religious values and movements*. South Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.
- Nye, J. L., & Forsyth, D. R. (1991). The effects of prototype based biases on leadership appraisals: A test of leadership categorization theory. *Small Group Research*, 22, 360-379.
- Omoh, D. A. O. (2007). Analysis of servant leadership characteristics: A case study of a community college president. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(4-A), 1550. (UMI No. AAI3262849)
- Osland, J. S., De Franco, S., & Osland, A. (1999). Organizational implications of Latin American culture: Lessons for the expatriate manager. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 8(2), 219-234.
- Paredes, O. L. (2003). *Leadership and political process in Peru*. Lima, Peru: Canadian Forces Leadership Institute.
- Parolini, J. L. (2007). Investigating the distinctions between transformational and servant leadership. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(4-A), 1550. (UMI No. AAI3264263)
- Patterson, K. (2003). Servant leadership: A theoretical model. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(02), 570. (UMI No. 3082719)
- Roberts, C. (2006). Service-learning: Developing servant leaders. *Academic Exchange Quarterly* 10(2), 237-243.
- Romero, E. J. (2004). Latin American leadership: El patrón & El líder moderno. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 11(3), 25-37.
- Romero, E. J. (2005). The effect of Hispanic ethnicity on the leadership process. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1(1). Retrieved from <http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/ijls/new/vol1iss1/romero/effect.htm>
- Ruloff, E. (2006). *El líder siervo: La esencia del líder es le character de Cristo* [The servant leader: The essence of the leader is the character of Christ]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Publicaciones Alianza.
- Salinas, P. (2001). Perú y su tradición autoritaria [Peru and its authoritarian tradition]. *La ilustración liberal-Revista Española y América*, 10. Retrieved from

- http://www.libertaddigital.com/ilustracion_liberal/articulo.php/231
- Sarkus, D. J. (1996). Servant-leadership in safety: Advancing the cause and practice. *Professional Safety*, 41(6), 26-32.
- Segura, H. (2005). *Mas allá de la utopía: Liderazgo de servicio y espiritualidad cristiana* [Beyond utopia: Leadership and Christian spirituality]. San José, Costa Rica: Kairos Ediciones.
- Seminario Evangélico de Lima (SEL) [Evangelical Seminary of Lima]. (2007). Retrieved from http://www.sel.edu/_english/english.html
- Serrano, M. (2006). Servant leadership: A viable model for the Panamanian context? *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67(7-A), 2655. (UMI No. AAI 3228983)
- Smith, B. N., Montagno, R. V., & Kuzmenko, T. N. (2004). Transformational and servant leadership: Content and contextual comparisons. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 10(4), 80-91.
- Smith, P. H. (1992). The search for legitimacy. In H. M. Hamill (Ed.), *Caudillos: Dictators in Spanish America* (pp. 95-105). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Spears, L. C. (Ed.). (1998). *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Stanley, M. F. (1995). Servant leadership in the fire service: It's never lonely at the top when you're leading. *Fire Engineering* 148(8), 30-31.
- Stephen, M. J. (2007). Servant leadership: An examination of public school principals' perceptions of servant leadership as a successful leadership style. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(3-A), 831. (UMI No. AAI3259618)
- Triandis, H. C. (1994). Cross cultural industrial psychology. In H. C. Triandis, M. D. Dunnette, & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. (2nd ed., Vol. 4, pp. 104-172). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Walker, J. J. (2007). The servant-led institution: A case study defining servant leadership in the not-for-profit social service organization. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(4-A), 1555. (UMI No. AAI3264264)
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization*. London, United Kingdom: Oxford University.
- Wolf, E. R., & Hansen, E. C. (1992). Caudillo politics: A structural analysis. In H. M. Hamill (Ed.), *Caudillos: Dictators in Spanish America* (pp. 62-71). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.