

Servant versus Self-Sacrificial Leadership:

Commonalities and Distinctions of Two Follower-Oriented Leadership Theories

[Servant Leadership Research Roundtable](#) – August 2005

Jeffrey A. Matteson, M.Div., M.Ed
Regent University

Justin A. Irving, M.Div., Ph.D.
Bethel University

Since Greenleaf (1977), research pertaining to servant leadership has carved a unique place in the leadership literature. The last decade has produced focused theory development including instrument development and empirical studies. This same era witnessed increased theoretical and empirical attention to the role of leader self-sacrifice. Recently, Stone et al. (2003) and Smith et al. (2004) examined the similarities and differences of servant and transformational leadership. This paper employs analogous methods to examine servant and self-sacrificial leadership. The authors suggest that although servant and self-sacrificial leadership share many common characteristics, they differ in focus, motivation, context, and outcome. They further suggest that servant, self-sacrificial, and transformational leadership can be placed on a leadership continuum from follower to organizational focus.

Commonalities and Distinctions of Two Follower-Oriented Leadership Theories

Research pertaining to leadership has been dominated over the last quarter century by the study of transformational leadership (Burns, 1978, 2003, Bass, 1985). This theory represents an important step toward balancing the needs of both leaders and followers as they work toward fulfilling organizational goals. Meanwhile, this same era has produced several other leadership theories, which represent a general movement toward follower-oriented models. Two of these models are servant leadership and self-sacrificial leadership.

Since Robert Greenleaf's (1977) initial insistence that a leader should be a servant first, theories of servant leadership have gradually taken shape. Servant leadership places the needs of followers before personal interests and works toward producing additional servants. The development of this view of leadership has several ramifications for organizations, leaders, and followers, not the least of which are the accompanying characteristics, attributes, practices, and outcomes of this behavior (Farling, Stone, & Winston, 1999; Laub, 1999; Patterson, 2003, 2004; Russell & Stone, 2002; Spears & Lawrence, 2002).

Self-Sacrificial leadership occurs when a leader forfeits one or more professional or personal advantages for the sake of followers, the organization, or a mission. A chief aim of self-sacrificial leadership is to encourage follower reciprocity (Choi & Mai-Dalton, 1998, 1999). This modeling behavior has the potential to move followers toward an organizational goal, modify their behavior, or simply to persuade them to attribute legitimacy to the leader, thus allowing the leader to gain influence (Choi & Mai-Dalton, 1998, 1999; Yorges,

Weiss, & Strickland, 1999; De Cremer, 2002; Javidan & Waldman, 2003; Halverson, Holladay, Kazama, Quinones, 2004; De Cremer, van Djike, & Bos, 2004; De Cremer & van Knippenberg, 2004; van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005).

The purpose of this paper is to describe the chief components of servant and self-sacrificial leadership, and to examine the commonalities and distinctions of the two conceptualizations. It is proposed that these two follower-oriented theories share some common characteristics and attributes, but differ in the areas of focus, motivation, context, and outcome. These propositions are supported by the theoretical frameworks associated with each concept. Subsequent to the delineation of the associated frameworks, the characteristics and attributes of each theory will be laid side by side in an effort to compare the concepts. The areas of focus, motivation, context, and outcome provide the structure for highlighting the theoretical distinctives of servant and self-sacrificial leadership.

Servant Leadership

Greenleaf's (1977) seminal work on servant leadership—the work attributed with bringing the concept of servant leadership to public discourse in the mid 1970s—has led to a growing body of literature surrounding the construct since the early 1990s. The literature surrounding servant leadership can generally be categorized into two main areas: theoretical and empirical. A majority of the works are theoretical in nature: Blanchard (1998); Buchen (1998); Cerff (2004); Farling et al. (1999); Graham (1991); Hale (2004); Jennings and Stahl-Wert (2003); Laub (2004); Ndoria (2004); Page (2004); Parolini (2004); Patterson (2003); Patterson and Stone (2004); Quay (1997); Rude (2003); Russell (2001, 2003); Russell and Stone (2002); Sendjaya and Sarros (2002); Smith et al. (2004); Spears (1995, 1998); Spears and Lawrence (2002); Stone, Russell, and Patterson (2003, 2004); Wolford-Ulrich (2004); Winston (2003); Winston and Hartsfield (2004); and Wong and Page (2003), though an increasing number of empirical studies such as Dennis (2004), Dennis and Winston (2003), Drury (2004), Hebert (2003, 2004), Helland (2004), Irving (2004, 2005a, 2005b), Laub (1999, 2003), Ledbetter (2003), Sendjaya (2003), and Winston (2004) have emerged as well.

As the construct of servant leadership has developed over the last 15 years, it has been operationalized in several different forms. For instance, Graham's (1991) discussion focused on the inspirational and moral dimensions of servant leadership, Buchen's (1998) discussion focused on the dimensions of self-identity, capacity for reciprocity, relationship building, and a preoccupation with the future, Farling et al.'s (1999) discussion focused on vision, influence, credibility, trust, and service, and Russell's (2001) discussion focused on vision, credibility, trust, service, modeling, pioneering, appreciation of others, and empowerment. Of the theoretical discussions of servant leadership that have become dominant in the field, Spears (1998), Laub (1999), and Patterson (2003) are frequently cited. These are the models that will be used in the current discussion examining the commonalities and distinctions between servant leadership and self-sacrificial leadership.

Because this paper will focus on the Spears (1998), Laub (1999), and Patterson (2003) conceptualizations of servant leadership, they will be briefly highlighted at this time. Spears' (1998) ten characteristics of servant leadership have been identified as an outgrowth of Greenleaf's (1977) discussion of servant leadership. Spears' (1998) ten characteristics of servant leadership are: (a) listening, (b) empathy, (c) healing, (d) awareness, (e) persuasion, (f) conceptualization, (g) foresight, (h) stewardship, (i) commitment, and (j) community building. Spears argues that servant leadership is tied to the character exhibited by leaders in their essential traits. Essential to the development of servant leaders, Spears' ten characteristics provide a practical starting point for leaders interested in developing as servant leaders.

Laub (1999) provides the second core conceptualization of servant leadership that will be utilized in this paper. Laub defined the essence of servant leadership in this manner: "Servant leadership is an understanding and practice of leadership that places the good of those led over the self-interest of the leader" (p. 81). But in what manner do servant leaders place "the good of those led over" themselves? For Laub this is answered by the results of his Delphi study. In the Delphi process, 60 characteristics of servant leaders were identified and eventually clustered into six key areas: (a) valuing people, (b) developing people, (c) building community, (d) displaying authenticity, (e) providing leadership, and (f) sharing leadership. For Laub, these are

the essential behaviors that characterize what servant leaders do, and are the answer to *how* servant leaders place the good of those led over their own self-interest.

The final core conceptualization of servant leadership that will be utilized in this paper is offered by Patterson (2003). As a theory-building dissertation, Patterson presented servant leadership theory as an extension of transformational leadership theory. This extension was based primarily on Patterson's observation that transformational theory was not addressing the phenomena of love, humility, altruism, and being visionary for followers. Because of this, Patterson's model of servant leadership includes the following dimensions as the essential characteristics of servant leadership: (a) *agapáo* love, (b) humility, (c) altruism, (d) vision, (e) trust, (f) empowerment, and (g) service.

Self-Sacrificial Leadership

The contemporary origins of the study of self-sacrificial leadership are found in the writings of Burns (1978) and Bass (1985). These transformational leadership theorists suggested that leader self-sacrifice is a tool, which great leaders use to motivate followers. Following their lead, current charismatic leadership theorists have perceived self-sacrifice in leadership to be a tactic which a leader could employ to influence follower attributions of charisma (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House & Shamir, 1993; Shamir, House, & Arthur 1993). Out of this movement, Choi and Mai-Dalton (1998) proposed a Model of Follower Responses to Self-Sacrificial Leadership. From these theoretical underpinnings, empirical studies have been undertaken to test the validity of this model along with a variety of additional variables, which may be associated with self-sacrificial leadership.

The empirical studies associated with self-sacrificial leadership have focused primarily on the outcomes of the sacrificial behavior on the perceptions of followers. Several of these studies found that self-sacrificing leaders were attributed charisma by followers and were perceived to be more influential, legitimate, and effective (Choi & Mai-Dalton, 1999; De Cremer, 2002; De Cremer et al. 2004; van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005; Yorges et al. 1999). Follower attributions of charisma were particularly pronounced during a period of organizational crisis or when the organization faced a social dilemma, which required cooperation (Halverson et al. 2004, De Cremer, 2002).

Self-sacrificial leadership has produced additional responses from followers beyond cooperative effort. Followers of self-sacrificial leaders intended to reciprocate the self-sacrificing behaviors (Choi & Mai-Dalton, 1999), were more committed to their organization (De Cremer et al., 2004), and performed at a higher level (van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005). Over and above the contextual factor of organizational uncertainty, the main effects of self-sacrificial leadership have been found to be moderated by leader self-confidence, the leader's group-orientedness, and distributive justice (De Cremer et al. 2004; De Cremer & van Knippenberg, 2004; van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005). The results of these initial empirical tests hint at a phenomenon, which encompasses a much larger portion of leadership theory than initially proposed. In fact, Choi and Mai-Dalton (1999) propose that self-sacrificial leadership plays a role in all three organizational processes of production, distribution, and consumption.

The proposition of a broad influence of leader self-sacrifice led Choi and Mai-Dalton to define self-sacrificial leadership as "the total/partial abandonment, and/or permanent/temporary postponement of personal interests, privileges, and welfare in the (a) division of labor, (b) distribution of rewards, and/or (c) exercise of power" (p. 399). The authors explain that self-sacrifice in the division of labor "involves volunteering for more risky and/or arduous actions, tasks, turns, or segments of work" (p. 399). They proffer that self-sacrifice in the distribution of rewards "involves giving up or postponing ones fair and legitimate share of organizational rewards" (p. 399). Self-sacrifice in the exercise of power is described in their research as "voluntarily giving up or refraining from exercising or using the position power, privileges, and/or personal resources one already has in his/her hand" (p. 399). Choi and Mai-Dalton draw a distinction between self-sacrifice in the distribution of rewards and in the exercise of power by noting that the former involves giving up claiming privileges and the latter involves consuming the privileges. These economic aspects of leader self-sacrifice, while supported both theoretically and empirically, should not be considered the final boundaries of the self-sacrificial leadership construct.

Theoretically, leader self-sacrifice includes activities that extend beyond the economic status of the leader. Other theorists note that leader self-sacrifice includes the loss of status, credibility, and promotion (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Javidan & Waldman, 2003). This expands the motivational aspects that lay the foundation of self-sacrificial behavior beyond the simple desire to influence followers. After all, if a leader loses their status as a leader, their credibility, or is demoted rather than promoted, it would be difficult to impossible to influence followers. Alternatively, leaders may sacrifice to demonstrate courage and conviction in the mission while serving as a role model (Shamir et al. 1993), to maintain personal beliefs and values (Yorges et al., 1999), to exhibit commitment to “the cause” (Avolio & Locke, 2002), or simply for the good of the company (Halverson et al., 2004). Therefore, it can be stated that the motivational foundation for self-sacrificial leadership may be directly related to the outcome of the behavior.

Theoretical Comparison

This section of the paper highlights the similarities and differences of servant and self-sacrificial leadership. In keeping with two previous attempts to compare servant leadership with another leadership theory, the authors have created several matrices to systematically compare the two theories. Stone et al. (2003) and Smith et al. (2004) previously compared servant and transformational leadership and their graphic representations informed this current effort. In addition to Spear’s (1998a) and Laub’s (1999) lists of characteristics—which were included in these prior analyses—this paper extends the servant leadership portion by including Patterson’s (2003) attributes in the comparison with self-sacrificial leadership. This segment concludes by placing servant, self-sacrificial, and transformational leadership side-by-side in the areas of focus, motivation, context, and outcome.

In the following tables, the servant leadership characteristics of Spears (1998), Laub (1999), and Patterson (2003) are listed in the vertical portion of the table. The self-sacrificial leadership attributes are placed horizontally on the table under the three economic headings from the definition provided by Choi and Mai-Dalton (1999) along with a charismatic leadership heading. The charismatic leadership heading is essential since the bulk of the research pertaining to the self-sacrificial leadership phenomenon is drawn from that research thread.

Self-Sacrificial Leadership and Spears’ (1998) Model of Servant Leadership

Table 1 highlights the similarities between Spears (1998) and the research completed by several self-sacrificial leadership theorists. Note that all ten of Spears’ servant leadership characteristics are listed, while the characteristics identified with the six self-sacrificial leadership studies shared are limited by their commonality with servant leadership under the broad headings identified by Choi and Mai-Dalton (1999).

Table 1
Mapping of the Characteristics of Servant (Spears, 1995) and Self-Sacrificial Leadership

Self-Sacrificial Leadership (Choi & Mai-Dalton, 1998, 1999; Yorges et al. 1999; De Cremer, 2002; Halverson et al. 2004; De Cremer & van Knippenberg, 2004; van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005)					
	Division of labor	Distribution of rewards	Exercise of power	Charismatic leadership	
Servant Leadership (Spears, 1995)	Listening				
	Empathy	Transcends selfish interests*	Gives up legitimate privileges for the benefit of others*	Models altruistic behavior*	
	Healing		Promotes justice		
	Awareness				
	Persuasion			Persuasion over personal authority	
	Conceptualization			Visionary leadership	
	Foresight			Visionary leadership	
	Stewardship				
	Commitment to the Growth of People	Models ideal group behavior; encourages cooperation	Promotes justice; Uses power for social rather than personal goals	Uses power for social rather than personal goals	Models expected behavior
	Building Community				Develops collective Identification

*Assumes empathy-altruism link (Avolio & Locke, 2002; Batson, 1991; Batson, et al. 2002)

It is immediately evident that servant leadership and self-sacrificial leadership share several characteristics. Seven of Spears' (1998) ten characteristics have some commonality with self-sacrificial leaders. The characteristics of "empathy" and "commitment to growth in people" show significant crossover with the self-sacrificial leadership categories. Empathy appears in the self-sacrificial leadership literature through its connection with altruism (De Cremer, 2002). The assumption of an empathy-altruism link, and its support in 25 empirical studies (Batson, Ahmad, Lishner, and Tsang, 2002), sustains this correlation between servant and self-sacrificial leadership. The modeling behaviors found in the self-sacrificial leadership literature shore up the common commitment to growth in people in both leadership theories.

The characteristics of listening, awareness, and stewardship are currently absent from the self-sacrificial leadership literature, although the case can be made that listening and awareness go hand in hand with empathy. It would appear difficult to make a case for stewardship as a component of self-sacrificial leadership, since by definition this type of leader may intentionally dispose of resources. In a sense, some self-sacrificial leaders are poor stewards of resources.

Self-Sacrificial Leadership and Laub's (1999) Model of Servant Leadership

Table 2 highlights the corresponding characteristics of Laub (1999) and self-sacrificial leadership. As in Smith et al. (2004), Laub's (1999) six components of servant leadership are listed with their accompanying behaviors. This presentation would appear to indicate a solid correlation between Laub's (1999) articulation of servant leadership theory and self-sacrificial leadership. However, it is only the areas of valuing people and building community, which have broad support in the self-sacrificial leadership literature. The components of developing people and displaying authenticity are only mildly supported in this comparison. In addition, there is little concrete theoretical or empirical research pertaining to leader self-sacrifice, which supports the thought that self-sacrificial leaders share power. If anything, they sacrifice their power, which can be distinguished from empowering followers. Instead, empowerment may be the product of the sacrificing behavior rather than the behavior itself. This comparison would evidently indicate that servant and self-sacrificial leaders may view followers in a similar fashion, but may choose to interact with them in a slightly different manner. In general terms it may be stated that both servant and self-sacrificial leaders hold followers in very high esteem, but deviate in several core behaviors.

Table 2
Mapping of the Characteristics of Servant (Laub, 1999) and Self-Sacrificial Leadership

		Self-Sacrificial Leadership			
		(Choi & Mai-Dalton, 1998, 1999; Yorges et al. 1999; De Cremer, 2002; Halverson et al. 2004; De Cremer & van Knippenberg, 2004; van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005)			
		Division of labor	Distribution of rewards	Exercise of power	Charismatic leadership
Servant Leadership (Laub, 1999)	Values people -Believe in people -serve other's needs before his or her own -Receptive, non-judgmental listening	Transcends selfish interests	Gives up legitimate privileges for the benefit of others	Uses resources to benefit others Models altruistic behavior	Models expected behavior
	Develops people -Provide opportunities to learn and grow -Model appropriate behavior -Encouragement and affirmation				
	Builds community -Strong personal relationships -Collaboration with others -Value other's differences	Models ideal group behavior Encourages cooperation	Promotes justice	Uses power for social rather than personal goals	Develops collective identification
	Displays authenticity -Open and accountable to others -Willing to learn from others -Maintain integrity and trust				Actions clarify goals
	Provides leadership -Envision the future -Take initiative -Clarify goals	Displays competence			Takes initiative during social/organizational dilemmas
	Shares leadership -Facilitate a shared vision -Share power and release control -Share status and promote others		Sacrifices status		Links followers to shared vision

Self-Sacrificial Leadership and Patterson's (2003) Model of Servant Leadership

Table 3 is a representation of the commonalities between Patterson (2003) and the components of self-sacrificial leadership.

Table 3
Mapping of the Characteristics of Servant (Patterson, 2003) and Self-Sacrificial Leadership

		Self-Sacrificial Leadership (Choi & Mai-Dalton, 1998, 1999; Yorges et al. 1999; De Cremer, 2002; Halverson et al. 2004; De Cremer & van Knippenberg, 2004; van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005)			
		Division of labor	Distribution of rewards	Exercise of power	Charismatic leadership
Servant Leadership (Patterson, 2003)	Agapáo Love	Models ideal group behavior Encourages cooperation		Models expected behavior	
	Humility				
	Altruism	Transcends selfish interests	Gives up legitimate privileges for the benefit of others	Uses resources to benefit others Models altruistic behavior	
	Vision		Promotes justice	Uses power for social rather than personal goals Links followers to shared vision	
	Trust			Actions clarify goals	
	Empowerment				
	Service	Displays competence	Sacrifices status	Models expected behavior Takes initiative during social/organizational dilemmas	

The strongest correlations are found in the areas of altruism and service with mild support for the vision category. The connection between the two theories through the characteristic of altruism adds further support to the earlier empathy connection found between Spears' (1998) understanding of servant leadership and self-sacrificial leadership. The common commitment to service may lend itself to an understanding of sacrificing behaviors as extreme acts of service. Although the modeling behaviors fit well in the category of *agapáo* love, it is reasonable to say that in some ways all of these characteristics are modeling behaviors.

Similar to the comparison with Laub (1999), there is a lack of support for the servant leadership characteristic of empowerment. The concept of trust is found in the self-sacrificial leadership literature, but it is discussed as an outcome of the self-sacrificing behavior and not as a characteristic of a sacrificing leader (Choi

& Mai-Dalton, 1999). Humility very well may be a characteristic of self-sacrificial leadership, but this notion is not present in the literature to date.

Commonalities and Distinctions: Proposing a Continuum Understanding of Servant, Self-Sacrificial, and Transformational Theories

Collectively, the effort to compare self-sacrificial leadership theory and three articulations of the associated characteristics of servant leadership has yielded several commonalities and distinctions. The shared characteristics with the greatest level of support in this analysis are empathy, altruism, valuing people, building community, and service. These behaviors are particularly strong when they are viewed as modeling activities. The investigation revealed some mild support for vision, developing people, displaying authenticity, and love. Primary distinctions were discovered in the areas of empowerment, power sharing, listening, awareness, stewardship and humility. Since self-sacrificial leadership theory development is still in relative infancy, the authors feel much more confident in the shared characteristic list and remain cautious in drawing firm conclusions on all of the dissimilar characteristics.

Although these two leadership theories share several characteristics, the provisional conclusions stated above lead to the understanding that servant and self-sacrificial leadership are similar but distinct leadership concepts. Since the close examination of the characteristics of these two theories is not capable of revealing a comprehensive understanding of this difference, a broader look at servant and self-sacrificial leadership alongside a third leadership theory may bring clarity to this evaluation. Transformational leadership theory appears to be the proper choice to include in this comparison given the recent examination of the similarities and differences of this theory with servant leadership by Stone et al. (2003) and Smith et al. (2004). Added to this, these authors have offered details regarding the focus, motivation, context, and outcomes of servant and transformational leadership. These four overarching categories will be employed to scrutinize the three leadership theories included in this discussion from yet another perspective.

Table 4 places transformational, self-sacrificial, and servant leadership in the four categories discussed in previous leadership theory comparison. This represents the first effort to include self-sacrificial leadership theory in this type of assessment.

Table 4
The Focus, Motivation, Context, and Outcome of Three Approaches to Leadership

	Focus	Motivation	Context	Outcome
Transformational Leadership	Organizational Objectives	Serving the Good of the Organization— Carrying out the Organizational Mission	Adaptation/Change	Empowered Dynamic Culture
Self-Sacrificial Leadership	Ethical Self-Transcendence	Serving the Greater Good— Doing What is Morally & Ethically Right, No Matter the Sacrifice	Organizational or Environmental Crisis	Dynamic Spiritual Generative Culture
Servant Leadership	Followers	Serving the Good of the Follower— Doing What is Best for the Followers	Static External Environment	Spiritual Generative Culture

The determination of the focus, motivation, context, and outcome of self-sacrificial leadership is drawn from published research pertaining to this phenomenon. The authors have taken the collective effort of prior authors and selected general terms to describe each category as succinctly as possible. In other words, an attempt was made to get at the heart or direction of the research to date. For example, since earlier research has noted that self-sacrificial leaders may demonstrate courage and conviction in the mission while serving as a role model (Shamir et al. 1993), to maintain personal beliefs and values (Yorges et al., 1999), or to exhibit

commitment to “the cause” (Avolio & Locke, 2002), the authors have placed these activities under the umbrella of “Ethical Self-Transcendence” in the broad category of focus. Additionally, since self-sacrificial leaders may be motivated by the greater good of the organization (Halverson et al., 2004), the ethical focus combines with this motivation to lead the authors to conclude that self-sacrificial leaders are provoked to serve the greater good.

The contextual question as it pertains to self-sacrificial leadership has been dealt with in several studies (Choi & Mai-Dalton, 1999; Halverson et al. 2004; van Knippenber & van Knippenberg, 2005). The research findings suggest that organizational or environmental crisis appears to be the primary context for leader self-sacrifice. Since this sacrifice comes during a time of change necessitated by these pressures and is likely intended to encourage follower reciprocity, the outcome descriptor selected by the authors intentionally combines the proposed outcomes of transformational and servant leadership as proposed by Smith et al. (2004).

The analysis of these three leadership theories through the categories of focus, motivation, context, and outcome has led the authors to two key propositions. First, servant, self-sacrificial, and transformational leadership may be represented on a continuum from follower to organizational focus. Servant leadership would represent the extreme of follower focus, transformational leadership would signify the extreme of organizational focus, and self-sacrificial leadership would be found in the middle of the continuum blending the needs of followers and the organization. Figure 1 provides an illustration of this continuum.



Figure 1. A Continuum of Leader Focus: Servant, Self-Sacrificial, & Transformational Leadership

The proposal that these leadership behaviors exist on a continuum suggests a second proposition that servant and transformational leaders may temporarily utilize self-sacrifice as a tactic to achieve their objectives. Transformational leaders may intentionally sacrifice in order to achieve a proposed change. The focus would remain on the organization, but the tactic is geared directly to followers. Conversely, servant leaders, although likely found in static environments, may choose to sacrifice as an act of service to increase the likelihood that followers will adopt servant behaviors. The temporary nature of this act implies that following the employment of the self-sacrificing tactic, servant and transformational leaders return to their standard set of leadership behaviors.

Summary

Follower-oriented leadership theories are likely to continue to be refined as leadership research progresses in the 21st century. Although transformational leadership has dominated the research agenda, servant and self-sacrificial leadership theories have staked a claim on a portion of contemporary scholarly efforts. Building upon prior comparisons of servant and transformational leadership, the present study has examined the commonalities and distinctions of servant and self-sacrificial leadership. The findings of this study suggest that while these two leadership theories share several characteristics, they are likely distinct phenomena.

The differences between servant and self-sacrificial leadership are evident in their focus, motivation, context, and outcome. When transformational leadership is considered alongside these two theories, a leadership continuum may be revealed, which places self-sacrificial leadership between servant and transformational leadership. This may indicate that leader self-sacrifice is a tactic employed by both transformational and servant leaders in order to accomplish their ultimate purposes, whether this be serving

the good of the organization or the good of the follower. These potential revelations lead the authors to suggest that an empirical study be conducted, which considers the results of this theoretical comparison.

References

- Avolio, B. J., & Locke, E. E. (2002). Contrasting different philosophies of leader motivation: Altruism versus egoism. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13(2), 169-191.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Batson, C. D. (1991). *The altruism question: Toward a social-psychological answer*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Batson, C. D., Ahmad, N., Lishner, D. A., Tsang, J. (2002). Empathy and altruism. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 485-498). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Blanchard, K. (1998). Servant-leadership revisited. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 21-28). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Buchen, I. H. (1998). Servant leadership: A model for future faculty and future institutions. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 5(1), 125-134.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Burns, J. M. (2003). *Transforming leadership*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Cerff, K. (2004). Exploring Ubuntu and the African Renaissance: A conceptual study of servant leadership from an African perspective. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved October 5, 2004, from .
- Choi, Y., & Mai-Dalton, R. R. (1998). On the leadership function of self-sacrifice. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9(4), 475-501.
- Choi, Y., & Mai-Dalton, R. R. (1999). The model of followers' responses to self-sacrificial leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(3), 397-421.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(4), 637-647.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- De Cremer, D., van Dijke, M., & Bos, A. E. R. (2004). Distributive justice moderating the effects of self-sacrificial leadership. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 25(5/6), 466-475.
- De Cremer, D., & van Knippenberg, D. (2004). Leader self-sacrifice and leadership effectiveness: The moderating role of leader self-confidence. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 95(2), 140-155.
- De Cremer, D. (2002). Charismatic leadership and cooperation in social dilemmas: A matter of transforming motives? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(5), 997-1016.
- Dennis, R. S. (2004). Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(05), 1857. (UMI No. 3133544)
- Dennis, R., & Winston, B. E. (2003). A factor analysis of Page and Wong's servant leadership instrument. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 24(8), 455-459.
- Drury, S. L. (2004). Servant leadership and organizational commitment: Empirical findings and workplace implications. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved October 5, 2004, from http://www.regent.edu/acad/sls/publications/journals_and_proceedings/proceedings/servant_leadership_roundtable/pdf/drury-2004SL.pdf
- Farling, M. L., Stone, A. G., & Winston, B. E. (1999). Servant leadership: Setting the stage for empirical research. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6, 49-72.
- Graham, J. (1991). Servant-leadership in organizations: Inspirational and moral. *Leadership Quarterly*, 2(2), 105-119.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Hale, J. R. (2004). A contextualized model for cross-cultural leadership in West Africa. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved October 5, 2004, from http://www.regent.edu/acad/sls/publications/journals_and_proceedings/proceedings/servant_leadership_roundtable/pdf/hale-2004SL.pdf
- Halverson, S. K., Holladay, C. L., Kazama, S. M., & Quinones, M. A. (2004). Self-sacrificial behavior in crisis situations: The competing roles of behavioral and situational factors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 263-275.

- Hebert, S. C. (2003). The relationship of perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction from the follower's perspective. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(11), 4118. (UMI No. 3112981)
- Hebert, S. C. (2004). The relationship of perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction from the follower's perspective. *Proceedings of the American Society of Business and Behavioral Sciences*, 11(1), 685-697.
- Helland, M. R. (2004). Maestro: Understanding the development of a servant leader. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved December 17, 2004, from http://www.regent.edu/acad/sls/publications/conference_proceedings/servant_leadership_roundtable/2004_proceedings.htm
- House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189-207). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- House, R. J., Javidan, M., & Dorfman, P. (2001). Project GLOBE: An introduction. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50(4), 489-505.
- House, R. J., & Shamir, B. (1993). Toward the integration of transformational, charismatic, and visionary theories. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership Theory and Research: Perspectives and Directions* (pp. 81-107). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Irving, J. A. (2004). Servant leadership and the effectiveness of teams: Findings and implications. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved October 5, 2004, from http://www.regent.edu/acad/sls/publications/journals_and_proceedings/proceedings/servant_leadership_roundtable/pdf/irving-2004SL.pdf
- Irving, J. A. (2005a). *Servant leadership and the effectiveness of teams*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Regent University, School of Leadership Studies, of Virginia Beach, VA.
- Irving, J. A. (2005b). Utilizing *The Organizational Leadership Assessment* as a strategic tool for increasing the effectiveness of teams within organizations. *Proceedings of the American Society of Business and Behavioral Sciences*, 12, 1, 837-848.
- Jacobson, C., & House, R. J. (2001). Dynamics of charismatic leadership: A process theory, simulation model, and tests. *Leadership Quarterly*, 12(1), 75-112.
- Javidan, M., & Waldman, D. A. (2003). Exploring charismatic leadership in public sector: Measurement and consequences. *Public Administration Review*, 63(2), 229-242.
- Jennings, K., & Stahl-Wert, J. (2003). *The serving leader: 5 powerful actions that will transform your team, your business and your community*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Ledbetter, D. S. (2003). Law enforcement leaders and servant leadership: A reliability study of the Organizational Leadership Assessment. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(11), 4200. (UMI No. 3110778)
- Laub, J. (1999). Assessing the servant organization: Development of the servant organizational leadership (SOLA) instrument. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(02), 308. (UMI No. 9921922)
- Laub, J. (2003). From paternalism to the servant organization: Expanding the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) model. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved July 15, 2004, from <http://www.regent.edu/acad/cls/2003ServantLeadershipRoundtable/Laub.pdf>
- Laub, J. (2004). Defining servant leadership: A recommended typology for servant leadership studies. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved October 5, 2004, from http://www.regent.edu/acad/sls/publications/journals_and_proceedings/proceedings/servant_leadership_roundtable/pdf/laub-2004SL.pdf
- Ndoria, J. L. (2004). Servant leadership: A natural inclination or a taught behavior. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved October 5, 2004, from <http://www.regent.edu/acad/cls/2004SLRoundtable/ndoria-joyce-2004SL.pdf>
- Page, D. (2004). Experiential learning for servant-leadership. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved October 5, 2004, from http://www.regent.edu/acad/sls/publications/journals_and_proceedings/proceedings/servant_leadership_roundtable/pdf/page-2004SL.pdf
- Parolini, J. L. (2004). Effective servant leadership: A model incorporating servant leadership and the competing values framework. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved October 5, 2004, from <http://www.regent.edu/acad/cls/2004SLRoundtable/parolini-2004SL.pdf>
- Patterson, K. (2003). Servant leadership: A theoretical model. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(02), 570. (UMI No. 3082719)

- Patterson, K. A. (2004). Servant leadership: A theoretical model. *Proceedings of the American Society of Business and Behavioral Sciences*, 11(1), 1109-1118.
- Quay, J. (1997). On becoming a servant leader. *Journal of Management Review*, 9(4), 712-721.
- Rude, W. (2003). Paradoxical leadership: The impact of servant-leadership on burnout of staff. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved October 5, 2004, from <http://www.regent.edu/acad/cls/2003ServantLeadershipRoundtable/Rude.pdf>
- Russell, R. F. (2001). The role of values in servant leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(2), 76-83.
- Russell, R. F. (2003). A practical theology of servant leadership. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved October 5, 2004, from <http://www.regent.edu/acad/cls/2003ServantLeadershipRoundtable/Russell.pdf>
- Russell, R. F., & Stone, A. G. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23, 145.
- Sendjaya, S. (2003). Development and validation of Servant Leadership Behavior Scale. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved July 15, 2004, from <http://www.regent.edu/acad/cls/2003ServantLeadershipRoundtable/Sendjaya.pdf>
- Sendjaya, S., & Sarros, J. C. (2002). Servant leadership: Its origin, development, and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership and Organization Studies*, 9(2), 57-64.
- Shamir, B., House, R. J., Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4(4), 577-594.
- 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.
- Spears, L. (1995). Servant leadership and the Greenleaf legacy. In L. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on Leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's Theory of Servant-leadership Influenced Today's Top Management Thinkers* (pp. 1-14). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Spears, L. (1996). Reflections on Robert K. Greenleaf and servant leadership. *The Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 17(7), 33-35.
- Spears, L. C. (Ed.). (1998). *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Spears, L. C., & Lawrence, M. (Eds.). (2002). *Focus on leadership: Servant leadership for the 21st century*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Stone, G. A., Russell, R. F., Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(4), 349-361.
- van Knippenberg, B., & van Knippenberg, D. (2005). Leader self-sacrifice and leadership effectiveness: The moderating role of leader prototypicality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(1), 25-37.
- van Knippenberg, D., van Knippenberg, B., De Cremer, D., Hogg, M. A. (2004). Leadership, self, and identity: A review and research agenda. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 825-856.
- Yorges, S. L., Weiss, H. M., & Strickland, O. J. (1999). The effect of leader outcomes on influence, attributions, and perceptions of charisma. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(3), 428-436.
- Winston, B. E. (2003). Extending Patterson's servant leadership model: Coming full circle. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved July 15, 2004, from <http://www.regent.edu/acad/cls/2003ServantLeadershipRoundtable/>
- Winston, B. E. (2004). Servant leadership at Heritage Bible College: A single-case study. *The Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(7), 600-617.
- Winston, B. E., & Hartsfield, M. (2004). Similarities between emotional intelligence and servant leadership. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved October 5, 2004, from <http://www.regent.edu/acad/cls/2004SLRoundtable/winston-2004SL.pdf>
- Wolford-Ulrich, J. (2004). Seeing servant leadership through the lens of design. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved December 17, 2004, from http://www.regent.edu/acad/sls/publications/conference_proceedings/servant_leadership_roundtable/2004_proceedings.htm
- Wong, P. T. P., & Page, D. (2003). Servant leadership: An opponent-process model and the revised servant leadership profile. *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Retrieved July 15, 2004, from <http://www.regent.edu/acad/cls/2003ServantLeadershipRoundtable/>