Chapter 2: Survey of Literature

2.1: Introduction

This Chapter reviews literature that forms the backdrop of the study. The review is presented in three distinct sections. **First Section** focuses on Leadership in general. In this section, a review of literature on different theories on Leadership is carried out. The evolution of leadership ideas is examined taking stock of theories, styles and eras. Literature beyond the theories and styles is examined next. A compilation of attributes of “Excellent Leadership” is attempted then. The use and misuse of power in leadership is examined as a separate topic. The intertwining of Spirituality with Leadership is also explored. Then, role of Altruism, Ethics and Moral Values is perused. The review then moves to the **second section**, which focuses on Servant Leadership. Servant Leadership has emerged as a viable alternative to the use of power and a practical way of implementing high Moral and Ethical standards in Leadership. It has high spiritual context also. In this section, elements of Servant Leadership literature are examined as it appears in Scriptures and then in the Secular realms as well. Cases of successful organisations where Servant Leadership has formally been practiced are examined next. Then, studies that have empirically measured Servant Leadership and its attributes are perused. The impact of Servant Leadership on employees of an organisation is explored next. In the **third section**, we have taken a stock of available literature on the NGO sector. First, literature focusing on emergence of NGO sector as a key sector, and its importance is perused. The importance and impact of Leadership in NGOs is examined next. Approaches employed to measure the impact of an NGO is examined next. This is done since one of the objectives of this study is to explore the parameters that impact the performance of NGOs. The challenges of measuring the impact of NGOs using outcome measures is examined, followed by the existing studies on the impact of NGO leadership on its employees and volunteers on parameters like their performance and motivation. Key inferences drawn from the survey of literature are presented in the end. The chapter concludes with identification of research gaps arising out of the survey of literature.
2.2: Leadership

Leadership has been a subject of numerous studies. Ancient literature, be it Egyptian, Chinese, Indian and many others, highlight the importance of leadership and the role of the leader. Indian classics like *Mahabharata*, and *Ramayana* are replete with leadership illustrations. This interest has continued in the modern times as well. Over time, many theories on Leadership have emerged as a result of empirical and conceptual contributions. King (1990) opined that Leadership is one of the most intricate and multifaceted occurrences that has been the focus of organizational and psychological studies.

King (1990) presented an overview of various leadership eras in his review. This review indicated that each leadership era symbolized a higher state of development in leadership thought compared to the earlier era. He also noted disenchantment at the end of each leadership era leading to search for an alternative model. These eras are shown in Fig 2.1.

The **Personality Era** focused on the leader as an individual or as a person. The attention was on the background or traits of the individual. This era has two streams, i.e., the **Great Man Period** and the **Trait Period**. The Great Man Period suggested that an individual who emulated great personalities was expected to emerge as a strong leader. In this Era, leadership was mainly equated with personality. Under the Trait Period, there was an endeavour to enlist the attributes which if espoused, would predict the performance of a leader.

Under the **Influence Era** leadership was considered as an association between people and not a trait. This paved the way for Behaviour Era, in which, leadership was considered to be a subset of human conduct. In this Era, Theory X&Y, the Managerial Grid Model received significant attention.

Under the **Situational Era**, it was acknowledged that there were aspects which extended beyond the leader and the subordinate. These situational facets decided which types of leader attributes, skills, impact and conducts led to successful leadership. Under the **Contingency Era**, there were attempts to select the situational moderator variables which best depicted which leadership style must be employed.
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this Era, the Contingency Theory, the Path-Goal Theory and the Normative Theory were considered to be most important. In the Transactional Era, it was suggested that leadership resided not in the individual or setting but in differentiating amongst the role and social interaction. In the Anti-Leadership Era, it was generally believed that there was no construct such as 'Leadership'. In the Culture Era, it was suggested that if a leader was successful in developing a strong culture, the employees would be able to lead themselves. The Transformational Era believed that leaders need to be proactive, radical and innovative. The Transformational Era combined several aspects of earlier eras. In this era, the leaders needed several qualities to perform successfully. They needed to think and to execute. He or she must be a visionary, and have the ability to think strategically. He or she must focus on creativity. At the same time they must be willing to take risks, be adaptable to change, and willing to delegate. They need to come out with intelligent actions to execute the strategy. New leaders need to take a collective perspective on leadership.

King (1990) also foresaw the need of a Tenth Era-, what he termed as the Integrative Era. He recommended that the Tenth Era hopefully would integrate conceptually varied approaches in creating a sustainable theory of leadership. Success of a leader cannot be ascertained by a single approach; it needs simultaneous interaction of varied kinds of variables.

In the backdrop provided by King (1990), let us review various theories of leadership as they emerged over time. Broadly, these theories can be grouped into eight categories.

First came the Great Man theory. This theory assumed that the capacity for leadership was inherent – that great leaders are born, not made. It portrayed great leaders as heroic, mythic and destined to rise to leadership when needed. This theory was popularized in the 19th century by Carlyle (1888) who commented that “The history of the world is but the biography of great men”. Great men were the leaders of men, the modelers, patterns, and in wide sense creators, of whatsoever the general mass of men contrived to do or to attain. All things that we see standing accomplished in the world are properly the outer material result, the practical realization and embodiment, of thoughts that dwell in the Great Men sent into the world, and thus the
soul of the whole world's history, it may justly be considered, are the history of these great men. The term "Great Man" was used because, at that time, leadership was thought of primarily as a male quality, especially in terms of military leadership.

This theory gave way to Trait Theory. Like Great Man theory, this theory assumed that people inherit certain qualities and traits that make them better suited to leadership. Trait theory attempted to crystallize particular personality or behavioral characteristics shared by leaders. Galton (1869) found that leadership was a unique property of extraordinary individuals, and the traits leaders possessed were immutable and could not be developed. Throughout early 1900s, the study of leadership focused on traits. However, a dilemma baffled the proponents of this theory. If particular traits are key features of leadership, then how do we explain people who possess those qualities but are not leaders? Further, the list of the traits grew endlessly with each leader bringing in additional traits. Many of the times, the traits were contradictory as well.

Behavioral theories were the next phase of leadership theories. This leadership theory focused on the actions of leaders not on mental qualities or internal states. According to this theory, people can learn to become leaders through teaching and observation. The leader's behaviours came to be called leadership styles. Lewin et al (1939) studied the influence of leadership styles and performance. The identified three styles namely: authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire, which impacted group decision making, praise & criticism (feedback), and the management of the group tasks (project management). In 1945, a group of researchers at the Ohio State University identified observable behaviors of leaders, and argued that it is not the personality traits that make a leader. They came up with two factors that accounted for most of the variance in leader behaviour. These two factors were labeled Consideration (the extent to which a leader exhibits concern for the welfare of the members of the group) and Initiating Structure (the extent to which a leader defines leader and group member roles, initiates actions, organizes group activities and defines how tasks are to be accomplished by the group). In 1947 Rensis Likert and his group of social researchers at University of Michigan launched series of leadership studies. These studies indicated that leaders could be classified as either "employee
centered," or "job centered." It identified three critical characteristics of effective leaders: task oriented behavior, relationship-oriented behavior, and participative leadership. The managerial grid model is also based on the behavioral theory. The model was developed by Blake and Mouton (1964). It suggested five different leadership styles, based on the leaders' concern for people and their concern for goal achievement.

Contingency theories of leadership focused on particular variables related to the environment that might determine which particular style of leadership is best suited for the situation. According to this theory, no leadership style is best in all situations. Success depends upon a number of variables, including the leadership style, qualities of the followers and aspects of the situation. Among the first proponents of this theory were Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1957), who developed a leadership continuum with relationship orientation characterized by high employee freedom on one extreme and task oriented behavior characterized by high use of leader authority at the other extreme. According to this model, as a leader became more relationship oriented, he became less task oriented. A more detailed (and more researched) Contingency model was developed by Fiedler (1964). This model recognized that the style of leadership that was most effective depended upon the context in which the style was applied. Leadership behavior was modeled as a continuum between either task oriented or relationship oriented. Fiedler also developed a scale to classify leaders into one of these styles.

Situational theories proposed that leaders choose the best course of action based upon situational variables. Different styles of leadership might be more appropriate for certain types of decision-making. This theory was propounded by Hersey and Blanchard (1969). The fundamental argument of the situational leadership theory was that there is no single "best" style of leadership. Effective leadership depended on the task and that the most successful leaders were those that adapted their leadership style to the situations. Effective leadership depended, not only on the person or group that was being influenced, but also depended on the task, job or function that was needed to be accomplished.
Functional leadership theory addressed how specific leader behaviors contribute to organizational or unit effectiveness. McGrath (1962), its proponent, suggested that the leadership role is "to do, or get done, whatever is not being adequately handled for group needs". This theory argued that the leader's main job was to see that whatever is necessary to group needs is taken care of; thus, a leader can be said to have done their job well when they have contributed to group effectiveness and cohesion (Hackman and Walton, 1986). One of the functional theories of leadership, used in many leadership training programmes, is "Action-Centred Leadership". (Adair, 1973)

Transactional theories, also known as management theories, focused on the role of supervision, organization and group performance. These theories proposed that leadership involved using a system of rewards and punishments. The main proponent of this theory was Burns (1978). Transactional Leadership theory gave the opportunity to the manager to lead the group and the group agreed to follow his lead to accomplish a predetermined goal in exchange for something else. Power was given to the leader to evaluate, correct, and train subordinates when productivity was not up to the desired level, and reward effectiveness when expected outcome was reached. These leaders gave clear instructions to followers about what their expectations were and when those expectations were fulfilled there were rewards in store for them and failure was severely punished.

Transformational theories, also known as Relationship theories, focused upon the connections formed between leaders and followers. Transformational leaders inspired people by helping group members see the importance and higher good of the task. These leaders were focused on the performance of group members, but also wanted each person to fulfill his or her potential. Leaders with this style often have high ethical and moral standards. Burns (1978), its proponent, noted that transforming approach created significant change in the life of people and organizations. It redesigned perceptions and values, and changed expectations and aspirations of employees. Bass (1985) further worked on this concept by explaining the psychological mechanisms that underlie transforming and transactional leadership. He extended the initial concepts by proposing how transformational leadership could be measured, as well as how it impacted follower's motivation and performance.
Running across the various theories was another dimension of leadership, i.e., leader’s behaviour. Behaviour of a leader in a given situation came to be referred as **Leadership Style**. This behaviour could depend on a number of factors like the leaders Skills, Knowledge, Values, Personality, Traits, Motives, etc. One of the earliest studies on Leadership Styles was that of Lewin et al (1939). They came out with three basic Leadership styles given in Table 2.1.

**Table 2.1: Lewin’s Leadership Styles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Leadership</td>
<td>Authoritarian leaders, also known as autocratic leaders, provide clear expectations for what needs to be done, when it should be done, and how it should be done. Authoritarian leaders make decisions independently with little or no input from the rest of the group. This leadership is best applied to situations where there is little time for group decision-making or where the leader is the most knowledgeable member of the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative Leadership</td>
<td>Participative leaders encourage group members to participate, but retain the final say over the decision-making process. Group members feel engaged in the process and are more motivated and creative. Democratic leaders offer guidance to group members, but they also participate in the group and allow input from other group members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegative Leadership</td>
<td>Delegative leaders offer little or no guidance to group members and leave decision-making up to group members. While this style can be effective in situations where group members are highly qualified in an area of expertise, it often leads to poorly defined roles and a lack of motivation. The members in this group also made more demands on the leader, showed little cooperation and were unable to work independently.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Lewin et al (1939)*

Further studies on leader behaviour by Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1957) suggested that leadership behaviour varies along a continuum and that as one moves away from the autocratic extreme the amount of subordinate participation and involvement in decision taking increases. They also suggested that the kind of leadership represented by the democratic extreme of the continuum would rarely be encountered in formal organisations.

Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1957) proposed four main leadership styles described in Table 2.2 that can be located at points along such a continuum.
Table 2.2: Leadership Styles Continuum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>Leader takes the decisions and announces them; expecting subordinates to carry them out without question (the Telling style).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>Leader takes all the decisions for the group without discussion or consultation, but persuades the group to accept the decision. Leader explains and 'sells' in order to overcome any possible resistance. The leader attempts to create enthusiasm for the goals (the Selling style).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td>Leader confers with the group members before taking decisions and, in fact, considers their advice and their feelings when framing decisions. He or she may, of course, not always accept the subordinates' advice but they are likely to feel that they can have some influence. The full responsibility of the decision remains with the leader but the degree of involvement by subordinates in decision taking is very much greater than telling or selling styles (the Consulting style).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Leader lays the problem before his or her subordinates and invites discussion. The leader's role is that of conference leader, or chair, rather than that of decision taker. Leader allows the decision to emerge out of the process of group discussion, instead of imposing it on the group (the Joining style).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1957)

Goleman (2000) opined that leaders with best results rely on more than one style of leadership. He postulated six kinds of leaders namely Coercive, Authoritative, Affiliative, Democratic, Pacesetting and Coaching. Key elements of these styles are presented in the Table 2.3

Goleman (2000) conducted this study to explore links between leadership and emotional intelligence, organisational climate (flexibility, responsibility, standards, rewards, clarity and commitment), and performance. This study noted that all six leadership styles had a measurable impact on each aspect of climate. Leaders who used styles which had a positive impact on the climate ensured superior financial performance. Goleman (2000) exhorted leaders to expand their options. For that, they need to comprehend their emotional intelligence (EI) competencies. Leaders need to have six styles in their repertoire and know when and how to use them. The leader needs to build a team with members who employ styles they lack.
Table 2.3: Goleman’s Leadership Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coercive Leadership</td>
<td>Demands immediate compliance. This is a “tell” mode of leadership. The refrain generally is “Do as I say”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Leadership</td>
<td>Provides vision and mobilises the team towards the same. Explains the reason for actions. Paints the big picture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative Leadership</td>
<td>Revolves around people – their emotions and goals. Keeps employees happy and creates harmony amongst them. People needs always comes first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Leadership</td>
<td>Forges consensus through participation. Fosters collaboration and team leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacesetting Leadership</td>
<td>Sets high standards for performance and exemplifies them by self. Exhibits high drive to achieve and initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Leadership</td>
<td>Develops people for future. Assists employees in identifying their individual strengths and weaknesses and link them to their personal and career goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Goleman (2000)

Most of the styles discussed till now focused on the Leader and much less on the Team members or followers. However, over a period of time, the efficacy of Team leadership became a subject matter of study. These studies highlighted the importance of the leaders’ relationship with his/her followers and an interdependency of roles. These set of conclusions emphasized that leader was not a hero or solo leader but a team leader. A leader had the capacity to follow. A leader was not necessarily the master, but the servant.

The first contribution on what could be called Non Leader centric style came from the works of Burns (1978). He put forth the Transformation Theory and Transforming style of Leadership, defining transforming leadership as “a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converted followers into leaders and might convert leaders into moral agents”. He suggested that “Transforming leadership occurred when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality...”

Bass (1985) expanded on this style of leadership, by studying the psychological mechanisms that underlie both transactional and transforming leadership. He
suggested ways to measure the transformational leadership and its impact on follower motivation and performance.

Tichy and Devanna (1990) built further on the work of Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) in organisational and work contexts. They described the hybrid nature of transformational as “... not due to charisma. It is a behavioral process capable of being learned”.

Bass continued his research on topic and along with Avolio (Bass & Avolio, 1994) suggested that “Transformational leadership is closer to the prototype of leadership that people have in mind when they describe their ideal leader, and it is more likely to provide a role model with which subordinates want to identify”.

In fact, Non Leader centric styles have been put forth much earlier when the idea of Scientific Management was getting crystallized. Taylor (1911) postulated Four Principles of Scientific Management, where the first was knowledge of the workmen. Then it was proposed that the second duty under Scientific Management was the scientific selection and then the progressive development of the workmen. In this way, the workmen become the subject of study. In the past, efforts were made to study machines not workmen. After the organization studied these workmen, then possibilities and ways of developing workmen were crystallized. The next principle suggested bringing scientifically selected workmen and the science together, so that work could be performed efficiently. The fourth principle suggested deliberate division of the work between workmen and management. This required cooperation between the management and the workmen. This study therefore laid the foundations for more Non Leader centric approaches to leadership.

Belbin (1981) studied the behaviour of Teams and differentiated “solo Leader” and a Team Leader. This is captured in Table 2.4. Belbin (1981) suggested that Team Leadership can be learned through understanding the nature of leadership and the qualities required. In the rapidly changing and uncertain work environment no one person has all the answers to leadership. A Team leadership style based upon the development of the strengths and the allowable weaknesses of all the roles would permit a more holistic, or participative, style of leadership where teamwork, problem
solving, decision making and innovation could flourish with heightened teamwork and work performance.

Table 2.4: Solo Leader Vs Team Leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOLO LEADER</th>
<th>TEAM LEADER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plays unlimited role. Interferes in everything</td>
<td>Chooses to limit role to preferred team roles – delegates roles to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strives for conformity. Attempts to mould people to particular standards</td>
<td>Builds on diversity. Values differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects acolytes, admirers and sycophants</td>
<td>Seeks Talent. Values people with special abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directs Subordinates</td>
<td>Develops colleagues. Encourages the growth of personal strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifies objectives. Lays down what everyone is expected to do</td>
<td>Creates mission. Projects the vision which others can act on as they see fit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Belbin (1981)

Table 2.5: Leader as follower

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Leader Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Individual performance** | As a leader, you must follow another individual, regardless of hierarchy, if:  
• That individual, through experience, skill, and judgment, knows best.  
• That individual's growth demands that you invest more in his or her skill and self-confidence than in your own.  
• Only that individual, not you, has the capacity (the time and opportunity) to "get it done" |
| **Team performance**     | As a leader, you must follow the team if:  
• The team's purpose and performance goals demand it  
• The team, not you, must develop skills and self-confidence  
• The team's agreed-upon working approach requires you, like all the others, to do real work |
| **Organizational performance** | As a leader, you must follow others, regardless of hierarchy, if:  
• The organization's purpose and performance goals demand it  
• The need for expanding the leadership capacity of others in the organization requires it  
• "Living" the vision and values enjoins you to do so |

Source: Katzenbach and Smith (1994)
Katzenbach and Smith (1994) proposed the idea of Leaders as followers. They highlighted the areas where being a follower was expected to give better results. This is highlighted in Table 2.5

Contemporary thinkers have studied leadership beyond the established theories and styles. They have explored various aspects of leadership that leads to better performance, better motivation, better success, and overall betterment of the world itself. There are conceptual and empirical efforts for exploring excellence in leadership, focusing both on individuals and organisations. Leadership has been studied in conventional settings in professional organisations. Leadership has been explained with context of varied non conventional settings like, in Orchestras, parables, and example of sledge dogs. Leadership has been studied through Mountaineering experiences. These studies attempt to find out what are some of the qualities that result in excellent Leadership.

Pinchot (1985) propounded Ten Commandments for leaders. He noted that team building is a team activity. The leader should share credit widely. One should ask for advice before asking for resources. He/she must underpromise and overdeliver. He/she must be prepared to undertake any job needed to make his dream work, regardless of his/her specific job description. One must remember that it was easier to ask for forgiveness than for permission. Keep the best interest of the company and its customers in mind. Come to work each day willing to be fired. Be true to your goals, but be realistic about how to achieve them, and honor and educate your sponsors.

Mintzberg (1989) noted that all managers are expected to play 3 broad roles; namely Interpersonal, Informational and Decisional. These broad roles have their sub roles as well. For interpersonal category, the manager was expected to perform a Figurehead, Leader or a Liaison role. For the Informational Category, the roles were as a Monitor, Disseminator or Spokesperson. Roles under the Decisional category are that of an Entrepreneur, Disturbance Handler, Resource Allocator or Negotiator.

Mintzberg (1998) later postulated the theory of Covert leadership, after studying leadership insights that he has gathered by closely observing an orchestra conductor. A symphony orchestra was like any other professional organizations. They employed
highly trained individuals who know what to do and they just do it. Covert leadership meant managing with a sense of balance keeping in view the constraints and limitations. A covert leader led without seeming to, without his people being fully aware of all that he was doing. In covert leadership, a leader was not completely powerless—but neither did he possess absolute control over others. The key insight was that in case of an orchestra conductor, a covert leader’s focus was on inspiring the team members.

Khandwalla (1992) studied many turnarounds in corporates and suggested six foundational turnaround elements and seven strategic elements of turnaround. The foundational elements were product mix changes, changes at the top, marketing related actions, restructuring, cost reduction measures (other than retrenchment), and plant modernization for greater productivity, efficiency, quality, etc. Strategic elements were use of staff motivational devices such as incentives, garnering the support of stakeholders, participation of lower level managers in turnaround related diagnosing & problem solving, increased HRD, formal diagnostic work, mass layoffs, and creation of organization-wide consensus on core values and required changes. This study confirmed the role of Leaders in the turn around of organisations. It reported that management change at top was involved in 93% cases of turn around.

Kim and Mauborgne (1992) explained leadership in terms of a “bowl of clay”. For many, the bowl is made of out of clay. But the true picture of a bowl must include that hollow that is carved into the clay – the unseen space that defines the bowl’s shape and capacity. Their search led them to Oriental masters who taught the wisdom of life through parables. Some of the qualities of excellent leadership that emerged out were ‘the leader’s ability to hear what is left unspoken, humility, commitment, the value of looking at reality from vantage points, the ability to create an organization that draws out the unique strengths of every member.”

Drawing from the experiences of 12 leaders whom he interviewed, Bennis (1994) argued that leadership starts with a leader’s capacity for self-invention, and this begins with self-knowledge. Leaders innovate and learn from experience without fear of mistakes. A leader is someone in the front, doing things others have not done. A leader must add knowledge of the world to self-knowledge. This knowledge of the
world should be gained through participation rather than reaction. A leader must trust his instincts, his *blessed impulse*. Blessed impulse is a tool for making decisions in a world too complex to be completely understood. Leaders must deploy themselves through self-expression. Leaders must get people on their side through constancy, congruity of words and action, reliability and integrity.

Coming to the realm of organisational leadership, Treacy and Wiersema (1997) focused on value disciplines needed for companies to become and remain number one in the market. They identified three value disciplines namely; *operational excellence*, *product leadership* and *customer intimacy*. *Operational excellence* requires leaders to look into the processes, avoid non value added steps in processes, reduce wastages, reduce cost and be able to turn around customer requirements with speed and urgency.

To build and sustain *Product leadership*, leaders need to be focused on innovation, reduce cost, and continuously seek customer feedback. *Customer intimacy* requires leaders to strive to be close to the customer and anticipate future customer needs. They must also acquire more knowledge on the product or service than the customers.

Singh (1999) pointed out the challenges of providing the world with leaders of *greater breadth* (Capacity to respect other’s opinions, freedom from prejudice or intolerance, ability to see the whole), *Versatility* (Ability to turn easily and readily from one subject to another and capability of dealing with many subjects), and *understanding* (Abilities to perceive, to conceptualize, to interpret, and to judge). The leadership role demands perspectives, worldviews, beliefs and a passionate commitment to some values balanced by a sense of responsibility. In addition leaders need a sense of humor, ability to maintain humility, and ability to listen to others. Leaders with such qualities are in short supply. These qualities can however be taught. Singh (1999) suggested that study of classic literature is one of the effective ways of developing such leaders. He suggested that choosing the right classic to read, relating literature to leadership & decision-making, and experiencing them through interpretation are the three steps that may help develop excellent leaders.

Dayal (1999) studied various behavioral characteristics of effective leaders and grouped them under three categories namely; *Organisation related*, *Individual related* and *Other people related*. Under *Organisation related characteristics* he noted that
leaders build organisations and have clarity of purpose. Deep faith, innovation, energy, service above self, and leading by examples fell into the *Individual related characteristics*. Under the *Other people related characteristics*, openness, allowing freedom and developing people were included. Dayal (1999) went further to look at processes for developing an effective leader. He felt that any interventions for leader development would have poor chance of success without developing an overall feeling of acceptance and belonging among the employees. The study identified three means to develop effective leaders. These are; *an urge to achieve or to succeed, a process of maturing, and a process of becoming oneself.*

Collins (2001) opined that organisations that are in good health also looked for leaders who can convert from good to excellent. His work indicated that one of the most significant differences, in turning an organisation from good to great is the quality and nature of leadership in the firm. He identified *"Level 5 leadership"* as a common characteristic of the great companies. In his opinion, Level 5 leaders build enduring greatness through a paradoxical blend of humility and professional will. This is summarised in Table 2.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Will</th>
<th>Personal Humility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sets high standards. Does not compromise on standards.</td>
<td>Channels ambition to the company. Focuses on and develops successors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes total responsibility for failures</td>
<td>Apportions credit to other people for success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Collins (2001)*

Badaracco, Jr. (2001) postulated the model of *Quite Leadership*. This style of leadership is practical, effective and sustainable. Quite leadership is highly effective
in situations where ethical challenges require direct and public action. This is because quite leaders prefer to choose their position carefully rather than doing something in haste and dramatically to achieve a single time glory. Quite leaders move carefully, incrementally and patiently and win the race without any bitterness and casualties. These people are called quite leaders because their modesty and restraint are in large measure responsible for their extraordinary achievements. The author believed that “big problems can be solved by a long series of small efforts.” Quite leaders, in spite of their apparently slow pace response, often proved to be the quickest way to take the world to a better place.

Following the studies on excellence in leadership, Fryer (2003) studied the attributes of successful leaders. He discussed how managers inspire ordinary people to do extraordinary things.

Table 2.7: Leaders and their characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carly Fiorina, Chairman and CEO of Hewlett-Packard</td>
<td>Start with the Truth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Bangle, Global Chief of Design at BMW</td>
<td>Appeal to Greatness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chauncey Veatch, 2002 National Teacher of the Year, USA</td>
<td>Make Them Proud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.M. Baker, jr. Chairman of Wachovia</td>
<td>Stick to Your Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert A. Eckert, Chairman and CEO of Mattel</td>
<td>Be a Broken Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Butcher, Four-time winner of the 1150-mile Iditarod sledge dog race.</td>
<td>Build Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross J. Pillari, President of BP America</td>
<td>Encourage Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb Baum, Chairman, President and CEO of the Dial Corporation</td>
<td>Call for the Little Guy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario Mazzola, Chief Development Officer at CISCO Systems</td>
<td>Ground without Grinding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert D. Ballard. President of the Institute for Exploration in Mystic</td>
<td>Leap First, Ask Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu Chuanzhi, Chairman Legend Group</td>
<td>Set Different Incentive Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hank McKinnell, Chairman and CEO of Pfizer</td>
<td>Work quickly through pain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The author profiled twelve leaders and described tough motivational challenges they had faced. Motivating people required a clear, unbiased understanding of situation at hand, deep insight into the vagaries of human nature at the individual and group levels, the establishment of appropriate and reasonable expectations and goals, and the balancing of tangible and intangible incentives. Table 2.7 lists the leaders profiled and the key characteristics that they advocate.

Goldsmith (2007) went against the norm of studying what leaders should do and focused on what they should stop doing. He compiled a list of 20 habits that every leader should be consciously avoiding in order to get ahead. He warned against the habit of wanting to win always. Leaders should curtail their desire to add 2 cents to every discussion. Excellent leaders do not pass judgment. They do not use sarcasm and cutting remarks. Only destructive leaders convey to everyone that I'm right and you're wrong. Excellent leaders do not have to tell the world how smart they are. They do not use emotional volatility as a management tool. They do not exhibit negativity. Excellent leaders do not withhold information. Some leaders do not progress because of their inability to give praise and reward. Excellent leaders do not claim credit that they don’t deserve. They do not make excuses. Only poor leaders cling to the past. They also play favorites. They refuse to express regret. Not listening is one of the other things he warns about. According to Goldsmith (2007) excellent leaders never fail to express gratitude. They never punish the messenger, and never pass the buck. Excellent leaders do not have an excessive need to be “me”.

Khandwalla (2008) studied the concept of greatness in corporate context. The author described greatness as outstanding performance in terms of business performance which is also outstandingly humane, upright and committed to some larger vision of quality of life. This study emphasized the need for blending of corporate greatness in business excellence and 'goodness’ excellence at the highest level. “These new breed of corporate managers need to possess an intriguing mix of skills. People at that level need to possess altruism and change agent competencies.” Change agent skills are anchored in a strong proclivity for innovation and ability to utilize other’s power for one’s mission. Their capacity to mobilize scarce resources and support of the stakeholders in a situation, task accomplishment drive, high self-confidence, and
leadership, communication, and inter-personal skills helps the organization to be effective. At the same time there is a need to ensure that the company has greater linkages (and influencing ability) with other external facilitators such as political system, the bureaucracy, the business community, and the civil society.

Jones and Jones (2008) noted that trust and confidence in leaders have fallen. To effectively face current and future leadership challenges, there is a need for leaders to embrace what the authors termed as Principled Leadership. Principled Leaders develop a long-term purpose and design their career based upon honesty, integrity and honor. They practice selfless service to the company, customer and team. They help followers to see success in their mind’s eye and motivate them to work harder and take challenging jobs in order to be effective. The foundation of Principled Leadership is The Holy Bible. The Apostle Paul demonstrated principled leadership characteristics. A Principled Leader must be hospitable, love what is good, self-controlled, upright, holy and disciplined. This theory was influenced by trait theory, and transformational theory.

Maxwell (2008) shared lessons from his own life and other leaders on how to become the smartest leader. He opined that looking for leadership insights in like mining for gold. Smart leaders do not isolate themselves from the people they are leading. Creating relationships with others brings more opportunities than leading alone. Self awareness and self control are two key aspects of becoming an excellent leader. Best leaders will always be the ones that listen to their employees. A leader can improve their performance through an honest evaluation from others. Leaders must be able to define reality. A leader must find the right people who work best for the organization. Leaders should always continue to ask questions. Excellent leaders keep learning. Finally a leader should always think about the impression they are leaving with others, because it will be the legacy after the leader is gone.

Manikutty and Singh (2010) noted that real/true leaders create a group of people who are willing to work beyond accomplishing pre decided tasks. Such leaders help followers raise their latent energy and spirit, helping them acquire certain amount of energy and vitality. A leader works quite differently from a manager. Leaders dream ideas and translate them into images that excite people. Leaders work through
passions whereas managers work through interests. Most people in an organization are managers. The potential ones among them need to prepare themselves to become leaders. This transition process requires managers to develop and manage emotions, set their own standards, and become dreamers.

Wilson (2010) studied Indian corporates focusing on how Indian Business leaders develop over time. This study intended to propose pathways to prepare executives to be more effective leaders. The author conducted interviews with more than 100 business executives from Indian industries. The study proposed an Opportunity Matrix of seven experiences and eleven lessons. The seven experiences of leaders were Bosses and superiors, Creating change: turnarounds, Creating change: new initiatives, Horizontal moves: job rotation and transitions, Cultural crossings, Increases in job scope and First professional job. The eleven leadership lessons learned were categorized under three broad groups, namely; Leading self (Confidence, Self-awareness, and Personal leadership insights), Leading others (Managing & motivating subordinates, Developing subordinates, Navigating politics & gaining influence, Engaging with multiple stakeholders and Cross-cultural savvy) and Leading the business (Effective execution, Innovation & entrepreneurship, and Functional & technical expertise).

Barney (2010) profiled the Indian IT company Infosys and compiled leadership lessons. Infosys's value system was explained as “the ability to accept deferred gratifications, the ability to make sacrifices currently, the ability to work in a team based on an agreed protocol of do’s and don’ts, subordinating individual egos and putting the interest of the organization ahead of individual interests, recognizing people competency and accepting the leadership of individuals in different areas.” He suggested that five ‘context-invariant and time-invariant attributes’ that lay the foundation for success at Infosys are openness to new ideas in an environment of pluralism, meritocracy - making sure that the best idea is selected, speed - doing things faster today than yesterdays, imagination and excellence in execution. These values were crystallized as C-LIFE, which stands for Customer Delight, Leadership by Example, Integrity & Transparency, Fairness and Pursuit of Excellence. These values were instilled in all employees and across company’s core values in all
processes. Leaders were interviewed for their perspectives on what made them so successful. Seven themes that emerged were metacognition & thought leadership, unconventional thinking, collective thought leadership, building on existing thought leadership, foresight plus insight, focus plus flow and personal contents, views & challenges. This study offered guidance to aspiring entrepreneurs on how to lead a start up organisation to great success.

Sharma (2010) proposed eight lessons that leaders, managers and entrepreneurs can apply to boost morale, command loyalty and improve productivity while fulfilling personal lives. He called them the eight rituals. These rituals are compelling future focus (get people excited about a compelling cause that contributes to the life of others), human relations (“Manage by mind, lead by heart”), team unity (employees who feel they are valued members of an exciting team will go an extra mile and give their best), adaptability & change management (there is a joy in change), personal effectiveness (focus on the worthy), self leadership (personal renewal, abundant knowledge, physicality, early awakening and the deathbed mentality), creativity & innovation (create a workplace that liberates these), and contribution & significance (leave a footprint and make a difference). Author concluded that the best way to ensure these leadership lessons became a part of who you are is to create rituals around them. These rituals will give the leader a strong support and foster self-discipline.

A summary of the attributes required for excellence in leadership that come out as a result of the studies perused in this section is presented in Table 2.8
Table 2.8: Excellence in leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Leadership Attribute</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dreams that invoke commitment, passion, determination and courage</td>
<td>Manikutty and Singh (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Metacognition and thought leadership</td>
<td>Barney (2010), Metcalfe and Shimamura (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Unconventional Thinking</td>
<td>Barney (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Master Managing of the Unexpected</td>
<td>Sharma (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Creating and Communicating Vision</td>
<td>Manikutty and Singh (2010), Sharma (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Picking your battles</td>
<td>Badaracco Jr (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Leading by example</td>
<td>Manikutty and Singh (2010), Wilson (2010), Barney (2010), Jones and Jones (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Keeping your word</td>
<td>Sharma (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Admitting mistakes, forgiving mistakes, be forgiven</td>
<td>Goldsmith (2007), Maxwell (2008), Barney (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Balancing work and life</td>
<td>Manikutty and Singh (2010), Maxwell (2008), Jones and Jones (2008), Badaracco Jr (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Being a learner</td>
<td>Maxwell (2008), Jones and Jones (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Identifying, selecting, motivating and developing the team members</td>
<td>Wilson (2010), Barney (2010), Sharma (2010), Goldsmith (2007), Jones and Jones (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Helping Others to Grow</td>
<td>Maxwell (2008), Jones and Jones (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Appreciating and Thanking</td>
<td>Goldsmith (2007)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s distillation
Apart from these general studies on excellence in leadership, specific topics on use of power, intertwining of spirituality, inclusion of ethical standards and altruism has been studied. These are discussed in the following sections.

2.3: Leadership and Power

Leadership has been linked with power for a very long time. The classical view of leadership is that power and authority flows from above. When professional organisations were established initially, this view dictated the organisational structures and procedures. In the modern era, an alternate view, called the Bottoms-up view, started emerging. Barnard (1938) was the first one to describe this view of authority. He proposed that people will accept an order if four conditions are met, namely; the person understands the order, the person believes the order is consistent with the organisations goals, the person believes that the order is compatible with his or her interests and the person is mentally and physically able to comply with the order. Follett (1949) analysed the word “authority” and noted that some of the words such as authority, supreme authority, ultimate authority, delegation of authority, etc are just a survival of former days. The modern business has surpassed business theory and business practice has gone ahead of business language. She opined that in the best managed businesses there is a focus on each individual to have the authority which goes with his particular job rather than in a position in a hierarchy. Leaders and thinkers are closer to the understanding and conclusion that a man should have just as much, no more or no less, authority that needs to perform his function or task. This concept gets rid of that kind of authority which puts one man over another because he is higher up in an organizational chart. The emphasis is on the job rather than on the hierarchy of position. Authority may go with three things - knowledge, experience and the skill to apply that knowledge and experience. Follett (1949) concluded by emphasizing that “The important thing about a decision is not who makes it but what goes into it. The important thing about responsibility is not to whom you are responsible, but for what you are responsible. The important thing about authority is that real authority and official authority shall coincide.”

In another study Follett (1973) directly addressed the issue of Power. She identified two types of power that are commonly prevalent – power-with and power-over. The
concept power-over generally denotes that the power of some person or group over other persons or groups. Whereas, power-with means, a jointly developed power, a co-active, not a coercive power. The author collected information from various literatures and noted that around ninety percent of our life is lived under the laws of suggestions and intimation, which means power-over. The challenge is how to reduce the power-over. She suggested few areas such as integration of desires, obeying the law of the situation and making businesses more and more of a functional unity.

McClelland and Burnham (1995) opined that power is a great motivator. They studied the motivational aspects of managers using the degree of a person’s need for power as a measure of success. The authors concluded that the effective managers tended to score high in their need for power. They exhibited desire to influence people. The authors noted that the most effective managers, what they termed as institutional managers, are disciplined and controlled their desire for power so that it was directed toward the benefit of the institution as a whole – not toward their own personal glory. This is socialised power. On the contrary there are managers with a need for personal power who instill low morale among subordinates.

Dasgupta (2001) noted that when people listen to their leader they really listen to themselves since they have made him/her a leader. The author focused on leader - team member power relationships in organizations through the lens of ego- management. In order to establish a strong leader – member relationship it needs to begin with a strong moral foundation in individuals. Bhaya (2001) opined that power is a motive force essential to move men or matter. So there is an essential requirement that the power has to be acquired and shared in an organization by an individual executive. Power in an organization flows from high pressure areas to low pressure ones - from top to the bottom, not the other way. Since most organizations are hierarchical in set up, the corollary is that the exercise of power affects an individual according to the position he or she holds in an organization. The author viewed the power dynamics between individuals and organizations in terms of two basic human emotions - greed and fear. The author argued that a shared rather than an autocratic use of power without diluting one’s final responsibility should be practiced and
promoted. Love of power for its own sake and using it for self-interest inevitably create disrespect and non-cooperation for the leader.

Mishra (2001) looked at power from a feminine perspective and argued that the feminine power principle has a universal applicability. It cannot be exclusive to women only. The author pointed out the keynotes of this principle in Islam, Christianity and Hinduism as being joy, love and duty which are very different from the nature of the masculine principle of power. She drew attention to the holistic Mother principle, referring the Goddess Durga, (a Hindu goddess) at once protecting, educating and nourishing. The author found that organisations driven mainly by the masculinity of power lack the nurturing-caring dimension and cease to be enduring or effective. On the other hand, leaders of society nourished by the feminine power principle will be engaged constantly in securing the welfare of all beings.

Mukherjee (2001) noted that "Irrespective of our wishes, without 'power', the engine of social life cannot run". He suggested the convergence of eastern and western ethics in the use of power. Restraint and containment of self-interest is a common keynote of ethical power management in both. The author highlighted the importance of power for the sake of self-empowerment. The author reminded the readers that use of power propelled by competitive envy is a sure way to abuse it.

Zafirovski (2001) noted that power in society and organizations is a complex social phenomenon that contains elements of the 'reciprocal shaping' of individuals and groups. Power always strives for social acceptance, approval and/or legitimization. He viewed organizations within society as power structures and treated managers as power-seekers within organizations. The author argued that economic organizations do not stick only to financial cost-benefits, but often display moral commitments as well. The author explained that even business agents, while operating within certain power structures, create and sustain moral norms and human values because of an intrinsic urge.

Kamath (2001) referring to a conversation between Swami Vivekananda and his disciple noted that "Be the servant if you will rule. That is the real secret. Your love will comfort even if your words be harsh. Instinctively, men feel the love clothed in
Vivekananda always expected his followers to eschew pride and jealousy. The author noted that Swami Vivekananda’s way of generating power was through renunciation. He concluded with three simple ways of managing power, namely; having a strong common sense, cultivating a public spirit and cultivating a distinct Philosophy.

Pruzan (2001) discussed focused on the modern perspectives on ‘power’ in organization. The first one is the capacity to effect (or affect) organizational outcomes, the second one is manipulative or behavioral perspective. The author stressed that leaders in organizations with multiple stakeholders must have spiritual power. The author recommended the culture of certain eastern concepts and processes like duty, equanimity, non-attached action, unity and non-violence. The author interpreted freedom in terms of doing one’s duty, not in terms of self-centered license but by practicing selflessness, non-attached work, or detached involvement or the Christian concept of ‘holy indifferences’. A self-less leader is stable, strong, trustworthy, and based on the sensitivity to general. This kind of leaders value and are sensitive to aspirations of various stakeholders and ultimately masters values-based leadership.

Chakraborty (2001) opined that, Power, in the social context, implies a process of governance, regulation, direction and influence for the symbolic protection and upliftment of both the individual and the collective. Leaders or managers fail to monitor wise use of power because of the dominance of ego over the mind. Ego-management is the central problem in acquiring and applying and its use by humans in the light of the supra-rational or cosmic/transcendental power. The author advocated for an honorable and chaste use of power. He pointed out that “Mind cluttered with contaminations like hatred, anger, greed, vanity, egotism cannot apprehend truth/reality.”

According to Miller (2001), the values such as quality, trust, creativity, collaboration, and service are all essential to sustainable business success. Businesses that exercise their power based on spiritual values generate more success and economic prosperity. Power has two basic purposes in business context, namely; to energize and to create. Energizing is by invoking spirit, enthusiasm, vitality, inspiration, and motivation.
Creating happens by building and sustaining something. The source of such power ultimately lies in the ‘spirit’ of one God.

McDonald (2001) argued that, from the indigenous viewpoint, power should be in the hands of those who are grounded in the spirituo-religious ethos of the community’s wellbeing, and could act as an anchor in the revealed vision of higher purpose. Focusing on integrity, he suggested that leaders’ failure to respond to the moral visions of other cultures is not good, and the longer we ignore for inclusion the more we deny everyone the possibility of integrity.

Khandwalla (2001) noted that the general concept of power is to pursue greater aims rather than petty, personal ends. There is little known about unknown persons using power for benign ends. Managers can use power constructively. The author recounted the bad and good use of power by CEOs in the field of turn around management of sick companies. While the former method is one of the ruthless application of power towards a lean-mean strategy for recovery, winning instant adulation and high financial benefits, the latter is humane, patient and not motivated by high reward. Khandwalla (2001) argued that for developing economies, like India, power used in an organizational climate characterized by a synthesis of altruistic – professional – organic – participative functioning, should result in long-term competitive advantage for corporate entities. He suggested that any short-sightedness, selfish abuse of power needs to be sublimed.

Lloyd (2001) opined that the subject of leadership has been moving away from top-down military model. Leadership at all levels of society, and inside organizations, needs to learn to listen and engage in a positive dialogue with the various stakeholders. The author linked power with the normative aspects of responsibility and reputation that are the keys to long-term corporate value. The ethics and values underlying decisions assume importance in this perspective. Trustworthiness becomes the key variable in this direction. Lloyd also mentioned progress towards an ‘inclusive’ view in corporate management as extending to all stakeholders, and to duties instead of mere rights. In order to translate this model into reality, he suggested processes like greater transparency, creating stakeholder maps, social and ethical auditing and so on. Such efforts, perhaps by external agencies, may prevent or reduce the abuse of power.
Ultimately, these approaches may lead to the formulation of a universal benchmark of social accountability. A gradual movement in this direction is being propelled by the greater expectations of society from corporate behavior.

Roychowdhury (2001) pointed out that “Power, whether institutional or interpersonal, is intrinsically derived from a position of hierarchical authority within an organization.” While power, authority, and hierarchy are inescapable in any institution, the manner of operating with and in them, rests on the values and attitudes of members and leaders. Selfless service, service with honour provides the only true foundation of positive value systems and leadership qualities. The bedrock of leadership power in the military still continues to be the grand traditional principles of character: *Nishkam karma* (unselfish work) from the Gita, or *Izzat aur iman* (honour and faith) from the Koran.

According to the Dandavate (2001), a high degree of centralization of power leaves the grassroots masses living in deprivation. He felt the need for cultivating ethico-moral consciousness among leaders.

Sen (2001) noted that Power is perceived both negatively and positively. It becomes positive or negative depending on the quality of mind that uses it. The importance of ‘quality of mind’ also influences the rightness and wrongness of the goal pursued.

Bhattacharyya (2001) indicated that power, even violent power when other forms have failed, is an essential force for ensuring non-selfish common good. Misuse or nonuse of power arises out of the human vice of the lust, greed and pride.

Badaracco Jr (2001) discussed the concept of Quiet Leadership and suggested that leaders need to cling to reality. Quite leaders always pay close attention to their authority, power and circumstances. These people believe that they are not extraordinary individuals rather see themselves as a part of the group. They consider the reality before they act on certain problems. The moral compass point these individuals in the right direction.

Focusing on Principled Leadership, Jones and Jones (2008) noted that “to become a Principled Leader and lead effectively one must first become a great follower. Leader
must know how to follow company leadership and authority and start practicing these before they expect others to follow them. So, the leaders first demonstrate a willingness to embrace and accept authority. This act earns followers respect for the leaders.

The above referred studies point to an advocacy of proper use of power for people in leadership positions. Many of the advocates of this also highlighted the need to be aware of factors other than mere organisational results and focused on common good, ethics etc. In the following section we will examine these studies.

2.4: Leadership, Spirituality, Altruism and Ethics

Traditionally, Spirituality and Leadership has been seen as two separate streams. In the Jewish and Christian tradition, the priests and the rulers were always separate. The power dimension of spiritual leaders has been studied early in recent history. Weber (1922) examined the social aspects of religion and noted that the priesthood of a religion is often part of the elite, the hierocracy. He theorized that early religious beliefs stemmed from the work of skillful, charismatic individuals, and their actions eventually transformed into a systematic, church-based religion. Therefore, religion begins with charismatic authority and is transformed into traditional authority.

However this and other early studies on the topic have focused on the behaviour of Spiritual Leaders. The inclusion of Spirituality in the concept of organisational and team leadership has been a more recent trend.

Ciffrino (1959) stated that spirituality and religion are the mainspring of Business Leadership. He argued that it is in the character of man to work and build. Man also desires to live in a world of harmony and order. When spirituality is built into the workplace, work climate is inclined to be stable and has order compared to the larger world full of anomalies, contrasts and cruelty. Leaders are motivated to shape the intrinsic setting developed by their industrial actions, and maintain a climate which others share. Involvement in spiritual activities is crucial to enhance the worker performance. It also fulfils the requirement of individuals to be part of a larger system. Both employees and employers need to develop a moral partnership and an innate sense of mutual responsibilities towards each other.
Block (1993) focused on stewardship, which incorporates the notion of service before self-interest. He emphasized on communitarian and humanitarian values, empowerment, participation, partnership, trusteeship, ethics, social responsibility, transparency and care for the stakeholders.

Conger (1994) examined the role of spirituality in leadership. He opined that spirituality can offer solutions to some of the increasing demands being made on today's organizations. As traditional sources of support and connectedness - such as community, church, and extended family continue to erode, the workplace is expected to meet the spiritual needs of its participants. Compiling the thoughts of management experts, an organizational development specialist, two Jesuit priests, a consultant & trainer to nonprofits, and the director of program evaluation for the Lilly Endowment, the author argued that organizations possess great spiritual potential because they provide individuals with an essential link to a larger world. They expanded the definition of leadership to include the development of hospitable spaces for worklife, services to both the organization and the community, and personal development of individuals within the organization. They recommended applying spiritual qualities such as justice, fortitude, and prudence to enhance personal fulfillment in the workplace and to strengthen the objectives and performance of their organizations.

According to Bass (1997) a leader supports universal brotherhood while liberating the human capability of their followers at the same time.

Cuilla (1998) pointed out the need for Ethics to be at the heart of Leadership. Any approach towards leadership needs to deal with its intrinsic and entailed moral basis. There are chances that leaders may employ incorrect techniques to attain a noble objective or a good technique may be employed to achieve a wrong end. If ethics are at the core, such approaches could be avoided.

According to Bass and Steidlmieier (1999), recognising real transformational leaders involves studying the culture of followers by people who are the experts. However, evaluation of real transformational leaders may be skewed as per the experts' individual ethics. Practical acts force an individual to behave in a way which would result in the maximum good and least evil of majority of individuals. Bowie (2000)
stated that leadership conducts which are empowering are not ethical if executed merely to enhance the worth of stakeholders.

Singh (2001) pointed out that the basic element of Beliefs, Values, and Ethics are more of emotion and less of reason. “The foundation of the inner life of an individual is a set of beliefs. The concept of beliefs can be extended to organizations, societies, and to the humanity at a large.” Our values are not only based on economic values but also emotional values, such as compassion, courage, freedom, creativity, justice and other emotive aspects of life. Ethics means moral conduct for living a good life in a good society. In earlier days, the source of ethical conducts and moral values were derived from religious texts and the religion. As time passed by, faith started losing its influence and reason gained supremacy. “Philosophers started searching for rational justification for morality and to look for principles and meaning of ethics, which were independent of religion, culture, and individual beliefs.” Author noted that the concept and meaning of virtue and wisdom is to help to know what is right and what is wrong. Making clear choice between these two is always difficult. This wisdom is based on beliefs only. “A basic need of a human being is to dream of a society in which justice and fair play are encouraged and suffering is minimized.”

Gandhi (2001) pointed out that Mahatma Gandhi saw his source of power to be God. Mahatma Gandhi’s management of power was based on perfection, spirituality and brahmacharya (celibacy). The important aspect of Mahatma Gandhi’s management of power was his emphasis on people’s empowerment. Fearlessness was a value that enabled him to use power with dignity. Gandhian approaches to conflict resolution recommended a spirit of constructive personal dialogue, and not public criticism of others.

Floistad (2001) studied the works of Tagore, and found that as a primary knowledge or first kind of knowledge, self-interest is necessary in order to take care of ourselves. Second kind of knowledge is about laws of the nature, of human behavior and of universal ethical principles. The third kind of knowledge is personal commitment to universal value. The author, was in agreement with Tagore’s understanding that a loving relationship with all is a form of power that is lost today in the world of business and politics. The author noted that the power of science alienates man from
Nature and community. Ethics cannot flourish in such a context. Welfare society with ego at the center is a contradiction in terms. The loving relationship between a leader and followers can lead to better individual performances and organizational outcomes.

Sendjaya (2005) focused on gap between morality and leadership. Researches on leadership have overlooked the morality aspect. This study attempted to understand whether importance of morality for leaders is self-evident in light of the far-reaching effects of leaders' actions or inaction on other people. He noted that as per extant literature, great leaders have always shared a consistent association with their followers. The variation between different leaders such as Hitler and Mother Teresa was in their intrinsic moral values rather than their capability and nature. Since business leaders have immense influence, adding morals in official and unofficial leadership programs is a necessity. The final objective of leadership education is to create successful and moral leaders. He suggested that good leadership might not be possible without the presence of morality.

Abramson (2007) studied the importance of archetypal psychology and its relationship with leadership theories, using the Abraham Myth in The Holy Bible. The findings indicated that in the Abraham myth, the presence of God's leadership can be compared to modern concepts of situational and visionary leadership leading to presence of a leadership archetype *(the original pattern or model from which all things of the same kind are copied or on which they are based)*; which existed over 3600 years in the human race. This leadership archetype identified is one that is of a leader who is fair and reliable, responsible for inaction of followers and always forgiving. The author recommended that God's leadership behaviour should be considered as an archetype which modern day leaders can follow. He recommended that leaders today should accept that they may face retribution from their followers. However they must be willing to forgive them for the same. Such a transformational leadership practice may enable followers to become leaders themselves. If such a leadership was promoted in modern world, narcissistic, aggressive and paranoid leaders would not exist.

Gardner (2007) argued the leaders need ethical minds. Business leaders need to repair associations with clients and workers by encouraging their ethical bent of mind.
Respect for others is broadened by an ethical mind. It is crucial to differentiate between the respectful and ethical mind as one may be respectful without really comprehending the cause. Developing an ethical mind helps one to become an unbiased spectator of the team, the firm and the world. There is pressure to dodge ethics for youngsters today. Markets also are becoming amoral; it is becoming difficult to segregate between shaded earnings and committing outright frauds. Individuals today do not trust one another. Employees today feel psychologically pressurised to follow the bad behaviour of their leaders. Hence the need to develop an ethical mind in leadership.

Khandwalla (2008) studied the path of corporate spirituality, altruism and business ethics. On Spirituality, he found that it can work very well even in the business place. Spirituality brings calmness, focus, and compassion in human beings and that in turn yield judgment, foresight, quality and commitment to one’s work. Spiritualizing the workplace requires setting of example by leaders throughout the organization. On altruism, he stated that Mahatma Gandhi favoured the concept of business altruism. The study reported that Altruistic style is the fifth most extensively used style in a sample of ninety Indian companies. The altruistic style was strongly correlated with six of the ten perceived criteria of organizational effectiveness, namely staff morale, a positive social impact, corporate image, performance stability, financial strength and innovativeness. As regards Business ethics, the author pointed out that it has tremendous relevance for the growth of a humane and productive business civilization. He identified three types of climates namely; egoistic or self-centered climate (prime concern is profitability, efficiency, and individual’s self-interest), benevolent or caring climate (friendly relationship at work, team spirit, social responsibility) and principle-oriented or professionalist climate (stress on law, rules, standards and personal morality). He presented a compilation of different ethical principles drawn from spiritual, philosophical and psychology point of views. These principles are follow the commands of God, follow laws and rules enacted by a democratic governance system for the good of all, follow social group norms to maintain harmony and make communal living possible, follow natural laws that our moral sensibility suggests such as sharing, not harming others, treat others as you would like others to treat you, strive to produce the greatest good for the greatest number of
people, use reason to deduce ethical principles that you wish should be applied universally in given circumstance, develop the disposition of right conduct to attain happiness, act to produce the greatest good for yourself / your organization, if you cause harm to someone unintentionally, compensate for their loss, do the best you can in the circumstances based on the principle of relativism or actability, and finally do your duty without any expectation of reward.

Jones and Jones (2008) stated that integrity is one of the most important characteristics of Principled Leadership. Integrity provides credibility. A leader with integrity remains faithful to even small things. This faithfulness will be awarded with more important things. Integrity in leadership attracts others to trust in leaders and this trust also encourages leaders to be more committed, responsible and dependable. Principled Leaders “develop their character quality of being people oriented, be friendly, courteous and kind”

Sharma (2010) asserted that More you give, the more you get. After you leave the organization, people will remember your legacy. They will remember how much value you have added to your organization and how many lives you have improved. To work for the common good is the best a leader can do and feel proud of. Legacy is not about impressing some of the friends and reaching the top; it is about fulfilling one’s duty and actualizing your humanity. The author noted that Legacy-based leadership is the most powerful type of leadership.

The literature perused above establishes the case for practicing altruism, spirituality and ethics in business leadership. These aspects when practiced, is expected to benefit the organisations. It will also pave the way for a better society altogether. There is a need for combining the principles of excellent leadership with these aspects. In the next section we will examine a leadership style that has those elements pointed out in this section.

2.5: Servant Leadership

Literature perused in the previous sections establishes that there has been an ongoing search for a viable alternative to the use of Power in leadership, ways of applying Ethics and morality in leadership; and combining of spirituality with Leadership. This
search has led to the emergence of the concept of Servant Leadership. Ancient philosophical and religious literature is replete with advice on how leaders should behave, with sensitivity and care for others needs. Several authors have attempted to dig out that wisdom from the past.

Chakraborty (2001) studied ancient Indian Scriptures and the principles and teaching of Indian leaders, rulers, Guru's, thinkers and philosophers like Gandhi, Vivekananda, Aurobindo, Buddha, Chandragupta, Chanakya, Harshvardhana, Shivaji, Akbar, Gobind Singh, Vidyaranya, Shankara, and Subhas Chandra Bose. He studied scriptures like the Vedas, Upanishads, Manusmriti, ancient Buddhist literature etc. The author noted that the charisma of all these leaders came from their high minded pursuit of self restraint, self control, self sacrifice renunciation and mental purity. He quoted Manusmiriti “Day and night he must strenuously exert himself to conquer his senses, for he who has conquered his own senses can keep his subjects in obedience.” A highest form of Self knowledge, a concept termed as 'Brahmavidya' is required for Kings. The controlled and transformational use of punishment is highlighted in the scriptures.

Rarick and Nickerson (2008) stated that Bhagvad Gita described a leader as “one who hates no creature, who is friendly and compassionate to all, who is free from attachment and egoism, balanced in pleasure and pain, and forgiving”. Gita makes several references to the importance of self-sacrifice and working for the benefit of the greater good. “All creatures are the product of food, food is the product of rain, rain comes by sacrifice, and sacrifice is the noblest form of action”. In many cases leaders must sacrifice their own interests in order to promote the well-being of the group they are leading. In Gita, leaders act in the role of servant, are humanistic, act without self-gain, and has great personal concerns for followers. They demonstrate harmlessness, forgiveness, fortitude, purity and freedom from hate & vanity.

Arthasastra, written by Kautilya, is an ancient Indian treatise in management. In Arthasastra, Kautilya (1915), while listing the duties of a king, pointed out that “In the happiness of his subjects lies his happiness; in their welfare his welfare; whatever pleases himself he shall not consider as good, but whatever pleases his subjects he shall consider as good.”
Lao Tzu, the founder of Taoism, is known to have said that the greatest leader forgets himself and attends to the development of others. Good leaders support excellent workers. Great leaders support the bottom ten percent. Great leaders know that the diamond in the rough is always found “in the rough”. Heider (1985) studied Lao Tzu and compared a leader to a midwife, who assists someone else’s birth. When the baby is born the mother will rightly say, “We did it ourselves”. Taoism recommended that leaders facilitate what is happening rather than what they think should be happening. A wise leader does not intervene unnecessarily. Tao, drawing on the analogy of a pond in the valley, challenged leaders to be open, receptive, quite and without desires and need to do something.

Beekun & Badawi (2004) reported that Prophet Muhammad, the founder of Islam, eloquently practiced servant leadership. The Holy Quran expects leaders to be servants of their followers. Leaders should seek their welfare and guide them towards what is good. Unus and Beekun (2007) studied the book of Surah Kahf (Surah 18) in the Qur’an. They recorded that Dhul-Qarnayn exhibited Servant Leadership in this story, and became a servant leader to his people and took care of their needs. Adair (2010) described Prophet Mohammad as someone with a central goal of serving the people, both exalted and humble, capable of vision and inspiration, yet at the same time dedicated to the service of [his] people. He described the essential attributes of leadership demonstrated by the Prophet, namely; courage, integrity, practical wisdom, moral authority, humility, leading by example, sharing & enduring hardship, doing things at the right time in the right way, innovation and trustworthiness. He quoted the Prophet Mohammad as saying "On a journey the leader of the people is their servant." Real achievement is a process of delivering what the community needs and is felt not by the individual who is initiating and catalysing change but by the people whom this change is aiming to reach. Muhammad, through the above attributes, was able to harness the support and commitment to Islam. For Muslims, the first and original leader is Almighty, and all are bound by their faith to obey His law. Thus a leader of an organization – business, political or religious – is also first and foremost a follower of God. One of the most important and beloved attributes of divinity (sifat e Allah) is to show and be shown mercy. Prophet Muhammad came to be known as nabi al-rahma, (the Prophet of Mercy), because he practiced this divine attribute.
himself. The author concluded that the Muslim tradition of leadership transcended the three great human traditions of understanding leadership (Western thought, Eastern philosophies and Tribal tradition), and had at its pinnacle, the ideal that human leaders should model themselves on the Lord of the universe.

The study of *The Holy Bible* brings forth that Jesus Christ demonstrated the concept of Servanthood in many occasions. In one occasion He washed the feet of his own disciples and then explained to them “You call me ‘Teacher’ and ‘Lord,’ and rightly so, for that is what I am. Now that I, your Lord and Teacher, have washed your feet, you also should wash one another’s feet. I have set you an example that you should do as I have done for you. Very truly I tell you, no servant is greater than his master, nor is a messenger greater than the one who sent him. Now that you know these things, you will be blessed if you do them. (The Holy Bible, John 13:13-17)

This meant that Servant leadership is seeing your role as leader, to be a servant to others. It is refusal to use the position of leadership to gain service from others. It desires use of power to provide appropriate service to people. Servant leadership does not rely on position, status or prestige. It is not holding onto leadership position at all cost. This style of leadership has the power to transform human experience.

Maxwell (2002) noted that Servanthood is one of the key Leadership Qualities that stand out, in *The Holy Bible*. He pointed out the difference between the World view and the spiritual view of leadership by looking into specific passages in *The Holy Bible*. Analysing verses 1-17 of the Chapter of John in *The Holy Bible*, the author suggested that Christ like Servant leaders exhibited characteristics, namely; motivated by love to serve others, possess a security that allows them to serve others, initiate Servant ministry to others, receive Servant ministry from others, want nothing to hinder their relationship with God, teach Servanthood by their example, and live a blessed life.

Woolfe (2002) citing case studies from modern business houses, argued that the biblical wisdom on leadership can be applied at a business level. She culled out traits and skills for modern leaders from The Holy Bible. These are honesty & integrity.
Senske (2003) noted that the important aspects of organizational leadership viz; getting results and integrating values are not often promoted together within an organization. He studied The Holy Bible and suggested ways of incorporating faith and values into the day to day business of organization. He suggested the Golden Rule of Leadership which enhances personal growth in employees and sustained economic growth through "incorporating the gospel values of love, honesty, respect, and justice into daily decision making and action. Senske (2003), highlighted characteristics of a Christ-based Leader as servant leaders - leaders who can be trusted, leaders who hire people with similar values, leaders who pay attention to public relations and leaders who make everyone a leader. He suggested several actions to develop Christ based servant leaders, namely; do the right things, practice value based strategic planning, develop and mentor a leadership team, connect employees to the organizational mission, balance family & professional life and lead a life of significance.

Worden (2005) opined that a strategic leader with a strong role identity in Christianity might adopt his or her charisma in the style of a servant, suggestive of the value of love as manifested in Jesus. This value in turn would involve the ethical principle of caring that is salient in Jesus' teaching and example. Such a leader might orient his caring to his employees or to external stakeholders in a self-effacing manner. Acting as a caring humble servant could prompt emotions pertaining to something larger than the mere actions entailed in demonstrating service. The transcendence to 'something more' personified by the leader in his charisma can arise from the perception of a resonance that the leader has with a larger model i.e., Jesus.

Manz (2005) encouraged the reader to confront some very important but often overlooked aspects of being a leader. The leadership of Jesus offers long-term advantages for the leader as well as the led, leadership based on sound, positive principles, such as living by the Golden Rule i.e., Do unto others as you would have them do unto you (Gensler, 1996) and leading by serving others. This helps leaders ascend well above leadership myths that tempt us to become great in a worldly sense.
at the expense of other people. It teaches leadership lessons like; *racing for last place, cleansing your insides, putting the gavel away* (not judging), and *using the power of golden mustard seeds* (have even the smallest amount of faith in God, the size of a mustard seed, and you can do great things).

Agosto, (2005) offered Jesus and Paul, the two key New Testament (*The Holy Bible*) characters, as models of servant leadership. He explored pictures and expectations that emerge from the earliest Christian communities, and established that Servanthood is the most important leadership lesson that came across. He opined that leadership is first and foremost about *character, integrity, humility, and self-sacrifice* as modeled by Paul and Jesus, who manifested their authority through the leadership qualities of *personal sacrifice, humility, risk taking, and the maintenance of a clear mission*. Jesus and Paul created an egalitarian social structure and worked for peace and reconciliation. Their leadership was based on a new partnership of equals based upon agape love.

Perusing *Secular Literature on Servant Leadership*, it may be noted that Taylor (1911) was the first one to use the term servant for a leader in modern leadership literature. He discussed the importance of developing others under what he called Scientific Management. He contended that Scientific management is not all about efficiency expedients. *It is a complete change of mental attitude of both sides towards their respective duties and towards their opponents*. The greatest gain under Scientific Management is the harmony that exists between the employer and employee in this system. He noted that "I can say truthfully that under scientific management the manager are more the servants of the men than men are the servants of the managers."

In the Scientific Management the sense of obligation is greater on the part of management than on the part of the men. Under this new system, every single workman is raised up, is developed, is taught so that he can do a higher, a better, and a more interesting class of work than he could before. This Scientific Management these workmen create brotherly feeling. It is no longer a case of master and men, as used to be under the old systems, rather it is a case of one friend helping another and is one doing the kind of work they are fitted for.
The literature perused above establishes that Servant Leadership was a theme in ancient literature and scriptures. It was also proposed in early modern management theory, i.e., Scientific Management. However, the concept remained dormant and rarely practiced in secular realms and professional organisations, till the writings of Robert K Greenleaf, who may be called the father of Modern day Servant Leadership Literature. Being the significant contributor to the concept, Greenleaf's life and ideas deserve special and detailed mention in this review.

Frick (2004) provided insight into the life and works of Robert K Greenleaf. Greenleaf is understood to have learned the idea of Servanthood from his father. By the time Greenleaf graduated from Carleton in 1926, he had embraced "servant" at the core of his identity. Greenleaf had a long career in AT&T, lasting till 1964. During this period, he contributed significantly to AT&T's leadership development initiatives, was present at the founding of National Training Laboratories, traveled for the Ford foundation, and began teaching at MIT and other schools. On his retirement from AT&T, Greenleaf founded the Center for Applied Ethics, which later on became the Greenleaf center for Servant Leadership. His first essay on Servant as a Leader came out in 1970, and he continued to add to the literature on the subject till his death in 1990.

Greenleaf (1970, 1977) pointed out that the idea of Servant as a leader came to him, from the Novel "Journey to the east", by Hermann Hesse (1956). In this novel, Leo is the servant of a band of travelers who are on a quest. Even as Leo serves the needs of the group, he also provides strength and stability to the group. When Leo leaves the group one night, the entire band begins to fall apart and the quest is ultimately abandoned. Later in the story it is revealed that Leo, the servant, is in reality the leader that the group was seeking. Leo was the servant leader and Greenleaf (1970, 1977) picked up on this as the core of his leadership theory.

Greenleaf (1970) addressed the question whether the roles of Servant and Leader can be fused in one person, in all levels of status and calling. He opined that both things can be combined in one person. The idea of Servant leadership necessitates a fresh look into the issue of power and authority. It encourages people to relate with one another in less coercive and more creatively supportive ways. This reinforces a moral
principle that “the only authority deserving one’s allegiance is that which is freely and knowingly granted by the led to the leader in response to, and in proportion to, the clearly evident servant stature of the leader. In a nutshell, Greenleaf (1970) summarised the servant leader as follows

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, perhaps because of the need to assuage an unusual power drive or to acquire material possessions. For such it will be a later choice to serve-- after leadership is established. The leader-first and the servant-first are two extreme types. Between them there are shadings and blends that are part of the infinite variety of human nature (p. 13).

Greenleaf (1970) proposed 10 attributes that differentiate a servant leader, namely:

- Listening – “Only a true natural servant automatically responds to any problem by listening first”
- Empathy – “The servant always accepts and empathizes, never rejects” and “Men grow taller when those who lead them empathize, and when they are accepted for who they are...”
- Healing – “to make whole”
- Awareness – “Without awareness, we miss leadership opportunities”
- Persuasion – “A fresh look is being taken at the issues of power and authority, and people are beginning to learn, however haltingly, to relate to one another in less coercive and more creatively supporting ways.
- Conceptualization – The servant-leader can conceive solutions to problems that do not currently exist.
- Foresight – “Prescience, or foresight, is a better than average guess about what is going to happen when in the future”.
- Stewardship – Organizational stewards, or ‘trustees’ are concerned not only for the individual followers within the organization, but also the organization as a whole, and its impact on and relationship with all of society
- Commitment to the growth of people – “The secret of institution building is to be able to weld a team of such people by lifting them up to grow taller than they would otherwise be”
- Building community – “All that is needed to rebuild community as a viable life form...is enough for servant-leaders to show the way”

Greenleaf (1970) believed that the best way to measure the effectiveness of a servant leader is whether those served grow as persons; do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants.
Laub (1999) extended the definition of Servant Leadership to include aspects like placing the good of those led over the self-interest of the leader, promoting the valuing and development of people, the practice of authenticity and the sharing of power and status for the common good of each individual, the total organization and those served by the organization. He also defined a Servant Organisation as an organization in which the characteristics of servant leadership are displayed through the organizational culture and are valued and practiced by the leadership and workforce.

The core idea of servant leadership as per Frick's (2004) summarization is quite simple authentic, ethical leaders, those whom we trust and we want to follow, are servants first. This is a matter of intent, actions, capacities and being. A servant Leaders stands in sharp contrast to a person, who wants to be a leader first and then, after clawing his or her way to the top, decides to perform acts of service. Servant Leadership is about the nature of legitimate power and greatness, to quote a subtitle of Greenleaf’s groundbreaking book “Servant Leadership” and it all begins with the individual. Servant Leadership goes beyond individuals however. To build a more caring society, organisations and their trustees can, and should, also function as servants.

Frick (2009) recorded Greenleaf’s belief that the servant leader’s journey was ultimately spiritual in nature. However, Greenleaf took extraordinary efforts to prevent his writings from being interpreted as the basis for a sect for any faith tradition. Greenleaf was convinced that servant leadership was based on a universal human impulse – the desire to serve and fits well to all faith traditions.

DePree (1989), discussing the art of Leadership, noted that; I would like to ask you to think about the concept of leadership in a certain way. Try to think about a leader, in the words of the gospel writer Luke, as "one who serves." Leadership is a concept of owing certain things to the institution. It is a way of thinking about institutional heirs, a way of thinking about stewardship as contrasted with ownership. He, like Greenleaf, said that leaders should ensure that followers should reach their potential, they should learn, they should serve, they should be able to achieve results, they should change with grace, they should be able to manage conflicts etc.
Ciulla (1998) brought out the importance of morality and ethics in Leadership. Leadership is a complex moral relationship between people, based on trust, obligation, commitment, emotion, and a shared vision of the good. It matters who the leaders and the followers are and how well they understand and feel about themselves and each other. It depends on whether they are honest and trustworthy, and most importantly, what they do and what they value.

Hunter (1998) developed an inverted pyramid model (Fig 2.1) with “Will” at the bottom and Leadership at the top. He stated that “Leadership begins with the will, which is our unique ability as human beings to align our intentions with our actions and choose our behavior. With the proper will, we can chose to love, the verb, which is about identifying and meeting the legitimate needs, not wants, of those we lead. When we meet the needs of others, we will, by definition, be called upon to serve and even sacrifice. When we serve and sacrifice for others, we build authority or influence, the ‘Law of the Harvest. And when we build authority with people, then we have earned the right to be called leader.”

Marella (2005) brought out the connection between ethics and servant leadership. True servant leadership facilitates a connection of the shared values and shared visions of leaders and followers. It also facilitates the connection of their spirits, their passions, and their souls. Moral courage provides the discipline and tenacity to tackle the difficult moral issues and to make the right choices. The most important ingredient
common to both servant leadership and to moral courage is character — character based on the core ethical values that have been the foundation for all successful and vital civilizations.

Neuschel, (2005) opined that the servant leader is one with a high sense of humanity. As Shakespeare (1564-1616) put it, "They that have the power to hurt and yet will do none." In effect, the leader by definition has the power to hurt, yet the mature servant leader will rarely if ever, use that power.

**Table 2.9: ACES Model of leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership domain</th>
<th>Key skills</th>
<th>Representative behavioral examples</th>
<th>Theoretical and Research Bases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>Quantitative analysis</td>
<td>Calculate a breakeven point</td>
<td>Scientific management (Taylor, 1911)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logical reasoning</td>
<td>Develop a decision tree</td>
<td>Theory of management (McGregor, 1960)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>Choosing one alternative over others</td>
<td>Agency Theory (Jensen &amp; Meckling, 1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>Qualitative analysis</td>
<td>Weighing and balancing the needs of multiple stakeholder groups</td>
<td>Cooperative systems (Barnard, 1938)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>Developing a new product</td>
<td>Organizational social psychology-based system (Katz &amp; Kahn, 1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curiosity</td>
<td>Facilitating a brainstorming session</td>
<td>Systems thinking and organizational learning (Senge, 1990a, Senge 1990b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Persuasive communication</td>
<td>Aligning employees around a vision</td>
<td>Hawthorne studies (Mayo, as described by Roethlisberger &amp; Dickson, 1966)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphatic understanding</td>
<td>Actively listening to an employee grievance</td>
<td>Transformational Leadership (Bass, 1985, 1997; Burns, 1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>Avoiding an unnecessary confrontation with a consumer and employee</td>
<td>Emotional Intelligence (Goleman, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>Self-reflection</td>
<td>Self-assessing a poor behavior or behavior</td>
<td>Self-actualization in the workplace (Maslow, 1965)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Assessing personal and organizational values congruence</td>
<td>Institutional theology and servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meditative thinking</td>
<td>Deeply considering the environmental impact of a new production process</td>
<td>Value-based leadership (House &amp; Aditya, 1997)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quatro, et al (2007) noted that leadership development programs and management education have traditionally focused on the analytical and conceptual domains. This study suggested the addition of the emotional and spiritual domains in their ACES (Analytical, Conceptual, Emotional and Spiritual) model of Leadership development. Management education and leadership development programmes can develop holistic leaders, by focusing on all the four. The effective leader purposefully integrates the four domains in his or her field of work. These four domains are detailed out in Table 2.9

Liden et al (2008) noted that the dwindling confidence in business leadership, buttresses the need for such leaders who keep self-interest aside and work for the betterment of their followers and institutions. Servant leadership is different from conventional leadership approaches as its focus is on forging long term associations with the personnel. A servant leader motivates his or her employees to enhance their growth, for their own good. Thus servanthood surpasses the needs of the self-ego and develops a working climate which develops feelings related to employee empowerment.

Trompenaars and Voerman (2009) studied the applicability of Servant Leadership across cultures drawing on examples from Greece, China and India. They noted that Servant Leadership work across cultures. Authors explained dilemmas that leaders face in terms of seven dimensions of cultural differences. These dilemmas and how servant leaders overcome them are explained in the Table 2.10

Authors also provided some general tips to deal with dilemmas, namely; Define a vision, mission & higher goal, Make an inventory of business dilemmas, Determine to what extent servant-leadership is already present, Chart the organizational culture, Start the Dilemma Reconciliation process, Focus on the most susceptible processes in the organization, Decide which people will join and which will be asked to leave and Communicate, communicate, communicate!!
Table 2.10: Cross cultural dilemmas and Servant Leadership solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dilemma</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>SL’s Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading-Serving</td>
<td>Definition of leader varies by culture. There is also clash between performance and attributes.</td>
<td>Dual focus. Both leader and follower serve each other. Use both performance and attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules-Exceptions</td>
<td>Clash between rules and individual needs. Should exceptions be made to accommodate differentiating elements?</td>
<td>Use synetics (application of creative processes, to the solution of problems by a group of diverse individuals). Reconcile differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parts-Whole</td>
<td>The clash between individualistic and communitarian cultures</td>
<td>Promote individual independence and creativity and use it for the benefit of the whole. Promote group thinking to stimulate individual freedom and innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-Passion</td>
<td>Degree of public exhibition of emotions vary between cultures.</td>
<td>Give more meaning to passion by expressing it in the process of control and vice versa. Balance between the two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific-Diffuse</td>
<td>Clash between giving specific tasks or staying with the broader perspective</td>
<td>Bring in practical angle. Check which approach works in practice and then apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term-Long term</td>
<td>Clash between long term investment and short term results</td>
<td>Connect the past, present and future in a manner that most suits a particular culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Push-Pull</td>
<td>Clash between Being seen as strong, bold &amp; outspoken or as empathetic and soft.</td>
<td>Connect will power with modesty and internal with external.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Trompenaars and Voerman (2009)

The literature perused above as well as others, highlight many attributes of Servant leadership. Table 2.11 lists these attributes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl No</th>
<th>Servant Leadership Attribute</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prioritization</td>
<td>Greenleaf (1970), Useem (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Envisioning the future</td>
<td>Trompenaars and Voorman (2009), Kim and Mauborgne (1992), Laub (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Setting High standards, and motivating team to achieve it</td>
<td>Jennings and Stahl-Wert (2003), Useem (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Respect for the Individual</td>
<td>Chakraborty (2001), Hunter (1998),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Adopting a Principle based approach (as against a rule based approach)</td>
<td>Trompenaars and Voerman (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Being a Model, exhibiting modeling behaviour</td>
<td>Laub (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Containing Greed</td>
<td>Chakraborty (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Demonstrating Passion</td>
<td>Trompenaars and Voerman (2009),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Humour</td>
<td>Trompenaars and Voerman (2009), Maxwell (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>Laub (1999), Hunter (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Purity of Mind and Thought</td>
<td>Chakraborty (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Self Discipline and Self Restraint</td>
<td>Chakraborty (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Kindness and Humility</td>
<td>Hunter (1998), Kim and Mauborgne (1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Giving generously</td>
<td>Chakraborty (2001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Researcher’s distillation
The literature perused above establishes Servant leadership as a distinct style - different from other leadership styles. This leadership style is focused on the welfare of the followers. In organisational terms, this leadership style is focused on the welfare of employees and other stakeholders of the organisation. In the following section an attempt has been made to study how this concept has been implemented in professional organisations.

2.6: Implementation of Servant Leadership

As evident from the previous sections, Servant Leadership is a form of leadership where caring for others is a prime driver. Greenleaf (1972) stated that “caring for persons, the more able and the less able serving each other, is the rock upon which a good society is built.” Currently provisions of care are largely bestowed upon large and complex institutions. Hence there is a need for such institutions to imbibe and practice servant leadership principles. He felt the need to raise the capacity to serve of existing major institutions. He particularly focused on three large institutions namely; churches, universities and business. He noted that being an attribute of individuals, both self serving and selfless attributes are prevalent in non-profit as well as in the profit making institutions. The trustee’s role implies that the institution makes a contribution and creates an opportunity for building a society that is more just and more caring. In addition to the trustees, he also addressed the qualities of operative group of serving institutions. “The prime force for achievement through service in any large institution is a senior administrative group with optimal balance between operators and conceptualizers.” The operating staff that carries the institution towards its objectives requires a leader to develop interpersonal skills, sensitivity to the environment, tenacity, experience, judgment, ethical soundness, and related attributes and abilities. A critical function of a trustee is to identify people meeting these requirements.

One of the earliest attempts to implement Servant Leadership in a corporate was in TDIndustries. This company formally introduced servant leadership in the 1970s. The case of TDIndustries has been studied by Spears (2001), Frick (2004), Frick (2009) and Glashegel (2009). TDIndustries is a Fortune 500 company and was rated as one of the top ten companies to work for in America for several years as confirmed by
Levering and Moskowitz (1993). Authors who studied TDIndustries noted the following basic principles leaders followed in the organisation.

- Leaders do not say, “Get going.” Instead, they say, “Let’s go!” and lead the way.
- Leaders assume that their followers are working with them.
- Leaders are people builders.
- Leaders do not hold people down – they lift them up.
- Leaders have faith in people.
- Leaders use their heart as well as their head.
- Leaders keep their eyes on high goals. And they are self-starters.
- Leaders are faced with many hard decisions, including balancing fairness to an individual with fairness to the group.
- Leaders have a sense of humor.
- Leaders can be led.

Frick (2009) documented key learnings from TDIndustries on how to implement servant-leadership successfully.

- Educate employees, give them a forum to have their say, and take the time necessary to involve stakeholders in reflection about the servant leadership philosophy.
- Top positional leaders communicate their commitment to servant leadership not only by their own behaviors, but by being personally involved with leadership development efforts.
- Provide servant leadership development courses and follow them us with continuous learning, coaching and conversations.
- Provide fair procedures for accountability.
- Find a trusted assessment that measures important servant leadership behaviors and stick with it.
- Create a sustaining culture of servant leadership: implement congruent policies, tell stories, celebrate, be open to implementing new research and evolving training and development efforts.
- Measure individual, team and corporate success by business results and servant leadership behaviours. Find tools to assess both.
Frick (2009) assessed other organisations to explore the extent to which Greenleaf's ideas were implemented. Using these examples Frick (2009) established that in implementing Servant Leadership, it is possible to operate with values of servant-leadership in all spheres, including businesses. He suggested some steps for preparation of implementing servant leadership, namely; Start with the self, Live it first, Find allies for Study, Reflection & Practice, Be patient, and Customize to the organisation.

Glashagel (2009) also researched eight successful business organisations that have explicitly implemented Servant Leadership. These organisations were assessed as to how they relate to their employees, customers, business partners and community partners. As regards employees, the organisations focused development of employees through training and continuing education programs, individualized growth & development systems and advancement and promotion opportunities. Development of servant-leaders in these companies focused on three areas namely; training & testing, measurement & feedback and coaching & support. Overall they worked to build and maintain a culture of trust. These efforts lead to low turn over rate among employees. These companies approached customers with respect and humbleness. They paid attention to listening to them at both macro and micro levels. They had their means and methods to listen to customers. This helped them learn useful things from their customers. This in turn helped them create products and services that serve their customers' wants and needs. This relationship between the servant-institutions and customers continued for a long run. The servant-institutions attempted to create a win-win situation with their business partners. When a problem appeared, the servant-institution attempted to get into the roots of the problem and work together to remove those bottlenecks. Servant-institutions also ensured that they listened to the needs of the community. They attempted to understand the negative impacts they might have on the lives of people and how to eliminate or reduce these negative impacts. Servant-institutions, by investing time and energy of employees, by active participation of customers, and through financial and other support attempted to reach out to the community. Another noteworthy feature of these organisations was the trustee's role being played out by one or more top leaders. The trustee ensured that the institution serves its employees, customers, business partners, and community
partners on regular basis. "As the leaders of servant-institutions look ahead, over the fence, or around the next corner, they do so through the lens of their commitment to serving every one touched by the organization."

Gallagher (2010) suggested ways to implement Servant leadership in churches. Widespread studies have proved that irrespective of the kinds of enterprises, all leaders face the risk of disconnect. It has been seen that more the leaders prosper, less precisely do they evaluate themselves. Hence the study suggested that superior generals in churches should have an official admonitor. The people who select the general are ones who select the admonitor. The admonitor has no official powers but can get in touch with the general at all times. This helps the leaders to remain connected and truly serve the followers.

2.7: Measuring Servant Leadership

Initially, the concept of Servant Leadership remained mostly discussed in philosophical, anecdotal and theoretical terms ever since it’s popularisation by Greenleaf (1970, 1977). Laub (1999) attempted developing an instrument to quantify Servant Leadership Characteristics. This culminated in crystallizing the Servant Organisational Leadership Assessment (SLOA or more commonly known as the OLA instrument). The scale measured six attributes of a servant leader, namely; *Valuing People, Developing People, Building Community, Displaying Authenticity, Providing Leadership* and *Sharing Leadership*. The OLA has been used subsequently in as many as 35 dissertations on the subject.

During the same time, Failing et al (1999) came out with the servant leadership model that was based on the variables of *vision, influence, credibility, trust* and *service*. They felt the need for empirical research on servant leadership and recommended the use of their model for further empirical research.

Page and Wong (2000) felt the need for measuring servant leadership attributes and developed a self assessment tool, 100 item scale, based on the four orientations of Servant Leadership, namely; *Character orientation, People Orientation, Task Orientation* and *Process orientation*. The instrument was statistically validated. The
authors proposed that the self assessment instrument be used for both diagnostic and research purposes.

Russell (2001) proposed three categories of Servant Leadership attributes namely; *Trust, Appreciation of others* and *Empowerment*. Russell and Stone (2002) developed two practical models of Servant leadership with the view of providing practitioners and researchers opportunities for application and study in this area. First model, (Model I) looked at the relationship between leader’s attributes and manifest Servant Leadership, with Servant Leadership being a controllable variable that affects organisations. Their second model, Model II, is discussed in a subsequent section. Graham (1991) compared Servant Leadership with different forms of Charismatic Leadership. He studied the similarities and differences between the Weberian Charismatic Authority, The Personal Celebrity Charisma, Transformational leadership and Servant Leadership. Graham (1991) noted that servant leadership went beyond transformational leadership in at least two significant ways. First, it recognized social responsibilities in the call to serve the have-nots in our world, together with all the others. Second, Servant Leadership affirmed that people were served by someone who influenced them to become wiser, freer, more autonomous etc, and thus convinced people that it was in their interest to change.

Dennis and Winston (2003) developed further on Page and Wong’s (2000) work and reduced their 100 item scale to 20 item scale yielding three factors, while confirming that the items were correlated.

Rardin (2003) developed a Servant Shepherd Leadership Indicator (SSLI) based on the four variables of *Mind, Motive, Manner* and, *Methods*. This scale measured two dimensions of a leader’s focus, namely; the *follower (servant)* and the *organisation (shepherd)*. The SSLI is a 360 degree feedback method, and collects data from the leader, the leader’s superiors, the leader’s peers and the leader’s direct reports. The SSLI was meant to assist one to one coaching of leaders.

Ehrhart (2004) developed a 14 item measure of Servant Leadership based on a review of the literature, using confirmatory factor analysis, and identified seven major categories of servant leadership behavior, namely; *Forming relationships with*
subordinates, Empowering subordinates, Helping subordinates grow and succeed, Behaving ethically, Having conceptual skills, Putting subordinates first and Creating value for those outside of the organization

Winston (2004) studied Heritage Bible College based on Servant Leadership Models proposed by Patterson (2003) and Winston (2003). He used the SSLI instrument developed by Rardin (2003). The study established that the then leader of the Heritage Bible College was a servant leader, and that the general morale and performance of the organisation has improved during his tenure. He identified attributes that made the person a Servant Leader, namely; Trust, Empowerment, Vision, Altruism, Intrinsic motivation, Commitment, and Service.

Khuntia and Suar (2004) developed a scale to assess Ethical Leadership (EL) of Indian managers. In this study 340 managers from two public and private sector companies were identified and the research instrument which had 22 items of leadership was tested. The results indicated that the leaders rated themselves much higher when compared to their subordinates. The study reported that ethical behaviour was higher among employees who had an ethical superior. The results indicated that two dimensions namely Empowerment and Motive & Character impacted ethical leadership, job performance, job involvement, organizational commitment and unethical practices. The study noted that when the supervisory official was ethical then there could be mobilization of the subordinates to improve their performance. The ethical behaviour of a superior would ensure that there was no alienation and non commitment among the employees. The study concluded with identification of a validated scale of Ethical leadership which could be applied in a competitive business environment.

Stone and Patterson (2004) studied the similarities and the differences between transformational leadership and Servant Leadership. Transformational leaders focused more on organisational objectives and Servant Leaders focused more on the people, their followers. However the authors pointed out that both transformational and servant leadership are higher order leadership paradigms and hence fit into the high concern for people and production segment in the Blake and Mouton Leadership Grid. Washington and Feild (2006) studied the relationship of Servant Leadership with
agreeableness, empathy, integrity and competence. The relationship between the perceived value of empathy and Servant Leadership empirically supported the “follower focus”. The relationship between the leaders perceived value of integrity and servant leadership supported the belief that integrity and honesty were critical components of Servant Leadership. These results also provided evidence of servant leadership’s suggested reliance on values of competence and effectiveness. The positive relationship established in this study between the leader’s agreeableness and perceived servant leadership offered empirical support for the notion that servant leaders visibly value and care for their constituents. Hale (2004) examined the relationships between Servant Leadership and transformational leadership and established Servant Leadership as a viable model for cross cultural leadership. He also proposed a contextual model for Cross cultural leadership in West Africa and called it “Divinely Empowered Transformational Servant Leadership”.

Sendjaya, Sarros, and Santora, (2008) developed a 35 item, six dimension, multidimensional measure of servant leadership behaviour (Servant Leadership Behaviour Scale) which proposed a Servant Leadership model characterized by its service orientation, holistic outlook and moral-spiritual emphasis.

Liden et al (2008) developed a scale that could be used both at individual level and at group level. This was a multi dimensional measure with the 9 dimensions of Servant Leadership, based on literature. The authors used exploratory study as well as confirmatory aspect evaluations. Factor analysis was conducted with a sample of 298 students. The researchers analysed the results on Servant Leadership aspects, controlling for transformational leadership and leader-member exchange (LMX). Through pilot study and statistical methods they then brought the scale down to a 28 item, under seven attributes namely; Conceptual skills, Empowering, Helping subordinates grow and succeed, Putting subordinates first, Behaving ethically, Emotional healing and Creating value for the community. It established that Servant Leadership was a crucial determinant of employee’s organizational commitment, community citizenship behaviour and on-the-job performance. The study showed that the impact of Servant Leadership surpassed that of transformational leadership and
LMX in describing the variance in community citizenship behaviour; on-the-job performance and organizational commitment.

Liden et al (2008) suggested that more studies with larger samples be carried out. This would help ascertain how Servant Leadership impacted various groups in a firm. The researchers also recommended that studies related to the theme be undertaken in regions other than USA. It was also recommended to study the degree to which people of a specific culture portray a need for servant leadership. Another domain for research would include development of a supervisor version of the servant leadership scale. Thus, it was recommended that servant leadership be explored considering the opinions of both leaders and the followers.

The studies referred above bring forth that Servant Leadership is a distinct model of leadership. These contributions crystallized different assessment tools for measuring Servant Leadership. These contributions also triggered the empirical studies on the impact of Servant Leadership in organisations, especially on the employees. This aspect of impact on employees is studied in detail in the next section.

2.8: Impact of Servant Leadership

Literature surveyed in the previous sections makes it evident that Servant Leadership is a distinct form of leadership. However there is a need to understand how far it brings desired results to organisations.

Wayne, Shore and Liden (1997) studied Perceived Organizational Support (POS) and leader-member exchange (LMX). POS described the creation of employee commitment to an organization. In situations wherein POS levels were high, employees were found to balance their exchange associations by developing attitudes and conducts which are equivalent to the degree of employer commitment to them. The study established that POS and LMX were linked to outcome variables in unique ways. It was seen that POS and LMX were also interlinked. The quality of LMX played a crucial role in affecting employees' opinions linked to organizational support. Additionally, it was also seen that POS and LMX were associated with several crucial employee attitudes and conducts.
One of the earliest empirical works on the impact of Servant Leadership on organisations was by Russell and Stone (2002). They developed two models Servant Leadership. Model I was discussed in the earlier section 2.7. Their second model (Model II) proposed the relationships between Organisational Performance, Employee attitudes, work behaviour, Organisational Culture, Accompanying attributes and manifest Servant Leadership.

Patterson (2003) developed a model of Servant Leadership, which highlighted seven aspects of Servant Leadership that work in processional manner (one follows the other, and each is impacted by the previous aspect) in this order; Agapo love (selfless love), Humility, Altruism, Vision, Trust, Empowerment and ultimately resulting in Service. Winston (2003) proposed a model that illustrated how followers provided service to leaders by using some of the same variables. He implied that the followers’ agapao (selfless) love/concern for the leader resulted in commitment to the leader and an increase in follower’s self efficacy as result of leader’s trust and empowerment.

Kraimer and Wayne (2004) studied perceived organizational support (POS) in terms of adjustment, career and financial issues among MNCs. The measures tested included job performance, expatriate adjustment, organizational commitment, role stressor, leader member exchange and perceived organizational support. The results indicated that the perceived organizational support is found to be made up of three different dimensions namely; Adjustment POS, Career POS and Financial POS thereby supporting the hypothesis that the POS dimensions are differentially related to the success of expatriates. The findings of this study suggested POS as a source of support for expatriates, since it directly impacts their success thereby stressing the importance of organizations to implement better measures promoting perceived organizational support.

Joseph and Winston (2005) empirically established positive correlation between servant leadership and leader trust. The study reported correlation between servant leadership and organisational trust.

Dannhauser (2007) explored the relationship between servant leadership, trust, team commitment and unit’s effectiveness. The study aimed to identify the degree of
relationship between different constructs. The results indicated that servant leadership correlated with trust and team commitment. The study felt the need to develop and validate servant leadership measuring instruments at different levels from organization to individual level.

Delving into the relationship between Organisation Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) and Servant Leadership, Ehrhart (2004) reported that when leaders recognized and responded to their responsibility to work for the good of their subordinates and other stakeholders, the unit they led, as a whole, felt that they were treated fairly. This was true also where the leader acted in ways to benefit subordinates and helped them grow and develop. Such units were characterized by higher overall levels of helping and conscientiousness behaviors from employees.

Winston (2004), quoted earlier, established that general morale and performance of the organisation has improved during the tenure of the then leader of Heritage Bible college. The study noted that this improvement was the result of the demonstration of Servant Leadership Characteristics by the leader.

Several researchers investigated Organizational Commitment (OC). Existing studies related to the theme have not reached to a consensus on how to conceptualize and measure the concept. There exist varied definitions of organizational commitment. Majority of the definitions emphasize on commitment linked behaviour. Commitment was also defined mostly in context of attitude. Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979) developed a tool for measuring organizational commitment. They defined Organisational commitment as the comparative strength of a person's recognition and participation in a specific firm. As an attitude, commitment varies from job contentment in several ways. Organizational commitment needs to be more stable when compared to work contentment. Research has proved that commitment attitudes are created gradually and continuously over time as people pay attention to the correlation amongst themselves and those who employ them.

Organizational commitment has been measured using varied scales. Mowday et al’s (1979) study summarized a stream of research intended to create and test a measure of employee commitment to the work organizations. This study covered 2563 employees
in nine divergent organizations. The study concluded that organizational commitment was well correlated to specific employee conduct. Thus, it could be proved that organizational commitment was a crucial construct to be included in modeling and researching employee conduct in organizations. Mowday et al (1979) recommended that future studies conceptualise and measure commitment in ways other than the attitudinal commitment. Such studies might compare attitudinal and behavioural conceptualisations of commitment. The researchers also stated that studies must focus on the link between commitment and job performance. Thus, it is recommended to undertake studies linked to comprehensively comprehending the function enacted by employee attitudes to ascertain employee conduct and performance of an organisation.

However, it is the work of Liden et al (2008) which attempted to measure the correlation between leadership and the Organisational Commitment. The study found that both Transformational leadership and LMX account for variance in the Organisational commitment of employees. However they were able to establish that Servant Leadership characteristics account for 4% more variance than what was accounted for by Transformational Leadership and LMX.

When leaders stress community involvement through their behaviour, employees are likely to emulate the leaders’ model and get themselves involved in community activities. This assumption was tested by Liden et al (2008) and established a positive correlation between Servant leadership Characteristics and Employees’ Community Citizenship behaviour (CCB). This study reported that neither Transformational leadership nor LMX accounted for the variance in the Employees Community citizenship behaviour, but the Servant leadership characteristics did correlate substantially well in this regard.

There have been attempts to explore relationship between leadership and On-the-Job Performance. Williams and Anderson (1991) reported that Organizational citizenship behaviours (OCBs) enhance organizational efficiency and effectiveness by significantly leading to resource changes, creativity and adjustability. This study noted that empirical and conceptual studies in this domain belong to two spheres namely; OCBO-conducts (which lead to overall advantage for the organizations) and OCBI-conducts (which are advantageous to particular people and indirectly help the
organizations). The measures included in the study were performance, contentment and organizational commitment. The study established that IRBs, OCBIs and OCBOs correlate positively to performance.

Wayne et al (1997) established that when leaders nurture self-efficacy and self-motivation and stress community involvement, employees are more willing to maintain high performance levels. Following up this work, Liden et al (2008) noted that neither transformational leadership nor LMX was significantly related to subordinate in-role performance. However they noted that when they included the seven dimensions of servant leadership, it explained an additional 5% of the subordinate-level variance. They reported that the “behaving ethically” dimension was positively and significantly related to in-role performance ratings.

The above studies indicate the level of impact that leadership has on employees, specifically three parameters, namely On-the-Job performance, Organisational commitment and Community Citizenship Behavior. As these aspects were reported to be impacted by leadership in general, it is expected that Servant Leadership would impact them in some ways.

Till now an attempt was made to take a stock of studies on the subject of Leadership, Servant Leadership and its impact on organisation outcomes. In the next section an attempt has been made to study the NGO sector, which is the scope of this study and hence one of its focus.

2.9: The NGO Sector

“NGO or Non Profit” is a term that is used and understood in different ways. The Term NGO is generally used in the developing countries as against the term Nonprofit in the west. Other names often used include the not-for-profit sector, the philanthropic sector, the voluntary sector, the third sector, the independent sector, or the social sector. It is also called as non-governmental organization or civil society organization. Anheier and Salamon (2006) listed four areas that form part of this sector, namely; Charitable, nonprofit & voluntary sector, Social Economy, Non Governmental Organisations and Civil Society. Charitable, educational and religious institutions (like the Catholic Church and associated organisations) existed since early times.
However, the formal concept of Nonprofit organisations started in the second half of the 20th century.

NGOs depend primarily on donations. Rose-Ackerman (1997) explored reasons why people give or donate to a Non Profit. She noted that the desire to give comes from people’s belief that distribution of income should be more equal and that basic services should be allocated to benefit the disadvantaged. The altruistic motives of individuals and ideological commitments of entrepreneurs come together to support charitable organizations partially supported by private gifts. Nonprofits can be outlets for the generous impulses of individuals.

Clotfelter and Ehrlich (1999) opined that philanthropy and nonprofit sector are central to furthering democracy and the search for social justice. They urged philanthropy and voluntary sector to take on new burdens as the roles of governments are reduced. The authors suggested further studies to understand forces that will determine the shape and activities of philanthropy and nonprofit sector in the next decade. how nonprofit or philanthropy sector will be strengthened or weakened by these forces, and how these challenges of grappling with these forces can be transformed into opportunities.

Smith (1999) found that the evolving roles of foundations were shaped based on the needs of the society and the interest of the donor agencies. Philanthropic agencies such as Rockefeller and Gates noted that “philanthropy was an instrument for seeking out the source of social ills. The best philanthropy is constantly in search of the finalities – a search for cause, an attempt to cure evils at their source.”

Boris (1999) opined that Nonprofits are indispensable to their communities. He suggested many ways to strengthen nonprofits and their ability to participate in communities and in the political processes. Creative solutions to the social problems require a realistic understanding of the role of the nonprofit and philanthropic organizations.

Referring to a study by Ryan (1999), Clohesy (2000) concluded that third sector organisations (TSOs) are under pressure to conduct themselves more like business. The future of third sectors would depend upon demonstrating how it differs from both...
government and business. On the topic of accountability, the author noted that it related to the ethical character of non-profit organisations. Stakeholder analysis, mission based evaluation and social audits indicate a growing trend toward accountability among the organisations. Fink (1990) noted that, “it is not surprising when donor dominated TSOs misconstrue, over simplify or patronize the groups they serve.”

Barrow and Jennings (2001) examined the historical and contemporary role of nongovernmental organizations in East and North-East Africa. The authors argued that “without an assessment of the contribution NGOs make to development and other national processes, important issues are submerged or even subverted. If however these issues are addressed, overtime, this could perhaps reduce the need for charity”. They argued that, “public understanding of what NGOs can and cannot do is crucial to its institutional and organizational learning processes.”

Kramer (2000) pointed out two contrasting theoretical views on the nonprofit sector. The dominant perspective stressed the growing institutionalization of third sector as the primary stakeholder on government in the provision of human services, promotion of culture and the arts, and advocate as core of the civil society. A second view questioned the utility of a social model which overlooks the blurring of boundaries and the extensive interdependence among organizations. He noted that since 1960s there is an enormous increase in the number and types of nonprofit organizations, and greater dependence of government revenue. Thus there is a need for new approaches to the study of the growing organizational universe in the human services.

Lyons and Hasan (2002) focused specifically on NGOs in Asia. In all Asian countries Third Sector has its presence. They noted that Asia’s third sector lacks resources and advanced management technologies compared to the counterparts in Western countries. There was little research into Asia’s third sector before the 1990s. This situation has been changing because of various efforts by agencies such as Asia Pacific Philanthropic Consortium (APPC) and several Asian foundations. Some of the studies conducted on Asia’s Third Sector by APPC revealed that a common theme in discussions among Asian scholars is the appropriateness of western concepts and theories derived from the study of western society.
Berry and Arons (2003) examined the inability of the third (nonprofit) sector to adequately market itself to the first sector (government) of society. They diagnosed the problem to be two fold - first, most nonprofits are ignorant about their rights to lobby the government, and second, they have a fear about losing their charity status if they lobby. The authors suggested that nonprofit organizations can and should lobby since the process is not perplexing, not expensive, and it is the right role for nonprofits.

Berger (2003) noted that NGOs today disburse more money than does the World Bank. Further, NGOs have become more active in influencing issues of Global importance. Since last couple of decades NGOs have successfully injected their voices in policy discussions including human rights, sustainable development, the environment, peace building, and governance.

Among the several millions of NGOs in existence today, an increasingly visible number of organizations are defining themselves in religious terms, referring themselves as religious, spiritual, and faith-based NGOs. Religious NGOs (RNGOs), as described by Martens (2002), are formal organizations whose identity and mission are self-consciously derived from the teachings of one or more religious and spiritual traditions and which operate on a nonprofit, independent, voluntary basis to promote and realize ideas about the public good at the national and international level. However, there are limited studies on the RNGOs. Berger (2003) set out to map the presence of RNGOs through the selection of a sample of 263 RNGOs and examination of their religious, organizational, strategic, and service dimensions based on the proposed analytical framework. The study reported that most of the Christian religious organizations tend to focus their mission on charity and emphasize the concept of “God” and “faith.” On the other hand Jewish organizations focus on social justice teachings along with God or religion.

Literature perused above highlight the importance of the NGO sector. They play a key role in ensuring a more caring society, and hence is a worthy area of study. In the next section we will look at the importance of leadership development among NGOs.


2.10: Leadership Development in NGOs

Since the NGO sector is gaining in importance, the leadership needs and aspects of NGOs has become a focus of studies. Barber (1965) opined that some people see leadership in Non profits as a path to material rewards, prestige, and power. Pearce (1982) noted that candidates for leadership positions in Non profits are hard to find. Miller (1987) also observed that those who aspire to leadership may be mainly interested in using the organization as a tool to advance a personal agenda. Drucker (1990) pointed out that the issues involved in NGO's leadership and management are somewhat different from those in the corporate sector or government. He highlighted the importance of a strong mission statement for the Nonprofit organisations. The mission of nonprofit organization is to bring about a lasting change in individuals and in society. Effective leadership in NGO context is not a leader's charisma rather it is his or her mission. Therefore, the first job of the leader is to define the mission of the institution. Task of nonprofit manager is to translate the mission statements into details or specifics. One should plan in such a way that when new tasks and priorities come in, the old ones become obsolete.

Golden-Biddle and Rao (1997) explored various studies on leadership in NGOs and found that despite the importance of leadership in non-profit sector, relatively little is known about voluntary association leadership.

Rose-Ackerman (1997) examined the question of whether the NGO managers and leaders have a motivation to perform. She reported that non-profit managers have little incentive to manage their firms efficiently since no one has a claim to the residual earnings. Managerial shirking may be an especially serious problem in non-profits simply because no market in ownership shares exists to discipline runaway managers. In addition, lacking market discipline, nonprofits firms may continue in existence when they are performing no valuable functions.

Boris (1999) noted that the donors of NGOs are going beyond simple altruistic sentiments and are looking for efficient means for distributing money while working to improve the operations of the institutions to which they donate. Their focus was on
modern business cooperation both for its techniques of scientific management and its structures of corporate governance.

According to Clotfelter and Ehrlich (1999), there is a state of crisis in leadership and intelligent management of philanthropic foundations.

Hailey (1999) observed that NGO sector is full of anecdotal stories about the detrimental impact of paternalistic founder leaders ‘charismatic autocrats’ or the ‘guru syndrome’. Referring to Chambers (1997) the author observed that NGO leaders can achieve many things through their guts, vision and commitment but the way they use power is a disability that jeopardizes organizational effectiveness.

Markham, Walters and Bonjean (2001) proposed three theoretical models of voluntary association leadership, namely; Democratic leadership, Oligarchy, and Leadership by default. Each emphasized the connections between leadership and problem facing voluntary associations. Democratic leadership is a cultural ideal, enshrined in the bylaws of many voluntary associations (Knoke, 1986) and occasionally realized in practice (Kanter, 1972; Rothschild & Whitt, 1986; Styrjan, 1989). The oligarchic model is characterized by a relatively small pool of aspirants to leadership. In this model, leaders are much more motivated by material and prestige rewards; holds a near monopoly of knowledge of the organization and power; prefer more centralized power and devote much more energy and time to the organization. Leadership by default happens when there is total absence of the leadership aspirants, who have the willingness to serve. The authors explored alternatives to these models of democracy, oligarchy and leadership by default. Any alternate model would need to be comprehensive, internally consistent model of leadership, in which key variables reinforce one another to form a stable system. Authors titled this model as leadership for self-development. In leadership for self-development, leaders and leadership aspirants see the role as an enjoyable activity that contribute to personal development, not as a path to material rewards or prestige. The desire to exercise and develop leadership skills is the predominant motivation of most leaders. The authors recommended additional case studies of organizations that practice leadership for self development.
Edwards and Fowler (2002) discussed the management challenges that most of the NGOs encounter in the changing global contexts. The authors reminded the nonprofit organization managers that NGOs must continuously justify their presence in and value to society. Further their engagement with citizens and social mobilization should be of high quality. The root to compliance of staff toward achieving goals and missions of NGOs lies in satisfying the self-motivation of staff and volunteers, as NGOs cannot rely on coercion or financial rewards as a means to coax staff to achieve targets. Establishing and sustaining the right connections lies in the heart of effective NGO management. The authors suggested that unique challenges encountered by voluntary organizations need managerial skills of the highest order, focused on context and value base of the voluntary world, not borrowing of secondhand advice from business schools or bureaucracies.

Helmig, Jegers, and Lapsley (2004) perused various research initiatives on nonprofit organizations (NPOs). They explored various challenges organizations encounter while it moves from general administration to professional management. As far as NPO strategic management is concerned, they observed that there is no single body of economic theory underpinning NPO strategic choices. The study suggested continuing research effort aimed at improving the professional management of NPOs, given their distinctive nature and complex settings.

Hailey and James (2004) explored leadership development in NGOs. They analysed existing and new research in the respect of NGO leadership, focusing on the relevance of both individual attributes and contextual relevance. The authors argued that Leadership development programmes need to focus on both the values and identity of individual leaders while also assisting leaders understand and proactively respond to their rapidly changing external environment. CIVICUS: The World Alliance for Citizen Participation (2002) has referred to the growing deficit in leadership abilities. They highlighted the rapid turnover of NGO staff in leadership positions into business and government and the difficulties NGOs have in replacing them. Referring to studies done by Adair (2002), Bennis and Nanus (2004) and Kotter (1996), the authors Hailey and James (2004) pointed out that, “to date, leadership research has focused primarily on the role and character of leaders in the for-profit sector and not
the non-profit or public sector.” The authors quoting Haslam (2001), said that “Elton Mayo had pointed out 50 years ago, ‘the desire to stand well with one’s fellows, the so-called human instinct of association, easily outweighs the merely individual interest and logical reasoning upon which so many spurious principles of management are based.’. The development and empowerment of a new generation of NGO leaders should be seen as one of the crucial elements of any investment in building the NGO community in all its forms.

Pijl and Sminia (2004) studied Strategic management in NGOs. They noted that the strategic management in NGOs not only needs to be aimed at the interests it represents, but it also has to incorporate the organization’s internal workings. The traditional hierarchy that normally is associated with the concept of formal organization only partly applies to an NGO. The responsibility of establishing purpose and direction within an NGO normally rests on both management and executive committees.

Theuvsen (2004) noted that more and more nonprofit organizations are now adopting management techniques originally developed and practiced in for-profit environments. He observed that, “due to growing economic and governmental pressures or through mere mimicry of organizations in the market sector, strategic planning, controlling, profit centers, human resource management, and so on are being used more and more in nonprofit sector.”

Bear and Fitzgibbon (2005) highlighted the leadership challenges of NGOs. According to the authors, professional leaders (i.e., paid chief executive officer [CEO], executive director, vice president, deputy directors, etc.) and volunteer leaders (i.e., board of trustees or directors, event and committee chairs) in today’s not-for-profit world must ensure that business-like operations do not displace the relationship-based approach and that the mission and passion are not lost in the process. Passion and zeal for the cause are important factors in managing the NGOs and today’s leaders cannot ignore that fact in the race to make the NGOs efficient and effective. At the same time it is important that the NGO leaders do not ignore the Business acumen when they enter an NGO.
Light (2004) stated that NGOs are facing unrelenting scrutiny now a days. Donors are interested in how nonprofits work. Many of them believe that NGOs are inefficient. Many Americans think the nonprofit sector has the right programs but that it often has the wrong organizations, or wrong people managing them. This indicates a pressing need for better leadership and management in NGOs.

Herman (2005) highlighted the need to develop proper leadership skills at various levels in NGOs. He compiled works which provided advice on managing nonprofit organizations which addressed key aspects such as board development, strategic planning, lobbying, marketing, fundraising, volunteer management, financial management, risk management, compensation and benefits, social entrepreneurship, financial leadership & capital structure, accountability & transparency, and the changing political-legal climate. Axelrod (2005) opined that the quality and commitment of the individual selected to serve in the board will not automatically result in an effective board. Adequate resources must be channeled into the recruitment, orientation, continuing education, and engagement of board members. The author suggested a number of Board development activities. Heimovics and Herman (2005) suggested that effective Executive leaders of NGOs should focus on the external relationship management. This is important since most service providing NGOs are highly dependent on external bodies like the government, politicians, accreditting bodies, funding organisations, foundations and corporate boards.

Curnow and McGonigle, (2006) highlighted the issue of performance in the NGO sector. The authors noted that federal government is taking an active interest in the professionalization of non-government occupations that hold a strategic role in providing services to the public.

Kee and Newcomer (2008) opined that the public needs caring, empathetic leaders who steward people and organizational resources with vision and integrity through changing circumstances.

Rowold (2008) studied the implication of transformational leadership among church leaders. As leaders, pastors play a crucial role for congregations. This study outlined the importance of the transactional - transformational leadership paradigm related to
pastoral leadership. It indicated that followers are more content with transformational leadership in contrast to transactional leadership. Transformational leadership was also found to impact the variance for predicting results more than transactional leadership. Transformational leadership strongly and positively impacted five performance determinants. Transactional leadership on the other hand had no relation with the outcome. It was established that transformational leadership assisted pastors to encourage followers to perform well and be content with their work. Additionally, this kind of leadership also impacted the congregational level positively and resulted in improved levels of contentment with the worship. This reiterates earlier studies undertaken for profit organizations such as private industries (Lowe et al. 1996).

The above referred studies substantiate the need for proper leadership development activities in NGOs. In the following section, we will study the specific need of Ethical orientation in NGO's leadership.

2.11: Ethical Leadership in NGOs

With the growing significance and importance of the NGOs the need for an ethical leadership has increased manifold within this sector. Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) are not free from scandals and controversies. It is suggested that NGOs do not need any government regulations rather they can be self-regulated. Brower and Shrader (2000) examined differences in moral reasoning and ethical climate between board members in not-for-profit and for-profit sectors. Authors reported that profit and not-for-profit boards may not differ in moral reasoning, but demonstrate different types of ethical climate. For-profit companies had climates higher in egoism than did non-profit organizations. Not-for-profit organizations reflected higher benevolence factors than for-profit firms. Not-for-profit directors devote their time/ skills/ talents to serve in an organization that has helped them or someone they love. The significant financial compensation involved in serving on a for-profit board complicates the incentives for a directors to make the most “selfless” or ethical decisions. Authors quoted the study of Jeffrey and Weatherholt (1996) who found no differences in moral reasoning between accountants in private industry and public service. They also cited Bowie and Freeman (1992) who suggested that board members do not perceive their governance role as anything more than symbolic. Their
study reported that the applied ethical reasoning is higher in the for-profit sector than what is observed in non-profit sector. Further, for-profit boards have better follow through, meaning what they say they will do. Additionally, for-profit directors may be better trained in how to make decisions, create a paper trail, and justify actions in order to limit the ramifications on their company and themselves. Board members in not-for-profit organizations, due to their voluntary roles, may not have as great a personal stake in, or the knowledge of how their decisions impact the organization from liability perspective.

Gibelman and Gelman, (2001) studied instances of wrongdoing in NGOs and concluded that the incidents of wrongdoing appeared to be motivated by self-interest (greed), perceived entitlement or sexual fulfillment. In all instances, ultimate responsibility for wrongdoing rested with the board. These cases revealed that the underlying issues had to do with the lack of appropriate oversight and the failure to institute or maintain accountability mechanisms. Symptoms of governance failures suggested in the cases examined include failure to supervise operations, improper delegation of authority, neglect of assets, failure to ask the right questions, lack of turnover of board members, and lack of oversight of chief executive officers. The study suggested that a significant number of wrongdoings involved CEOs and chief financial officers. Long-term implications of wrongdoings include difficulties in raising money, loss of board members who want to disassociate, and calls for greater accountability by citizens and government. Quoting Gregoire, (2000), the authors opined that majority of NGOs do not as yet demonstrate a commitment to the concept of accountability, and in general, their boards are not meeting the basic roles and responsibilities essential for effective governance. Hence there is a need to clarify board responsibilities, to establish board development in order to enable them to carry out their roles effectively, and new, committed, trained board members matched by a need for better staff.

A later study by the same authors Gibelman and Gelman (2004) noted that NGOs are more susceptible than other types of organizations to public disillusionment. The authors identified six categories of wrongdoings in NGO sector, namely: theft, mismanagement of resources, misconduct, excessive compensation, personal life style
enhancement and sexual misconduct. The authors suggested that unless the underlying conditions that permit such systemic failures are addressed, fresh scandals would occur and public trust in NGOs would further erode. Growth and development of NGOs worldwide must include capacity-building in the ethical realm. The authors suggested a number of measures including setting up additional watchdogs and more governmental monitoring to reduce the risk of wrong doing and fraud among NGOs.

The studies perused above establish the importance of integrity and ethics at all levels, especially at the leadership levels in NGOs. We now shift our focus to measuring the impact of leadership in NGOs.

2.12: Impact of Leadership among NGOs

NGOs have come under pressure to demonstrate their impact through quantitative measures recently. While for-profit organizations have their set of metrics to demonstrate leadership effectiveness, non-profits do not fit into that category. Attempts have been made to define and measure the impact in different ways.

Blankenberg (1995) listed the key concepts surrounding impact assessment namely: sustainable change, unanticipated changes owing to catalytic effects of the intervention and that change can be negative. Impact assessment describes an assessment of the longer term and sustainable changes that are planned to occur from development interventions.

Fowler (1997) distinguished between outputs, outcomes and impact. This is presented in Table 2.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point of Measurement</th>
<th>What is Measured</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>Implementation of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Use of outputs &amp; sustained production of benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Difference from the original problem situation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fowler (1997)
Tassie et al (1998) noted that the concept of organizational effectiveness is elusive, contested, and particularly difficult to grasp in nonprofit organizations. The views from various researchers and theorists suggested the organizational effectiveness evaluation falls into two categories. For one group the evaluation is a political process and for another group it is a rational process. The study revealed that people assigned in carrying out evaluations can differ in their perceptions of three significant components of the process namely; Who they believe they are evaluating (scope of the evaluation), What they believe they are evaluating (focus of the evaluation), and How they do the job of evaluating (methods of evaluation). Because of the possible combinations of various aspects involved, inconsistencies can easily arise between evaluators as they can have divergent bases for evaluation.

Adams (2001) identified three main difficulties in development of an appropriate methodology for impact assessment i.e., Confusion between the evaluation of an intervention’s objectives and an assessment of its long-term impact, Poorly developed evaluation tools and methodologies, and Complexity in the measurement of quality of impact.

Flynn and Hodgkinson (2001) opined that their presence, sustenance, multiplication, and spread are the prominent parameters that make the NGOs significant. Scholarly literature or evidence is in short supply for assessing the roles, functions and contributions of the nonprofit sector. There are many challenges to conduct as accurate assessment of the impacts that the nonprofit organizations and the sector as a whole have on society. The authors concluded that “measuring the impact of the nonprofit sector on society poses formidable challenges. The danger is that what can be quantified may not be the most valuable contributions of the sector.”

Cobb (2001) stated that one of the difficulties that arise in evaluating NGOs arise from the tendency to treat failure as a taboo and denial of failure as virtue.

Despite varying views on measurement, some authors have argued in favor of measuring outcomes for several reasons. Weisbrod (2001) argued that the nonprofit sector has not been granted the status held by private entities or for-profit organizations. Solid evidence on the contribution, success, uniqueness of nonprofit
sector would help the ongoing discussion and debate about the significance of nonprofits.

Land (2001) suggested a practical model of indicators with inputs, outputs, outcomes, side-effects, and impact as essential variables. Mathews (2001) asserted the necessity to develop and measure political capital; it was proposed that a framework constituting relationships, civil infrastructure, practices, and civic learning must be used. He suggested that there should be mechanisms to capture citizen's views and assessment of the real outcomes of nonprofits.

Campbell (2001) stated that measures are required so that leaders and legislatures can define the appropriate role of the state in NGOs. The author suggested that the broad approach of measuring nonprofit organizations should focus on distributional impacts, not just income redistribution. It also covers the ability to measure the "incidence of benefit", that is, who benefits from different types of nonprofit organizations and how.

Connel and Klem (2001) felt that measuring outcomes or impact need to be comprehensive, but uniquely tailored to each specific change situation and within the confines of existing institutions. The challenge of these types of measurement or assessment is that it would yield a systematic underestimation of nonprofits' social contribution. This is because nonprofit organizations provide outputs that are difficult to value as these are focused on social changes.

In order to grow and develop, voluntary sector organizations need to be evaluated in transparent and useful ways. Sanders' (2003) suggested that voluntary organizations need to be able to evaluate themselves as an integral part of their work. Then the evaluation strategies need to be compatible with the underlying philosophy and goals of the organization.

Collins et al (2003) conducted a study in four nongovernmental organizations to explore approaches to the assessment of impact in small and medium-sized voluntary organizations. Authors realized that given the diversity of areas the organizations focus, it is difficult to achieve realistic impact measurements. They also found that there are some aspects of impacts that are difficult to measure or identify using the range of available tools. It was also noted that the resources required for an in-depth
demonstration of impact were not readily available. It appeared that perception of impact varied according to a person's role in the organization, resulting in a focus on either personal, community or organizational level impact.

Another concept that gained value as a possible mode of NGO impact is that of Social Capital. Putnam (1993) defined social capital as "features of social organization, such as trust, norms, networks that can improve the efficiency of the society by facilitating coordinated actions." Using this concept, Bhattacharyya, Jayal, Mohapatra, and Pai (2004) attempted to translate this concept in Indian scenario. The authors argued that India is diverse in terms of religion, ethnicity, language, caste, and class. For example, education considered as important in Indian context whereas Putnam's (1993) study does not regard this in any form. The case studies demonstrated that the presence of high social capital alone may not necessarily result in democratic and efficient governance. Bhattacharyya et al (2004) argued that the presence of social capital alone cannot make public institutions work. Rather preconditions such as existence of responsive institutions, a certain level of economic development, and forms of power relations, among other factors, are needed for its successful mobilization.

Reed, Jones and Irvine (2005) used the approach of "Appreciative Inquiry" to collect data from a range of service users and providers. AI (Appreciative Inquiry) allowed organizations to explore ways in which schemes had developed overtime, and where they would progress in the future. The AI approach was effective to demonstrate and explore long-term and unexpected outcomes, largely through the loosely narrative structure of the interviews, which were able to accommodate participants' perspectives and time scales, rather than impose an external driven and right evaluation framework.

Barman (2007) revealed that quantification has been employed by nongovernmental organizations on various occasions. Author pointed out that the priorities of what processes and activities are to be measured by charities have altered over time. Whereas the focus of charities in the early twentieth century was to measure community need to justify their new methods of intervention, charities in 1960s and 1970s reported their financial efficiencies to assert their legitimacy. The author by
referring to various studies concluded that the use of measurement is never neutral or objective.

The studies cited above point to the fact that measuring the impact of leadership impact using outcome measures of NGOs is a complex and difficult task, and unlikely to provide verifiable results. We will now examine an alternate way of measuring the same in NGOs.

While the measurement of the outcomes of the NGO has not been successfully established, it has empirically been established that Leadership behaviours within NGOs have an impact on the employee motivation, employee performance, employee creativity, etc. Vroom (1964) suggested that motivation is a multiplicative function of expectancy (perceived link between performance and rewards), instrumentality (the perceived link between effort and performance), and valence (the preference one holds for the rewards tendered). Low values of any of these three constructs can result in radically diminished motivation.

The concept of sensemaking has been studied by different authors. Sensemaking is the process by which Managers and volunteers in nonprofits interpret their job and services through a cognitive construct based on the past interactions and experiences. This construct – sensemaking – then guides the managers' perceptions of subsequent interactions with volunteers and peers. Similarly, volunteers make sense of their surroundings through cognitive constructions formed through their own experiences. However, both managers and volunteers do not always make sense of their surroundings in the same way. Weick (1979) defined “sensemaking” as a mental process that has three steps: selection (select specific things from what they observe), retention (storage of the observations and people ability to link it as relevant and irrelevant), and enactment (individuals' beliefs of why things are as built from the selected and retained images). Kovach (1987) noted that an understanding of volunteer involvement is a key to the success of managers of volunteers and to the effectiveness of the organizations they manage. Liao-Troth and Dunn (1999) observed that the structure that makes nonprofit sector so distinctive is its extensive reliance on a voluntary based workforce. The authors assessed sensemaking of volunteer motivation from the managers’ point of view and compared with a previous study of
volunteers themselves. The survey findings indicated that managers tend to make sense of volunteer motivation in the same way that volunteers do. The authors suggested that, in order to be effective, managers must possess a precise understanding of their employees' motivation to work, whether they are volunteer or paid staff.

Researching NGOs in Lithuania, Jaskyte and Kisieliene (2006) observed that a number of scholarly literature exists to prove that Leadership Behaviour impacts employee creativity in NGOs. This study noted that innovative cognitive style, intrinsic motivation, and cultural norms from diversity were the most important predictors for creativity. Creativity is the building block of innovation and it can provide the competitive edge in programming, fundraising, marketing, budgeting, and many other areas (Anderson and College, 1992). The study revealed that leadership has been repeatedly identified as playing a crucial role in fostering and supporting employee creativity.

Osborne (2008) studied the linkages with matters like innovation and the internal structures of the organisation, in NGOs. The structural characteristics were a function of internal environment such as its leadership and patterns of communication, perception of and relation to its external environment, and institutional context and its search for legitimacy. The study pointed out that the innovative capacity of voluntary organizations has a relationship with the specialization of their job roles and the professionalization of work processes within these organizations.

The studies referred above, viewed together with the studies in section 2.8, assessing the impact of leadership on employees in general, indicate that leadership outcomes can be measured using employee parameters like creativity, innovation, motivation etc.

2.13: Summary

The literature perused within this chapter brings forth the following

- There is a continuing search for understanding “excellence in leadership, both at Individual levels and at organisational levels
• Servant Leadership has emerged as a distinct paradigm that might provide answers to this quest for Excellence in Leadership

• Servant Leadership is a suitable subject for empirical studies

• Servant Leadership has been practiced in many successful organisations and is a suitable model for corporates

• Since the “followers” feel taken care of under Servant Leadership, they feel motivated to achieve more for the organisation, do more for the community around them, and create a positive organisational climate

• This higher level of motivation and positive organisational climate can result into higher organisational performance.

• In line with other leadership attributes, Servant Leadership attributes can be measured

• Validated tools are available for measuring Servant Leadership attributes

• Validated tools are available for studying the interrelationships between Servant Leadership attributes and other employee parameters like On-the-Job performance, Organisational Commitment and Community Citizenship Behaviour.

• NGOs have an important role to play in the development and well being of humanity. They complement the efforts by the Government, Public sector and Private sector organisations.

• While external factors like funding and policies play an important role in the overall effectiveness of NGOs, management/leadership of the organisation is equally important.

• NGOs are subject to increased level of public scrutiny and the need for transparency and ethical leadership is on the rise.
• The measurement of Leadership effectiveness of an NGO using outcome measures is difficult and no established methods are available.

• However, the measurement of Leadership effectiveness using impact on employees is a feasible proposition.

• There is a need for developing leadership skills among NGOs

• Servant Leadership could be a natural fit for the NGO sector, considering its focus on Social impact and Community relationships.

• When leaders in NGOs demonstrate Servant Leadership characteristics, it impacts the employees' motivation to perform and hence the NGOs are expected to make a greater impact.

2.14: Research Gaps

The study of available literature brings out the following Research Gaps

• The researcher has not been able to lay his hands on any documented study on Servant Leadership in India. By the same token, we did not come across a study focusing on Servant Leadership in NGOs in India

• There is limited research on the application of Servant Leadership in the NGO or Non Profit Sector world wide

• The relationship between various demographic variables and Servant Leadership in NGOs has not been studied in India.