



## Introduction – Volume 3, Issue 1

Phillip Bryant, Ph.D., Columbus State University

Executive Editor, SLTP

As it is our expressed goal to move the field of servant leadership forward, it is also our goal to move your journal forward. We've made a few changes here at SLTP. Our co-founder and my good friend, Dr. Steve Brown, has relocated to a different university. Steve's change of focus gave us reason to act upon our desire to build an editorial team.

We are proud to have on board our new Associate Editors; Dr. Steve Brown, Dr. Victor Claar, Dr. Kevin Hurt, Dr. Kathleen Patterson, and Dr. Neal Thomson. Each has been a good friend to our journal and to our field. Renee Lambert, former Editorial Assistant for SLTP, has graduated and accepted another position; Danielle Vann has stepped into the responsibility of Editorial Assistant. I have taken on the role of Executive Editor.

Contributors and reviewers alike will be pleased to know that we are working with the CSU library to move our process from a manual, email-based system, to a more automated, online system. The conversion process will be completed this spring. With these improved structure and processes we are positioned to proudly ask that all stakeholders encourage their colleagues to submit their work to SLTP.

In addition to these changes, SLTP has partnered with CSU's Turner College of Business to inaugurate the first annual Contemporary Thoughts on Servant Leadership, a speaker series highlighting successful servant leaders who are willing to tackle difficult topics in servant leadership such as power, self-interest, managing competing interests, the role of the follower in servant leadership, and applying Greenleaf's best test. Many of these presentations will be uploaded to the Turner College's YouTube channel.

Now, on to our current articles. In our editorial essay one year ago, Dr. Brown and I wrote about "the lack of agreed upon measures" in servant leadership (Brown & Bryant, 2015, p.10). Though the lack of agreement may still exist, I think most servant leadership scholars can agree that the field already has reliable and well validated measurement instruments. See Green, Rodriguez, Wheeler, and Baggerly-Hinojosa (2015) for a review.

Rather than reinventing new measures, I would urge researchers to use the existing measures to further delineate and validate proper uses of those that already exist. SLTP

## 10 P. BRYANT

will continue to consider new measures for publication, but will also hold them to high standards of conventional psychometrics before accepting them for publication.

Having stated the foregoing, then why is our first article in this issue focused on the creation of a new servant leadership assessment? The reviewers and editors involved in the decision process came to the conclusion that a behavioral-based, 360 degree feedback assessment designed specifically for leadership performance appraisal and development is a substantially different tool than the existing servant leadership measures which were designed and developed primarily for purposes of conducting scholarly research. (We acknowledge that Laub's, [1999] OLA was designed also for practical application within organizations, but this tool is more of a measure of organizational climate and culture rather than a measure of individual leaders' servant leadership behaviors.)

Also in this issue, we are proud to present Eric Russell's "Servant Leadership's Cycle of Benefit." Herein, Russell reminds the reader that servant leadership is practiced by real people with real personal motives and agendas and that it is alright to acknowledge that the practice of servant leadership can be expected to come with its own rewards for the leader as well as the follower.

With their article, "Cultivating Dialogue," Ralph Gigliotti and Brigid Dwyer make the case that good dialogue should be seen as a competency of servant leaders, is a potential [partial] solution to social injustice, is a primary value of servant leadership, and is actually "constitutive of servant leadership itself."

Rounding out this edition of SLTP is Michael Duffy's, "Gung Ho, Marine!" in which he examines Evans Carlson's use of Gung Ho within the 2nd Marine Raider Battalion. Duffy builds and defends the idea that Gung Ho and servant leadership hold much in common.

As always, it has been our pleasure to produce for you this edition of SLTP. We hope you find its contents useful for both theory and practice.

## REFERENCES

- Brown, S., & Bryant, P. (2015). Getting to know the elephant: A call to advance servant leadership through construct consensus, empirical evidence, and multilevel theoretical development. *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice*, 2(1), 10-35.
- Green, M., Rodriguez, R., Wheeler, C., & Baggerly-Hinojosa, B. (2015). Servant leadership: A quantitative review of instruments and related findings. *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice*, 2(2), 76-96.
- Laub, J. (1999). Assessing the servant organizational leadership assessment (SOLA) instrument. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation & Theses database. (UMI No. 99219922).