



Moving Servant Leadership Forward: One Issue at a Time

Phillip Bryant, Ph.D.

Steven Brown, Ph.D.

Co-editors, *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice*

Introduction, Volume 2, Issue 2

We published the inaugural issue of *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice*, one year ago with the stated mission “to advance servant leadership, both as a field of academic study and as a management practice” (Bryant & Brown, 2014). We’ve been encouraged by the quantity and quality of researchers and practitioners who share similar missions and have submitted their work to further advance the field of servant leadership. We recognize that you have many other publication outlets to make your submission choices, and we are honored every time you choose us to consider your work. We are also humbled when we consider the caliber of individuals whose work we’ve been given the opportunity to publish. Every one of our authors is outstanding in their own right. We encourage you to do an Internet search on any of our authors. You will find that, as an author, you are in very good company, and, as a reader, you are a part of the audience of some truly great minds.

In Volume 1, Issue 1, Claar, Jackson, and TenHaken (2014) wrote: “it seems possible that a skillful manager may potentially draw from the quiver of authentic servant leadership on a situational basis” (p. 46). In the present issue, Staats builds on this idea as he offers us “The Adaptable Emphasis Leadership Model.” With his model, Staats nicely places servant leadership within the well-established contingency perspective of leadership. It is also of interest to note that Staats offers the possibility of what he coins “pseudo-servant leadership” versus “authentic servant leadership” much in the same vein as Bass and Steidlmeier’s (1999) “pseudo-transformational leadership” versus “authentic transformational leadership.”

In Volume 2, Issue 1, Reed explored servant leadership within the emergency response and services industry (2015). Here, she conducted a quantitative study of 897 9-1-1 emergency communications center (ECC) employees in North America

(predominantly the United States and Canada) and Australia. She found that ECC employees typically rate their leaders high on servant leadership qualities. She also found that these leaders' servant leadership behaviors had a positive relationship ($R^2 = 0.42$) with followers' organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs).

Keeping with both the content and contextual themes of Reed's article, we've included two similarly themed articles in the present publication. In regards to a theme of similar content, we offer Brubaker, Bocarnea, Patterson, and Winston's article, "Servant Leadership and Organizational Citizenship." Herein, they explore the relationship between servant leadership and OCBs as did Reed (2015), but their context is in Rwanda. They find that the positive relationship between servant leadership and OCBs is fully mediated by followers' perceptions of their leaders' effectiveness. In other words, according to the analysis of their data, it is through the perceptions of effective leadership associated with servant leadership that followers' OCBs appear to emanate. Also, in line with mounting evidence from additional studies (cf. Carroll & Patterson, 2014; Reed, 2015; Trompenaars & Voerman, 2010), Brubaker and his colleagues add to the evidence that servant leadership is indeed a universal principle.

In regards to similarities of context with Reed's (2015) article, herein you will find Russell, Broomé, and Prince's article, "Discovering the Servant in Fire and Emergency Services Leaders." In this qualitative study of 15 uniformed and sworn fire and emergency officers, they discover primarily that "fire and emergency leaders must serve their followers," and serve them specifically by developing them, meeting their needs, and listening to them.

Finally, in the previous volume, we wrote about "Getting to Know the Elephant" of servant leadership (Brown & Bryant, 2015) in which we discussed the "lack of agreed upon measures in servant leadership" (p. 10). Our final article within this publication is written by Green, Rodriguez, Wheeler, and Baggerly-Hinojosa. They begin to tackle the problem of a "lack of agreed upon measures" in their quantitative review of servant leadership instruments and related findings. They also offer a summary of servant leadership outcomes as measured by these instruments in various studies. Their summary organizes these servant leadership outcomes into leader, follower, and organizational-level outcomes.

To conclude our introduction to this issue, we want to thank you for your submissions, your readership, and your ambassadorship of our journal and field of servant leadership. Keep serving. Keep leading.

REFERENCES

- Bass, B.M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 181-217.
- 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.
- Bryant, P., & Brown, S. (2014). Enthusiastic skepticism: The role of SLTP in advancing servant leadership. *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice*, 1(1), 7-11.
- Carroll, B.C., & Patterson, K. (2014). Servant leadership: A cross cultural study between India and the United States. *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice*, 1(1), 16-45.
- Claar, V., Jackson, L., & TenHaken, V. (2014). Are servant leaders born or made? *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice*, 1(1), 46-52.
- Reed, L. (2015). Servant leadership, followership, and organizational citizenship behaviors in 9-1-1 emergency communications centers: Implications of a national study. *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice*, 2(1), 71-94.
- Trompenaars, F., & Voerman, E. (2010) *Servant leadership across cultures: Harnessing the strength of the world's most powerful leadership style*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.