FIGURE 5:
Final model of servant leadership’s contingent effects

Solid lines (———) represent direct links.
Dashed lines (---------) represent moderations.
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION

6.1 Summary of results

Given the large number of hypotheses and predictions tested in this study, this section opens with a restatement of the major findings, illustrated in Figure 5 and primarily contained within the analytical models of moderated mediation, as given the significant results found in those models, they contain the most complete information in this research regarding servant leadership's effects. Servant leadership affected all three predicted outcomes of employee voice, in-role performance, and servant leadership behaviors, through a variety of different mechanisms and some contingencies. As predicted, servant leadership behaviors were linked to subordinate prosocial motivation and positive psychological capital, although those effects proved to be dependent upon subordinate female gender role schema, such that servant leadership was effective at growing these personal characteristics when subordinates were high in female gender role schema, but less effective for subordinates low in female gender role schema. Of the two mediators, there was some evidence that prosocial motivation further impacted subordinate voice behaviors, whereas psychological capital had positive effects on both subordinate voice and subordinate servant leadership. The moderated mediation hypotheses involving the gender of the leader were not supported, but the proposed interaction did serve to predict all three outcomes in a direct manner, such that servant leadership exhibited main effects on voice, performance, and employee servant leadership when the manager was female. The two moderators therefore operated in conjunction with servant leadership in strikingly different manners: manager sex moderated direct effects of servant leadership, whereas subordinate gender role schema moderated the indirect, transformative impact of servant leadership.

Overall, these results support servant leadership's usefulness in the modern organizational context, as well as the social learning approach to servant leadership, predictions of gender role
congruity theory (Eagly & Karau, 2002), Greenleaf's (1970) original proposal of servant leadership's contagious nature, and the influence processes outlined in this dissertation. The temporally lagged nature of this study is worthy of note, in that nearly all major servant leadership research to date (Ehrhart, 2004; Hu & Liden, 2011; Hunter et al., 2013; Liden, Wayne, Liao, & Meuser, 2014b; Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008; Schaubroeck, Lam, & Peng, 2011; van Dierendonck, Stam, Boersma, de Windt, & Alkema, 2013) has been cross-sectional (see Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010, for an exception), providing additional evidence for servant leadership's effectiveness. As one of the first studies to investigate moderating boundary conditions of servant leadership, as well as the first to test new mediators (prosocial motivation and PsyCap) and outcomes (voice and subordinate servant leadership), this research builds our understanding of why, how, and when servant leadership works, in accordance with the basic guidelines of conceptual understanding and theory (Whetten, 1989).

In the sections that follow, I discuss this study's theoretical and practical implications, as well as its strengths, limitations, and suggested avenues for further research.

6.2 Implications

6.2.1 Theoretical implications and future research directions

One important contribution of this study is the proposal of a new conceptual definition of servant leadership itself, as the construct has gone mostly undefined in both academic journals and practitioner books and magazines. Even when servant leadership is defined in research or practice, it is usually explained as either "a style of leadership which...", leaving its true meaning somewhat vague, or it is defined by its outcomes, as is the case with Greenleaf's popular definition of servant leadership as creating others who are "healthier, wiser, freer", etc. (Greenleaf, 1970). By proposing servant leadership as influence behaviors, manifested humbly and ethically within relationships and oriented toward follower development, empowerment, and continuous and meaningful improvement for all stakeholders, I hope to contribute to ongoing debates as to what leadership in general, and servant leadership specifically, represent. This proposed
definition of servant leadership is not the first proposed by scholars, and I hold no illusions that it will be the last. However, even if this definition is not accepted by the general servant leadership community, it is my hope that its introduction will at least catalyze a discussion that has so far been lacking: beyond the operational definition, what exactly does servant leadership mean?

Given the community's progress in studying servant leadership, it seems somewhat backward that this discussion has not yet taken place; indeed, agreement on conceptual definition of a construct is a necessary precondition to strong and testable theory regarding that construct (Hempel, 1965).

The definition of servant leadership proposed here does have several meaningful advantages for leadership researchers, including its similarity with scholars' ideas of what leadership should be and how it should be studied (Nohria & Khurana, 2010; Podolny, Khurana, & Besharov, 2010; Yukl, 2010) and its alignment with Robert Greenleaf's own ideas of how servant leadership should be understood (Greenleaf, 1970, 1996). As weaknesses are noted in the current dominant and fully task-focused approaches to leadership in research (Van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013; Yukl, 1999) and as those approaches come to be viewed as inadequate for ensuring organizational survival in the modern context (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Graham, 1991; Nohria & Khurana, 2010), it is important that management scholars identify a theoretically sound, effective, and sustainable leadership theory. Although servant leadership is not yet that ideal theory, it is my hope that this paper helps to develop such a theory and moves servant leadership down that road. Of the three most researched "positive" approaches to leadership in the literature, servant leadership stands alone in its conceptual and operational emphasis on organizational performance and sustainable stakeholder good. Neither authentic leadership (Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008) nor ethical leadership (Brown, Treviño, & Harrison, 2005) include performance orientations or behaviors in their conceptual and operational structures; servant leadership, on the other hand, may be a more holistic approach to the type of leadership needed for modern organizations to succeed (Liden, Panaccio, Meuser, Hu, & Wayne, 2014a; Nohria & Khurana, 2010). In this way, attention by scholars to servant leadership, an approach
introduced nearly five decades ago, may "close the leadership circle" by suggesting an answer to our query of how to research and promote an effective, theoretical, and sustainable form of leadership.

Authentic leadership (Gardner, Cogliser, Davis, & Dickens, 2011; Walumbwa et al., 2008) focuses on the authenticity and transparency of the leader him or herself, with a limited behavioral focus, whereas ethical leadership (Brown & Treviño, 2006) employs a narrow focus on the leader's own ethical character, and his or her behavioral attempts to transmit those ethics to others in the organization. All three positive schools of leadership arguably rose to academic prominence following the ethical scandals of the early twenty-first century, due to perceived weaknesses in the ethically neutral transformation paradigm and the rise of the positive organizational scholarship literature (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Bass & Steidlmeyer, 1999; Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003). Although they are sometimes conceptually distinguished from one another in introductory papers, their differences (and differential predictive power) remain somewhat murky. Questions of when a researcher (or organization, for that matter) should consider servant leadership, as opposed to authentic or ethical leadership, may be difficult to answer. I believe that this cross-conceptual vagueness is a logical outcome of conceptual vagueness in the servant leadership construct itself, and I hope that renewed attention to its definition helps resolve these issues. It may be that servant leadership's emphases on stakeholders and their development is what sets it apart from these other schools of positive leadership, just as attention to the leader's own honesty and authenticity is somewhat unique to authentic leadership, and attention to the leader's explicit efforts to enforce and share ethical character are somewhat unique to the ethical approach. More theoretical and empirical work distinguishing these approaches should be fruitful.

Although this study is not the first to propose (Liden et al., 2014a; Russell & Stone, 2002) nor test (Liden et al., 2014b; Walumbwa et al., 2010) the social learning perspective to explain servant leadership's outcomes, I contribute to the literature by producing evidence for its
usefulness in studying servant leadership and empirically demonstrating new avenues by which it may operate. Indeed, given the explicit importance of role modeling and subordinate development in early servant leadership theorizing (Graham, 1991; Greenleaf, 1977; Liden et al., 2008), it is surprising that more servant leadership research has not examined it from a social learning angle. Mechanisms such as trust and reciprocity are commonly cited in leadership research (Dirks, 2000; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), and undoubtedly play a role in servant leadership processes, but do not speak to the fundamental transformation of individuals' motives and abilities suggested by servant leadership theory. It is feasible that such servant leadership development takes place over significant periods of time (Bandura, 1977), so mechanisms such as trust and social exchange may serve as initial or parallel processes by which servant leaders impact outcomes. Evidence exists for many mechanisms of servant leadership's effectiveness, and this research supports the role of social learning, rather than providing any evidence against other mechanisms. Although I planned to control for trust in my analyses, extreme collinearity between trust and servant leadership rendered this infeasible. Future studies should consider modeling relationships which contain multiple mechanisms simultaneously, so as to better understand how these mechanisms might work together, vary sequentially, or even interact with one another.

To my knowledge, this is the first empirical test of prosocial motivation and positive psychological capital as mediators of servant leadership, although both have been theorized as likely mechanisms of servant and general positive leadership (e.g. Liden et al., 2008; Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007). Results here do support the contingent theory of servant leadership presented in this dissertation, although with some meaningful caveats. For instance, this study's results support contingent links from servant leadership to prosocial motivation and psychological capital, supporting the social learning approach, but both mediators were curiously unrelated to in-role performance in my analyses (servant leadership was itself directly related to in-role performance, moderated by leader gender, as will be discussed below). Both mediators have been linked to various types of performance in previous empirical scholarship (Grant, 2008;
Korsgaard, Meglino, & Lester, 1997; Luthans et al., 2007), suggesting that the lack of a result here may have been driven by the sample. There is some evidence that the nature of Organization 1 (which was the largest in my multi-organizational sample) may have played a role; prior to data collection, I conducted several qualitative interviews at this large profit-focused financial transactions company. Compared to similar interviews I have conducted with other organizations, the salience of citizenship seemed somewhat low; both employees and managers commented on how organizational and community citizenship (both conceptually aligned with prosocial motivation and psychological capital) had never historically been seen as very important within the company. If these interviews are generalizable to the company as a whole, this might help to explain the lack of relationship between the mediators and in-role performance. Replication of this study in different types of organizational environments is necessary before any strong conclusions regarding these mediators can be reached.

The relationships of the mediators to the other two outcomes of voice and employee servant leadership behaviors were somewhat stronger. Both are new outcomes of servant leadership untested in previous literature, although voice has been described as a mechanism by which servant leadership might grow procedural justice climates (Walumbwa et al., 2010) and employee enactment of servant leadership is arguably the primary, fundamental outcome of servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1977, 1996; Liden et al., 2014a), albeit previously untested. With this in mind, the results of this study are quite encouraging, answering several calls from leadership scholars (Liden et al., 2008; Spears, 2002; van Dierendonck, 2011). This research serves as the first scholarship to empirically test and verify the assertion at the heart of servant leadership that those led by servant leaders become wiser, freer, and more likely to become servant leadership themselves (Greenleaf, 1970). This is an important development in this field, in that it speaks to the long-term sustainability of the servant-as-leader approach, provides support for the theoretical and conceptual roots of the construct, and opens promising new lines of research inquiry as to how servant leadership aligns with leader development.
One question left unanswered by this research is how such leader development processes may play out over time, and whether other leadership competencies are developed alongside servant leadership (Dragoni, Tesluk, Russell, & Oh, 2009). Additionally, if the followers of servant leaders become servant leaders themselves, what then do leadership networks look like? As empowerment is a fundamental operational element of servant leadership (Ehrhart, 2004; Liden et al., 2008) and as servant leaders are by nature willing to share power, these results suggest the emergence of shared leadership team processes (D’Innocenzo, Mathieu, & Kukenberger, 2014) within groups led by servant leaders. Consistent with theories of adaptive leadership (DeRue, 2011) and followership (Uhl-Bien, Riggio, Lowe, & Carsten, 2013), leader role influence can then emerge throughout organizations and teams, which should have meaningful implications for processes and performance. Over time, do additional positive effects on performance and other outcome variables appear as leadership emerges from multiple sources? If the hierarchical manager grants leader identities to others on her team who had become servant leaders, what impact would this have on the outcomes and processes of leadership?

Another major contribution of this study is the integration of gender role congruity theory with the servant leadership approach to identify a female leadership advantage. Sex is often considered one of the most salient factors determining leadership emergence (Kent & Moss, 1994; Schein, 1973), with men nearly universally more likely to emerge as leaders due to implicit "think leader, think male" masculine leader stereotypes (Bem, 1981; Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992; Schein, 1973). As leadership has traditionally been seen as dominant, independent, aggressive, forceful, and otherwise typically masculine (Eagly & Karau, 2002), female leaders have struggled with cognitive dissonance in their implementation of leader behaviors, despite the equivalent quality of those behaviors (Morrison, White, & Van Velsor, 1987). As part of their gender role congruity theory, Eagly and Karau (2002) specifically raised the possibility that women might hold advantages for any less masculine forms of leadership, forms more communal in nature, although they called any such approaches "rare". Over a decade
later, this study supports their prediction: although not exclusively communal and feminine, servant leadership is certainly more balanced than most traditional forms of leadership, providing a model by which female and communal gender stereotypes are more closely aligned.

It is worth noting that the sex of the servant leader did not, however, impact the developing effects of servant leadership on subordinate prosocial motivation and positive psychological capital; rather, female servant leaders were able to directly impact the outcomes of voice, performance, and employee servant leadership, whereas male servant leaders in this sample were less able to do so directly. This does not mean that men are unsuited to servant leadership, any more than classical leadership research results have meant that females were unsuited to leadership; rather, it seems that females may have a distinct advantage when using the servant leadership approach due to implicit leader and gender stereotypes (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Although the slopes from servant leadership behaviors to the outcomes were insignificant for male managers, male managers had no such disadvantages when their leadership influence worked its way through the mediators of prosocial motivation and psychological capital. This is itself an interesting result worthy of consideration and eventual replication, and suggests several follow-up questions: are females then able to more quickly impact organizational outcomes through servant leadership than males? Would females have a natural advantage in using servant leadership to build trust (Hu & Liden, 2011; Schaubroeck et al., 2011) and service climates (Hunter et al., 2013; Liden et al., 2014b), other empirically supported mediators of servant leadership? Might there be an interaction between leader and follower genders in determining the effectiveness of developing the servant leadership of the follower? All of these are promising research questions.

Social learning theory itself provides an interesting counter-argument which may help to explain the lack of a moderated mediation for leader gender. Specifically, social learning processes become stronger and more effective as behaviors are perceived as more unexpected and unique (Pyszczynski & Greenberg, 1981). With this in mind, it is possible that a male servant
leader would actually make for a stronger social learning model, as a male servant leader engaging in more feminine and communal activities such as "emotional healing" and relationship building (Liden et al., 2008) might be seen as more unexpected than if those same behaviors emerged from a female manager. Thus, although role congruity theory supports the female manager as having the servant leadership advantage, social learning theory provides evidence for the male manager. This conflict is captured in the results of this study, such that females do have the advantage for direct effects of servant leadership, but the advantage is neutralized for the social-learning-dependent paths to prosocial motivation and psychological capital.

Whereas the gender of the leader moderated the direct link from servant leadership behaviors to the distal outcomes, the female gender role schema of the follower moderated the link from servant leadership to the mediators of prosocial motivation and positive psychological capital. This suggests that gender schema may be a boundary condition of servant leadership unique to its social learning effects, but possibly absent from its effects through trust and service climate. As hypothesized, the effects of servant leadership on mediating subordinate characteristics were strongest when subordinates had higher female gender schemas, consistent with theories of person-supervisor fit (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005), gender congruity (Eagly & Karau, 2002), and similarity attraction (Byrne, 1971). For the proposed social learning processes to take place, employees seemed to need some level of comfort with the more feminine and communal aspects of servant leadership (Bandura, 1977). As gender role did not moderate direct effects of servant leadership on outcomes, this suggests a question of how subordinates low in female gender schema might be affected by servant leadership initially. Will they come to trust a supervisor over time, sufficient to 'break through' their low female gender schema, or might team processes within a strong servant climate have the same effect? Does the theoretically orthogonal masculine gender schema play a role? Of these, the first question seems especially interesting, and also raises the issue of whether gender schema might itself be changed.
by exposure to servant leadership, as an individual's gender schema may be somewhat flexible (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

Altogether, these results provide strong support for the theory of servant leadership presented here, indicating the salience of social learning, the critical moderating roles of leader gender and follower gender schema, and servant leadership's impacts on prosocial motivation, positive psychological capital, performance, voice, and the development of servant leadership behaviors in others. As servant leadership continues to grow in popularity and prevalence, this research will hopefully provide a base framework for future questions regarding its efficacies and effects. Although the model tested provides meaningful support for the servant leadership theory developed here and by other scholars (Greenleaf, 1977; Liden et al., 2014a), several other mediators and outcomes remain untested. For instance, values, defined as the "guideposts" that provide meaning to experiences and help individuals determine toward what ends to guide their behaviors (George & Jones, 1996; Lewin, 1951; Perrewé & Hochwarter, 2001) are distinct from motivation (Parks & Guay, 2009) and may also grow through exposure to servant leadership, and relate from there to organizational and personal outcomes. Community citizenship (Liden et al., 2008), untested in this research, also seems a critical component of servant leadership theory: if individuals truly are becoming more servant-like and concerned about the improvement of communities and society, would they not become more active in their citizenship outside of work? Additionally, would these relationships hold while controlling for other styles of leadership, from the predominant transformational approach to the more closely related ethical leadership style?

Perhaps the two most important conclusions from this study involve the outcome of employee servant leadership behaviors, and the moderations by gender constructs. In the case of the former, this research is the first to empirically demonstrate that servant leadership does indeed create servant leaders, just as Greenleaf (1970) originally proposed, and just as servant leadership theorists have been predicting ever since (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Liden et al., 2008; van
Dierendonck, 2011). This is a very promising development for servant leadership scholarship, "closing the research circle" by returning to the very first outcome ever proposed for servant leadership, and the one Greenleaf suggested as most important. Academically, this finding suggests the potential for integration with other theories of distributed leadership and many new promising areas of research inquiry. In the case of the latter, I conclude that females have a distinct advantage in implementing servant leadership, as opposed to males or other leader approaches, providing a method by which longstanding male implicit leadership prototypes (Lord, Foti, & de Vader, 1984; Schein, 1973) might be offset. Replication is certainly needed, but this suggests that just as society is changing to become more accepting of female leaders (Davidson & Burke, 2012), leadership itself may be changing to become more gender-neutral (Eagly & Karau, 2002), making opportunities more accessible to all.

6.2.2 Practical implications

These results provide practical guidance for organizations hoping to install people-oriented, moral, and stakeholder-driven models of leadership within their management teams. First and foremost, this study adds to a growing body of evidence that servant leadership, despite its lack of primary and proximal focus on goals, mission, and profits, nonetheless has meaningful positive effects on goals, mission, and profits (Liden et al., 2014b; Peterson, Galvin, & Lange, 2012; Schaubroeck et al., 2011). Beyond these results, however, this research also suggests several other outcomes of potential interest to organizations. Servant leadership can grow employee prosocial motivation, which may in turn lead to organizational citizenship and proactivity (Grant, 2008; Rioux & Penner, 2001), and positive psychological capital, which raises employee commitment, performance, well-being, and safety (Newman, Ucbasaran, Zhu, & Hirst, 2014). The employee voice outcome of servant leadership may be valuable to organizations for its positive impacts on decision quality, learning and development, and employee job satisfaction (Morrison, 2011). And if servant leaders truly are capable of creating more servant leaders from
their employees, the other benefits mentioned here improve exponentially, not even mentioning resources saved that would be used in leader development and succession planning efforts.

A writer with the Harvard Business School press recently asked the question, "Why aren't there more servant leaders?" (Heskett, 2013). If servant leadership is such a good thing for organizations and businesses, he asked, and if so many people write so much about it, why isn't it more prevalent? These results may provide a partial answer to this quandary. As this study suggests that servant leadership may be more difficult in the short-term for male managers to successfully enact (due to male managers needing to work through the social learning mediators), and given the very small percentage of female executives in modern organizations (Gayle, Golan, & Miller, 2012), it is feasible that male members of top management teams might attempt servant leadership, initially struggle with it, and give up on it before its developmental effects have a chance to take shape. As both positive and negative leadership behaviors tend to transmit through organizations from the top in a "trickle-down" manner (Aryee, Chen, Sun, & Debrah, 2007; Mayer, Kuenzi, Greenbaum, Bardes, & Salvador, 2009), this could explain the absence of more dominant servant leadership frameworks in modern organizations. This study provides evidence that male managers may initially struggle with some aspects of servant leadership, but also suggests that the difference between male and female managers may fade in the long-term, as servant leadership effects route through prosocial motivation and positive psychological capital.

Servant leadership is not a "quick" solution, and it may not be one that many managers are suited for; although research on antecedents of servant leadership is somewhat minimal, Greenleaf suggested that only a very special kind of "servant," with genuine concern for others, was truly suited to become a servant leader. On the other hand, narcissism may be somewhat prevalent in the upper echelons of organizations (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007; Gerstner, König, Enders, & Hambrick, 2013) where trickle-down leadership would need to start, representing another barrier to servant leadership in organizations. It is likely that some managers, at both high and low levels, have 'faked' servant leadership behaviors at some point, perhaps after attending a
training, reading a book or magazine article, or hearing about it from others. These leaders may experience cognitive dissonance if their own motives are not so other-centric as their servant leadership behaviors might indicate (Maio, Cheung, Pakizeh, & Rees, 2009; Rokeach, 1973). On the other hand, though, as Kurt Vonnegut wrote in *Mother Night*, "We are what we pretend to be," and we become what we pretend to be, an idea that has been supported in psychological research (Galinsky, Wang, & Ku, 2008). Such behaviors can become habitual over time, by simple virtue of repetition and priming (Aarts & Dijksterhuis, 2000; Neal, Wood, Labrecque, & Lally, 2012). Again, this points to the same practical advice as the previous paragraph: organizational management must give adequate time for servant leadership to work its effects on individual outcomes. It may not operate especially quickly, particularly in organizations which are predominantly viewed by their employees as masculine (such as heavy industry or transportation, perhaps).

Female managers may find the most useful practical implications in this study, as my results suggest that servant leadership is an ideal leadership style for women to use in order to minimize and even invert the usually negative effects of masculine leadership stereotypes and associated cognitive dissonance. Due to its nature as being more communally oriented than traditional styles of leadership, this study demonstrates that women may be more effective as servant leaders than men. These findings suggest that modern organizations, especially those in more female-dominated and communal industries, should consider training new managers on servant leadership practices, rather than the more common and predominant transformational and transactional approaches. Although there is certainly not a one-size-fits-all solution to leadership, even for a gender group, women who in the past have struggled to match more masculine and agentic approaches and expectations of leadership (Eagly & Karau, 2002) may find servant leadership a more palatable and effective approach. The gender schema findings also suggest the usefulness of servant leadership particularly in such communal industries characterized by helping and service, such as healthcare and education.
6.2.3 Limitations

Although this study has many strengths such as its temporally lagged nature, multi-organizational framework, and detailed analysis of multi-level moderated mediation, it is not without its limitations. The first of these may be the sample size - although this study featured a multi-organizational sample spanning a variety of industries, the actual sample size of participants was somewhat small. Additionally, although employee and manager participation was quite high in two of the three organizations sampled, the response rate was somewhat lower in the largest organization (46% for employees; 51% for managers). Two factors, however, may minimize concerns regarding response rates and sample size. First, the multi-level power analysis conducted a priori indicated that this sample size was more than sufficient to identify effects of moderate size in all relationships. Second, missing data analyses confirmed that the data missing from that organization was missing at random, in that the demographics of the sample were not significantly different from those of the organization, and no study variables were related to whether a particular case was missing or not. Together, this data bolsters the validity of the sample and the generalizability of these results.

A second limitation was also related to the sample size, in that each moderated mediation was tested piecemeal, rather than all at once. A preferred approach might be to test all mediations, moderations, and outcomes simultaneously, likely in a multi-level structural equation modeling (MSEM) framework (Preacher, Zyphur, & Zhang, 2010). Unfortunately, the sample size in this study was not appropriate for this type of approach. The relatively low correlations among most study variables, however, and the robustness of the results given the small sample size and the variance decomposition framework used, lend confidence to the results of the hypothesis testing.

Third, more control variables might be ideal to test these relationships and rule out alternative explanations for the effects recorded. Although "blind" inclusion of control variables is not recommended in organizational research and some scholars have argued that management research controls overmuch and risks skewing true effects (Spector & Brannick, 2011), the use of
carefully chosen controls can be useful to isolate alternate effects and explanations. Subordinate trust in leaders was meant to be a control to help rule out an alternative explanation for servant leadership's effects, for instance, but was revealed to be far too highly correlated with other variables to be a useful control. Survey length restrictions from the organizations which took part in the study precluded the inclusion of other leadership scales and additional mechanism controls. Ideally, with a larger sample with greater tolerance for survey length, tests would be conducted to determine whether these effects are truly unique to servant leadership, and how they are affected by the measurement of other leadership behaviors (such as authentic or ethical leadership).

Although this study was temporally lagged, this was not sufficient to determine causality nor rule out reciprocal effects. Whereas these results provide some evidence, for instance, that servant leadership behaviors can grow positive psychological capital or voice behaviors in others, it is also feasible that the causal arrow works in the opposite direction. That is, managers might be spurred to the relationship-building and empowerment of servant leadership through their employees' high PsyCap and voice, or servant leaders might purposely select employees already high in these constructs. This study was temporally lagged in that manager-ratings of outcomes were rated after employee-ratings of leadership, and such that mediators were measured after outcomes (in two out of three organizations), but as these were neither exclusively new employees nor new employee-manager relationships, a strict causal order cannot be empirically verified. Future research might use qualitative or experience sampling methods to unpack these relationships, or examine new manager-employee teams to determine exactly how these process develop and play out initially, and over time.

Finally, to build and test a truly complete theory of servant leadership, antecedents of servant leadership would need to be theorized and tested as well. Little is currently known about the factors which drive individuals to engage in servant leadership (Hunter et al., 2013), although this study provides some evidence for antecedents in its finding of significant relationships among positive psychological capital, experienced servant leadership, and displayed servant
leadership. Given my interest in the outcomes, processes, and boundary conditions of servant leadership, antecedents were not included in this study. Future research should expand the theory of servant leadership started here and in other work (Greenleaf, 1977; Liden et al., 2014a; van Dierendonck, 2011) by specifically examining its antecedents.

6.2.4 Conclusion

Nearly fifty years ago, Robert Greenleaf conceptualized servant leadership as a force for both organizational and societal good, which would, in his words, help grow others into individuals who were "healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants" (Greenleaf, 1970). This research supports this proposition, finding evidence that servant leadership may in fact alter individuals to become healthier through positive psychological capital, wiser with prosocial motivation, freer and more autonomous with their expression of voice behaviors, and, finally, more likely themselves to become servant leaders. This final finding, closing and completing a circle of servant leadership, may be very encouraging for scholars and organizations. As servant leadership also boosts job performance, this style of leadership emerges as a holistic theory of effective management, boosting performance while providing a range of positive and ethical outcomes, in many ways an excellent match for the type of theoretically supported positive leadership which scholars and practitioners alike have been seeking for years (Graham, 1982; Hackman, 2010; Nohria & Khurana, 2010). Beyond answering calls for this type of sustainable leadership for a modern world, servant leadership also provides an intriguing answer for women who have struggled with traditionally male prototypes of leadership, potentially turning the "think leader, think male" prototype on its head and giving females an implicit advantage in their employee management. Altogether, the contingent theory of servant leadership is supported, suggesting the usefulness of a new approach (or perhaps, more accurately, the relevance of an old one) for modern organizational and personal success.
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